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Abstract
This thesis is a study of the ways in which readers actively and collaboratively co-produce fiction. It focuses on American Sherlockians, a group of devotees of Arthur Conan Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes stories. At its centre is an analysis of geographical and travel writings these readers produced about Holmes’s life and world, in the later years of the twentieth century. I argue that Sherlockian writings indicate a tendency to practise what I term ‘expansionary literary geography’; that is, a species of encounter with fiction in which readers harness literature’s creative agency in order to consciously add to or expand the literary spaces of the text.

My thesis is a work of literary geography. I am indebted to recent work that theorises reading as a dynamic practice which occurs in time and space. My work develops this theoretical lens by considering the fictional event in the light of encounters which are collaborative, collective and ongoing.

I present my findings across four substantive chapters, each of which elucidates a different aspect of Sherlockians’ expansionary literary geography: first, mapping, where Sherlockians who set out to definitively map the world as Doyle wrote it keep re-drawing its boundaries outside of his texts; secondly, creative writing, by which readers make Holmes move while ensuring he never wanders too far from the canon; thirdly, debate, a popular pastime among American Sherlockians and a means for readers to build Holmes’s world out of their own memories and experiences; and fourthly, literary tourism, used by three exemplary readers as a means of walking Holmes into the world.

I conclude with a call for literary geography as a discipline to continue to broaden its horizons beyond the writers and readers of self-consciously literary fictions. The kinds of reading practices I discuss here can take us closer to demonstrating the role that literature and encounters with fictions play in the wider production of space in everyday life.
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‘Come Watson, come! The game is afoot. Not a word! Into your clothes and come!’

- Arthur Conan Doyle, ‘The Adventure of the Abbey Grange’

‘The tale is the map which is the territory. You must remember this.’

- Neil Gaiman, American Gods
Chapter 1 - The game is afoot: introduction

Beginnings

This project began with an attempt to understand how readers of Arthur Conan Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes stories had received or interpreted these texts. I first encountered these stories as a commuter, in London. Sitting each day for an hour and a half underground, travelling between south London and Oxford Street, I found that Doyle’s stories provided a suitable distraction to the monotony of the Northern Line. From my own experience, I had an idea that these stories provided a form of escape. I wanted to understand the extent to which Doyle’s readers saw these stories as a means of what Robin Jarvis calls ‘imaginative transport’ (Jarvis 2011: 8). However, in the archives I found accounts written by readers of their encounters with Doyle’s stories that challenged this idea. I could not, I came to realise, simply write about readers interpreting Doyle’s stories: I had to write about the active role they have played in shaping them.

This thesis is about a group of readers – American Sherlockians, self-confessed devotees of Doyle’s detective – who have consciously added to or extended the literary spaces of these stories, through a reading practice that I here call ‘expansionary literary geography’ (I will say more about this in a bit). Through a reading of travel writing and geographical texts about Holmes’s world written by these Sherlockians, I propose to demonstrate that American Sherlockians, reading together, have collectively created Holmes’s world, in the image of their own expectations, memories and experiences.

My study is guided by an aim, influenced by recent work in literary geography, to explore how encounters with fiction can be shared, collective, co-productive experiences. I will pursue this aim through two objectives: through building a collection of Sherlockian travel writings, or texts which talk about the geography of Holmes’s world; and through focusing on Sherlockians’ delight in the repeat or re-performance of their original reading of Doyle’s stories. I will demonstrate how Sherlockians individual reading experiences, the things they think and remember and believe when encountering Doyle’s texts, have spilled over into
still more collective, collaborative, and co-productive encounters with these texts, which
together have driven the cultural production of the Sherlock Holmes stories.

I should here discuss in more detail exactly what my thesis is – and what it is not – doing. In
this research, I am exploring how reading can be a social affair: how people read together;
how they work collectively to produce new textual and extra-textual spaces; and how these
literary geographies evolve and change through various readers encounters and re-
encounters.

I am also extending literary geographers’ interest in the fictional event and in encounters
with fiction beyond the realm of the individual. My theory of expansionary literary
geography (which I discuss in more detail in Chapter 2 and which forms the backbone of this
thesis) provides a way for geographers to think about the relational nature of reading -
where readers’ encounters with texts are a vital element in making fictions happen - in
terms of group or communal reading. Whereas literary geography imagines a relation
between reader, author and text that creates a fictional encounter, expansionary literary
geography provides a way imaginatively to extend that encounter into future interactions
between texts and multiple readers – or to think about such encounters which have already
happened.

Furthermore, my research draws on an understanding of literary space as crossing the
boundaries between the fictional and the actual worlds (see Hones 2014: 8). It relies on this
understanding to investigate specific points of interaction between readers’ different kinds
of spatial experiences – in the form of individual Sherlockian writings and geographical
imaginations.

My research is not looking to contribute to the development of theories in travel writing;
the travel writing I look at here is one genre of Sherlockian reader-produced writing which
provides a useful means of exploring Sherlockian understandings of, and attempts to shape,
the literary spaces of the Sherlockian Holmes stories. My study of Sherlockian travel writing
is not – in this thesis at least – intended to contribute to long-standing debates in travel
writing studies.
Furthermore, it is not an overt engagement with mobilities theories in geographical research. The idea of mobilities that has been a mainstay of human geographical research for the past few decades inevitably informs my study (for more about this see Chapter 2). However, I am not attempting, for the moment, to demonstrate new or original theorisation of mobilities and reading. Rather, my focus on readers being mobile derives from my decision to focus on Sherlockian travel writing as a useful genre of entry into the literary geographical imaginings of these American readers.

The imaginative breadth and temporal depth of American Sherlockian studies – this community has, after all, been writing about Sherlock Holmes, his life, and his world since the early twentieth century – means that this thesis is only able to explore a relatively small subset of Sherlockians writings. As I discuss in more detail in Chapter 2, my focus on American Sherlockian travel writing provides a window into the workings of Sherlockians’ literary geographical imaginations and the ways in which these readers have collectively shaped and expanded on the Sherlock Holmes stories. However, I cannot claim that this thesis provides a complete mapping of Sherlockian readers’ endeavours to create ‘the fictional world of Sherlock Holmes’. Such a mapping would be a lifetime’s work.

This thesis is a contribution to our understanding of how people’s encounters with fictions and with each other contribute to the production of literary spaces. This study looks at one famous character and readers’ relations to him in ways that are indebted to cultural geography’s (very) recent return to an appreciation of the power or words in the world (see Wylie and Rose 2017, McGeehan and Philo, 2014). In this thesis I understand the Sherlock Holmes stories – a corpus which I am interpreting very broadly, including works which go beyond the boundaries of Doyle’s oeuvre – as being events or things (and often both) which work to bind people together across space and time. The literary geography of the Sherlock Holmes stories, as I demonstrate here, goes beyond questions of who read what and when – or who did what where in a fictional world. It questions how we as readers, participating in this collective act of encountering stories, create the world(s) in which we live.

I will start, however in a place altogether different from Baker Street. About two kilometres north of Tulsa, Oklahoma, in the heart of Osage County, stands a modest hill. The visitor,
driving north and west along Apache Boulevard, might spot a bald eagle circling the skies overhead as, ascending the north side of Reservoir Hill, the peak’s domed summit comes into view. Atop the summit are the remains of an old cairn, presumed to have once been a look-out point used by Osage peoples during their hunting forays into the territory. Near the base of the hill, not too far to the south, runs the course of a trail which the Osage people used to travel from their homes in Missouri to hunting grounds near the Arkansas River. From between the pages of travellers’ tales by Europeans and white Americans, mythical creatures such as unicorns and yetis rise to stalk the nearby landscape. Standing under the vast prairie skies of mid-western America, this hill was designated Holmes Peak by the United States Board on Geographical Names, in October 1984; it is one of only two monuments in the universe to be officially named for the Great Detective. The other is on the moon. Holmes Peak, as an unexpected example of the expansionary literary geography practised by American Sherlockians, is a suitable starting point for my examination of the wonderful world of Sherlock Holmes as these readers have created it.

What’s the problem? Warner’s Guide Book

The readers’ writings and embodied engagements that I explore in this thesis are all informed by the idea that the world of Sherlock Holmes, as a geographical imaginary and a textual entity, was not fixed in place by Doyle but is rather a messy, dynamic blend of actual and fictional elements, co-produced by a dialogue between author and readers, and readers together. They are also indicative of a movement within Sherlockiana, beginning around 1970 and continuing through the 1990s, that promoted corporeal mobility together with imaginative explorations as the best way to experience Holmes’s world. Richard Warner’s 1985 Guide Book and Instructions for the Ascent of Holmes Peak (fig 1.1), a celebration of the claiming of this landmark for the world of Sherlock Holmes, was published in the very middle of the period I am looking at and is emblematic of the materials that underpin this study.
Mobility, corporeal and imaginative, plays a large though little-acknowledged role in Sherlockian’s approach to the world of Sherlock Holmes. Understanding this can help explain perhaps the most interesting aspect of Warner’s Guide Book - that he wrote it as a guidebook at all. In fact, Warner first introduced the Sherlockian world to Holmes Peak in an article in the Baker Street Journal (BSJ), the irregular quarterly publication of the Baker Street Irregulars, the world’s oldest and largest Sherlockian society. In this article from May 1985 Warner wrote of the process for securing the name of this previously unnoticed hillock outside Tulsa, Oklahoma and briefly described the Peak and its whereabouts. In his later Guide Book he expanded dramatically on this information and importantly added to it, with a history of the Peak, instructions on getting to the area, maps and a guide for climbing the hill. In doing this, Warner put corporeal mobility and embodied experience of this literary place at the centre of Sherlockian approaches to the Peak.

For Sherlockian readers, corporeal mobility to and within spaces of Sherlockian significance is a long established and much-practised form of engagement with the texts. As Umberto Eco once commented, ‘we all know that there are people who go looking for Sherlock Holmes’s house in Baker Street’ (Eco 1994: 84). However, Warner’s Guide Book suggests...
that these readers also go further afield. Since 1968, members of the Sherlock Holmes Society of London have made an ‘irregular’ pilgrimage to the Reichenbach Falls in Switzerland. Each year, at the beginning of January, Sherlockians from all over the world gather in New York to celebrate Sherlock Holmes, the Great Detective; among the events on offer is the Morley Walk, a walking tour of Manhattan that visits the homes and haunts of founding Sherlockian and native New Yorker Christopher Morley, alongside various New York historical landmarks. Even for Sherlockian tourists in London, Baker Street is not the only place to experience. *On the Scent* by Arthur Alexander (under the *nom de plume* of Arthur Axelrad), one of many guidebooks and walking tours of Holmes’s London from this period, recommended readers not to head straight to Baker Street on their arrival in London but rather, ‘approach it as our good doctor and his even better colleague did from the hospital where they met’ (Alexander 1984: 15). In Alexander’s framing a visit to Bart’s hospital, as well as University College London and the Northumberland Fusiliers’ museum in Salisbury, is as important an experience of Holmes’s London as dropping in to Baker Street.

By writing his guidebook, Warner also sought to claim the Peak, control its meaning and establish ways of seeing it. Travel writing has long been a tool for claiming spaces through textual description. Scholars have long noted the power of travel writing as a tool of imperial discourse, order and control. Early European scientists travelling to unknown lands believed themselves part of a project to uncover the true nature of things by locating their rightful place in a grand system of natural order. However universal the new systems of classification used by these early travellers seemed, they in fact represented the imposition of a localised, European system of knowledge. The apparently universal Linnaean system was inspired by the Swedish system for recording births, deaths and family relations (Kuehn and Smethurst 2009: 4, Pratt 2008: 35).

These new ways of thinking about the world, within Europe as well as without, were cemented through the translation of terrain into literary representations. Travellers’ texts transformed the newly discovered worlds into more easily controlled representations; they also, as Davis argues, foregrounded the representation of space as something ‘qualitatively distinct from life’ (Davis 1987: 54). Though Warner’s ludic approach may disguise it, his text
owes much to this European or Western history of claiming lands by walking and writing them. (I will return to this idea in more detail in Chapter 6.)

One can draw a parallel between the ‘proper’ European naming of plants, animals and people in the era of exploration and Warner’s ‘proper’ naming of the Peak and its environs using Sherlockian terms. For instance, he renames a tree stump about half way up the hill as ‘Camp Marylebone’. This appropriation of the landscape and the control of meaning that it implies is driven by Warner’s gaze: his instructions for the ascent of the Peak are not technical but descriptive, requiring the reader to tread where Warner treads, to see what he sees (both literally and imaginatively). Yet Warner’s ludic approach, a sure sign that his Guide Book is grounded in Sherlockiana, deliberately undermines this effort: at the summit of the Peak he marvels, tongue firmly in cheek, that ‘The view is breathtaking. The climber can see some distance in all directions, except down’ (Warner 1985b: 11).

Warner’s attempts to control the meaning of Holmes Peak and the ways of seeing it were inspired by the tradition of Sherlockiana in which he is writing. His Guide Book can be understood as one response to an ongoing conversation, taking place across time and space, as to the extent and nature of Holmes’s world; a conversation conducted mostly in the pages of Sherlockian journals and magazines. Since the 1950s America’s leading Sherlockian society, the Baker Street Irregulars (BSI), has produced a journal, the Baker Street Journal. It contains articles from Sherlockians on subjects ranging from the real location of 221B Baker Street (McCullem 1969: 101-108), to the identity of Holmes’s father (Bradway 1995: 175-183), and the kind of hats worn by characters in the canon (Potter 1978: 98-102), in formats ranging from the quasi-scholarly article to poems and short stories. The BSI’s scion societies - local Sherlockian organisations scattered throughout America - have also produced their own magazines, journals and newsletters. (I provide examples of these journals and their impact on the literary spaces of Sherlock Holmes in Chapter 5.)

These journals have created ways of understanding the world of Sherlock Holmes as bound up with the actual world. Local magazines, many of which are no more than four typewritten sheets of paper stapled together (Randolph 1973), include reports on the
actual-world activities and concerns of members, alongside an assortment of fictions, articles and games and puzzles relating to Sherlock Holmes. Reports of society outings or events are circulated for the benefit of members who could not participate. In this way, the texts of Sherlockiana - the fictions, articles and reports - became a space in their own right, a meeting place for Sherlockians regardless of their ‘real’ (or rather, non-Sherlockian) location.

This blurring of the actual and the fictional points to the importance of corporeal and imaginative mobility to Sherlockian reading. Holmes Peak, for instance, has a place in the world of Sherlock Holmes due to the activity of readers, not the movements of Holmes. As Warner wrote in the BSJ, the necessary connection of the Peak to Holmes was made not due to Canonical connotations but because ‘the area is alive with Sherlockians and the Tulsa area is a hotbed of activities’ (Warner 1985a: 29-31). The Peak is not the only such space. In his tour of Holmes’s America Sherlockian travel writer David Hammer visited several of these Sherlockian-inspired sites, including Moriarty, New Mexico, a small, dusty town in the desert which has become a part of Holmes’s world principally due to its name (although it is no relation) and the activities of the local Sherlockian society The Brothers Three of New Mexico and its most famous member, John Bennett Shaw (Hammer 1991: 279-284). Sherlockian places such as these straddle the border between past and present, fact and fiction, text and experience.

However, the world-migration inherent in these hybrid literary spaces is not a straightforward endeavour, involving the simple crossing wholesale from the actual world to the fictional and back again. As Warner’s Guide Book indicates, the fractured, multiple spaces of Holmes’s world come together to create a messy, folded geography. In the act of describing Holmes Peak, Warner imaginatively creates four ‘camps’ as way stations for its ascent (fig. 1.2). They are called Base Camp (which is the car park), Paddington, Marylebone and St Pancras. By naming each ‘camp’ after a Victorian railway terminal in London, all of them near to Baker Street, Warner’s text folds the urban geography of Victorian London into the rural geography of contemporary Osage County. The naming of ‘camps’ after railway stations – a principal cause of modernity’s annihilation of time and space – suggests
Warner’s desire to equally annihilate the space and between Holmes Peak, Oklahoma in 1985 and London, England in 1895.

Finally, Warner’s Guide Book suggests that the Sherlockian experience of the world, as produced by and mediated through the practices of Sherlockiana, represents a new kind of literary tourism. Sherlockians who follow Warner’s footsteps to the summit of Holmes Peak are treading on ground never featured in any Sherlock Holmes fiction; they are arguably ignoring mainstream literary touristic practices of seeking to ‘recapitulate through the protocols of tourism’ the sensibilities of an author’s text, as one literary scholar defines it (Watson 2006: 12). Yet nor are these readers seeking in Holmes Peak a chance to commune with Doyle as an author, since the neither the Peak, nor any land for miles around, could be found on a list of Doyle’s homes and haunts.
How can we think about Warner’s Guide Book, about Holmes Peak, and about the readers’ writings and embodied engagements of which they are exemplary? What do practices like these mean for the ways in which researchers understand reading, mobility and popular fiction? In the next sections I will introduce three different bodies of literature, each of which has its own answer to this question. First I will think about Holmes Peak as a form of misinterpretation; secondly, I will read it against other geographical writings about the Sherlock Holmes stories; thirdly, I will consider the answers provided by literary tourism research. Each of these literatures, I suggest, provides an explanation for Warner’s Holmes Peak, yet none of these explanations provides a model to satisfactorily explain what seems to be going on here: namely, readers who are actively and deliberately shaping the literary spaces of fiction through their own ideas and memories, experiences and actions.

‘Different from the reading of text’

The first way to think about the naming and claiming of Holmes Peak is also, perhaps, the most straightforward: we might simply agree with a group of literary theorists who would argue that Warner and his fellow Sherlockians are wrong. They are guilty of misreading Doyle’s text. They have engaged with Doyle’s imaginary geographies of London, of England, and (sometimes) of eastern America, and emerged with an image of Oklahoma. Writing about textual analysis for an introduction to methods in English studies, Catherine Belsey notes precisely why this kind of reading is wrong. A text, she writes, much like Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes stories, plays a role ‘in defining how it can legitimately be read and the range of its possible interpretations... the text [can] “invite” certain readings and “offer” specific positions to its addressee’ (Belsey 2005: 163). Yet, Belsey adds a warning, stating forcefully that ‘Meaning is plural. But not infinitely plural: only saints and psychotics see meanings as unique to them personally, and independent of the signifier’ (Belsey 2005: 164). Though Belsey is not labelling Warner a psychotic per se, her understanding of reading as a dialogic practice arguably proscribes Holmes Peak as a suitable outcome.

Other critics have gone further. Umberto Eco, writing about this same process, specifically highlights Sherlockian practices as examples of what not to do. Noting that ‘we all know that
there are people who go looking for Sherlock Holmes’s house on Baker Street’, he goes on to dismiss these as ‘episodes of literary fanship - which is a pleasant activity, and moving at times, but different from the reading of text. To be a good reader of Joyce, it’s not necessary to celebrate Bloomsday on the banks of the Liffey’ (Eco 1994: 84). Eco is not alone in his assessment. Quoting his discussion of readers and actual-world geographies, Robert Tally agrees with Eco that some readers who look to line up the book and the world, to bring characters out of the pages and into physical spaces ‘may be taking things to far’ (Tally 2013: 84). And with even greater disdain, Terry Eagleton dismisses not only ‘ordinary readers’ but also critics who might debate whether Sherlock Holmes really lived by calling them ‘not clinically insane, simply philosophers’ (Eagleton 2013: 4). (Holmes’s life and subsequent death were key factors in Warner’s naming of Holmes Peak.) In Eagleton’s remark we can see traces of a broader critical dismissal of Sherlockian investment in Holmes’s life as beyond the pale.

Figure 1.3 Taking things too far? David Hammer and friends preparing to ascend Holmes Peak, Oklahoma.

Published in David Hammer’s *To Play the Game*

What Warner and his fellow Sherlockians miss, according to this line of thinking, is that Doyle’s works are not reality, but realism. Scholars have, in fact, long been at pains to point
out that while realist fictions seem real (so real as to lead a reader like Warner to name a hill after a man who never lived), they are not. Eric Bulson, in his analysis of literary maps and the disorienting power of modernist fiction, quotes Sharon Marcus’s point that realism is not reality, rather ‘it would be more accurate to say that realist novels seem real because their narrators invoke culturally current frameworks for perceiving time and space’ (Bulson 2007: 13). Elsewhere, Lilian Furst has pointed a finger at literary studies itself, and the tendency among scholars to cite referentiality (those parts or qualities of a text which refer to, or imitate, the actual world) as realist fiction’s key attribute. This is a problem, she argues, because referentiality ‘is also directly connected to belief in the truthfulness of fiction in the literary sense, of a “close correspondence to reality”’ (Furst 1995: 16), it can lead readers to extend the realm of fiction outside of itself. ‘Such rapid empiricism’, she writes, ‘is a gross inversion of reading priorities that makes the text subservient to the extraneous model’ (Furst 1995: 16, emphasis added). Rather than succumb to realist fiction’s illusion, Furst recommends a particularly close and suspicious scrutiny of the text, ‘to concentrate on the margins, the slippages, the tensions, the crossings, probing the processes whereby the fiction seeks to validate its claim that “all is true”’ (Furst 1995: 27). It is literary criticism’s role to unmask the illusion.

Other critics take a more sympathetic approach to this problem, though one which still emphasises how wrong interpretations such as Warner’s are of realist fictions. Eco, for instance, after dismissing the kinds of reading practised by Warner as ‘literary fanship’, later suggested that such errors were not the really readers’ fault: they were simply carried away by what they read:

In fiction, precise references to the actual world are so closely linked that, after spending some time in the world of the novel and mixing fictional elements with references to reality, as one should, the reader no longer knows exactly where he or she stands. Such a state gives rise to some well-known phenomena. The most common is when the reader maps the fictional model onto reality - in other words, when the reader comes to believe in the actual existence of fictional characters and events. The fact that many people believed and still believe that Holmes really existed is only the most famous of a great many possible examples (Eco 1994: 125).
Jonathan Gottschall has explored this tendency of readers to become overwhelmed by the reality effect, and declared it an artefact of the development of the human brain. He notes our susceptibility to the power of a good storyteller to draw us in, what he calls ‘the witchery of story’. He offers an example from Nathaniel Philbrick’s *In the Heart of the Sea* (2000), to prove the effectiveness of good writing. He warns his readers that ‘Philbrick is a crafty old wizard; he waves his pen like a wand. The effect is to drag readers’ minds out through their eyes, teleporting them across time and halfway around the world’ (Gottschall 2012: 2). He provides his readers with various techniques to resist, yet ultimately concludes such resistance would fail. Elsewhere, Gottschall writes that ‘Knowing that fiction is fiction doesn’t stop the emotional brain from processing it as real. That is why we have such a powerfully stupid urge to scream at the heroine in the slasher film, “Drop the phone and run! Run for God’s sake! Run!”’ (Gottschall 2012: 62, emphasis in original). In this manner, Gottschall sheds a different kind of light on those readers who get drawn in to stories; those naive dupes of authorial prowess: they are all of us.

Rita Felski’s recent work, *The Limits of Critique* (2015), provides a starting point for rethinking the apparently ingrained literary value system which raises up ‘proper’ reading and dismisses its shady cousin, ‘naive’ reading. Felski’s title appears to be a subtle reversal of Eco’s earlier *The Limits of Interpretation* (1991) in which he discussed more forcefully and in more detail his reservations about the kinds of non-readings described in the quotations above. Felski’s work takes aim at precisely this attitude, that reading is a strictly delimited practice, best left to the trained minds of literary scholars and critics: that others need not apply. She argues that current literary studies have been almost entirely overtaken by ‘a new mode of militant reading: what Ricoeur calls a *hermeneutics of suspicion*’ (Felski 2015: 1). Felski’s point is not to discredit critique, or what she calls ‘suspicious reading’ (Felski 2015: 3), but rather to point out that ‘literary scholars are confusing a part of thought with the whole of thought’ - and that academic myopia is a dangerous thing, for it leads critics to dismiss ‘a range of intellectual and expressive possibilities’ (Felski 2015: 5). Her aim is to revive other kinds of reading practice: to encourage scholars to avoid peremptory dismissals of any readings that approach fiction as something to be enjoyed, rather than to be probed for hidden meanings. She writes: ‘the aim is to de-essentialize the practice of suspicious
reading by disinvesting it of its presumptions of inherent rigour or intrinsic radicalism - thereby freeing literary studies to embrace a wider range of affective styles and modes of argument’ (Felski 2015: 3, emphasis added).

The value of such an approach has been demonstrated by David Brewer’s recent work on what could be termed the pre-history of literary fandom, or ‘naive’ reading: eighteenth-century readers who appropriated literary characters for their own creative amusement. Picking up on the kinds of accusations by writers such as Eco and Furst, that naive readers have simply invested too heavily in the reality effect of realism, Brewer counters with a sharp reminder that these readers were ‘hardly idiots running around in an ontological fog unable to distinguish fiction from reality’ (Brewer 2005: 3). Rather, Brewer’s release from the intellectual shackles of suspicious reading better enables him to appreciate these eighteenth-century fans in a different light. ‘This, then, will be a story not of good readers or bad readers, misreads or proper readers, much less of readers who are types (in the sense of typology) of ourselves; it will simply be a tale of past readers who, like Oliver Twist, wanted some more’ (Brewer 2005: 10).

**Geographical Holmes**

A second way to think about Warner’s walking over Holmes Peak is within a broader tradition of thinking geographically about the Sherlock Holmes stories. As with the literatures reviewed above, these works, I would argue, provide an equally unsatisfying tradition in which to think about the problems raised by Warner’s *Guide Book and Instructions for the Ascent of Holmes Peak* (1985b). The issue here is that much of the literature which looks at the Sherlock Holmes stories from an explicitly geographical or spatial point of view has done so in relation to Arthur Conan Doyle’s canon of fifty-six short stories and four novels. In this tradition, more by default than by wilful dismissal, Sherlockian writings have been lost. Nevertheless, it is worth looking at some examples, to consider points of connect and of disagreement. These works can be gathered into three categories: studies which look at the physical geography of Doyle’s stories, those which analyse the didactic role the stories’ social geographies play, and analyses which ground Holmesian geographies in their nineteenth century contexts.
I will consider studies of Doyle’s physical geographies first. Of these there are relatively few. Andréas Pichler’s ‘Deduction and Geography in Conan Doyle’s A Study in Scarlet’ (2015) is a good example. Pichler’s aim is to ‘reflect on what Holmes’s science of deduction actually consists in and whether the emerging geographical sciences - meteorology, geology and topography - carry a pertinent function in the disclosure of the mysteries’ (Pichler 2015). The author’s claims to originality in terms of his geographical analysis are made thanks to some interesting academic acrobatics: Pichler effectively sidesteps recent work from literary studies’s spatial turn, to claim that geography really means ‘physical geography’. He writes:

Comparatively little research has been done that locates the author’s detective stories within their renewed geographic contexts. Most publications focus either on the murderer’s footprints in the soils, the emergence of detective fiction as a literary genre... or, most recently, on the question of gender. Furthermore, Doyle’s stories have frequently been analysed through the lens of imaginary geography; few critics have focused on the physical geographical properties (Pichler 2015).

I disagree with Pichler’s claim that geographical studies of the Sherlock Holmes stories have been so lacking. The rise of detective fiction, for instance, is bound up with the spatiality of urban living (Stashower 2006) and of the circulation of newspapers (Panek 2011). Further, in Pichler’s own field of the physical geography of Doyle’s stories, he is right to point out that these studies have been fewer still - yet his own work omits one of the more relevant: Randall Cerveny and Sandra Brazel’s ‘Sherlock Holmes and the Weather’ (1989) (fig. 1.4), a somewhat rambling review of meteorological instances in Doyle’s texts (Cerveny and Brazel 1989: 80-84). Regardless of its limitations, Pichler’s paper does help to illustrate the salient element of this tradition of geographical analysis of the Sherlock Holmes stories. In justifying his geographical focus, Pichler indicates that he ‘will examine how the whodunnit is shaped by the geography of Utah’s Wasatch Mountains and by that of London’s urban maze’ (Pichler 2015). Thus, a geographical study of these stories can reveal something of the plot.
Pichler is not alone in his use of geographic themes as means of gaining further insight into Doyle’s narratives. Nils Clausson undertakes a similar project, this time in relation to *The Hound of the Baskervilles* - arguably the most popular Sherlock Holmes story Doyle wrote. Clausson focuses on geographical elements in the story - particularly the train journey from London to Devon near the opening - to argue that *The Hound of the Baskervilles* is as much a *fin-de-siècle* Gothic tale as a detective story (Clausson 2005: 63). He draws a comparison between *The Hound* and other contemporary Gothic tales, particularly in relation to ideas of degeneration which stalk the novella. Yet, it is his attention to the story’s geography which underpins his argument. Of the train journey, he writes,

Watson’s and Sir Henry’s journey from London to Baskerville Hall, like Marlow’s up the Congo River (*Heart of Darkness* appeared one year before *The Hound of the Baskervilles*), or Jonathan Harker’s to Transylvania, is represented as a regressive journey into the primitive: the journey through space is also a journey backward through time (Clausson 2005: 72).
Clausson concludes by arguing that the novella includes two different plot lines: the detective plot, represented by Holmes, the man of the city, whom the reader (and Watson) believes to be in London for much of the story; and the Gothic plot, represented principally by the moor itself. ‘The novel seems to oppose Holmes’s empirical science to the language of regression and degeneration in the Gothic plot’ (Clausson 2005: 75).

Another strong tradition of geographical analyses of the Sherlock Holmes stories looks not to the physical but to the social geography of the Victorian world that Doyle evokes. The principal aim of these studies is to elucidate the social messages being broadcast by these prime examples of popular fiction. D.A. Miller’s *The Novel and the Police* (1988) for instance, asks why, even in detective fictions, ‘the police never quite emerge from the ghetto in which the novel generally confines them’ (Miller 1988: 3). He argues that realist novels in the Victorian era - in which the Sherlock Holmes stories are counted - aspired to a kind of bourgeois self-policing, a simultaneous patrol of, and reassertion of, middle-class social and behavioural norms. Victorian novels attempt to structure real-world good behaviour of their middle-class readers. Other scholars have taken this idea, in relation to the Sherlock Holmes stories in particular, and run with it. Joseph McLaughlin (no relation to this author) attempts to explain the ‘formal peculiarity’ of *A Study in Scarlet*, a story which ‘is an amalgam of two plots - crime story and Western - that in 1887 had not been articulated in genres of their own (McLaughlin 2000: 27). He argues that Doyle’s inclusion of the Utah interlude, complete with American frontiersman and tracker Jefferson Hope, serves two ends, both of which are sociological. It serves to illuminate Doyle’s understanding of London as being a place of extant and growing frontiers, and it introduces Holmes as a superior tracker, establishing his identity as one who can effectively patrol the shifting and invisible frontiers of the new urban century (McLaughlin 2000: 28-32).

Other elucidations of this social geography reading of the Holmes stories have advanced these themes in one direction. Rosemary Jann (1990, 1995) presents a Foucauldian reading of Holmes, in which she argues that his role as a detective in late-Victorian Britain is to codify the social body and use that information to maintain social order, based on emerging middle-class norms. Jann notes that, like the retired sergeant of marines whom Holmes
identifies from across the street by his walk, in *A Study in Scarlet*, Holmes’s method is based on ‘specifying codes, codes that in turn assume the existence of fixed behavioural types’ (Jann 1990: 687). It is the universal prevalence of these types, in his world, that enables Holmes to be so successful in his efforts to return the world to its ‘rightful order’. In similar vein, Christopher Clausen argues that it was Doyle’s focus on solving crime as reasserting social order which made the stories so popular in the late-nineteenth century and early decades of the twentieth (Clausen 1984: 123). Finally, Laura Otis has approached Holmes’s behaviour from a medical angle, inspired by Doyle’s famous, life-long medical career. Like Jann, Otis argues that Holmes’s role is to maintain social order, through the policing of foreign influence on Britain. She describes Holmes in highly medicalised terminology: ‘as an imperial leukocyte, Holmes succeeds so often in reaching his target because he moves freely throughout the imperial body’ (Otis 1999: 110). The goal of his movement, as any immune system, is to neutralise invasion and restore order.

A final category of geographical studies into the Holmes stories contains those works which use geographical analyses of Doyle’s Holmes stories to probe certain psychological or environmental aspects of the historical contexts from which they emerged. Kate Thomas’s *Postal Pleasures* (2012), for instance, discusses *A Study in Scarlet* in the light of the communications networks which link Holmes to the wider world. She argues, against the thinking of Otis’s stasis, that it is Holmes’s connectedness which makes him so effective - his use of the telegraph lines, to uncover Jefferson’s Hope’s identity, for instance, furnish him with success in that case. Thomas grounds this reading in the context of Doyle’s own involvement in a late-Victorian movement to better connect (perhaps even to re-unify) Britain and America, within an Anglophone world order (Thomas 2012: 166-167). In another example, Lawrence Frank focuses on Doyle’s use of landscapes, particularly Gothic ones, as ways in to understanding his position on scientific thinking about the human mind. For instance, he writes that, ‘With its muted allusions to Paradise Lost, [John] Tyndall’s “Scientific Use of the Imagination” has informed Dr. Watson’s vision of the Man on the Tor, the figure outlined against the moon, rising above yet allied to the depths of the moor and the Grimpen Mire’ (Frank 1999: 370). Yet, such insights are, he admits, quite difficult to extract, as in this passage: ‘As this vision of consciousness [the image of the man on the tor in *The Hound of the Baskervilles*] may have proved too illusive for readers of *The Strand in
1902, Doyle returned in 1910 to familiar landscapes and themes in “The Adventure of the Devil’s Foot” (Frank 1999: 362). This landscape – Cornwall – is a place where ‘traces of modern England seem almost to have disappeared, as a forgotten time reasserts itself in enduring relics’ (Frank 1999: 362).

This discussion of the tradition of geographical thinking about the Sherlock Holmes stories is, necessarily, brief. However, as accomplished as these various studies are, in their use of geography as a means of providing insight into Doyle’s stories, it is precisely for this reason that such a tradition makes an unsuitable frame in which to think about Richard Warner and Holmes Peak. His Guide Book and Instructions for the Ascent of Holmes Peak (1985b), like all the examples of Sherlockian writing which I will presently introduce and discuss in this thesis, represents a path less travelled by. Warner’s walk and text cannot be analysed in the frame of scholarly work on Doyle’s geographies, because by their very nature they transcend them, they subvert them, they play with them.

**Literary Tourism**

The third and final body of literature through which we might think about the kinds of reading practices that Warner’s Guide Book and his ascent represent is literary tourism. Indeed, it is no hard thing to relate David Hammer’s hike up Holmes Peak, for instance, (Hammer 1991: 359-364) into the longer, Sherlockian tradition of Holmes-inspired travels. Sherlockians have travelled in search of Holmesian sites since the early twentieth century. One of the earliest, Gray Chandler Briggs, travelled to London in 1921, camera and notebook in hand, to trace Holmes and Watson’s route from Cavendish Square through the back alleys of Marylebone, to the eponymous empty house, in search of the precise location of 221B Baker Street (Redmond 2000: 70-71). Elsewhere, British Sherlockians have made an irregular pilgrimage to the Reichenbach Falls in Switzerland, site of Holmes and Moriarty’s apparently fatal struggle, since 1968 (Saler 2012: 121). Warner’s decision to introduce Holmes Peak to the world via a guidebook and a guided walk speaks to this Sherlockian propensity for literary tourism.
Inspired by Nicola Watson’s argument that the story of literary tourism is a tale of reading becoming ‘progressively and differentially locked to place’ (Watson 2006: 1), studies in literary tourism have looked to touristic encounters with place, through fiction, as the defining characteristic of this practice. These encounters have been understood in one of three ways: as an act of marking and connecting to literary celebrity; as an appurtenance of heritage and memory; or, thirdly, in order to ‘concretize a narrative’ (Lee 2012: 53). Yet, useful as this is, it hardly exhausts the meanings we might ascribe to ‘literary tourism’, and it is hard to place the productions of Sherlockians into these categories – without doing violence to what they are, or ignoring them altogether. I shall explain over the following pages.

It all begins with the notion that readers become literary tourists due to a desire to get closer to authors. Nicola Watson’s groundbreaking *The Literary Tourist* (2006) argues that the ever growing publishing markets of the nineteenth century reduced readers’ opportunities for intimacy with authors - the kind of intimacies shared by epistolary readers of Samuel Richardson, for instance, and which the novel’s form so readily implies. In place of this unattainable connection, readers sought others. What they could not gain with their
minds they sought with their bodies - physical proximity, to authors’ homes or their grave sites (Watson 2006: 14, 23-55). This form of authorial connection has remained a cornerstone of literary tourism practices throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and into contemporary times.

Writing at the beginning of the twenty-first century, Mike Robinson and Hans Christian Anderson foreshadowed Watson’s author-focused understanding of literary tourism when they defined the practice as being ‘about the commodification of the imagined and the imaginers’ (Robinson and Anderson 2002: 15, emphasis added). Like Watson, they foreground the spectacle of authors’ homes, haunts and graves as central to the practice of literary-inspired travels (Robinson and Anderson 2002: 17-20). Erin Hazard writes about the late nineteenth century in America, the ‘interim between the occupation of this first [American] generation of literary houses by their authors and their establishment as museums’ as being a time ripe for curious readers to engage in ‘surveying all their spaces and contents, and probing the details of the private lives once contained therein’ (Hazard 2006: 27). Others, such as Andrea Zemgulys, have pointed to the importance of ‘sites of origin’, particularly the inn, tavern or drinking house, because ‘it had been favoured by the (conversing, observing) writer and offered a glimpse of the working writer at rest’ (Zemgulys 2008: 21). All these scholars note the power of the haunting authorial presence to inspire readers’ travels to such places.

It is perhaps hardly necessary to point out that this mainstream image of author-inspired literary tourism does not help us to better understand the embodied engagement with literature represented by Warner’s Guide Book. The thrill offered to many literary tourists visiting authors’ homes, ‘the promise that the writer might at any point re-enter’ (Robinson and Anderson 2002: 19) is conspicuously absent from a literary tourism centred entirely on the character of Sherlock Holmes. Though Warner’s Holmes Peak might be an extreme case, venerating as it does a site to which there is no connection at all to Arthur Conan Doyle, other Sherlockian literary tourists have minimised Doyle in their travels, or placed him secondary to Holmes. As I will discuss in more detail in Chapter 3, David Hammer’s visits to Doyle’s childhood home in Edinburgh and his school at Stonyhurst, were both motivated by a desire to know Holmes and his world better.
And yet, Doyle is still remembered. In Warner’s *Guide Book*, in a section entitled ‘Future Plans for Holmes Peak’, he outlines various imaginary attractions that might be built around the site to encourage tourists to come, including a Doyle Ski Basin (Warner 1985b: 13). (I will go into more detail about the complicated relationship Sherlockians have with Doyle in Chapter 4.) Despite these references to Doyle, the notion that literary tourists are motivated by a need to be close to an author does not help us entirely to understand this kind of Sherlockian practice.

A second attempt to explain the behaviour of literary tourists is the theory that these readers are attempting to ‘recapitulate through the protocols of tourism’ the ‘sensibilities implied by the text’ (Watson 2006: 12). Christina Lee describes literary tourism as a practice which ‘attempt[s] to concretize a narrative’ (Lee 2012: 53). To understand the behaviour of literary tourists, she argues, it is necessary to recognise ‘the importance of the embodied experience of space and affective sensibility of touristic practices’, which themselves have the power ‘to turn facts and details of fictional narratives into experience’ - the tourist’s own experience (Lee 2012: 53). There are two ways in which this concretisation, this turning of fiction into experience, can happen. First, it can be accomplished by recognising the places where factual and fiction worlds collide. Nicola Watson writes of seeing places of fictional composition, such as ‘the very table on which Austen’s *Emma* was written at Chawton, the table on which Milton’s *Paradise Regained* may have been written at Chalfont St Giles’ (Watson 2006: 3) as examples of tourists’ attempts to make the fictional ‘real’.

Secondly, literary tourism involves the ‘imaginative (re)possession and (re)discovery’ of landscapes, as geographies are remade through fictional labels and knowledges (Watson 2006: 4). Although Watson warns that such practices are rather specific, due to the fact that ‘no author or text can be successfully located to place unless their writings model or cue tourism in one way or another’ (Watson 2006: 12), others disagree. Zemgulys has noted that the practitioners of what was, in the early twentieth century, called ‘literary geography’, elaborated a rather different relation of association in constructing original scenes: factual and fictional literary worlds coincided loosely, through expansive speculation.
rather than precise labelling. Associations made almost any landscape relevant to the memory of a writer: they encompassed sites known only to distant ancestors, sites just reminiscent of fictional settings, sites simply curious and interesting to those who wish to know more about their beloved poet or novelist (Zemuglys 2008: 23).

More recently, Nicky van Es and Stijn Reijnders have illuminated an alternative form of making narratives concrete through literary tourism, focusing not on readers’ attempts to fit a literary text into real places but rather on tourists’ attempts to better understand an urban place through its association with literature: in this case, London and the Sherlock Holmes stories (Es and Reijnders 2016: 2).

This idea that literary tourism involves locating fictional narratives in the actual world is more applicable to the actions of Sherlockian travellers than any attempt to explain them through a need to get close to Arthur Conan Doyle. Zemgulis’s expansive notion of ‘association’, of the loose coincidence of the facial and fictional worlds, gets close to a suitable description of Holmes Peak. The relief map drawn by Warner, which locates ‘camps’ named for three north London train termini (Paddington, Marylebone and St. Pancras) over an image of this Oklahoman hill, seems to be a good example of such an expansive association. However, this explanation still locates the person of the author at the centre ground. Zemgulys’s point is that expansive association ‘made almost any landscape relevant to the memory of the writer’ (Zemuglys 2008: 23); yet Sherlockian sites such as Holmes Peak, or The Chequers Pub in Oxford (see Chapter 3), or Long Island, Tennessee (see Chapter 5) are, more often than not, relevant to the memories and experiences of the reader. Sherlockian tourists like Warner are not entirely, I would argue, attempting to make concrete Doyle’s narratives in the actual world; rather, as I discuss in more detail in Chapter 6, they are seeking to go beyond Doyle’s borders, to write Holmes’s world in their own image, to tread out the paths of Holmes’s movements in the world using their own footsteps.

Literary tourism studies offer one final way to explain the kinds of practices exemplified by Warner’s tramping over Holmes Peak: they act as an appurtenance to heritage and memory.
There is at present a general ‘conflation of literary tourism with that of heritage tourism, conceiving of this practice to be the “corollary of the present-day obsession with heritage and cultural memory”’ (Es and Reijnders 2016: 5). The causes of this association between literary tourism and national cultural heritage is not hard to discover. Nicola Watson argues that it was a short leap from literary tourism’s necessary act of ‘imaginative (re)possession and (re)discovery’ (Watson 2006: 4), to a place where the ‘emerging national literary canon [could be] seized upon in order to effect a sort of interiorised national mapping’, abetted by the fact that literary pilgrimages in Britain effectively ‘allowed travellers to make themselves imaginatively at home across the nation through the medium of literature’ (Watson 2006: 14).

The history of literary tourism and literary mapping is associated to the nineteenth-century rise in geographical education, directed towards nationalistic ends. ‘Locating fictional spaces on a map’, Bulson notes, ‘allows readers to transform fiction into practical knowledge. That explains why educators, learning from tourists and the guidebook companies, latched on to literary maps early on to teach students about literature, geography, and history simultaneously’ (Bulson 2007: 4). If such connections suggest an unconscious or ‘natural’ association between literary places and cultural identity, Zemuglys reminds us that ‘heritage has been fundamentally understood as a possession, the “spoils” claimed by nations and ethnicities for both moral and immoral ends’, drawing on texts about literary heritage produced in its ‘heyday’ to argue that ‘the placed literary past was regarded as a possession over which collectivities could be defined’ (Zemuglys 2008: 40).

The activities of Warner, Hammer and his fellow Sherlockians on Holmes Peak might seem a world away from the culture wars over national heritage which framed the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, yet to a degree this frame can help illuminate their actions. As I discuss in Chapter 6, Warner’s Guide Book is structured in a way similar to nineteenth-century American guidebooks, which themselves encouraged their white, often middle-class readership, to go out and take symbolic possession of the country through travels. In a similar manner, David Hammer’s guides to England, or Gunnar Sundin’s guide to London (see Chapter 3) represent an attempt to create a heritage tourism industry aimed specifically at Sherlockians.
Yet, however much we might draw a favourable comparison between the work of Warner and the earlier work of George Putnam, who originated a particularly American literary heritage tradition through his books in literary homes and haunts (Hazard 2006: 18), there are still aspects of these Sherlockian experiences which cannot be explained in this way. For instance, Andrea Zemuglys writes that tourism has a markedly obverse relationship to heritage: despite American tourists’ claims to greater affinity with British literary heritage – something noticed, too, by Nicola Watson (Watson 2006: 10) – ‘the superficial consumption that tourism signified was definitively not ownership’, in relation to the sites of literary heritage (Zemuglys 2008: 23, emphasis in original). Yet, Sherlockians such as Warner and Hammer deliberately use the tourist’s subject position and its inherent mobility to create new literary sites for Sherlockian ownership; as I write further in Chapter 6, they use their literary tourism to claim new parts of the world for Sherlock Holmes.

Encounters with Sherlock Holmes

In the last three sections I discussed three scholarly traditions through which we might begin to think about Warner’s *Guide Book*, and in fact all such geographical writing by Sherlockians. However, no one of these traditions gets to the heart of the matter - what motivated Warner to claim new spaces for Holmes’s world? Academic work on literary tourism comes closest to asking this question. Using this frame, it would be possible to understand Warner’s act, for instance, as either a means of gained affective connection to Arthur Conan Doyle, or, perhaps, of attempting to re-inscribe the Sherlock Holmes stories in the world. Yet neither Doyle nor the fictional Holmes have any connect to Oklahoma: the ‘why here?’ question may remain unresolved if I utilised this frame. The other two traditions - of using geographical themes to gain insight into Doyle’s stories, or of dismissing Warner’s (and his fellows’) writings as not really reading - do disservice to Warner’s creativity. They either subsume his *Guide Book* to the imperative of critically reading the originary text, or they dismiss his creativity altogether.

In this thesis I will take a different approach. I will read Warner’s and his fellow Sherlockians’ writings through a literary geographical lens, one which enables me to recognise them as a
kind of reading practice. More accurately, literary geographical thought encourages me to think of Sherlockian writings as the result of (and the further producer of) encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories. These encounters are made by people who become readers in the act of reading - not by subscribing to any particular critical approach, but rather by the simple act of encountering a text and engaging with it. The archives abound with indications that Sherlockian writings in the vein of Warner’s *Guide Book* are the result of encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories.

In Warner’s own text, references to elements of the Sherlock Holmes stories, from the snake in ‘The Speckled Band’, to Paddington train station, are repeatedly embedded in the Oklahoman landscape, arguably reflecting the intertwining of home and away going on in Warner’s mind as he read (Warner 1985b: 5-6). Other Sherlockian writings bear similar traces. Evan Wilson, a retired American diplomat, for instance, describes scouring his personal collection of original *Baedeker* guidebooks, in the light of his reading of ‘The Adventure of the Devil’s Foot’ (Wilson 1982: 7-10). Showing perhaps a greater inclination towards completeness in his encounters with fiction, Sherlockian Richard Foster has written about his travels to Pennsylvania to prove to himself a hunch developed whilst reading ‘The Adventure of the Red-Headed League’ (Foster 1971: 98).

With such an approach, I am drawing on recent thinking in literary geography which - as I shall explain in greater detail in the next chapter - encourages us to think about texts and spaces as being produced together, in parallel. As Miles Ogborn argues, scholars need to recognise that ‘texts are part of the cultural production of spaces, and spaces are part of the cultural production of texts’ (Ogborn 2005: 146). Thought about in this way, Warner’s Holmes Peak, or Wilson’s Cornwall, or Foster’s Pennsylvania, are as integral to their readings and constructions of the Sherlock Holmes stories, as Doyle’s writings. Yet, I am going further, drawing on the work of Sheila Hones, to better recognise encounters with fiction like Warner’s (and others) as part of a broader network of actors, including particularly authors, readers and texts themselves, in which each actor plays a role in the final co-production which we call literature (Hones 2014: 31-32). I will discuss this, again, in greater detail in Chapter 2.
For now, it is sufficient to say that a literary geographical approach such as this will enable me to look for the traces of connections and influence which radiate out of texts like Warner’s, Wilson’s or Foster’s, into the wider Sherlockian community beyond, yet also back into Doyle’s texts (and potentially forward, too, into other readers’ encounters). Warner, for instance, explicitly mentions the role of other readers - principally members of his own local Sherlockian societies - in driving the idea and process for naming Holmes Peak (Warner 1985a: 31). Without the reading community, both virtual and actual, of which he is a part, Warner’s idea, the product of his encounter with the Sherlock Holmes stories, would not have been made reality. As I have suggested here other approaches, even the reader-focused literary tourism studies of Watson and others, may potentially ignore these links in their emphasis on reading as an individual practice. Yet, drawing on Hones’s theories about the multiple-actor influences on fictional encounters, and Ogborn’s reminder that texts and spaces are mutually co-productive, I will be able to hold in mind the idea that many different constituencies bear on the meaning of fictions.

I will explore the spatial nature of these fictional encounters, not as a theme or a topic in readers’ minds, but as a practical reality of the ways in which readers encounter and engage with fictional texts. Warner’s walk sets the scene for a Sherlockian tradition of encountering the Sherlock Holmes stories in a mobile and embodied manner which puts the spatiality of those encounters to the forefront. Yet, this spatiality is a part of all fictional encounters - we all read somewhere.

My thesis’s research question, then, is ‘what can Sherlockian writings reveal about how readers encounter fiction?’ My answer is that these writings suggest that certain readers, encountering fictions collectively, practise a form of reading which I will term ‘expansionary literary geography’. It is a deliberate endeavour to turn personal and embodied experiences of actual-world places into extensions of Holmes’s fictional world - and to influence fellow Sherlockians’ imaginative encounters with that world - that are the hallmarks of this practice. My thesis is a contribution to understanding the Sherlock Holmes stories as a product of the many somewheres of their reading; it is also a manifesto for greater recognition that ‘reading’ can be many things - even a quick ascent to the top of a small, American hill.
Structure

The idea of expansionary literary geography drives this thesis. In Chapter 2 I will establish expansionary literary geography as a theoretical framework through which to think about and to approach the Sherlockian texts under study here. As a framework for a particular species of reading, expansionary literary geography is rooted in recent work from literary geography’s relational turn, which argues that reading is an inherently spatial activity, by which readers enter into relations across time and space, with other readers, with authors, and with other incarnations of the text, all of which potentially shape their particular encounter with fiction.

Featuring most prominently in this account is Sheila Hones’s theory of ‘the event of the novel’, which I am refiguring, for the purposes of analysing the range of creative practices produced by Sherlockians, as ‘fiction as an event’. This idea takes literary studies’ long-standing recognition of the dialogic nature of textual encounter and suggests that we can think about this relation, like all relations, spatially. Following Hones and others, I argue for an approach to Sherlockians’ encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories that recognises these encounters as happening in times and spaces, and as ultimately productive of new fictions and new literary spaces. In the rest of the chapter I ground these ideas in the relevant literary geographical, literary, and human geographical traditions of thought on fiction and space as being mutually, and communally co-produced by a variety of actors.

The following four chapters are more empirical, establishing and then interrogating the Sherlockian practice of expansionary literary geography. In Chapter 3, ‘Plotting and mapping: the world strictly according to Doyle?’, I demonstrate the Sherlockian tendency towards expansionary literary geography through an analyse of four reader-produced mappings of Holmes’s world. My analysis follows recent work in human geography about the processual and ontogenetic nature of mapping - as a practice which is always developing and which creates space as much as it records it. I argue that we can think about these maps, created by Sherlockians to find their way in Holmes’s world in this latter regard. They are not devices to be held up against the text, to be found wanting. Rather we should think
about them as alternative ways of representing and of creating the inherent spatiality of the
Sherlock Holmes stories. Each of the mappings I analyse begins as an attempt to map the
literary spaces which Doyle created yet, in a demonstration of the practice of expansionary
literary geography, each pushes the boundaries of Holmes’s world beyond the limits that
Doyle wrote.

Chapter 4, ‘Between the canon and the commons: writing Holmes’s world’ examines the
first of three means by which Sherlockians have practised expansionary literary geography:
creative writing. Although it is the mainstay of most collective reading communities of this
kind, creative writing competes with debates about Holmes’s world as the most popular
form of reader engagement. In this chapter I look at the tendency for Sherlockians to use
their writing to pull Holmes out of the geographical, temporal and ontological limits in
which Doyle originally encased him. Across sections on developing the Watsonian archive,
expanding Holmes’s biography, and professing a belief that Doyle was only the ‘literary
agent’, I argue that Sherlockian fictions represent a repositioning of Doyle, his creative
agency, and his canon of stories from their place as ‘originary’ to Holmes and his world. This
repositioning is apparent in two forms: first, Sherlockians have signalled their move away
from Doyle’s influence by writing Holmes into new territories, whether social, psychological,
or geographical; secondly, perhaps paradoxically, readers’ creative license to move Holmes
is rooted in their recognition of the importance of Doyle’s creative agency.

The other most popular form of Sherlockian engagement, criticism and debate, what has
been known to many academics as ‘pseudo-scholarship’ is the subject of Chapter 5,
‘Experience and memory: debating Holmes’s world’. Starting from the position that, as one
Sherlockian asserted, ‘Investigations into the literature and the world of Sherlock Holmes
that are presented in written form are a major way in which every Sherlockian can
participate actively in the Holmes Saga’ (Shreffler 1986: 37), I explore the ways in which
Sherlockians have used this tradition of investigating the Great Detective’s life and times as
a means of inserting the spaces of their own, personal encounters with fiction into the
collective imaginations of the wider community. I argue that these individual investigations,
and the environment of group debate surrounding them, has contributed to the shaping of
the world of Sherlock Holmes as a literary space into something far exceeding Doyle’s
designs. Looked at now, the literary space of the Sherlock Holmes stories is a messy blend of actual and fictional spaces, whose exact form and topography is difficult to pin down, changing depending on who is viewing it and when.

The last substantive chapter is concerned with the more embodied and mobile means by which Sherlockians have practised expansionary literary geography. In Chapter 6, ‘Sherlockian travels: walking Holmes’s world’ I argue that examples of Sherlockian literary tourism are precisely forms of creative encounters with fiction which actively seek to inscribe new spaces into fictional geographies. They use the act of walking in and between places associated with Holmesian narratives as a means of experiencing those geographies whilst also creatively expanding them beyond the bounds of Doyle’s authorship and authority. In an approach somewhat different from earlier chapters, I pursue this argument across sections which are not thematic, but which each provide an in-depth look at one piece of Sherlockian travel writing. There are three texts which are the focus of this chapter: Arthur Alexander’s On the Scent (1984), David Hammer’s A Dangerous Game (1997), and Richard Warner’s Guide Book and Instructions for the Ascent of Holmes Peak (1985b). Importantly, each of these texts represent their readers’ encounters both with Doyle’s textual world and the actual world through narratives of discovery, mediated in whole or in part by walking: they describe a fictional world and its referents but also, by physically getting out into the world, they co-produce it.
Chapter 2 - Fictional encounters: methodology

Introduction

This chapter sets out the study’s methodology and research design. It provides an empirical justification and a theoretical framework for my focus on Sherlockians’ encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories.

My study is driven by textual analysis, by the examination of a group of exemplary texts, with the aim of understanding how American Sherlockians have encountered the Sherlock Holmes stories and why that should be so. To facilitate this approach, much of the space of this chapter is given over to explaining the theoretical approaches which have informed my analysis and to grounding them in the relevant scholarly traditions. Establishing those paths I have not followed is as important a part of this as showing those I have.

At the heart of my research agenda are two claims: first, that there is value in understanding the ways in which Sherlockians have encountered these texts; and secondly, that it is possible to gain an insight into the ways in which these various encounters have been made – and the fictions and spaces they have produced – by reading examples of Sherlockians’ own writings.

In this chapter I will ground these claims in a theoretical approach which I am terming expansionary literary geography. Its central tenets are that literary geographies cannot be confined to the space of literature found in source texts, capable as they are of being co-produced by collaborative practices of creative literary ‘commoning’. At the heart of this theory sits an idea that fiction or literature is neither a thing nor an object, but an event, a happening in time and space. I have drawn this idea of ‘fiction as an event’ from recently adumbrated relational approaches to literary geography, which I will consider here in relation to other strands of literary geographical thought. I will then move on to elucidate in greater detail the theoretical pillars on which expansionary literary geography stands - literature as a living thing built on a co-production of reader and text; and literary spaces as
whole, yet fragmented, and always under construction. The final part of this chapter will comprise a research design and audit, including an account of my methods of data generation and analysis.

**Expansionary Literary Geography**

The first role of this methodological discussion must be to establish expansionary literary geography as an idea. Its hallmarks are a deliberate endeavour to turn personal and embodied experiences of actual-world places into extensions of Holmes’s fictional world - and to influence fellow Sherlockians’ imaginative encounters with that world. It is a species of encounter with fiction in which readers harness the creative agency of literary production in order to consciously add to and extend the literary space of the story. This conscious effort is necessarily creative and co-productive; crucially it is collective or collaborative too. The Sherlockians I discuss in this study represent their own encounters with the Sherlock Holmes texts as an argument for a particular way of reading fiction and place as being produced together, unfolding in space and time beyond the bounds of a single text or indeed the subjectivity of a single reader. As a process in which not just the individual reader’s but also the collective readers’ contribution is key.

By making this argument, I am indebted to recent work in relational literary geography (Alexander 2015; Anderson 2015; Hones 2008; 2014; Anderson and Saunders 2015). This strand of literary geography has coalesced around the recognition that fiction, as Hones explains, is ‘dynamic, unfolding collaboration, happening in time and space’ (Hones 2014: 32). The phenomena of reading groups is an obvious example of this process. Yet the implications for our understanding of what reading as a collaborative endeavour is have not been fully appreciated, something that is obvious if we consider work on literary ‘commoning’. By talking about ‘expansionary literary geography’ I am folding into this vision of reading the work of David Brewer. His notion of ‘imaginative expansion’ has gained traction among scholars of fandom as a means of understanding the power of collective or communal engagement with fiction (Jenkins 2006; Mackey and McClay, 2008; Rebaza 2009; Rigney 2012). Thus, Brewer explains that for many fans it is membership of a community, virtual or actual, that provides the impetus for readers’ desire to expand on an originary text.
with creative writings of their own (Brewer 2006: 12-13). Members of a reading community are more likely to share a sense of collective ownership or investment in characters and other literary artefacts, which can lead them to neglect or even nullify, for the purposes of collective activity which strengthens their ties to the group, the proprietary rights normally associated with authorship and get creative with their fictional encounters. The implications for relational literary geography are that people who read in groups, such as Sherlockians, are perhaps more likely to see the ‘dynamic, unfolding collaboration’ of a fictional happening (Hones 2014: 32) as a group affair - and to attempt to communicate the results of their encounters with fiction to their fellow fans.

Acts of discovery are an important theme in Sherlockian textual encounters, as they lend a sense of vitality to the readers’ collective depiction of Holmes’s life and world. Through representing their literary tourist encounters as acts of discovery, on the edges of Doyle’s texts, Sherlockian travel writers engage in the act of legitimising their contributions to the collective mission of expanding Holmes’s literary spaces – building on what they call ‘the Saga’ (Shreffler 1986: 37) with acts of readerly creativity. References to ‘saga’ indeed implicitly suggest not an authorial canon consonant with the age of copyright but a world or landscape of shared stories whose authorship is held in common.

In the next three sections I will unpack the theoretical traditions with which expansionary literary geography engages and from which it draws, beginning with interdisciplinary literary geography.

**Practising geography with literature**

Literary geography is a fast-growing interdisciplinary field of study. Its chief asset right now may well be its methodological diversity. In an editorial written for the launch of the first journal dedicated to this sub discipline, Hones et. al note that, literary geography today ‘has come to include work grounded in a wide range of academic fields including not only human geography but also literary criticism, literary cartography, geocriticism, comparative literature, and the digital and spatial humanities’ (Hones et al 2015: 1). Such methodological diversity is arguably the reason there have been successive calls for the re-founding of
literary geography (Brosseau 1994; Piatti et al. 2008; Sharp 2000; Saunders 2010; Thacker 2005), and resulted in a broad variety of approaches, whose practitioners often talk across each other (Prieto 2011, 2013; Tally 2013, 2014; Thacker 2005; for a fuller discussion of this issue see Hones 2014: 163-179).

Still, the lack of agreed definition among practitioners of what literary geography is need not be an obstacle to this study. As Andrew Thacker noted more than a decade ago, ‘it is essential to note that questions of space and geography can be brought to bear upon texts without necessarily’ being tied to any one theoretical framework (Thacker 2003: 58). In recognition of this, I am persuaded to follow Hones et al. in their ‘general position’ that ‘literary geography is essentially a way of reading’ (Hones et al. 2015: 1-2). From this foundational point, it follows that debates around literary geography can be understood as methodological - the central theme of debates in this area concerns how to practise geographically-attuned reading. Although my work is intended as a contribution to interdisciplinary literary geography, its initial theoretical foundation has developed from my studies in cultural geography. So, in the following pages, I will discuss three ways in which geographers have approached literature: as a source of geographical information, as an incubator of alternative geographical knowledges, and as a participant in the production of space.

*Literature as ‘valuable storehouse’*

The first method of geographically-attuned reading I will discuss here is the practice of using books as sources of geographical information. Pioneered by regional geographers in the mid-twentieth century and taken up by humanists from the 1970s onwards, the study of literature by geographers was promoted ‘in relation, and as a counterpoint, to the scientific geography which was most strident in the 1960s’ (Pocock 1988: 88). At the core of this method of doing geography with literature was a practice of reading novels, particularly realist novels from the nineteenth century, for the ways in which they represented landscapes or regions. This method of mining literary texts for their descriptive passages of landscapes and places has been ascribed to two distinct movements within human geography which arose in the latter decades of the twentieth century: regional geography
and humanistic geography (Brosseau 1994, 2009; Lando 1996; Pocock 1988; Thacker 2005). These two movements embodied different understandings of the power of literature in relation to geographical study. As Pocock notes in his early analysis of geographical approaches to literature, regional geographers often drew on realist literature and ‘the descriptive power of authors to extract certain passages to justify the concept of region, illustrate landscape “signatures”, investigate regional consciousness or image or, in the earliest and most common engagement, to enhance felicitous regional description’ (Pocock 1988: 88).

Novels, says Pocock, have long been the geographer’s greatest source in this regard, since ‘from the beginning the whole genre was distinguished as ‘the literature whose form was primarily spatial and whose space was that of a map’ (Pocock 1988: 89). Such a mapped space necessarily filled with recognisably human interactions - the very stuff of literature - provided a useful antidote to the abstractions of quantitative geographies. Pocock offers two reasons why geographers have been interested in literary depictions of place. First, he suggests that ‘there is obviously more concreteness about setting than there is for character or plot. Moreover, since this element may be present from the beginning - “setting the scene” - and not left to unfold gradually, as are the other two, then some sections of region or landscape description may be particularly amenable to “use” by geographers’ (Pocock 1988: 90). Second, he notes that geographers’ assumption of a factual basis for these landscape descriptions ‘is fostered by knowledge of the extent to which authors visit potential localities, investigate local history and customs, or construct or consult maps’ (Pocock 1988: 89).

Regional geographers have not been the only scholars to use literature for geographical ends in this way. Humanistic geographers, led by Yi-Fu Tuan, have sought to ‘bring human experience, subjectivity, and agency, as well as notions of meaning and value back to the core of geographic inquiry’ (Brosseau 2009: 214). Fabio Lando, for instance, describes the guiding thought of humanistic geography’s approach to human-landscape relations as being about what he calls ‘place consciousness’: drawing on the work of Tuan, he explains that ‘feelings, emotions and intuitions enrich our visions and our knowledge, transcending daily states of mind to deepen our place consciousness’ (Lando 1996: 4).
Lando’s approach to literature reveals the debt humanist geographers owe to regionalist thought. He explains that ‘Art in general, and literature in particular, constitute a “valuable storehouse” or “diagnostic index” that captures best people’s emotional reactions to their environments’ (Lando 1996: 3). To access this storehouse or index (two particularly static metaphors, at odds with the dynamic understanding of the Holmes stories evinced by the Sherlockians in this study), Lando’s method involves the ‘analysis of territorial settings in novels and stories as well as the study of landscapes, regions and geographical phenomena (all of them geographical facts)’ (Lando 1996: 4, emphasis in original). He treats literature as an instrument of geographical knowledge, rather than a generator of knowledge in its own right.

It is this instrumental approach to literature which prevents me from adopting this method of practising geography with fiction for my own study. First, this kind of literary geography has been too reliant on a ‘conventional geographical practice of taking description in realist fiction as a reliable historical source’ (Hones 2014: 21). In this study I am interested in the ways in which readers have encountered the Sherlock Holmes stories. Were I to treat my sources as inherently reliable it would limit my own critical distance, allowing me to do little more than judge whether these readers’ understandings of Holmes’s London were ‘correct’ or not, according to Doyle’s stories. As I discussed in the last chapter, I believe this line of thinking can only get us so far when analysing Sherlockian travel writings. One way in which humanistic geography’s approaches to literature can be beneficial to my own work, is, how, in Brosseau’s words, these scholars ‘showed how the geographical imagination is not the sole property of academic geographers’ (Brosseau 2009: 215). This understanding is the very foundation of my reliance on Sherlockian writings.

*Fictive geographies and textual form*

The second method of practising geography with literature that I will discuss here is characterised by the attention its practitioners pay to the formal properties of literature. It is an approach which recognises that literary texts do not simply reflect actual-world geographies of region, place or human experience – they create their own geographies (see
Brosseau 1994, 1995, 2009). Although certainly more sophisticated in its handling of literary texts than the mode of treating novels’ representations of places as unvarnished geographical knowledge, many geographers who have used this approach continue to ask similar questions: namely ‘what does literature know?’ and ‘what is the relationship between the real world and representation?’.

In an article calling for geographers to pay greater attention to literature on its own terms, particularly to the ways in which form gives rise to meaning, Angharad Saunders quotes Henry James’s metaphor of ‘the house of fiction’, which “has in short not one window but a million - a number of possible windows not be reckoned” each of which harbours its own claim to truth and each of which is needless of reinforcement’ (Saunders 2010: 441). Her point is that any geographer asking ‘what does literature know?’ cannot help but engage with the formal properties of literature. If geographers reading literature as an unvarnished source of information about space and place often looked past literary uses of language, metaphor and form, geographers in this new methodology have grappled with them as the very means of generating their insights.

The probable origins of this new approach to literature by geographers is Marc Brosseau’s ‘Geography’s Literature’ (1994). Hones calls this paper ‘an important moment in the development of geographical literary geography’ (Hones 2014: 21). This paper surveyed the field of literature geography in English and in French, as it stood in the early 1990s; Brosseau’s aim was to demonstrate the limitations of a geographers’ approach to literature which treated it as a source of geographical information - what Lando calls ‘a “valuable storehouse” or “diagnostic index”’ (Lando 1996: 3). Those limitations, as I have discussed, involve analyses which brush aside the very language and forms which make literature what it is. Brosseau devotes much space to these limitations, to strengthen the case for his preferred approach. This is ‘to consider more closely how the literature text may constitute a ‘geographer’ in its own right as it generates norms, particular models of readability, that produce a particular type of geography’ (Brosseau 1994: 349). The suggestion that literature produces ‘models of readability’ indicates that Brosseau is proposing for geographers to approach literature as literary scholars do - by engaging in ‘a greater examination of the
literary text, be it in terms of its ambiguity, density, polysemy, complexity or self-referentiality, construction, composition, etc’ (Brosseau 1994: 349).

Further, Saunders urges us to take note of, ‘the way meaning interweaves itself within the form of the text and is not wholly exterior to it’ (Saunders 2010: 442). The nature of literary meaning, she argues, is ‘something far more personal and private [than the knowledge found in scientific texts, her comparison], something that is innate, perhaps, even intangible, always plural’ (Saunders 2010: 440).

This emphasis on literature’s innate plurality of meanings, interwoven within literary language and form itself, is key. Literature’s usefulness to human geography lies not in the quality of referentiality between a given place and its textual representation. Rather, geographers should approach literature on its own terms, to engage with new geographies that are produced there. In this approach ‘the fictive dimension of literature [is not seen] as a problematic barrier to overcome or neutralise, but rather as an important source with which to engage for epistemological insight’ (Brosseau 2009: 216). Thus, Brosseau’s 1994 paper, founding this approach, praises the work of Brian Robinson (1977, 1988), who, drawing on a Lefebvran understanding of space, ‘insist[s] that literature does not “translate” a concrete experience directly and there is not necessarily a unity in space but rather a spatiotemporal fragmentation’ (Brosseau 1994: 348). He also approvingly mentions Alastair Bonnett, whose ‘Art, ideology and everyday space’ drew ‘attention to some subversive artistic tendencies and their transgression of art and everyday space’ (Brosseau 1994: 348). Saunders, in turn, writes that ‘Literature gets us to think anew, it knows about the ‘other’ and motivates us to contemplate different spatial and social orders… Its aim is not definitive truths, but interrogation of the reasonableness of alternatives’ (Saunders 2010: 440-441).

For scholars taking literature seriously as an object of geographical enquiry, the aim of this approach is to excavate alternative geographical knowledges, to provide a test or a challenge to existing ways of thinking about the world. Andrew Thacker’s ‘critical literary geography’, which he also terms ‘geographical criticism’ or ‘spatial criticism’, has been equally influential to the development of this approach. In ‘The Idea of a Critical Literary Geography’ (2005), Thacker argues that if, ‘neither theories nor social processes “exists
without geographical extent and historical duration”, then tracking how a literary work is also to be located geographically is now a major challenge for literary and cultural studies’ (Thacker 2005: 62). To do this, he warns that ‘it is important not only to discuss space and geography thematically, but also to address them as questions with a profound impact upon how literary and cultural texts are formally assembled’ (Thacker 2005: 63). Thus, ‘To investigate a novel as a spatial text must amount to more than simply considering how the text represents an interesting location’ (Thacker 2005: 63). Similarly, literary geography must ‘stress the distance from an effortless mapping of represented landscapes in literary texts, and to raise more complex questions about space and power’ (Thacker 2005: 60).

Central to his approach is a question of the representation of space in text, as per his nostrums about literary geography, Thacker is interested not in whether literary spaces faithfully reproduce actual-world spaces. Rather, he is interested to know, ‘how specific streets, stations, cafes, monuments or shops are represented in texts, and how such places offer an endorsement or contestation of official representations of space’ - in the Lefebvran sense of ‘representation of space’ as the official organisation of space (Thacker 2005: 63).

Other geographers, have engaged with this idea that literature’s multiple forms can and do produce new and different geographies. Philip Howell’s ‘Crime and the City Solution’ (1998), for example, reads crime fiction to demonstrate that even this most popular genre of literature can offer ‘different ways of conceiving space and place’ (Brosseau 1994: 348). He critically examines the claim that this genre can ‘provide radical geographers with imaginative methodological models of how various spaces of a city are connected through acts of violence’ (Schmid quoted in Howell 1998: 357-358). Howell’s readings demonstrate that crime fiction offers more geographies than those which simply - perhaps reductively - support radical geography’s epistemological assumptions. In Howell’s words: ‘It is argued here that some forms of crime fiction develop what can be called “urban knowledges” that are as critical and counter hegemonic, if not more so, than much of what passes for radical urban geography’ (Howell 1998: 358). His argument that crime novels can provide alternative forms of geographical knowledge is rooted in his approach to these texts: ‘crime novels are not generic carriers of hegemonic ideology... novels carry heterogeneous and plural readings, and in fact we can readily find in crime novels implicitly epistemological critiques’ (Howell 1998: 365). Howell’s approach demonstrates the fruits of close scrutiny of
literature’s formal properties, yet, it still represents a case of geographers talking to geographers.

Kitchin and Kneale’s study of science fiction’s geographies takes this work further. They argue that science fiction, or as they term it ‘cyberfiction’, ‘thus helps to create the imaginal sphere in which cities are being conceived and developed, and also details the coming spatial logic of postmodernity’ (Kitchen and Kneale 2001: 32). Their conclusion comes from an approach which understands texts as representational spaces, or, in their words, ‘as cognitive spaces that provide sites to contemplate possible futures given current trends. As we have argued, SF is concerned with re-presenting the present’ (Kitchin and Kneale 2001: 31). Present in their work are echoes of Lefebvre’s understanding of literature as a device which represents the plural possibilities for the organisation of the world; it generates representational space, ‘unofficial, often aesthetic conceptions of space’ (Thacker 2005: 63).

For Betrand Westphal, this approach to literature as the generator of representational spaces, as a reminder that ‘there is always another way of looking at the same thing’ (Saunders 2010: 440), lies at the heart of the methodology he calls geocriticism: ‘I will never got tired of repeating’ he writes, ‘that fiction does not reproduce the real, but actualises new virtualities that had remained unformulated, and then goes on to interact with the real according to the hypertextual logic of interfaces... fiction detects possibilities buried in the folds of the real, knowing that these folds have not been temporised’ (Westphal quoted in Prieto 2011: 20). Alternatively, for Thacker, this interaction between the possible geographies of fiction and the spaces of representation is not limited to academic geographers acquiring new ways of seeing the world. When he states that ‘the “where” of texts is variously located in the brute matter of social space’ (Thacker 2005: 59) he deliberately does not define ‘social space’ to any particular scale or register.

The idea that geographers need to take seriously literature as an object of study, to ensure that it does not ‘become reduced to the status of subject matter, theme, or raw data’ (Hones 2014: 7), has its place in my work. My study looks at the ways in which Sherlockian readers have collectively produced new geographies - of Holmes’s world and of their shared, Sherlockian world - in much the same way as Thacker’s study looks at how ‘space
and geography affect literary forms and styles’ (Thacker 2005: 60). Still, for my own work this approach leaves too many questions unanswered. Geographers such as Brosseau and Howell and literary critics such as Thacker and Westphal, treat the literary work as the main object of study. Their questions about the possible geographies enacted are aimed at the work’s initial production. They leave aside the afterlives – or, rather, the ongoing processes of co-production; the very stuff with which my project is concerned. To access these repeat performances of encounters with fiction, I will employ a third and final strand of literary geographical thought – one which emphasises these afterlives, these repeat performances, as integral to the understanding of geography and literature.

Relational thinking

The final means of doing geography with literature I will discuss here is also the direct foundation of expansionary literary geography - my own theoretical and methodological frame. It is an approach that has been called ‘relational literary geography’ (Saunders and Anderson 2015: 116), defined as a way of looking at fiction which takes as its focus not the text itself but rather the interaction between reader and text, understood as an important site of literature’s creation. Sheila Hones has called this the ‘event of the novel’ (Hones 2014: 19-34). This theory is rooted equally in literary studies’ understanding that textual interpretation is based on a dialogue or relation between text and reader (Belsey 2005: 163) and in human geography’s appreciation of space as a product of interrelations, as an open system made of ‘loose ends and missing links’ (Massey 2005: 11). This interaction is a relationship, in the sense that human geographers employ, because through their encounter the text becomes a text (as opposed to simply a collection of marked sheaves of paper) and the reader becomes a reader – understood as a subject position, rather than a permanent identity.

Relational literary geography argues that, like any relationship, this interaction between reader and text can be thought of as a spatial event: it happens in space and time, yet it also creates new spaces. Therefore, as interactions which happen in space and time, each encounter between text and reader is the source of creative agency. It is the producer of a fiction - not simply a new reading or interpretation of a set text; a fiction which is made by
combining the ideas and images on the page with those already extant in the reader’s mind or which form there through the course of a textual encounter. Further, this interrelation between reader and text happens as part of a broader set of interactions, relationships and contexts which make up the world - it is a part of space which is itself at once whole and fragmented.

Miles Ogborn’s ‘Mapping Words’ (2005) provided literary geographers with many of the necessary tools to take up this particular approach to literature in geography. He preemptively raises the spectre of a then-moribund kind of scholarship in literary studies and human geography which understood that ‘spaces were what was represented, texts were where they were represented’ (Ogborn 2005: 145). In its place, Ogborn indicates that a new kind of literary geographical thinking is rising, one in which, after Jameson, Harvey, and Soja, ‘both spaces and texts are treated as cultural productions that work along the same sort of lines. They are both something made. They could have turned out differently under different circumstances’ (Ogborn 2005: 146, emphasis added). Methodologically speaking, Ogborn’s position ‘raises serious questions about how the mode of literary cultural production actually works’ (Ogborn 2005: 146). It is this challenge which I am attempting to take up, in part, in this thesis. Ogborn’s further assertion that ‘neither spaces nor texts can be the a priori basis for the other’ (Ogborn 2005: 146), is reflected in Hones’s later definition of fiction as ‘a geographical event, a dynamic unfolding collaboration happening in time and space’ (Hones 2014: 32).

One way to think about fiction as being a sociospatial event, as a process which unfolds in space and time, rather than as being confined within an object such as a book, is as a performance. (Ogborn 2005: 148; Hones 2014: 4). To think about fiction as a performance is to immediately assert its social, its spatial and its relational aspects. Playwright David Hare argues that, ‘A play is what happens in between the stage and the audience’ (quoted in Richardson 2015: 13). This evocative image is a reminder of the in-betweenness of literary creation. The ‘play’ does not reside entirely within any one part of the performance - not the script, nor the actors’ performance, nor the audience’s reception - but comes into being through the relationship between all of these. And whilst group reading of novels or newspapers is no longer as popular as it was two hundred years ago, reading literature can
equally be a performance, in that fiction cannot be said to reside wholly in any part of the
exchange - it is neither entirely the text, nor is it wholly the creation of the reader.
Performances of fiction equally happen **somewhere**, and the theory of fiction as an event
helps to focus our attention on the **where** of Sherlockian performances – and how these
spaces shape the stories which are produced.

Thinking about encounters with fiction as performances also helps us to overcome an
assumption that there is a hierarchy among literary meaning-makings. In traditional literary
criticism, the construction of literary meaning or insight is rooted in an action, whether that
is reading or writing. ‘Performance’ can describe all actions which bear on literary meaning
making - whether writing, reading, remembering, or discussing a fictional work (Hones
2014: 6). It also emphasises their ongoing nature. The usefulness of this blanket term is not
in any assumption that these actions are the same, but comes from an understanding that
they bear equally on the production of fiction. It recognises, to follow Julian Yates, after
Jane Bennett, the utility of imagining a ‘flat ontology’ of readers, writers, and others
involved in the creation of literature (Yates 2013: 43). By talking of ‘performance’ rather
than ‘reading’, we can broaden our frame of vision regarding fictional encounters, from
initial readings of originary texts, to the kind of ongoing, on-paper and in-person discussions
of those same stories which are a cornerstone of Sherlockian practice.

This approach to practising geography with literature also encourages us to look at the
dispersed interactions between different readers. The idea that fiction is the result of a
performance can act as a reminder that the people who read fiction are not only academics
in pursuit of scholarly insight. Jo Sharp’s ‘Towards a critical analysis of fictive geographies’
(2000) laid some of the earliest foundations of this kind of thinking for literary geography.
She argued that scholars paying attention the literary form, as suggested by Brosseau (1994)
was useful, but that ‘it is also important to consider the text as a thing. Otherwise the
academic interpreter must assume either that all read the complexities of the text with the
same informed skills, or that the academic interpretation is somehow more valid than other
possible readings’ (Sharp 2000: 332). Ogborn recognises this facet of relational literary
geographical inquiry with greater urgency. He argues that literary geographers need to
‘show how reading is undertaken in fundamentally different ways in different places’,
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because the ‘same text takes on quite different meanings, and is put to very different uses, as readers interpret and appropriate texts through distinct reading practices’ (Ogborn 2005: 148). How might we go about uncovering these different meanings and uses? Saunders provides the beginnings of a specific approach, when she counsels scholars ‘to examine what really happened [during the creative process] and to unearth the people and places that collide along this line of creation - to grasp the very livedness of the writing process - the daily minutiae’ (Saunders 2010: 450). It is this that I will do with regard to reading Sherlockian writings and the contexts of their production.

Relational literary geography further allows us to conceptualise these texts as productions by more than a single author. According to the methodological and theoretical stances of Hones, Ogborn and others, fictive geographies are products of the interactions between authors, texts and readers. Such an approach is useful for this study, as it allows me to move beyond simply asking questions of Doyle’s texts and to include the encounters and writings of Sherlockian readers in my understanding of the creative agency of the Sherlock Holmes stories. This idea rests on Ogborn’s notion that readers appropriate texts and put them to various uses (Ogborn 2005: 148). But it goes further. The ‘idea of text as event - that a text ‘happens’ when read - is well established in literary studies, particularly in the fields of reader-response and reception’ (Hones 2008: 1302). Nevertheless, ‘the happening has rarely been understood within literary studies as a spatial event, something with a geography; which is to say, something which happens at the intersection of agents and situations scattered across time and space, both human and non-human, absent and present’ (Hones 2008: 1302). Thinking about literary production as a relation, with its roots both in the ‘brute matter of social space’ (Thacker 2005: 59) and in the dialogic relation between reader and text, literary geographers have demonstrated that looking at the encounter between reader and text is a fruitful site for understanding the production and development of fictive geographies.

In essence, this approach takes up the challenge established by scholars such as Thacker, who argued that literary geographers should ‘raise more complex questions about space and power, and how space and geography affect literary forms and styles’ (Thacker 2005: 60), or Ogborn’s call for a literary geography which recognises that ‘texts are part of the
cultural production of spaces, and spaces are part of the cultural production of texts’ (Ogborn 2005: 146); it answers this challenge by insisting that as cultural productions texts and spaces are not made only once, by individuals, but rather are products of Massey’s ‘multiplicities’ (Massey 2005: 11). This approach ‘rests on a definition of textual meaning as the result of negotiation - the product of an interaction - a definition that makes it interestingly difficult to locate meaning and assign agency in any precise sense’ (Hones 2014: 22). This acceptance of dispersed creative agency and recognition that its location is always imprecise guides my approach to Sherlockian readers as collaborative shapers of Holmes and his geographies.

Finally, using relational literary geography can help us shake off the idea that literary criticism should be concerned with praising good readings and condemning bad ones. This is particularly important for this thesis, which must challenge the prevailing scholarly scorn for Sherlockian readings. The conceptualisation of fiction as an event, with its explicitly spatial approach to fiction contains an ‘inherent validation of multiplicity in reading’, a proposition which ‘provides a helpfully non-competitive way of understanding and dealing not only with incompatible interpretations of particular texts but also with widely different definitions of the reader’ (Hones 2008: 1302). Categories of good or bad reading must fall away in the light of readers, authors and texts as relational effects. It is a serious justification for putting Sherlockians into the frame. It is worth quoting Sheila Hones in full, when she writes:

> Once we begin to think of the author and the reader, for example, as relational effects rather than independent entities, then we can start to think of the event of the text as a contingent achievement. This is important for work in literary geography because its shifts the emphasis away from the critical assessment of a reading and toward an engagement with the range of readings that is less concerned with evaluation. In so doing, it becomes less interested in distinguishing good readings from bad readings, skilful analyses from unsophisticated reactions, and instead becomes able to consider the ways in which different kinds of reading perform different kinds of contextual appropriateness (Hones 2014: 31).
Thought of in this way, Sherlockians writing about Holmes’s world as place on the borders of fact and fiction, whose own borders are undefined in space and time, are not bad readers - they are people engaged in a fictional performance that is appropriate to its particular context, which is Sherlockiana itself.

Drawing thus on theoretical guidance from relational literary geography, I will approach my topic with a focus on the encounter between Sherlockian readers and the Sherlock Holmes stories as an event, with imaginative and spatial consequences. Such an approach, itself the foundation of expansionary literary geography, raises two more issues that I will deal with in the next two sections. First, how can I refine the idea of fiction as an event to better understand the social context in which these Sherlockian encounters with texts take place? Secondly, what analytical tools are available to help me appreciate the spatiality of these Sherlockians’ acts of fictional co-creation? I will address each of these in turn.

Living fictions

It is a common expectation, in what is still the age of the novel, that reading is a rather quiet, personal and isolated pursuit. Such an image is used to great effect by Italo Calvino, near the beginning of his *If on a winter’s night a traveller…* (1981). Speaking to his intended reader, Calvino suggests they ‘Relax. Concentrate. Dispel every other thought. Let the world around you fade. Best to close the door (Calvino 1981: 3). This image of the world fading around the reader, as they slip into silent, individual communion with a book, has been equally popular with academics. Writing about textual analysis for an introductory book on research methods in English Studies, Catherine Belsey follows Calvino’s advice well: her discussion of the dialogic relationship between text (in her case, a painting) and viewer, treats the viewer’s ‘position’ as if it were locatable in abstract space - the world around her and Titian’s *Tarquin and Lucretia*, whether it is an art gallery, or her own office, seems to have truly faded into the background (Belsey 2005: 161-166).

The members of the British-based Henry Williamson Society present a good example of readers being silently absorbed. Though observed specifically for their social reading practices, as members of a literary society, many of these readers are shown to be wholly
absorbed in silent, individual acts of reading. ‘Liz does most of her reading in bed’, writes ethnographer Adam Reed, whereas Dave preferred position is ‘Lying sprawled on the leather sofa, with his shoes off and feet dangling over the armrest’ where he ‘can happily read regardless of distractions’ (Reed 2004: 113). For these readers, books are objects of desire - to be stacked up by the bed, or stored in bookcases so numerous they seem to line every wall: ‘it was almost as though they conceived of a home as one large bookcase, a space into which these objects must fit’ (Reed 2004: 113). Reed’s imagery brings to mind Blanchot’s claim, that literary space ‘implies the withdrawal of what is ordinarily meant by "place"; it suggests the site of this withdrawal’ (Blanchot 1982: 10). One interviewee, reflecting on the attraction of reading, suggests something similar when he says that ‘when you really get into a good book you lose time and space, don’t you, you are gone’ (Reed 2004: 114). Sitting immobilised in bed, or on the sofa, surrounded by books on every wall and surface, the members of the Henry Williamson Society seem to exemplify this image of the still, silent, isolated reader, withdrawn from the world.

Despite the popularity of the idea of silent reading, human geographers argue that encounters with literature cannot actually be untangled from their social contexts (Ogborn 2005: 146; Thacker 2005: 59). Saunders, for instance, responding to a suggestion that ‘it is, perhaps, time to shift attention to the geographies of reception’, notes that literary geographers need to ‘recognize that meaning and significance often lie at the intersection of creation and consumption, production and reception’ (Saunders 2010: 449). The idea that fictional encounters are collaborations ‘happening in space and time’ (Hones 2014: 32) may carry with it a sense that the process is automatic, or at least often unconscious. Relational literary geography describes fiction as necessarily an ongoing process, as never completed (Anderson 2015: 124). In this thesis I am interested in the encounters with fiction of a group of readers who have often deliberately sought to make and remake the Sherlock Holmes stories. David Brewer’s idea of imaginative expansion, a theory of communal reading, can help to identify those ‘multiple traces of other readers and writers’ (Hones 2008: 1301) that make up any fictional event. Further, it provides a tool to analyse them not as part of a subconscious process of cultural co-production, but rather as a highly conscious and deliberate process of readers adding to or expanding Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes stories for their own, social ends.
Brewer’s theory of ‘imaginative expansion’ has gained traction among scholars of fandom as a means of understanding the power of collective or communal engagement with fiction (Jenkins 2006; Mackey and McClay, 2008; Rebaza 2009; Rigney 2012). He argues that the impetus for readers’ desire to expand an originary text with creative writings of their own can in many cases be traced back to their membership of a community, whether virtual or actual (Brewer 2006: 12-13). Members of a reading community are more likely to share a sense of collective ownership or investment in characters and other literary artefacts, which can lead them to neglect or even nullify, for the purposes of collective activity that strengthens their ties to the group, the proprietary rights normally associated with authorship and get creative with their fictional encounters. The implications for relational literary geography are that people who read in groups, such as Sherlockians, are perhaps more likely to see the ‘dynamic, unfolding collaboration’ of a fictional happening (Hones 2014: 32) as a group affair - and to attempt to communicate the results of their encounters with fiction to their fellow readers. Franco Moretti writes about the ‘slaughter of literature’ (Moretti 2000: 209), yet this is perhaps more an example of the continuing abundance of fictional creation.

At the centre of Brewer’s theorisation of reading communities and readers’ desires for ‘more’ of a character are two imagined spaces - the textual commons and the coterie public. Brewer’s study is of eighteenth-century readers and it is from this period that the idea of the textual commons originated. He quotes one contemporary reader-appropriator, William Kenrick, who claimed that, ‘readers have a traditionary right to use characters, just as cottagers have the right to use the commons’ (Brewer 2005: 12). The textual commons, therefore, is an imagined space where characters roam free, to be utilised (but not owned) by readers and other writers. As textual cottagers, these readers are part of a semi-exclusive group, centred on a common cultural object. Readers ‘who imagine characters as common, and hence available to the public [beyond authorial control], also imagine themselves as part of a public, a virtual community interested in the same things as they are’ - in other words, imaginative expansion (Brewer 2005: 14). This process must be felt more strongly among the actual communities of Sherlockiana. The coterie public, contrastingly, describes a more intimately social environment: a self-selecting group that forms around a character or
text and, whether collaboratively or antagonistically, shapes its development whilst retaining over it a sense of shared but contested ownership (Brewer 2005: 121-122). Both these images - of the loose yet defined public, united around a shared desire to imaginatively expand a character, and the tight-knit, intimate and quarrelsome circle, furiously negotiating the shape of characters and stories’ directions - come together in the immensely popular yet often intimate community of Sherlockiana.

These theories are particularly useful to understand the imaginative expansionary tendencies of Sherlockians, as a brief overview of other theories from fandom research can demonstrate. One example is Abigail Derecho’s idea of fan fictions as ‘archontic’ literatures. Opposing earlier understandings of fan fiction, which explained the relationship between these texts and originary, source texts using apparently pejorative descriptive terms such as ‘derivative’ and ‘appropriative’, Derecho’s theory instead proposes an intertextual relationship between source texts and fan fictions that values the creativity of each equally (Derecho 2006: 63). Her idea draws on the work of Derrida, whose ‘archontic’ archive describes a self-enlarging and intertextual archive of literature bound together by a relationship to an originary text (Derecho 2006: 63-64). Other theorists have built on Derecho’s archontic label. Sheenagh Pugh, for instance, focuses on the ‘why’ rather than the ‘what’ of fan fiction and finds it in the readerly desire for ‘more’ that haunts the creation of many such texts. She distinguishes between readers looking for ‘more of’, and those seeking ‘more from’, an originary text or character (Pugh 2005). Similarly, Sabine Vanacker builds on Derecho and Pugh to create a “critical perspective developed for the collaborative, democratic and ever-open phenomenon of fan fiction and other so-called ‘archontic’ literature”. She applies this theory directly to the Holmes stories, arguing that the central, ‘master text’ around which others gather is Doyle’s early work, before he attempted to kill off Holmes at the Reichenbach Falls. His later stories all, like fan fictions, she argues, involved fixing ‘yet another Holmes adventure within the existing body of work’ (Vanacker 2012: 94).

In contrast, Brewer’s theory usefully de-centres originary texts from their assumed position as ‘master texts’, by arguing that many story artefacts can only be imaginatively expanded on once they have become unmoored from their originary texts (Brewer 2005: 10-15). The
instance of Sherlockian fans relegating Doyle from originary creator to Watson’s friend and literary agent is a case in point. More strikingly, Sherlockian writings propose a challenge to Derecho’s central claim that fan fictions, as archontic literature, are inherently ethical and democratic, having historically provided a platform for the progressive engagement with canonical or popular texts by economically and socially marginal authors (Derecho 2006: 67). His emphasis on the struggles among the coterie public to own and define characters and texts can help us to think through these points of contention (Brewer 2005: 121-125).

Further, imaginative expansion suggests a connection between the communal practice of expansionary reading, often theorised as contained within some form of fanatical domain or ‘fandom’, and an individual’s encounter with fiction. Literary scholars have long debated the co-productive or co-creative nature of reading. The graphic artist Peter Mendelsund describes this in geographical terms, claiming that, ‘We colonise books with our familiars; and we exile, repatriate the characters to lands we are more acquainted with’ (Mendelsund 2014: 2011). This kind of dialogism is well captured by what is known as ‘gap-filling’. Bakhtin talked about the process of readers’ visualising writers’ words, where ‘time thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; space, for its part, “becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history”’ (cited in Pechey 2007: 84). Yet, readers do more than imagine a writer’s words - they commingle their own memories and experiences, their own ideas and images, with those found on the page. Narratologist Marie-Laure Ryan, for instance, argues that ‘while story space consists of selected places separated by voids, the narrative world is conceived by the imagination... as a coherent, unified, ontologically full and materially existing geographical entity’ (Ryan 2010 quoted in Hones 2011: 688). Other scholars go further. J. Hillis Miller, for instance, builds his theory of the relation between landscape and fiction on the Heideggerian idea that to contemplate a place is to be made to inhabit it. He illustrates the applicability of this idea with a reference to nineteenth-century realist fiction: ‘a great many Victorian novels presuppose in their readers an intimate knowledge of the socio-economic topography of London’ (Miller 1995: 20). In other words, these novelists were taking advantage of their readers’ expectations of being drawn into the story, of necessarily populating it with the minutiae of their own lives.
What characterises the idea of readers’ gap-filling is the sheer subjectivity of the act. A Victorian reader more familiar with London will surely have a different image of the streets around the Old Curiosity Shop than one who was not? Mendelsund’s characters-in-exile must live in different places than my own, given our very different memories and experiences. French psychologist and literary critic Pierre Bayard has tackled this question in relation to Doyle’s *The Hound of the Baskervilles*. In *Sherlock Holmes Was Wrong* (2011), Bayard argues that all texts are unfinished, and only become completed when the reader fills in ‘the rifts’ in the text - achieves a state of ‘subjective closure’ (Bayard 2008: 66, emphasis in original). Like other scholars who have tackled this question, Bayard mobilises a spatial metaphor, in his case it is the idea of a psychological space in which readers and characters meet; not inside the storyworld yet not in the actual world either. ‘[T]here exists between the world of fiction and the “real” world an intermediate world unique to each person... inhabitants from both worlds meet there and intermingle’ (Bayard 2008: 124-125, emphasis in original). It is in this space, which is populated equally by elements of the text and of the readers’ lives, that readers’ subjective fictions are created. However, it is precisely because the results are so subjective that they remain an individual experience: each reader ‘will find it impossible, past the level of superficial agreement, to truly communicate with other readers of the same book - precisely because they are talking about the same book’ (Bayard 2008: 66-67, emphasis in original).

When thinking about communal reading, such as that practised by Sherlockians, it is unsatisfactory to begin and end an investigation into the ‘multiple traces of other readers and writers’ (Hones 2008: 1301) at the level of the individual. Yet, how can this barrier of subjectivity be overcome? Taken together, Hones’s relational literary geography and Brewer’s imaginative expansion provide the answer. Unlike members of the Henry Williamson Society, Sherlockians do not primarily engross themselves in readings of Doyle’s canonical stories. Social gatherings, as my thesis shows, are perhaps more important than silent reading. This is important because, as Hones reminds us, the kinds of individual encounters with fiction that Bayard describes, ‘only become publicly accessible when subsequently articulated within the mediating context of a particular social situation’ (Hones 2008: 1302). Brewer’s ideas of textual commoning and the coterie public can help to shed light on the particularity of the Sherlockian social situation: it is one in which readers
do not read alone but rather form part of a community ‘interested in the same things as they are’ (Brewer 2005: 14). In the case of Sherlockians, this communal interest lies in ‘obsess[ing] about every detail of the fictional universe... mentally inhabiting this geography of the imagination’ (Saler 2012: 107). In other words, Sherlockians, reading as part of a large community devoted to exploring every facet of Holmes and his world, overcome the subjectivity inherent in inserting themselves into Doyle’s stories by openly recognising they are doing as much through *sharing and discussing this practice with their fellow readers*. Their articles and writings on Holmes are presented to other readers as attempts to negotiate the meaning and significance of these stories beyond the bounds of a single text or the subjectivity of a single reader.

The interactions between readers which make up this communal approach to encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories are often far messier than these readers might admit. As Sheila Hones has argued, ‘if we take up the idea that all readings are articulated within the mediating context of some kind of social situation’ then we can understand that all readings are *the same* practice ‘differently conditioned by context, conventions, and expectations’. This should lead us to ask:

> What kinds of interpretation are considered appropriate? How is disagreement managed? How is originality assessed and how much is it valued? What skills are privileged? What kinds of other texts are referred to? (Hones 2008: 1306-1307).

Hones’s questions provide a way to cut apart the façade of the Sherlockian community and to peer into its darker corners, to look more closely at the ways in which this community negotiates differences – of imagination, of opinion, of perception. I touch on these ideas in Chapter 5, first in relation to the apparent tensions between two different views of Peshawar – a former colonial city – one by Western visitor and one by a local Sherlockian. Secondly, I discuss certain community members’ historic antipathy to women.

However, the reader should note that Hones’s questions do not form a backbone to this study. That is, my exploration of Sherlockian co-productions looks to the communal level and does not dig deeper. This is a conscious decision, informed by the fact that this study is
but the start of a longer research project. In this instalment, my aim is to demonstrate that there is such as thing as a community of Sherlockian readers, who have practiced expansionary literary geography and, by so doing, have co-produced the literary spaces of Holmes’s world. In later projects I will delve more deeply into the apparent antagonisms and tensions by which this community has together crafted a collective vision.

Open literary spaces

In the decades since Mikhail Bakhtin’s work on dialogism and chronotopes was translated into English, it has become a matter of broad recognition among academics working with literature that space is a necessary frame through with to approach texts, and that readers play a crucial role in making and shaping literary space. For scholars working with detective fiction, a genre whose apparent foregrounding of action and plot perhaps elided the equal importance of setting and space, this debate has been slower to come, perhaps, than for other genres. Writing as recently as 2008, David Geherin noted that, whilst crime fiction of the twenty-first century had, for the most part, moved beyond the idea of literary space as having ‘mainly an ornamental purpose, a decorative background to the action’ (Geherin 2008: 3), he added the caveat that some critics and writers of crime fictions still find appeal in this idea of space as a container for action. It is also noticeable in scholarship which insists on treating literary space as only representational, and argues that representations of space are reflective of, and receptive to, the detective’s imposition of order onto the chaos of crime.

Often, the textual spaces of crime fiction have been represented in geographical or social isolation from the chaotic world beyond. This serves both to limit the criminal act in time as well as space and ensure the scene of the crime will return to a semblance of natural order once the detective’s privileged narrative (‘the solution’) is asserted. Thus, cast out of time and the spaces of the everyday, these spaces of crime lend detective fiction an air of immobility: bodies are arrested in motion, individualism is quashed (see Moretti 1983: 135) and even time stagnates, in ‘the endlessly repeating present’ (Priestman, quoted in Vanacker 2012: 94).
The reader may have guessed, from my words so far, that this is not the approach to the spaces of Holmes’s world that I find useful. My work, rather, aims to understand the literary spaces of a Holmesian, or perhaps, Sherlockian world as open, dynamic and filled with potential. What does an approach to literature aimed at exploring the openness of literary spaces look like? In the first instance, I am guided by the work of relational literary geographers, particularly by Sheila Hones and her notion of fiction as an event. In this approach to understanding the spatiality of literature the focus is not on the detective, as the chief protagonist, and his or her influence on narrative space as a subsidiary of plot.

Rather, the focus, my focus, is on readers as the active agents in creating both time and space in the story. Hones argues, for instance, that ‘a literary geography for which texts happens in interaction’ – that is, which follows the logic outlined earlier in this methodology, that fictions are not bound up in any one person’s mind, nor in any text, but rather are the product of interrelations between text, author, and reader, the result of an active performance – has no need ‘to separate time from space’ (Hones 2014: 10). Thinking like this de-centres the detective character as the locus of space in texts like these and re-centres it on the reader.

With the Sherlockian reader at the centre of the production of space in the Sherlock Holmes stories, I would further argue that the space created by Sherlockians’ engagements with these texts is a real space. By this I mean to draw attention, in this study, to the fact that for Sherlockians there both is and is not a difference between the spaces of Holmes’s world and the spaces outside of these texts. We can see this ambiguity at work when we consider that Sherlockian and academic Michael Saler’s comment about readers being eager to explore this ‘fictional universe… this geography of the imagination’ (Saler 2012: 107) sits alongside John Shelton Reed’s eagerness to draw the spaces of his own childhood into Holmes’s world (which I discuss in more detail in Chapter 5). We can see it in Michael Hammer’s willingness to at once confirm Holmes as an entirely fictional character and yet to go tramping around two continents in pursuit of his footsteps.

Relational literary geography provides a way to think about this. ‘The literary-geographical space in which fiction happens is a real space’ writes Hones, it is ‘an active dimension of
interrelations, intertextualities, and multiplicity’ (Hones 2014: 9). Returning to an idea I raised earlier in this chapter, I propose a ‘flat ontology’ of literary and extra-textual spaces (Yates 2013: 43). This is not to say that literary spaces and actual-world spaces are the same thing - they are different kinds of spaces, yet both real spaces nonetheless. Miles Ogborn suggests something similar when he writes of literary geographical methodologies which are concerned with ‘treating spaces and texts in parallel - which is not to say that they are treated as the same thing - and drawing out interpretations and connections from that’ (Ogborn 2005: 145).

Speaking about literary spaces in terms of creation and production provides a useful terminology to understand the ways in which Sherlockians make the literary spaces they encounter malleable to their own ends. This is a group of readers who have gathered around the idea of exploring every nook and cranny of Holmes’s world. I would suggest that the term ‘discovery’ is also useful in this regard, as it describes Sherlockian appropriations of spaces for the purposes of imaginatively expanding Holmes’s, and fits well with an approach to literary space in which ‘texts are part of the cultural production of spaces and spaces are part of the cultural production of texts’ (Ogborn 2005: 146). Acts of discovery are indeed an important theme in Sherlockian textual encounters, as they lend a sense of vitality to the readers’ collective depiction of Holmes’s life and world. Through representing their literary tourist encounters as acts of discovery, on the edges of Doyle’s texts, Sherlockian travel writers engage in the act of legitimising their contributions to the collective mission of expanding Holmes’s literary spaces – building on what they call ‘the Saga’ (Shreffler 1986: 37) with acts of readerly creativity. References to ‘saga’ implicitly suggest a world of shared stories whose authorship is held in common.

The idea that fictional spaces can be discovered and built on, over and again, stands in contrast to other popular theories of fiction and space. Take fictional worlds theories, for instance, pioneered by Thomas Pavel and advanced by the work of narratologist Marie-Laure Ryan. It is a central tenet of fictional worlds theorists that the ‘real’ or ‘actual’ world, the world outside of fiction, the world of you and of me, stands distinct from fictional or possible variations of it. Pavel likened the profusion of fictional and possible worlds that spring out of the multiple possible and actual representations in fictions and imagination
(what Dolezel called ‘heterocosms’) to ‘distant planets that orbit a star’ - the star being reality (quoted in Westphal 2007: 76) The plural reference to planets is deliberate - Pavel argues that ‘the gradual detachment of fiction from truth is a historical process, in the course of which various types of fictional territories and borders arise, each entertaining its own kind of relation to the actual world’ (Pavel 1983: 83). Yet, just as Pavel’s image of fictional worlds as distant planets establishes a sense of unassailable removal from spaces of the everyday, he corrects such thinking with a warning: ‘Far from being well-defined and sealed off, fictional borders appear to be variously accessible, sometimes easy to trespass, obeying different sorts of constraints in different contexts’ (Pavel 1983: 88).

If Pavel’s work discussed the idea of borders between the fictional and the actual, Ryan’s work addresses the question of what kind of spaces make up fictional worlds. Like Pavel, Ryan’s theory of literary spaces as fictional worlds appears to offer an explanation for the ways in which Sherlockians have approached and appropriated the spaces of Doyle’s texts. She argues that there is merit in the idea that ‘Once we become immersed in a fiction, the characters become real for us, and the world they live in momentarily takes the place of the actual world’ (Ryan 1991: 21). Ryan is equally aware of the important role of readers in the creation of literary spaces, particularly in relation to detective fiction: ‘The greatest masterpieces of the plot-world – such as the archetypal plots of the detective novel, or of the tale of the dragon-slayer – are not individual achievements but collective creations’ (Ryan 1991: 150). Yet, the fictional worlds that Ryan describes are noticeably static, preformed, and lacking in the ‘connections yet to be made, juxtapositions yet to flower into interaction’ (Massey 2005: 11) that appears to characterise Sherlockian writings about Holmes’s world.

The inherent stability and static nature of Ryan’s fictional worlds, so amenable to the fictional detective’s social control yet so alien to the Sherlockian’s practice of expansionary reading, is illustrated by the spatial metaphor by which she describes it: a concentric series of territories: ‘each territory is contained within another, and as travelers cross the narrative space, they must recenter in reverse order each of the territories encountered on the way’ (Ryan 1991: 175). This idea of fictional worlds as concentric stacks, inside and outside each other, does allow for oddities, such as the contamination of levels, strange loops, and an
endlessly expanding stack representing an open-ended text. Nevertheless the rigid nature of this mental construction belies its utility in understandings the messy, dynamic and continually forming and reforming socioliterary spaces of Sherlockiana.

Instead, my thesis’s approach to literary space is built on human geography’s understanding of space as always under construction. The cornerstone of this way of thinking is Henri Lefebvre’s idea that space is at once fragmented and whole - that is, ‘the space of social practice, the space occupied by sensory phenomena, including products of the imagination’ (Lefebvre 1991: 12) is made up of the multiple different interactions, interrelations and practices which produce space(s) and yet is also the total of all those practices. The metaphor sometimes offered is that of a prism, through which light can be discerned as at once divided into many colours and yet being itself whole. My thesis draws more readily from the work of Doreen Massey who, building on Lefebvre, has suggested three propositions for geographers about space.

First, space is the product of interrelations, it does not exist a priori as a container for action but rather is made by actions and interactions. Second, space is ‘the sphere of the possibility of the existence of multiplicity in the sense of contemporaneous plurality’ (Massey 2005: 9) - that is, space is the sphere where many different actions, ways of life, and thoughts coexist, often on different trajectories. (Massey contrasts this with a modernist notion of time in which all things are converging towards the present.) Third, space is always under construction; it is never fixed. Space is ‘is a product of relations-between, relations which are necessarily embedded material practices which have to be carried out, it is always in the process of being made. It is never fixed; never closed. Perhaps we could imagine space as a simultaneity of stories-so-far’ (Massey 2005: 9). As I understand it, this idea of space as ‘stories-so-far’, rather than as a fixed structure produced by an author, or the logic of the detective as a chief protagonist, or even by the reader’s encounter with fiction, describes well the communal, co-productive and collaborative literary space that Sherlockians have created.

Here I will outline two models of literary space which directly inform my approach to Sherlockian writings about Holmes’s world, both of which develop Massey’s three principles
above. The first model, borrowed from Sheila Hones, suggests that there are three kinds of literary space, of interest to the literary geographer. It builds on Massey’s idea that space is the site of multiplicity (in the case of literature there will always be multiple readings in process at any one time). First, ‘the fictional space generated in the event of the text’ (Hones 2014: 8) - that is what might be termed ‘narrative space’, although taking into account the reader’s interaction with the spaces of the text and the resulting mixed spaces which are produced. Second is the ‘uncontained intersexual space that opens out from’ the text with every reading (Hones 2014: 8) - in other words, the spaces, literary and actual, which readers bring into the text, and which break out from the text, with each reference made or recognised by the reader. Third is the wider ‘sociospatial dimension of the collaboration’ between all manner of people involved in the production, dissemination, and reception of the text (Hones 2014: 8). Each of these kinds of literary space can be considered on its own, yet each contributes to the whole of literary space.

My second model comes from the idea that space is ‘a simultaneity of stories-so-far’ (Massey 2005: 9). David Coughlan suggests that the notion of the intertextual provides a useful means of understanding literary space as social space. He invites us to consider ‘the way that this networked space, which extends the space of texts, is structured, for… we can visualise that situation where a quotation from one text appears in another, and [ask] whether quotations transport us to another part of the literary space or insert another space into their own’ (Coughlan 2002: 207). His answer to that question is to characterise citations and quotations as ideas in ‘copresence’, and to argue that the intertextual ‘is not a means by which we can link one textual space with another, or move from one to another, but is itself a part of that space, is, in fact, the whole of that space. Like Lefebvre’s l’espace, textual space is a space made up of spaces, and though we may see the covers of the book as the borders of our wandering, a wider horizon is always available’ (Coughlan 2002: 208). To both of these models I would add the caveat that spaces can be generated through encounters with re-performances and repeat performances of earlier encounters with fictions, as well as through encounters with written accounts of other readers’ own encounters. Both of these situations are common for Sherlockian readers. They are a reminder that literary spaces are not solely the product of encounters with originary texts.
Research Design

Reading by example

In the abstract, ideas about world making can seem forbidding. The notion of expansionary literary geography, even after this, might seem opaque. To address this, my research reads by example. I follow a technique that could be thought of as Aristotelian - a peripatetic act of learning from encounter and experience - rather than the Platonic method of discerning truths from ideal forms, from a scholarly idea of how literature should work. One reason I took this approach is that it brought me closer to my subject material, so that I could better understand and analyse the data that my research generated. During an encounter with my departmental advisory committee in my first year of research, I was advised that a thesis about mobility could not be done in good faith whilst standing still. In this frame of mind, I travelled, and I took part in a small way in the practices of Sherlockian expansionary literary geographies. From my room in Washington, D.C., I wrote short pieces for the *Baker Street Journal*. I joined a Sherlockian tour of New York City. I travelled from Cambridge to Washington D.C. and Minneapolis, to experience for myself the textual world Sherlockians have together created. In my own way, I followed in Holmes’s footsteps, trying to observe as well as see.

From the beginning, my understanding was that a philosophically-minded thesis, characterised by my own musings on the nature of reading and its relationship to literary spaces, would not be an effective means of achieving my research aims. At first I attributed this to a kind of intellectual modesty. ‘What could I, a mere student, say about texts that has not been said already; how can I provide insight?’. Later, I accredited it to my early training as an historian; presenting cases as evidence for a larger explanation was a tried-and-tested technique. However, in time I recognised that there are more material reasons why my thesis is framed around a series of textual case studies. First, I am interested in what some might call the afterlives of literature; in the repeat performances of stories between readers; in what happens when things get passed on. Of course, as I explain throughout the thesis, the term afterlife is perhaps misleading, for these performances are an integral part of the continual, collaborative co-production of fiction, happening over and over again. To
this end, I could have used my own readings of Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes stories. Other academics, such as Jon Anderson in his recent paper on producing literary geographies in Cardiff (Anderson 2015) have put this technique to good use. Yet, as I see it, academic autoethnographies are a staple of current literary geography practice - I wanted to look at other readers.

Secondly, my analysis of texts produced by Sherlockian readers, in the same manner and with the same tools as critics have read originary texts, is part of a conscious effort towards the rehabilitation of these sources into serious scholarship. Rather than think of these texts as readily-ignorable examples of Umberto Eco’s ‘literary fanship’ (Eco 1994: 84), I have approached them with an understanding that each text can reveal something important about how people make stories and how they make spaces. In this way, my approach presents a challenge to a species of academic thought exemplified by Robert Tally, for instance. He defines literary geography as a process whereby, ‘The critical reader becomes a kind of geographer who actively interprets the literary map in such a way as to present new, sometimes hitherto unforeseen mappings’ (Tally 2013: 79, emphasis added). By presenting for close inspection the maps, stories and analyses of Holmes’s literature, life and world created by Sherlockians – those uncritical, ‘ordinary’ or even ‘naive’ readers – I hope to dispel this idea that only critical or academic readers hold such power. Further, I believe that such evidence can provide a chance to explore ‘how the mode of literary cultural production actually works’ (Ogborn 2005: 148, emphasis added).

Finally, my choice to present my findings as case studies is due to how this research conceptualises space. A ‘case’ is ‘a unit of human activity embedded in the real world; which can only be studied or understood in context; which exists in the here and now; that merges in with its context so that precise boundaries are difficult to draw’ (Gillham 2000: 1) In this thesis I follow Doreen Massey’s understanding of space as ‘a simultaneity of stories-so-far’ (Massey 2005: 9). Space, in this understanding, is not a fixed realm created by an author, or imagined whole and complete by a reader, it is open, dynamic and filled with potential connections and interrelations: stories waiting to happen. Such an image of space happening and about to happen does not lend itself, I believe, to abstract philosophic
speculation but to the study of examples of what has gone before, with a mind to preparing oneself for what could happen next, as time as space unfold.

Detective fiction

Detective fiction is a literary form particularly suited to my project of uncovering readers’ co-productions of literature and spaces. This stems from a complex relationship between reader and author, that in this genre is established through plot and setting. On the one hand, crime fiction of all stripes is used by many as a form of escapist reading. Much of its power in this regard comes from the control established by authors over their stories. Lennard Davis argues that detective fiction is a prime example of what he calls the teleogenic plot – a narrative arc whereby later events, such as the revelation of the detective’s solution, significantly alter the reader’s perception of events earlier in the story. Teleogenic plots reinforce the basic ideological function of the novel: to make the reader believe they have a say in the plot, while in fact reinforcing the novel’s core, bourgeois message of personal change at the expense of political upheaval (Davis 1987: 206-210).

Other scholars have recognised the extent to which this authorial control over plot can be used to reinforce certain ideological ends. In his survey of London at the turn of the twentieth century, Jonathan Schneer noted that the Sherlock Holmes stories were one of many examples of Empire-oriented popular culture, which grew out of a climate of pro-imperialism meant to be consumed uncritically (Schneer 2001: 113). Alternatively, D.A. Miller argues that Victorian detective fictions, particularly those which featured a lone, middle-class amateur detective and which portrayed the regular police as bumbling fools, played a central role in enforcing bourgeois standards and expectations on their readership (Miller 1988: 16). Still today, far from a world in which Sherlock Holmes defended British Imperial ambitions abroad and maintained social standards at home, the events on the BBC’s Sherlock (2011) television series unfold in the same way: notwithstanding the plethora of fan theories about how Holmes did or did not escape his dramatic end in season two’s The Reichenbach Fall, writers Steve Moffatt and Mark Gatiss asserted authorial privilege by revealing the ‘true’ version of events in The Empty Hearse.
Setting is, however, another matter. The high levels of realism demanded of most detective stories mean that they sit in a complex relationship with the actual world, as the following argument from Clive Bloom illustrates. He argues that the worlds of detective fiction arguably mirror the social forces of the actual world at the time of their originary production. They incorporate the social and historical forces from which they claim to represent an escape. Yet, to achieve its end, detective fiction must deny its origins in the actual world and replace this with a world organised towards its own needs - a substitute world in which the detective can win, in accordance with the author’s plans. The extant social and historical forces, although mirrored, altered or neutralised, represent the contamination of the fictional with the actual. I would take this further and argue that, as in any piece of fiction, particularly realist fiction, readers play a vital role in populating fictional worlds with the geographies of their own memories and experiences. (I shall speak more of this in Chapter 5.)

It is in the interaction between intended authorial control - represented by the teleogenic plot - and the blurred boundaries of fictional and actual geographies, mediated by readers, that detective fictions’ suitability as an object of study here becomes apparent. This is because, as scholars of detective fiction have recently noted, setting plays a defining role in characters and their actions (Geherin 2008; McLaughlin 2000). In recognising that readers’ imaginations co-produce crime fictions’ story worlds, we must also recognise that this puts them in a relationship with authors over the production of narrative and plot. Pierre Bayard has demonstrated this well through his own brand of ‘detective criticism’ (Bayard 2011: 57-69). Bayard argues that the principle of incompleteness, the recognition that no novel is complete until its readers add in their own memories, experiences and ideas, also gives readers the freedom to rewrite the ‘truth’ of seemingly unassailable solutions to fictional crimes. He does just this with his argument that Beryl Stapleton, not her husband, is the real murderer in Arthur Conan Doyle’s The Hound of the Baskervilles (Bayard 2011: 164). In this way, I would argue, the slippery relationship between a story seemingly produced and controlled by an author, and a fiction that is ultimately co-produced by the author and by the reader makes detective fiction an ideal vehicle for this study of expansionary literary geography.
The Sherlock Holmes stories present an ideal starting-point for the study of expansionary literary geography, precisely because there is so much material to hand. The Great Detective – as Sherlockians call him – is one of the world’s most famous literary characters. Organised groups of readers have collectively encountered these stories, and written about these encounters, or produced new material of their own, across the world for many decades. Indeed, the real issue for the researcher looking to understand what these readers have been saying and why is paring this material down to a corpus that is as revealing as it is manageable.

The many records of Sherlockians’ encounters with Doyle’s stories - and with each other’s writings have been variously termed ‘researches’ or ‘investigations’. Steven Rothman, the current editor of the Baker Street Journal, for instance, has written that ‘Until the founding of the Baker Street Journal in 1946, the “Bowling Green” [BSI-founder Christopher Morley’s weekly column, in The Saturday Review of Literature] was the only place for American Sherlockians to share their researches in print’ (Rothman 1990: 12). Elsewhere, the Journal’s former editor Philip Shreffler has said that,

> Investigations into the literature and the world of Sherlock Holmes that are presented in written form are a major way in which every Sherlockian can participate actively in the Holmes Saga and celebrate the Master at the same time. Such papers are often the main-stay of scion society meetings, and, of course, publications both great and small (Shreffler 1986: 37).

Sherlockians’ emphasis on recording their encounters with Doyle’s stories in text and on sharing those records with other readers, whether in the form of letters to Christopher Morley’s ‘Bowling Green’ column or as published books, means that they provide an accessible means of identifying the ‘multiple traces of other readers and writers’ (Hones 2008: 1301) which contribute to fictions as ‘a dynamic unfolding collaboration, happening in space and time’ (Hones 2014: 32).
These Sherlockian investigations come in many varieties and flavours. Just one issue of the *Baker Street Journal* (from March 1979), for instance, contains essays on: Victorian crime; Watson’s extended family; Holmes’s views on heredity; baritsu (Holmes’s idiosyncratic martial art); and the south London suburb of Norbury. Travel writings and travel guides are only one subset of this diverse textual community. In fact, over the course of my research I catalogued 300 articles from *The Baker Street Journal* written in the period between 1970 and 2000 about travel or other geographical themes. As the brief description of articles from just one issue of this fan magazine suggests, these 300 articles in travel and geography were but a part of the whole of Sherlockian investigations.

If the breadth of Sherlockian investigation threatens to overwhelm any standalone academic study, then its temporal depth demands that lines be drawn in the scholarly sands, too. As Rothman’s quote above demonstrations, Sherlockians have been practicing their craft for many decades; they show no sign of stopping as the twenty-first century grows older. The writings that I focus on here count for but one part of a tradition which has its roots in recent history and which will continue on by new paths, arguably for many years to come.

With that in mind, the Sherlockian travel writers on which I focus in this study represent not only an important moment in readers’ encounters with fiction and in Sherlockians’ imaginations of the world of Sherlock Holmes. They also represent a very manageable object of study.

*Sources*

Holmes Locations (1991); and Thomas Bruce Wheeler’s The London of Sherlock Holmes (2011).


Two, Michael Harrison’s The World of Sherlock Holmes (1975) and Sherlock Holmes in America (2009) edited by Michael Greenberg, Jon Lellenberg and Daniel Stashower, are more clearly works of the authors’ imaginations. The final two texts are maps: Philip S. Hench’s ‘The Various Segments of the Upper Reichenbach Falls’ (1957) and Julian Wolff’s The Sherlockian Atlas (1952). Where relevant to my argument, I have further drawn on articles from the Baker Street Journal and from smaller-circulation publications drawn from the collection of John Bennett Shaw.

I gathered them from two archives: The Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., and the Sherlock Holmes Collection at the University of Minnesota’s Elmer L. Anderson Library, in Minneapolis. The former collection was created, in part, due to the United States’ federal mandatory deposit law. This law requires that two copies of the best edition of every copyrightable work published in the United States be sent to the Copyright Office within three months of publication’ (US Copyright Office, 2016). Some items of Sherlockiana, however, were deposited in the Library of Congress to protect the author’s copyright claim. Julian Wolff’s The Sherlockian Atlas is one example: its inside-front cover declares that ‘This copy of The Sherlockian Atlas is for The Library of Congress’ (Wolff 1952). The latter collection, by contrast, is built on the enormous private collection of John Bennett Shaw, who, according to the collection’s website ‘attempted to collect everything on or about Sherlock Holmes and nearly succeeded. The Shaw Collection is the most diverse, with items
Due to a research fellowship provided jointly by the U.K.-based Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) and the Library of Congress, and a further generous grant from the University of Cambridge, I spent a total of seven months in these archives. This time was not divided equally. I spent more than six months as a British Research Councils Fellow at the Library of Congress, perusing their materials in some detail; in contrast, I spent only one, frantic, week at the coal-face in Minneapolis, photographing as many documents as the curator, Tim Johnson, could wheel out to me.

**Geographically-attuned reading**

The sheer scale of each collection seemed at first to defy any attempt at categorisation. However, during my time at the Library and in Minneapolis, I noticed that across both collections there was an identifiable tendency towards texts which discussed the world of Sherlock Holmes in geographical terms, or whose writers sought to venture out and explore that world for themselves, among material produced between the 1970s and the late 1990s. These texts represented a geographically-attuned moment in Sherlockiana. If ‘fans of the canon obsess about every detail of the fictional universe Conan Doyle created, mentally inhabiting this geography of the imagination’ (Saler 2012: 107), then the period between 1970 and 2000 was a particularly vibrant time for such activities.

Thus, each of the thirteen Sherlockian writers under study here wrote to expand on the character and stories of Sherlock Holmes, whilst also extending the literary spaces of Holmes’s world. The texts do this in a variety of ways. David Hammer’s books, which are framed as records of his embodied travels through England, France and America, searching out Holmes’s footsteps, provide one example. The arguably feminist rewriting of Watson’s past found in Lyndsay Faye’s ‘The Case of Colonel Warburton’s Madness, one of the short stories published in *Sherlock Holmes in America* (2009), is another. In this story, Watson is uprooted from his British youth and migrated to the colony town of San Francisco, a move which brings Watson out from Holmes’s shadow and imbues him with many of the Great
Detective’s attributes in the process. Gunnar Sundin’s *Sherlock’s London Today* (1985) directs the reader on a walking tour of the British capital as it was in the late-twentieth century, to make the argument that Holmes and Watson’s historical influence can still be felt, across time and the boundary between fact and fiction. In contrast, Michael Harrison’s *The World of Sherlock Holmes* (1975) treats Holmes as an historic figure and the starting point for an exploration of the mores and manners of Victorian Britain. Despite these differences in form and content, each of the texts gathered here has in common a tendency to expand Holmes’s world - and to use a mobile Holmes as the excuse for such an imaginative expansion.

*Travel writing and mobility*

Underpinning my decision to take Sherlockian travels as the focus of my study is an understanding that, among the various genres in which Sherlockians have written about their encounters with fiction, travel writing is one in which the creation of space is more readily apparent - and thus more amenable to study. Andrew Thacker argues that ‘travel writers must produce space as an undiscovered entity before the narrative commences, in order to justify their journey’ (Thacker 2005: 64). Although he was talking about the role of maps at the beginning of travellers’ tales, his point about the relationship between travel, writing and the production of space has broader applicability. Other scholars have recognised this apparent creative power of writing travels in textual form, too. Robert Tally argues that ‘In producing this patchwork representation of a world (that is, the narrative itself) the narrator also invents or discovers the world presented in the narrative’ (Tally 2013: 48).

Lennard Davis, in arguing that the novel is a certain kind of bourgeois cultural artefact whose representation of the world readers are dangerously susceptible to regard as fact, relies on accounts of early modern travel writers to make his case. In an artful piece of metaphor, Davis likens the role of linguistic description of represented spaces to Robinson Crusoe’s practice of ‘describing’ his living space by drawing a line around it: by ‘describing’ his space, Crusoe claims it for his own. In much the same way, says Davies, ‘the refashioning of the terrain through language and extended description is a development in political
control’ (Davis 1987: 73). Further, Mary Louise Pratt’s ground-breaking study of European travellers and the order they sought to impose on non-European spaces, she maintains that they did this through imposing particular forms of descriptive language into these spaces, reshaping the newly discovered worlds into lands newly ‘discovered’ (Pratt 2008: 35). If travel writing is a genre particularly marked by the impulse to create and control spaces, it is likely that such a creative impulse regarding literary spaces should be more apparent, and thus easier to study, in Sherlockian travel writing than in other genres.

However, as much as my decision to focus on Sherlockian travel writing has been informed by the understandings here, I should note that my study is not intended as a contribution to broader debates about travel writing as a genre. It is true that the Sherlockian writers whose work I discuss describe themselves as travellers, and their literary creations as guidebooks or travel guides. It is also true that many of these writings do could be used in an argument which speaks to this debate. For instance, the writings of David Hammer, or Gunnar Sundin, or Richard Warner do reveal the traveller as much as they reveal the places and people being ‘travelled’ (see Duncan and Barnes 1992). Their texts are inherently spatial things, their production and consumption indivisibly entwined in their writers’ movements across the Atlantic and in their readers’ position at home (see Gregory and Duncan 1999). They illustrate the continued impact of imperial ideas on modern travel – even if many of these Sherlockian writers do not necessarily challenge those tropes (see Youngs 2002).

In this study I have chosen to use ‘travel writing’ not as a guiding scholarly frame through which to encounter, understand and critique these texts. Rather, I have used ‘travel writing’ as a rough tool to categorise the texts under study; to help me to distinguish between one group of Sherlockian writers and another; to assist in the process of sorting through ideas and discerning similarities and connections. In making this choice I was guided primarily by the sources themselves – by the frequency and clarity with which the likes of Hammer and Hench, Warner and Weller describe their own texts as ‘travel writing’, as well as by the generic similarities that each of these texts represented to each other.

Behind this overt choice lay the nagging sense, which only grew with each Sherlockian travel text I read, that these guidebooks, travel guides and mappings are equally distanced from
the idea of ‘travel writing’ and the intellectual and cultural baggage which that label entails. Carl Thompson argues that:

all travel involves an encounter between self and other that is brought about by movement through space, all travel writing is at some level a record or product of this encounter, and of the negotiation between similarity and difference it entailed (Thompson 2011: 10).

If there is one characteristic which defines almost all the exemplary Sherlockian travel texts I have discussed here, it is the palpable absence of ‘the other’. For instance, Arthur Alexander’s London of Sherlock Holmes is made of historical but empty streets, augmented by cartoons of Holmes and Watson (see Chapter 6). Gunnar Sudin’s lens focuses on that city’s nineteenth-century heritage by skilfully avoiding the twentieth-century concrete architecture all around him (see Chapter 3). Even Richard Warner’s hillwalking is unmarred by other Americans, whose presence could undermine his imaginative efforts. This absence of other people is a key characteristic of these texts because they were not intended to be a record of the self’s encounter with otherness. Rather, as David Hammer wrote in The Worth of the Game, ‘the little book which follows is intended to buttress your particular dream’ (Hammer 1993: xiv). It is the role played by these self-described travel writings, in buttressing of Sherlockian spatial imaginations, both individual and collective, that I will explore in this thesis.

In this same vein, the ‘Mobile Holmes’ of my dissertation’s title is not a reference to an intervention into geographical debates in mobility studies. Rather it is a recognition of the frequency with which Sherlockian writings on travel and geography make Holmes move, as the agent through which they explore and expand the limits of their collective imaginary geographies. This is not to say that scholars working in mobilities studies have not influenced my thinking. Over the course of this study I have been influenced by the work of writers such as Ole Jensen, whose recognition that mobility is a ‘dialectical relationship between fixity and flow’ (Jensen 2009: 146) is reflected in my discussion of Sherlockian mappings in Chapter 3. The ideas of Peter Adey and Tim Cresswell, who both emphasise the role of context in informing peoples’ understandings of mobility (Adey 2010: 69; Cresswell
More explicitly, in Chapter 6 I have relied on Rebecca Solnit’s reflections on walking as a particular form of mobility to frame my reading of Sherlockian travels on foot as attempts to locate literary creativity in their everyday, embodied connections with the earth. My understanding of the importance of the circulation of ideas and imaginations (found particularly in Chapter 5) owes much to Nigel Thrift’s argument that places are not static but rather ‘stages of intensity, traces of movement, speed and circulation’ (Thrift 1994: 212-213). I owe my familiarity with this idea to my contact with John Urry’s *Mobilities* (2007), a study which encouraged me to go beyond human geography’s focus on sociology-inspired models of mobility towards the study of ‘imaginative mobilities’, as Urry describes it (Urry 2007: 41).

This thesis is primarily a work of literary geography, intended as a contribution to our understanding of the ways in which fiction happens and literary spaces are produced. Its interaction with studies in travel writing and mobility, while not considered in detail here, do provide an idea of new avenues of research that could open out from the growing field of literary geography.

**Taking Sherlockiana seriously**

Studies in Sherlockiana are only just emerging as a topic of serious discussion by academics. To paraphrase Roberta Pearson’s recent lament, ‘Why do we hear of Sherlockians everywhere in the media, but until very recently have heard of Sherlockians almost nowhere’ in academia (Pearson 2015: 188)? Edited collections such as Sabine Vanacker and Catherine Wynne’s *Sherlock Holmes and Conan Doyle: Multimedia after-lives* (2013) or Tom Ue and Jonathan Cranfield’s *Fan Phenomena: Sherlock Holmes* (2014) have discussed Sherlockiana in digital media. Doctoral theses such as Ashley Polasek’s ‘The evolution of Sherlock Holmes: adapting character across time and text’ (2014) have turned a critical eye to these readers. There are indications that Sherlockians’ concerns are spilling over into academia. In a recent review of some of these new studies, Christopher Pittard recognised that ‘questions of ontology - in what sense does Holmes exist? What are the conditions of that existence? - underpin, in more or less explicit forms, recent critical work on Arthur Conan Doyle and his creation’ (Pittard 2016: 138).
Yet, little such work has yet been undertaken in relation to the pre-internet era. Far from being a simple gap, a part of literary geography and history that academics have yet to properly explore, academics’ ignorance of Sherlockiana is rather studied. With labels from ‘parodic scholarship’ (Saler 2012: 116), to pseudo-scholarship, many academics have been rather eager to dismiss this valuable literary resource. I discussed in Chapter 1 how much this might be due to many literary scholars being keen to declare the Sherlockian game of claiming to believe in Holmes as a flesh-and-blood man as not an active, ludic choice but rather a passive acceptance of Doyle’s authorial talents. Umberto Eco, for instance, argues that:

In fiction, precise references to the actual world are so closely linked that, after spending some time in the world of the novel and mixing fictional elements with references to reality, as one should, the reader no longer knows exactly where he or she stands. Such a state gives rise to some well-known phenomena. The most common is when the reader maps the fictional model onto reality - in other words, when the reader comes to believe in the actual existence of fictional characters and events. The fact that many people believed and still believe that Holmes really existed is only the most famous of a great many possible examples (Eco 1994: 125).

If, as literary geographers, we are serious in our claims to explore ‘how reading is undertaken in fundamentally different ways in different places’ and how the ‘same text [can] takes on quite different meanings, and is put to very different uses, as readers interpret and appropriate texts through distinct reading practices’ (Ogborn 2005: 148), rehabilitating Sherlockian writings and taking seriously their active participation in the communal, co-production of Sherlock Holmes’s world should be our first step.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter I have sought to provide a theoretical and methodological foundation to the analyses which follow over the next four chapters. My theoretical framework is based
around a recognition that Sherlockians, like many such groups of readers joined by a shared literary interest, practise what I call ‘expansionary literary geography’: a species of encounter with fiction in which readers harness the creative agency of literary production in order to consciously add to and extend the literary space of the story. I have positioned this species of reading, and my exposition of it, in relation to the broader tradition literary geographical work in human geography. It is a body of work that can be sorted into three categories, each based on a specific methodology in relation to the practice of geography with literature. First, the oldest form of literary geography which regards literary texts as repositories of representations of actual spaces. This methodology finds spaces to exist a priori of texts and looks to representation as the work of an author, for example Hardy or Dickens. Secondly, a methodology which understands texts to create spaces, born out of formal and linguistic properties. This means of doing literary geography does not find space outside of texts but recognises textual space to be created from within. Historically it looks to ‘literary’ texts and provides few tools for the academic keen to understand diverse reading and literary space.

Thirdly is the methodology on which my thesis builds – an approach to literary geography which understands literary spaces, indeed fictions themselves, as products of a relation between texts, authors and readers. This methodology provides the tools to explore Sherlockian space, and the Sherlock Holmes stories, as a product of the relations between readers and readers. It allows me to explore literary geographies that extend beyond an original text, by tracing lines of connection through the literary spaces that exists ‘in between’ texts – in readers’ writings and in their extra-textual experiences. All of these ‘in-between’ spaces contribute to the co-production of literary space.

Further, I have demonstrated that expansionary literary geography rests on two foundations. First, a determination to take seriously so-called naive or non-professional readers, who, through their interactions with the text and, often, with each other, work to keep fictions alive. I have argued, in relation to David Brewer’s idea of textual commoning, that whereas literary studies used to speak of the death of the author, or the slaughter of literature, we may now speak of a reader-led abundance of literary creativity, emerging from a textual commons defined by reader interaction and shared subjectivities. Secondly,
an understanding drawn from human geography that space, including literary space, is not a fixed container for independent action but is, rather, a product of that action, a sphere of openness and possibility. Drawing on Donna Massey’s writings about space I have proposed to think of literary space, as Sherlockians find it, create it, and share it, as a ‘simultaneity of stories-so-far’ (Massey 2005: 9).

Over the next four chapters I will use this framework to analyse a collection of Sherlockian readers’ writings, centred around sixteen texts, all of them evidence of Sherlockians practicing their own form of geographically-attuned reading. I have chosen these texts because they are representative of a particular moment in Sherlockian history, when these readers chose to get up from behind their desks and explore the world in the service of expanding Holmes’s own. Further, these texts, embedded as they are in the collective practices of a well-connected group of readers, will better allow me to follow the ‘multiple traces of other readers and writers’ (Hones 2008: 1301), which relational literary geography, and therefore expansionary literary geography, theorises are present in each reading and rereading. Finally, by looking at Sherlockians, a group that have until very recently been deliberately avoided by ‘serious’ literary scholars, I will attempt a rehabilitation of a group of readers whose fictional events are no less worthy than any others. These texts will allow me ‘to consider the ways in which different kinds of reading perform different kinds of contextual appropriateness’ (Hones 2014: 31).

I will begin this study in the next chapter, Plotting and Mapping, where I will introduce the kind of expansionary literary geography which characterises Sherlockian reading practices. I will demonstrate, through a comparison of four very different methods of mapping this fictional space, that the world of Sherlock Holmes, as devotees have encountered it, is always-already bound up with spaces beyond the borders of Doyle’s creation.
Chapter 3 - Plotting and Mapping: The world strictly according to Doyle?

Reading for the Map - Introduction

It is a central claim of this thesis that American Sherlockian readers, encountering Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes stories in the period between 1970 and 2000, expanded the life and world of the Great Detective far beyond the confines of Doyle’s text, that they practised what I call an ‘expansionary literary geography’ – a species of encounter with fiction in which readers harness the creative agency of literary production to consciously add to and extend the literary space of the story. In Chapters 4, 5 and 6 I will discuss three distinctive methods by which Sherlockians have accomplished this: creative writing; criticism and debate; and literary tourism, respectfully. In this chapter I will provide a context for these examples of expansionary literary geography, attempting to secure the foundations of this study by arguing that even what look on the surface like derivative literary geographies, dependent on the published fiction, exhibit elements of this expansion that I want to foreground.

In other words, expansionary literary geography is more prevalent, more normal, than we might otherwise suppose. I do this by comparing four versions of Holmes’s storyworld, four ‘geographies’ based on four different methods of mapping this fictional space, namely: pen-and-paper maps; on-the-ground reconnaissance; literary tourism; and virtual mapping. Michael Saler has noted readers’ tendency to ‘obsess about every detail of the fictional universe Conan Doyle created, mentally inhabiting this geography of the imagination’ (Saler 2012: 107). He reminds us that Sherlockians have long practised a form of literary geography: of reading for the map. I will demonstrate however that these familiar maps represent the ‘world’ of Sherlock Holmes as always-already bound up with spaces beyond the borders of Doyle’s creation. In the process of defining Holmes’s world as Doyle made it, Sherlockians’ highly collaborative and social ways of encountering fiction have led them to imagine a world that cannot but spill over and into both real-and-fictional spaces.
The evidence for the popularity of a geographically-attuned reading is found in the large number of maps produced by Sherlockians in all decades of the twentieth century. Some, such as Philip S. Hench’s large, hand-drawn map of the Reichenbach Falls, in Meiringen, Switzerland (which I discuss in more detail in Chapter 5) are highly detailed cartographic representations, produced from first-hand experience of the area. Others are instrumental, such as the Nicholas Utechin’s floor plan of Hurlstone Manor and its grounds (Utechin 1971: 142), drawn to support a geometric reading of ‘The Musgrave Ritual’. Notably, the number of maps produced by Sherlockians about Holmes’s world is far greater than those made by Doyle, or even referenced by him. Maps or charts are mentioned fifteen times in all Doyle’s fifty-six short stories and four novels. They are undoubtably instrumental to a handful of cases – the treasure map from The Sign of the Four is perhaps the most famous (Doyle 2009: 119). The canon nevertheless contains only three visual representations of Holmes and Watson’s world: a sketch map of the neighbourhood in ‘The Adventure of the Priory School’ (Doyle 2009: 545); a ‘rough chart’ of Professor Smith’s house from ‘The Adventure of the Golden Piece-Nez’ (Doyle 2009: 610); and a pencil-sketch map of Percy Phelps’s office within the Foreign Office buildings on Whitehall appears alongside the text of ‘The Naval Treaty’, although no reference is made to it in the narrative (Doyle 2009: 451). Maps are not important features in Doyle’s world, yet mapping has been enormously popular among Sherlockians: why?

We can think about the answer in three ways. First, literary maps have the power to orient readers in narrative spaces. Eric Bulson argues that literary maps have been used to orient readers, both in relation to the fictional world they encounter in the text itself and in relation to the actual-world (Bulson 2007: 20-26). He suggests that authors have drawn on modern cartography’s popular reputation as a paratextual means of asserting the reality effect of their text: ‘No matter how fantastic, surprising, magical, or ridiculous novels may seem, the literary map was a way to stave off the skepticism of readers’ (Bulson 2007: 21). Similarly, Barbara Piatti’s project to create a literary atlas of Europe draws on the twin positions that ‘each literary work takes place somewhere’ and that literary maps are a suitable tool to pin down that ‘where’ to a definite location (Piatti et al. 2008: 180). This orienting power need not lie in visual representations. Robert Tally suggests that an author’s role in creating narrative spaces or a fictional world should be likened to a map-
maker, drawing a semantic connection to the actions of ‘plotting’ a story and ‘plotting a map’ (Tally 2013: 49-50). Of course, authors are not the only agents who determine meaning in fiction. Franco Moretti’s project to map literature demonstrates that literary maps can ‘orient’ readers in more ways than one. He draws his own map of Holmes’s London (fig. 3.1), to better understand the social relations between Holmes and his clients. In doing so he gains insight into Doyle’s stories - ‘interesting’ crime is literally removed from the quotidian world of breaking and entering in London’s east end, to the richer west and the metropolitan suburbs (Moretti 1998: 137).

So far as scholars seem agreed on the power of literary maps to orient readers, how well they do this remains a subject for fierce debate. There is a distinct and longstanding antipathy for such maps from many literary scholars. For some, literary maps reduce the
complex spaces created by narrative prose in two ways. First, literary maps flatten the immersive sense of space created by prose, turning it into raw data. Bulson writes that, ‘It goes without saying that living in Paris would be quite different from seeing it on a map... [Zola] conveyed the feeling of living there using meticulous descriptions of the environment and the living conditions of the characters’ (Bulson 2007: 22). Richard Jenkyns goes further, witheringly dismissing literary maps as offering little more than ‘a game to play as a substitute for a properly literary imagination’ (Jenkyns 2004: 152). Secondly, the geographical precision demanded by literary maps, one source of their apparent power to reassure readers of the accessibility of fictional spaces, can diminish the necessary messiness of narrative space. Bulson again: ‘literary maps over-rationalise the space of the novel. They want exact, not approximate, distances and locations’ (Bulson 2007: 23). We can see this at work looking again at Moretti’s map of Holmes’s London (fig. 3.1). Moretti’s representation, reliant on dots and stars to fix Holmes in place, rids the detective of his dynamic mobility. (We might think of this as a kind of extended elision, an orthographic convention that substitutes for a spatial practice). Its effect is clearest in the collection of dots which represent Holmes and Watson’s walk from south London to the riverside in The Sign of the Four: translating this movement from text to map reduces it to a series of unconnected, immobile, yet defined locations.

There are, however, other ways to think about the relationship between map and text that present a more complex and complementary picture. One way is to consider literary maps’ functions. Sally Bushell suggests that, when thinking about literary maps we should not ask how well they represent the narrative but rather ‘What does the reading of the map do to the reading of the text, and vice versa? What might the map reveal about the text, or the text about the map?’ (Bushell 2012: 153). Another way to think about this relationship is to recognise that both maps and fictional narratives, as inherently spatial forms of representation (Piatti 2008: 179), are means of ‘accounting’ for space (Bickers 2016: 284). Peraldo and Calberac argue that the presence of maps alongside text in fictions ‘makes us realise the incapacity of a sequential text to take into account space, which has no beginning, no ending, and no chapters’ (Peraldo and Calberac 2014). In contrast, Piatti contends that this relationship can also be reversed: that the ‘soft’ boundaries of fictional space are in fact a problem for cartography: ‘narrated spaces don’t have definite borders
(with some very rare exceptions). Usually, cartography works with hard boundaries to show the edges of phenomenon mapped’ (Piatti 2008: 184).

To this range of ways in which we can think about Sherlockian literary maps, I would add another: a recognition that maps are not objects but the results of processes. Kitchin and Dodge observe that maps

are ontogenetic in nature. Maps are of-the-moment, brought into being through practices (embodied, social, technical), always remade every time they are engaged with... As such, maps are transitory and fleeting, being contingent, relational and context-dependent. Maps are practices – they are always mappings (Kitchin and Dodge 2007: 335, emphasis in original).

Thinking of the range of Sherlockian mappings represented in this chapter – from traditional, paper maps, to gazetteers, and on-the-ground encounters with specific locations – as ongoing processes (a definition that would be recognised by many of these Sherlockian cartographers) can help us to move away from questioning how well these maps represent the originary narrative spaces of Doyle’s texts. It can lead us towards asking what these mappings reveal about how their authors have encountered Holmes’s world.

The Sherlockian Atlas

The first Sherlockian cartographer I shall discuss has greatly influenced how Sherlockians imagine Holmes’s world. Julian Wolff is primarily remembered for establishing the *Baker Street Journal* (BSJ) as the leading mouthpiece for writings on Holmes by Sherlockians. Among Wolff’s many contributions to the practice of Sherlockiana in America was ‘his Sherlockian cartography... in 1940 he produced a set of five black and white maps’, showing ‘The World, Europe, England, London, and The United States’ (Austin 1986: 73). The enduring influence of these maps on how Sherlockians have imagined Holmes’s world can be intimated from the many times they have been reprinted, copied and commented on. Through the 1960s, Lord Donegal, editor of the BSJ’s British sister-journal, *The Sherlock Holmes Journal*, produced a series of Christmas cards each bearing on its cover one of
Wolff’s maps. William Baring-Gould’s much admired *Annotated Sherlock Holmes* included Wolff’s maps as illustrations for the front and back covers. Further still, ‘Beginning in September 1979 and running through December 1981, each issue of the *Journal [BSJ]* carried one of Julian’s maps’ (Austin 1986: 74). The popularity of these maps stems from the way in which they captured a common aspect of Sherlockians’ reading experience: a desire to be oriented in Holmes’s world as a place made of both Doyle’s originary texts and the readers’ own encounters with them.

![Map of the World Strictly According to Doyle](image)

Figure 3.2 – Julian Wolff’s ‘The world strictly according to Doyle’

For Wolff’s maps were meant to better orient Sherlockian readers in the literary spaces encountered within Doyle’s texts, as his map of the world illustrates (fig. 3.2). His first five maps, drawn in 1940, were used to illustrate Edgar W. Smith’s *Baker Street and Beyond*, a gazetteer which promised to provide ‘the names of all the spots that knew his [Holmes’s] magic touch’ (Smith 1940: 12). To do this, Smith had combed through the canon in search of each town, village, hamlet and - for London - each street, square or place which had seen action in the stories. He produced these as an alphabetical list, each named place accompanied by a brief summary of the action that occurred there. Smith’s book was an
exercise in literary geography that would have been recognisable, if appearing slightly archaic, to authors and readers of the time. In its aims and its gazetteer format it reflects the literary mappings of the 1890s, created to guide reader-tourists to ‘Dickens Country’ or around England’s literary history mentioned by Bulson, for instance (Bulson 2007: 26-28). It represents a form of literary geography, of reading for the map, that would be recognisable to modern geocritics such as Robert Tally or Bertrand Westphal, too, largely owing to Smith’s act of orienting himself by Doyle’s fictional narrative (see Tally 2013: 49 and 79).

That Smith and Wolff’s ongoing mapping was meant to orient Sherlockian readers in Holmes’s world is evident from Smith’s own comments: ‘The places listed in the Gazetteer, and on the maps, do not include hotels or inns or clubs or bars or any of the purely local spots where fateful deeds were done and high adventure stalked… It is enough today to get the other places straight, and look them over, one and all, before we go ahead to other things’ (Smith 1940: 12-13). Despite this mapping being only the beginning, Smith is confident that it will be useful. ‘The world of Sherlock Holmes, like every finite world, is made of space and time’ he writes. ‘I do hope, with Dr. Wolff, that now the corners of the Sherlockian globe may be found to have been pulled about us just a little closer’ (Smith 1940: 13).

To understand why Wolff chose to draw maps of Holmes’s world to help orient his fellow Sherlockians is to recognise two things. First, as I mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, maps are used by Holmes and other characters fifteen times in the canon, most often as clues. The ‘map of the Colony of Victoria’, used by Holmes to decipher a dying man’s odd ‘allusion to a rat’ as actually an attempt to ‘utter the name of his murderer. So and so of Ballarat’ (Doyle 2009: 206-214), is one example. Another is the importance of the map pointing the way to the Agra treasure, from The Sign of the Four (Doyle 2009: 119). However, maps as drawings to represent Holmes’s world to the reader appear only three times: in ‘The Adventure of the Priory School’; ‘The Adventure of the Golden Piece-Nez’; and ‘The Naval Treaty’. In each story, the map shows only a small area - an office corridor, a field, and a professor’s study, respectively. They do not orient the reader within the story. Wolff’s maps, presented as extradiegetic representations of Holmes’s world, were designed to enhance his fellow Sherlockians’ experience of encountering Doyle’s stories, allowing them to point to locations on the map as they read along with the narrative.
The maps also reflect Holmes’s frequent clamouring towards a world that is cartographically legible and, by proving that legibility, allow Sherlockians to play at being the Great Detective themselves. The imaginative scene which opens ‘A Case of Identity’, in which Holmes confesses to Watson a longing to ‘fly out of that window, hand-in-hand, hover over this great city, gently removes the roofs, and peep in at the queer things which are going on’ inside (Doyle 2009: 191), arguably represents Holmes’s desire for the kind of Apollonian viewpoint which is encapsulated in Wolff’s maps. Holmes relies on this cartographic imagination on other occasions, such as when he recognises the arcane rhymes of the Musgrave Ritual as a form of treasure map (Doyle 2009: 394-397). In The Hound of the Baskervilles, a tale whose power rests on the idea that perception is unstable and illusory, Holmes enacts a version of his desired, imaginary flight over London from ‘A Case of Identity’. Early in the story, pondering over the case of Charles Baskerville and the legend of the hound, Holmes uses a ‘very large’ scale map of Devonshire, to imaginatively visit the area around Baskerville Hall. As he explains to Watson, ‘After you left I sent down to Stamford’s for an Ordnance map of this portion of the moor, and my spirit has hovered over it all day. I flatter myself that I could find my way about’ (Doyle 2009: 683). When Holmes visits Devon he is at first reluctant to give up his Apollonian viewpoint, substituting for it the less elevated vantage provided high atop Black Tor. By providing Sherlockians with the totalising, Apollonian view desired by Holmes, Wolff is contributing to their abilities not to be but to be like the Great Detective, a central aspect of this social reading experience.

However, Wolff’s maps do more than merely reflect the canon back to itself. Some years after his collaboration with Edgar Smith, Wolff republished his maps, along with others he had originally published in the Baker Street Journal, and some that were entirely new, in a pamphlet called The Sherlockian Atlas (1952) (Austin 1986: 74). Within this book, he gave new names to his old maps, referring to them as ‘The Sherlockian Map of…’, followed by England, or Europe, and so on. This renaming suggests a need to think about Wolff’s maps and their relation to Doyle’s texts, to ask what the reading of the maps can do to the reading of the text (Bushell 2012: 153). In this context, the meaning of the word ‘Sherlockian’ is ambiguous. It can mean ‘about Sherlock Holmes’, but it can also mean ‘by or about a devotee of Sherlock Holmes’. This semantic confusion is why I have, in this thesis,
reserved the word ‘Sherlockian’ to mean only the latter, using ‘Holmesian’ to mean ‘about Sherlock Holmes’. Wolff, however, relies on this semantic ambiguity to signal the slipperiness of his maps: to move away from the claims Smith made at the start of his orientation project and to suggest that the literary spaces in which Wolff orients his readers are more-than-canonical. His use of the word ‘Sherlockian’, I am arguing, indicates that these maps owe as much to his own encounter with Doyle’s canon as they do to Doyle’s narrative spaces alone.

The new maps in this collection mark a creative and epistemological departure from the apparent devotion to canonical ‘accuracy’ of his earlier efforts. Yet, by moving away from representing the world strictly according to Doyle (as the title of one of Wolff’s early maps put it (Wolff 1952: Plate VI)) Wolff does not sacrifice accuracy for inventiveness: rather, his maps more accurately reflect the influence of his own textual encounters on the ways in which he imagines this fictional world. For instance, his map of ‘Dartmoor’ emphasises Wolff’s role as mapmaker, in the act of representing Holmes and Watson’s world as Doyle made it (Wolff 1952: Plate X) (fig. 3.3). The map dutifully represents such fictional locations from The Hound of the Baskervilles as the Grimpen Mire, where Stapleton kept his ghoulish hound, and Lafter Hall, from where Frankland spied on his neighbours using his telescope. Yet, the map shows more. Wolff has drawn a magnifying glass, for instance, that looks as if it is resting on top of the map. The glass magnifies the image of Baskerville Hall in relation to the houses and villages around it. This intervention at once signals to the viewer the relative importance of Baskerville Hall above the other locations in this literary geography of Dartmoor, whilst also being a ludic representation of Wolff’s own Sherlockian engagement with Doyle’s Dartmoor, undertaken in the detective spirit of Holmes himself (Wolff 1952: Plate X).
In a second example, dubbed ‘Operation Reichenbach’ (Wolff 1952: Plate XI) (fig. 3.4), Wolff represents the literary geography of ‘The Final Problem’, the short story in which Doyle nearly succeeding in killing off Sherlock Holmes, as a mission to save Europe. Rather than simply mark the locations through which Holmes and Watson travel in the story, Wolff goes further. He adorns the map with quotations from the story to ‘thicken’ the space of his map. He uses the crossed-swords symbol, indicating historical battle sites, to illustrate sites where European nations faced existential threats – such as Waterloo. Finally, he emphasises the story’s terminal plot line with a mile-marker bearing the legend ‘the last miles’ (Wolff 1952: Plate XI). These objects blur the boundary between Doyle’s narrative and Wolff’s own experience of encountering the text. Taken as part of his ongoing project to orient the reader in Holmes’s world they suggest that such orientation is necessarily shaped as much
on the readers’ own encounter with the stories as on understanding and recording the narrative spaces created by Doyle.

Reading Wolff’s maps alongside Doyle’s Canon indicates that the world of Sherlock Holmes in which Wolff wished to orient his fellow Sherlockians is one that is always-already expanded beyond the confines of Doyle’s originary texts. This expansion is the result of Sherlockians such as Wolff bringing their own imaginations, memories and experiences to bear on the texts they encounter (Hones 2014: 102). Further, the ongoing popularity of Wolff’s maps among Sherlockians, where viewing them is so often a shared experience, suggests that many of his fellow readers would have agreed with Wolff’s insights about the ‘Sherlockian’ nature of Holmes’s world.

**The England of Sherlock Holmes**

The second map-maker I will discuss here, David Hammer, was arguably the most prolific Sherlockian travel writer in the last few decades of the twentieth century. By the turn of the new century, Hammer had written six travel guides to Holmes’s world: three about Britain, one apiece for continental Europe and America, and one that dealt exclusively with London. In this section I will consider his attempts to map Holmes’s England, focusing on two books - *The Game is Afoot!* (1983) and *The Worth of the Game* (1993). Hammer’s travel writing represents the ontogenetic qualities of mapping emphasised by Kitchin and Dodge. His mapping is a process, involving ‘as many as three or four trips’ to England, to locate particularly intransient sites (Hammer 2001: 12). It is ‘brought into being through practices (embodied, social, technical)’ and, evident from his multiple books about Holmes’s locations, ‘always remade every time’ it is engaged with (Kitchin and Dodge 2007: 335, emphasis in original).

Further, these guides fulfil the function that Peraldo and Calberac attribute to maps: they provide an alternative means of accounting for the space of the text, in a language designed for representing space (in this case, the travelogue). He said as much in the introduction to *The Game is Afoot!*, when he explained that his aim was ‘to put the canon to the acid test - to return to the original source’ (Hammer 1983: 7). However, as I will discuss here, the
paradox in Hammer’s books is that this desire to return Holmesian geography to its Doylean source results in accounts of Holmes’s world that pulls it beyond the borders of Doyle’s texts, folding it together with the spaces of Doyle’s youth and the spaces of his own encounters.

To understand how Hammer’s travel guides function as a mapping of Holmes’s world, we must look at his motivation and his method. Hammer indicates that his motivation to seek out and accurately locate the sites of this fictional world comes from a desire to be oriented. He described *The Game is Afoot!* as ‘an attempt to locate and identify the geographical verities of the Canon’, necessary because ‘There are few residences located with any simple certainty in the Canon’ (Hammer 1983: 8-9). In other words, he was trying to situate himself in Sherlock’s England.

Later, in *A Dangerous Game*, Hammer’s travel guide to Holmes’s Europe, he was more specific, noting that his need to be oriented was motivated by the infuriating inconsistencies, temporal and geographical, within Watson’s own account of his flight from London with Holmes in ‘The Final Problem’.

Finally, in his memoir, *The Game is Underfoot!*, Hammer located his mapping project in a desire for a Holmes-themed tour of England. Although, as he admitted to his contact in the Danish tour agency, SAS, ‘if I knew the sites, I wouldn’t need the tour’ (Hammer 2001: 9). From these examples, we get a better understanding of Hammer as a tour guide. Touring, though it became his passion, was only a means to an end: what mattered to this self-described ‘site-maven’ was to accurately plot Holmes’s world; to create the map that he did not have.
Hammer’s method further supports the case that his travel writing was an attempt at mapping Holmes’s world. His approach can be likened somewhat to that of Smith and Wolff, whom I discussed earlier in this chapter. Hammer himself suggests such a comparison by using Wolff’s map of England as a template for his own map, at the beginning of The Worth of the Game (Hammer 1993: iv-v) (fig. 3.5). The map is a line-drawing of England, showing county divisions, marked here-and-there with the names of major towns. It is evident that he has been inspired by Wolff, for in addition to his echoing Wolff’s proportions and details, down to the circular branding located over the Irish Sea, Hammer, like Wolff, shows the land only as far north as parts of Yorkshire. This despite his book opening with a tour of Scotland. However, unlike Smith and Wolff, Hammer did not sit down with his copy of the canon and tot up all the place-names mentioned there. He started from a very different point: Doyle.

Hammer ‘was convinced from the number of sites near his Norwood home that Doyle had seen places on his constant walks and related his already developed story ideas to them. I believe also that the sites themselves sometimes created the stories, and certainly they always influenced them’ (Hammer 2001: 10). From this understanding that many of the locations in Holmes’s world had their origin in Doyle’s motion through actual-world England,
Hammer set out to triangulate the definitive sites by taking Holmes and Watson’s movements for a guide and walking their footsteps himself. This unusual method of literary cartography resulted in a mapping of Holmes’s England based as much on Doyle’s encounters with England (and Scotland), and Hammer’s encounters with both the Holmes stories and the English landscape, as much as it was based in narrative spaces.

Perhaps the most (and at the same time the least) expected result of Hammer’s cartographic method is the inclusion of British places from Doyle’s life into his map of Holmes’s world. Most expected, because he was open that his method for defining this fictional world was based on an understanding of Doyle’s influence on its creation. Least expected, because including Doyle in a representation of Sherlock Holmes’s universe seems to run counter to the usual rules of ‘playing the game’. He explained this idiosyncratic approach to Sherlockian game, when he wrote,

> it is high time for a semi-intimate confession... which is that I never really believed that Holmes had lived. I still don’t, but I do believe that he was real. So real, in fact, that if he has not become a figure of history, he has of heritage, which surely constitutes a significant form of reality. Besides, as I once wrote in the same context, there is meaning in myth, and fact in fiction (Hammer 2001: 10).

Earlier, in *The Worth of the Game*, he justified including Doyle’s childhood home, school and university in his guide by reasoning that, ‘Whether one chooses to regard Dr. Doyle as the father of Mr. Holmes or his literary accoucheur, he was necessarily author or agent, and in either capacity his antecedents and environment are well worth the enquiry’ (Hammer 1993: 6).

The result of this openness to Doyle’s creative agency is that Hammer pushes the boundaries of Holmes’s world outside of its originary texts and into Doyle’s own life, equally pulling Doyle’s life into Holmes’s world. Unlike non-Sherlockian guidebooks which contain both Doyle and Holmes (see Foster 2011; Pugh et al. 2010), Hammer does not present any clear line distinguishing places of authorial inspiration from places of narrative importance. In *The Worth of the Game* these Doylean places are part of the main body of the text,
framed by the foreword in which he describes his book as mapping ‘the English haunts of Mr. Holmes’ (Hammer 1993: xi). Later, in *A Deep Game*, his London-specific travel book, Hammer includes the former offices of *The Strand Magazine* among his list of Holmesian sites around Trafalgar Square. It was here, he tells his readers, ‘two neat holographic manuscripts... were submitted by an unknown writer, a Dr. A.C. Doyle of 2 Upper Wimpole Street’ (Hammer 2002: 15). The overlap between his discussion of Doyle’s writing career with his mapping of places central to *Holmes’s* life means that Hammer’s Holmesian and Doylean geographies are folded together. Yet, the folds do not align where one might expect them to. The diegetic and extradiegetic cities are joined not at the nib of Doyle’s pen but by the tarmac of The Strand.

It is not only Doyle’s personal geography which gets folded into the literary spaces of Holmes’s world by Hammer’s mapping. Due to his method of geolocation, triangulating between his own encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories and his experiences of English places, Hammer further folds into the map of Holmes’s world the spaces of his own life. For instance, his arguments that certain locations deserve their place on the map of Holmes’s world often depend on his own connections to their actual-world counterparts. Take his discussion of The Chequers in Oxford as the location of the pub in which Holmes and Watson stayed during ‘The Adventure of the Creeping Man’. Hammer notes that this story was set in ‘Camford’, an amalgam of Cambridge and Oxford, and that the usual Sherlockian basis for deciding which town is really Camford ‘falls along lines of loyalty - alumni loyalty’ (Hammer 1993: 50). As an Oxford man, Hammer begins his search there. It turns out that Hammer’s choice of The Chequers pub is just as personal: this was a pub in which Hammer used to drink as a student. Like his visits to Doyle’s stomping grounds of Stonyhurst and Edinburgh University, Hammer’s own past experiences in The Chequers are folded in to his account of Holmesian spaces. As he admits: ‘We are all prisoners of our past’ (Hammer 1993: 55).

Finally, Hammer’s ontogenetic mapping (Kitchin and Dodge 2007: 335), as it developed over the years, admitted more and more scope for his fellow Sherlockians’ imaginations to create and recreate the map of Holmes’s world. In his memoir, Hammer confides that his first publisher, Jack Tracy, ‘convinced me that the manuscript [of *The Game is Afoot!*] needed to
show how the sites were located, adding personal details of the search to make it more interesting. What I had regarded as hubris he saw as engaging detail, making the reader a fellow passenger on the search’ (Hammer 2001: 13). By the time he wrote The Worth of the Game a decade later, Hammer had come not only to make his readers fellows in his own search, but to recognise the validity of their own searches, too. ‘Just as the poets their special visions possess’, he wrote, ‘so do we Sherlockians each hold in secret possession our own private view of the immediate world of the doctor and the detective’. Therefore, he reasoned, ‘While we each invoke our own visions, the little book which follows is intended to buttress your particular dream’ (Hammer 1993: xiii-xiv). This open-ended and idiosyncratic mapping of Holmes’s world, dependent on the individual experiences of each Sherlockian, is removed from Hammer’s original desire ‘to put the canon to the acid test’ (Hammer 1983: 7) and definitively map Doyle’s fictional space.

Intended as an alternative form of spatial representation, to account for the spaces of Holmes’s world, Hammer’s series of travel guides instead became an account of the sheer spatial complexity of this geographical world. Barbara Piatti indicates the difficulty of accurately mapping fictional spaces onto the actual world, offering instead ‘imprecise geographies’ made of ‘fuzzy shapes’ and ‘animated symbols’, designed to capture ‘the complexity of a fictional text you encounter’ (Piatti 2008: 184). I would argue that we can think of Hammer’s Game series as evolving into a form of mapping in this manner. Instead of a derivative representation of a ‘storyworld’, we might think of these maps as more akin to the ‘onto-stories’ or ‘onto-tales’ described by Jane Bennett (Bennett 2010: 116). For here we have not a hierarchy anchored by such terms as author, story, reader, but a flat ontology that here refuses a definitive demarcation between Doyle, Holmes, and Hammer himself. Of course Hammer does not use this language, but he approached a recognition of this complexity, and of the world of Sherlock Holmes he had made, with its overlapping Doylean, Holmesian, and Sherlockian spaces blurring the boundaries of Doyle’s originary texts, in A Dangerous Game (1997). There, he wrote: ‘My personal proofs are more ambiguous. I have been able to find most of the places but there are those who claim that they were visited not by Holmes but by his biographer or, God save the mark, by his literary agent, and no one can gainsay at this remove which is true’ (Hammer 1997: 1).
London as Holmes saw it

In this third section I will discuss two related mapping projects which indicate Sherlockians’ interest in knowing the world of Sherlock Holmes from the character’s perspective. I have touched on this idea before, when discussing Wolff’s Apollonian maps as an attempt to capture the vision of Holmes’s world that the detective *aspired* to see. Gunnar Sundin’s *Sherlock’s London Today: A Walking Tour of the London of Sherlock Holmes* (1985) and Charles Merriman’s *A Tourist Guide to the London of Sherlock Holmes* (1989) take a different approach, mapping Holmes’s city from street-level. As guidebooks, their texts engage with the mapping project, born from embodied and social practices, begun by David Hammer. Sundin writes that ‘The sole purpose of this book is to locate, as accurately as possible’ the places known by Holmes and Watson (Sundin 1985: 7). Similarly, for Merriman ‘The purpose of this guide is to allow the visitor to London to view this Great Metropolis through the eyes of Holmes and Watson’ (Merriman 1989: 2). Orienting the reader within a fictional world, as I mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, is one of the key features of the ‘literary map’ as scholars have defined it. These two guidebooks suggest first, that the world of Sherlock Holmes is a place outside of the everyday experience of American Sherlockians. Secondly, they reflect the way in which their authors have encountered this world, not at-a-glance but rather as narrative which unfolds in time and space.

The Holmesian world in which these guidebooks orient their readers is at once distanced yet accessible. Both Sundin and Merriman recognise their fellow Sherlockians’ likely place as outsiders in Holmes’s home city. Sundin’s books is for ‘visitors’; Merriman’s is for ‘tourists’. Visiting Holmes’s world is imagined in two ways. First, most Sherlockians, American or not, do not live in London; these authors recognise the sheer geographical distance between their primarily American audience and Britain’s historic capital. Secondly, they suggest the world of Sherlock Holmes is not wholly fictional, that it can be visited and experienced in person. Indeed, both authors perform a trick of swapping the ontological distance between actual-world readers and Holmes and Watson’s narrative spaces, for the geographical and temporal distance between twentieth-century America and nineteenth-century London. As Sundin and Merriman map it, the world of Sherlock Holmes ceases to be a ‘nostalgic country of the mind’ (Starrett 1961: 93) and becomes instead a known and accessible, if distant
space in the world. To achieve this, both present Holmes’s story and the city’s actual-world history as inextricably intertwined. Their walking, unlike Hammer’s, is not intended to ape Doyle’s own movements but rather as a means of weaving the map of Holmes’s London into the city’s streets and alleyways.

Figure 3.6 – The East End as Sundin represents it.

These mappings from below use three different representational devices, combined and working together, to present Holmes’s London as an accessible space. First, the guides use visual maps to orient their readers through the streets of contemporary London. Unlike the detailed maps drawn by Julian Wolff I discussed earlier, these show very little information. Take Sundin’s map of the East End (fig. 3.6). He represents this busy part of the metropolis, no less active in Holmes’s day than in our own, as little more than a series of lines. Many of the larger roads, such as Commercial Road, The Highway and Whitechapel Road are left incomplete, beginning and ending in a void (Sundin 1985: 90). The same is true of Merriman’s map of the City and the East End (fig. 3.7). The roads, also no more than the blank space between two parallel lines, are sometimes joined to each other, although those heading south from Aldgate trail to nothing. Unlike Sundin, Merriman does not represent the river at all. Further, in a map which represents London from Bank in the west to Whitechapel in the east, Merriman includes just four buildings (Drapers Hall, the Royal Exchange, Leadenhall Market and a post office) and two underground stations (Aldgate and Aldgate East) (Merriman 1989: 8). In both guides, these poorly-detailed maps are further
isolated from each other, presented alongside each walk and never shown as one, complete image. Obviously, they were designed for readers’ following the walking routes.

Figure 3.7 – Merriman’s map of the City and the East End.

The second representational device employed by these guides to orient readers in Holmes’s London is text: specifically, the narrative of a guided walk. I would argue that for these books, the text is a fundamental part of their cartography of Holmes’s city. The text of each guided walk fills in the details missing from the visual maps. Further, the details provided by the text complements the detached, Apollonian viewpoint of the blank maps with an embodied, mobile, street-level gaze. Look again at Sundin’s chapter on the East End. Opposite his ill-defined sketch of the area, Sundin offers a richly detailed prose map, leading the reader step-by-step through the by-ways and backstreets of Wapping. The opening lines of this walk are worth quoting in full, by way of comparison:

Aldgate Underground Station is the beginning of this excursion. Your first sight of Sherlockian interest comes before you even leave the station’s platform. From the
platform where southbound Metropolitan and Circle Line trains arrive you can see the intersection of several lines and a series of points (switches) just north of the platform. It was here that the body of Arthur Cadogan West was found... You will be able to observe this actual situation by waiting for a Metropolitan train to veer sharply left as it approaches the platform but turns instead to head farther east (Sundin 1985: 91).

The level of detail imparted by the text is far greater than that of the map. This is deliberate: by representing West’s fall in a passage of descriptive text, relayed from his own and his readers’ points of view, he immerses the reader in an embodied and social experience of Holmes’s London. What is important here is not just that these points are the place where West’s body fell in ‘The Adventure of the Bruce-Partington Plans’. It is more important that the reader take note of the way in which the trains swing and move as they roll down the line. With this text, Sundin adds a further dimension of experience to his map of Holmes’s London, drawing his reader down from the heights of distanced Apollonian viewing and into an embodied encounter with the streets themselves (whether in their own bodies or, virtually through Sundin).

The third representational device used by Sundin and Merriman to map Holmes’s city is photographs and illustrations. For both cartographers, these objects locate Holmes’s city in time - adding to the way the drawn maps and texts locate the city in space. Merriman’s A Tourist Guide, for instance, contains fifteen illustrations over its sixteen pages. Of these fifteen, one third are reproductions of contemporary Victorian and Edwardian drawings or paintings. The illustrations accompanying his Walk No. 1, which runs from the Portland Place through Marylebone to Oxford Street, are reprints of contemporary drawings: first, of The Langham Hotel, second of Claude Vernet’s Rocky Coast with Shipping in a Storm - placed here to honour Holmes’s claim of a familial relation to this French painter (Merriman 1989: 5). The few original photographs that are scattered throughout the guidebook play a secondary role to these reproduced illustrations (see Merriman 1989: 16). Often, these photographs show an intimate angle – up close, from below – which implies a sense of the awe intended by their Victorian and Edwardian architects. Yet, this angle also divorces these buildings from their surroundings. Sundin’s approach is quite similar. His photographs of the
University of London’s old medical school, for instance, or of the old British Library reading rooms, are limited to close-up shots of their respective signs, taken again from a low angle (Sundin 1985: 25-26). His photograph of Russell Square indicates the power of selective photography to convey an impression of London as a place of enduring Victorianism. It shows the square still lined with nineteenth-century buildings, ignoring entirely the 1930s-era monolith of the University of London’s Senate House, or the Imperial Hotel, built in the 1960s (Sundin 1985: 26).

Taken together, these maps, narratives and illustrations work to create an holistic mapping of Holmes’s London. This mapping, which is both distanced and embodied, rooted in the past yet experienced in the present, reflects, I would argue, the ways in which Sherlockians such as Sundin and Merriman (and likely their readers) have encountered the literary spaces of Holmes’s world. In both guides, though the maps and the illustrations play a clear role, it is the text, narrating the author’s personal experience of the city and guiding the reader to his or her own, which is paramount. These texts represent Holmes’s world not as a single entity, knowable from a distanced viewpoint, like Wolff’s maps or Smith’s gazetteer. Rather, they indicate that Holmes’s world can only be known up close, by a reader-tourist who is orienting his or herself, step by step, as the world unfolds in the time and space of the encounter.

This direct, embodied mapping is recognisable as the way in which readers would encounter the narrative spaces of Doyle’s texts, as what Hones has terms ‘a dynamic, unfolding collaboration happening in time and space’ (Hones 2014: 32). The texts’ representation of their authors’ embodied encounters with both city and story provide the dynamism that pictorial maps miss. Their authors also recognise the ever-ongoing, highly social process of re-encountering and remaking Holmes’s world. They recognise their mappings as inherently ontogenetic practices (Kitchin et al. 2012: 480). We can see this recognition in the words with which Sundin ends his introduction:

Finally, to those fellow Sherlockians who will pick apart this guide, as we have picked apart so many other writings, I can only say, as Holmes did in THOR ['The Problem of Thor Bridge’], “Well, Watson, we can but try” (Sundin 1985: 9).
The world in which these books orient their readers is far larger than that contained within the covers of Doyle’s canon. Sundin, again, explains it well when describing his first, disappointing experience of searching for Holmes in London:

When I first went to London I wanted to visit the sites where the Master had trod. I wanted to visit Baker Street, to drink at the Criterion Bar, to eat at Simpson’s, and to take a train at Victoria Station. When I arrived in London, I was overwhelmed. I found Baker Street easily, but where was 221B? I walked almost the entire length of Oxford Street in search of the Capital and Counties Bank... I thought I had prepared myself. I had read Baring-Gould’s *Annotated Sherlock Holmes* and Jack Tracey’s *Encyclopaedia Sherlockiana*... Michael Harrison’s books, as well as those of numerous other Sherlockians, filled my bookshelves and had been read (Sundin 1985: 7).

The London of Sherlock Holmes as represented by Sundin and by Merriman rests on more than their individual encounters with Doyle’s narrative spaces. The world in which they orient themselves and their readers has been built through a combined, common effort by Sherlockians in America, in Britain and across the world. Furthermore, as Sundin writes, *knowing* the world of Sherlock Holmes as Sherlockians have described it, as it lives on outside of Doyle’s texts, is not enough. To truly know where one stands within Holmes’s world requires an encounter with the actual world, too: for it is here that Holmes lives, in the world beyond Doyle’s stories, outside of any ‘country of the mind’ (Starrett 1961: 93).

**Virtual mapping**

The fourth and final Sherlockian cartographer I shall discuss is Thomas Wheeler. Although he ‘discovered the Great Detective as an undergraduate’ and ‘retained his interest for over sixty years’, not until retirement was he gifted with enough time to write about his passion. He began with *Finding Sherlock’s London* (2003), later expanding it into *The London of Sherlock Holmes* (2011). This mapping project is important for two reasons. First, with its combination of gazetteer-type listing of the locations that make up Holmes’s London and its
accompanying maps, Wheeler’s later book mirrors the efforts of Smith and Wolff more than half a century earlier, which are discussed above. In this manner, both Baker Street and Beyond (1940) and The London of Sherlock Holmes (2011) provide neat bookends to this study of twentieth-century Sherlockian’s mappings of Holmes’s world. Further, Wheeler’s book represents the point at which the paper-based Sherlockian community that I study begins its precarious accommodation with internet-age Sherlockiana. Wheeler’s evident infatuation with the possibilities offered by the internet allow him to effectively straddle the divide between the textual and hypertextual communities. The similarities between The London of Sherlock Holmes and the other geographical imaginations discussed here suggests that, although the new technologies of twenty-first century Sherlockiana appear to mark a great departure from earlier practices, the processes of mapping Holmes’s world continue onwards as they always have.

I suggest that Wheeler’s The London of Sherlock Holmes should be thought of as a refutation of Richard Jenkyns’s withering commentary which I mentioned in the introduction to this chapter – that ‘one should always be suspicious of stories with maps attached to them... the map-making all too often offers the reader a game to play as a substitute for a properly literary imagination’ (Jenkyns 2004: 152). With his variety of technologies at hand to map Holmes’s world – his list of locations ordered by their nearest rail or tube station, a series of maps showing various walks from the stories, and global positioning satellite (GPS) coordinates of every identifiable Holmesian location in London (among others) – Wheeler’s guide rejoices in the variety of ways to encounter and orient oneself in Holmes’s city; many more than might be available to the reader anxious to maintain only a ‘properly literary imagination’. If map-making is a game to Wheeler, part of the game, at least, it is one to be played whole-heartedly and without restraint.

Wheeler’s project to orient his readers in Holmes’s world begins in Baker Street. He represents 221B Baker Street as a space in which other spaces are joined through narrative. He then proceeds to unfold those spaces, emphasising their connectedness. In effect, Wheeler represents these spaces as readers would encounter them. This is most noticeable from the way Wheeler orders the locations of each story. Baker Street and Beyond (1940), Smith’s earlier gazetteer, lists the relevant locations of Holmes’s London alphabetically. John
Christopher’s contemporary The London of Sherlock Holmes (2012) lists them by region. Wheeler organises his story-by-story. This shapes his representation in a fundamental way. For example, one might expect that the first location listed in ‘The Adventure of Charles Augustus Milverton’, a story which begins with Holmes and Watson returning to 221B Baker Street to discover a mysterious letter, would be the flat in Baker Street. However, Wheeler begins at ‘Regents Park Zoo’. This is because ‘Holmes told Watson that Charles Augustus Milverton... “reminded him of the serpents in Regents Park Zoo”’ (Wheeler 2011: 198).

Other stories begin with similarly unexpected locations. ‘The Adventure of the Bruce-Partington Plans’, for instance, starts like Doyle’s story, at ‘No. 31 “221B” Baker Street’ (Wheeler 2011: 178), where Holmes received an urgent telegram from Mycroft. However, Wheeler’s text moves in quick succession to the Woolwich Arsenal, Aldgate Station, Barnard’s Theatre and Admiralty House, as it follows the course of Mycroft’s narrative of the discovery of Cadogan West’s body and subsequent top-secret investigation. In Doyle’s text these places are contained within Mycroft’s narrative, delivered in 221B Baker Street.

For each story, Wheeler orders the locations by the role they play in what Peter Brooks, after Todorov, has called the fabula, not the sjuzet - that is, the story of the crime, not the story of the inquest (Brooks 1992: 24). He disrupts what Tally has described as the author’s plotting or mapping (Tally 2013: 49-50), to re-plot the locations onto a new map – one which better orients the reader within Holmes’s own time and space. We can see this at work in his plotting of ‘The Greek Interpreter’. He guides his readers to locations, such as Charing Cross, Shaftesbury Avenue and Wandsworth Common, which are introduced into the sjuzet by means of Mr. Melas’s narrative, told to Holmes and Watson in the rigid atmosphere of the Diogenes Club in Pall Mall (Wheeler 2011: 64-65).

By unpicking Doyle’s knotted narrative spaces and spreading them out, Wheeler reveals the extent to which Holmes’s world is made of what Barbara Piatti calls ‘projecting’ spaces (Piatti et al. 2013: 2). He recasts 221B, principally, as the centre of a network of spaces held together by narratives, where other spaces are recalled and can be imaginatively visited. This networked idea of Holmesian space reflects the ordered structure of Holmes’s world as imagined by scholars such as Srdjan Smajić, who argues that Holmes’s archival tendency extends outwards from his brain attic, through the lumber room of his library, into his
attempts to turn the entire city into an archive - a petrified version of itself (Smajić 2010: 127). However, following Wheeler’s spatial imagination, Holmes’s personal library of stories and Watson’s boxes of case notes become not a means of locking London down, but narrative routes by which its network of interconnecting spaces can be further explored.

Figure 3.8 – Screenshot of 2017 Google Maps Street View of Pall Mall, home to Mycroft Holmes’s secretive Diogenes Club in ‘The Adventure of the Greek Interpreter’.

Wheeler’s second means of orienting his readers is by using Google Maps Street Views to visualise London. This software, developed by the technology company Google, allows viewers to virtually explore large parts of the world at street-level, by stitching together images captured from cameras mounted on cars or backpacks, and integrating them into Google’s digital mapping platform. The result is a simulacrum of the actual world around which users can virtually move (fig. 3.8). Wheeler harnesses the power of Street View, embedding hyperlinks from his ebook text to pre-selected Street View locations, to give his readers the virtual experience of moving down the very streets where Holmes and Watson trod (Wheeler 2011: 25). (Owners of the hard copy, such as this author, can access this virtual map by typing the provided latitude and longitude figures into the Google Maps toolbar.)

These Google Maps links and the GPS coordinates which underlie them, work to support Wheeler’s central claim that ‘Conan Doyle was unusually precise in his London locations’ (Wheeler 2011: 25) through their insistence on cartographic accuracy. In this way, we can
understand Wheeler’s use of Google Maps as a response to the problem which Bulson defines, of mapping practices which reduce the complexity of literary spaces (Bulson 2007: 23). Yet, the maps go further, helping to expand Holmes’s world outside of his originary texts. This is due to Google Maps offering images of the actual-world present, not the fictional past. By indicating to his readers that Holmes’s world is locatable in the here-and-now, much like the claims of Sundin and Merriman I discussed in the previous section, Wheeler draws its boundaries well beyond the covers of any Sherlock Holmes anthology. Further, building on the image of Holmesian space as being a network joined by narratives, Wheeler’s use of Google Maps renders the London of Sherlock Holmes as a network of virtual spaces, connected not to each but via Wheeler’s book itself through Hypertext Markup Language (HTML). Wheeler’s book acts like Holmes, who, as Watson observed, liked to sit ‘in the very centre of five millions of people, with his filaments stretching out and running through them’ (Doyle 2009: 888). This is a form of expansionary literary geography similar to Wolff’s earlier maps, which also sit outside of Doyle’s narratives but purport to link directly back into it, as an archive of that world.

Thirdly, Wheeler silently orients his readers within the network of spaces produced by other Sherlockians’ encounters with Doyle’s stories. This is evident from the order in which Wheeler presents Doyle’s stories. His adventures begin with ‘The Gloria Scott’, dated to 1874, and end with ‘His Last Bow’ from 1914. This is a departure from the standard technique of ordering Doyle’s stories by their publication dates. This layman’s series begins with A Study in Scarlet from 1887 and ends with ‘The Retired Colourman’ published in 1926. The discrepancy is due to Wheeler’s decision to organise the stories according to the chronology of Holmes’s ‘actual’ life. Michael Saler has argued that attempting to define the ‘true’ order of the events of Holmes’s life has been one of the longest-standing Sherlockian pastimes (Saler 2012: 116). This choice to order the stories not by Doyle’s canon but by the Sherlockians idea of Holmes’s ‘true’ life is a form of expansionary literary geography: it relies on Wheeler’s investment in the idea that Holmes had a life outside the confines of Doyle’s text. It runs counter to H.R.F. Keating’s notion that outside of Doyle’s writings ‘the rest is silence’ (Keating 1979: 149). It represents the kind of reading that literary scholars might term ‘naïve’ (Brewer 2005: 3). The impact on his mapping is to make it appear is as if Wheeler ripped the pages from each collected volume or novel written by Doyle, spread
them out on the floor, and rearranged them according to the insights of his fellow Sherlockians.

It is possible to discern traces of this hidden network which expands Wheeler’s Holmesian London beyond Doyle’s texts by connecting it to the times and spaces of other Sherlockians’ own encounters with the stories. Throughout the book, the dates of many stories are accompanied by a question mark, reflecting the ongoing debates among Sherlockian chronologists. At other times, Wheeler claims actual-world locations as ‘true’ sites of fictional places. He habitually labels Holmes and Watson’s address as ‘No. 31 “221B” Baker Street’ (see Wheeler 2011: 143). He describes ‘The Empty House Walk’ as ‘not the usual rambling tours but walks that Holmes and Watson took in one of their adventures’ (Wheeler 2011: 26). Both this walk and the claim that 221B is ‘really’ 31 Baker Street have been attributed to British Sherlockian Bernard Davies. His ideas were later put into practice by the American Sherlockian Arthur Alexander, who was the first to walk the route and to describe his journey in print (Alexander 1984, 1999). That Wheeler drew these locations and movements not from Doyle’s ‘precise’ geography but from the broader network of Sherlockian imaginative expansions is only hinted at in his acknowledgments, where he indicates an unspecified ‘special debt’ to Davies and Alexander (Wheeler 2011: 24).

Wheeler’s London of Sherlock Holmes is a classic Sherlockian contradiction: exactly mappable as Doyle created it, yet tied in to networks of spaces which go far beyond the borders of the originary texts. Like Sherlockians before him, particularly Smith and Wolff, Wheeler claims to be simply recording the precise geography left by Doyle. Yet, in its execution, Wheeler’s guide is as prone to practicing an expansionary literary geography, of filling in the blanks and of dragging Holmes’s world beyond the confines of Doyle’s covers. With its reliance on the Sherlockian community’s knowledge and debates over the ‘true’ dates of Holmes and Watson’s lives, its hyperlinks to online maps, and its innovative ways of unfolding Holmesian space to allow for readers’ own encounters, Wheeler’s work is made of a vast bundle of connections which ground Holmes’s London in something far bigger than Doyle might ever have expected - the collective imaginations of Sherlockian fans. It is in this sense that even what looks most derivative, the GPS mapping of Doyle’s fiction, is similarly ‘Sherlockian’, the coproduction of a collaborative literary enterprise.
Conclusion

In this chapter I have analysed four different, reader-led mappings of Sherlock Holmes’s world. My aim was not to judge whether these maps maintained a fidelity to the narrative spaces that Doyle created, but rather, following Sarah Bushell’s investigation into the ‘slipperiness’ of literary maps (Bushell 2015), to ask what the world in which Sherlockians orient themselves looks like, and what this can reveal about how these readers have encountered Doyle’s stories. I demonstrated that when encountering these fictions, Sherlockians find themselves in a literary space that cannot help but transcend the boundaries of Doyle’s text: they find themselves in a world made by their own and other readers’ expansionary literary geography.

This expansionary literary geography - this species of encounter with fiction in which readers harness the creative agency of literary production to consciously add to and extend the literary space of the story - is evidently at work in each mapping from the way in which these readers leave the spaces of Holmes’s world incomplete. The rough lines and trailing roads of Sundin and Merriman’s tourist maps of London, for instance, provide the gaps through which each author’s personal, embodied experiences of London can contaminate the otherwise static representations of Holmes’s city. Wolff, whose cartography inspired many other Sherlockians to map Holmes’s world for themselves, experimented with detail and with representing his own reading experiences in ways which suggested that The Sherlockian Atlas (1952) was far from complete.

This sense of incompleteness, its necessary incompleteness, is further intensified by taking a longer view of readers mapping Holmes’s world. Each mapping project here represents a different way to understand, to represent and to orient the author and fellow Sherlockians in Holmes’ world. Yet, whilst each project aims for a form of accurate orientation or exact knowledge, there remain plenty of questions and omissions to occupy the next generation of Sherlockian cartographers. The fact that Wheeler, working in 2011 could proclaim canonical geographies to be accurately locatable and yet still produce a map that diverged widely from Smith and Wolff’s original project, suggests that Sherlockian attempts to orient themselves in Holmes’s world will never be complete - certainly so long as they are based in
readers’ own encounters with Doyle’s stories, and increasingly with other Sherlockians’ writings. As Kitchin and Dodge write, Sherlockian mappings are ‘always remade every time they are engaged with’ (Kitchin and Dodge 2007: 335, emphasis in original).

One point of orientation which all these maps share is the recognition that America lies on the periphery of Holmes’s world, but at the centre of the Sherlockian world. American Sherlockians in the period under review have been central to this textual community’s project of keeping green the memory of the Great Detective. Here I have demonstrated that Sherlockians’ attempts to orient themselves in Holmes’s world are always-already contaminated by the creative agency at work in their encounters with the text - an agency which draws on the spaces and times of their reading. In the following chapters I will look more closely at three avenues of expansionary literary geography in more detail. I will begin, therefore, in the next chapter with an examination of the ways in which Sherlockian fan fictions have imaginatively expanded on the world that Doyle created whilst remaining in between the canon and the ‘commons’ - not entirely dependent on the designs of Doyle, yet not wholly at odds with the originary texts.
Chapter 4 - Between the canon and the commons: writing Holmes’s world

Introduction

A popular hallmark of collective reading communities, reader-produced fictions or ‘fan fictions’, are a notable element of Sherlockiana. In this chapter I will discuss the ways in which Sherlockian creative writings - that is, fictional writing by Sherlockian readers, for Sherlockian readers - have contributed to the collective practice of expansionary literary geography in relation to Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes stories. Among scholars who have studied fan fictions, a cohort whose membership seems ever-growing in the age of internet fandom, the idea that these readers want to see ‘more’ of something - more stories featuring a favourite character, more works seemingly from the pen of a beloved author, more adventures relevant to themselves - is a popular explanation for why people engage with cultural products like this, brushing aside authorial property claims and writing, scripting, or filming their own versions instead.

However, I will argue here that the impulse behind Sherlockian creative writings is different. Perhaps the most well-known ‘fact’ about Sherlockiana is that ‘Sherlock Holmes was the first fictional creation that adults openly embraced as real while deliberately minimising or ignoring its creator’ (Saler 2012: 107). Yet, as the evidence in this chapter demonstrates, Sherlockian creative writings are the product of a much more complicated and dialogic relationship with Doyle than is popularly credited. I would argue that Sherlockian fictions represent a repositioning of Doyle, his creative agency, and his canon of stories from their place as ‘originary’ to Holmes and his world. This repositioning is apparent in two forms, both of which I develop here: first, Sherlockians have signalled their move away from Doyle’s influence by writing Holmes into new territories, whether social, psychological, or geographical; secondly, perhaps paradoxically, readers’ creative license to move Holmes is rooted in their recognition of the importance of Doyle’s creative agency.
We can get a better idea of how Sherlockian creative writings have developed in this middle ground between the canon and the commons by considering some exceptions which prove the rule. Sherlockians have long been motivated by a collective desire to “obsess about every detail of the fictional universe... mentally inhabiting this geography of the imagination’ (Saler 2012: 107). While Michael Saler’s words suggest a vast fictional space for Holmes to inhabit, very few examples of Sherlockian fictions are truly out-of-this-world. Of the eighty-three stories collected by Sherlockian and bookseller Otto Penzler, published in a recent compendium, just five are gathered under the heading ‘Not of This Place’ (Penzler 2015: 265-302). Of those, four involve supernatural elements on Earth and just one takes place further afield - Paul Anderson’s ‘The Martian Crown Jewels’ (collected in Penzler 2015: 273-284). In a similar vein, the 1970s saw the birth and death of crossover fan publication The Holmesian Federation. This short-lived magazine provided space for readers to explore the outer limits of Sherlockian fandom; stories developing the hinted genealogical link between Holmes and Mr. Spock were particularly popular (Landon 1978). One final example is John Kendrick Bangs’s The Pursuit of the Houseboat: Being some account of the divers [sic] doings of the Associated Shades, under the leadership of Sherlock Holmes, Esq (1970) (fig. 4.1). Bangs’s work was as much as spoof as it was a piece of fan fiction - he and Doyle had met during Doyle’s 1894 American tour (Lachtman 1985: 28-29). Yet, in its clear removal of Holmes from the haunts where Doyle placed him into worlds unknown, Bangs’s story is a reminder the rich expansionary potential to which a character as popular as Holmes might be put. Yet, his work is also a reminder of the refusal of mainstream Sherlockiana to explore that potential. Indeed, it is more apt to describe Holmes’s movements in Sherlockian creative writing as being closer to his own description of Mycroft, in ‘The Adventure of the Bruce Partington Plans’: he ‘has his rails and he runs on them’ (Doyle 2009: 1147).
Why might this be? Is there a theory that can shed light on why mainstream Sherlockiana has so adroitly trod a path between the canon and the commons, in co-producing Holmes’s world in an expansionary fashion? If we were to look only to classic fan fiction theories, with their emphasis on creative freedom and a focus on fans who want more, we might expect that writings like The Holmesian Federation should be more common than they are. Abigail Derecho’s idea of fan fictions as archontic literatures has been particularly influential on modern fan fiction theorists (Rebaza 2009; Duffett 2013). Conscious to rescue fan fictions from their longstanding, pejorative positioning by scholars as ‘derivative’ and ‘appropriative’ of ‘originary works’ (which were, presumably, considered ‘truly creative’), Derecho stated her ‘wish to replace these terms with a new one: I choose to call this kind of writing archontic, which I think better describes what fanfic is and how it operates as a literature’ (Derecho 2006: 63). Appropriating Derrida’s theory of the archontic archive, where ‘any and every archive remains forever open to new entries’ (Derecho 2006: 64), Derecho goes on to argue that the ‘adjective archontic better describes the intertextual relationship at the core of literature... [it] is not laden with references to property rights or judgements about the
relative merits of the antecedent and descendent works’ (Derecho 2006: 64). This continually open, expanding and non-judgemental archive of creativity has ‘a long history of appealing to women and minorities, individuals on the margins who used archontic writings as a means to express not only their narrative creativity, but their criticism of social and political inequalities as well’ (Derecho 2006: 67). As enticing as Derecho’s model of fan fiction is, it can only take this study so far - it does not provide a frame in which to understand the Sherlockian community’s willingness to limit itself to writing in the grounds between Doyle and a free-for-all.

Thinking more about potential limits on fan fiction is a more helpful approach. Margaret Mackey and Jill McClay have tacitly echoed Derecho’s notion that reader-creations are prone to an infinite openness, underpinned by an inherent intertextuality. Yet, they position this ‘aesthetic of unfinish’ (Mackey and McClay 2008: 132) associated with ‘slippery texts’, or, rather, with texts which are proactively ‘rendered slippery’ by readers (Mackey and McClay 2008: 133-134) within a broader framework of rules, collectively developed and understood by the relevant reader community. Drawing on Paul Rabinowitz’s work on the conventions of reception, they identify a range of limitations, including rules of notice (what readers pay attention to), rules of signification (how readers pay attention to what is noticed), and rules of coherence (making sense of what was just read), which cut across reading communities and help individuals to collectively construct a fandom around a central text.

Speaking more broadly, Stanley Fish gestured towards similar rules that affect all readers, imparted knowingly or not by the interpretative community within which a reader is engaging with a text. These communities can be as small as a parlour reading group or as large as a nation (Fish 1980: 303-321). More directly, Louise Stein and Kristina Busse write about the ‘limit play’ involved in collectively creating and curating the archives of reader-co-produced fictions. They argue that ‘Fans create fiction and art in a space between their imaginative expansive impulses and various restrictions’ and that ‘fan authorship and artistry thrive on limitations of technological interface, genre, cultural intertext, and community’ (Stein and Busse 2009: 192). Whereas Derecho’s argument that fan fictions, or reader-co-produced writings, are inherently as creative and worthwhile as so-called
originary literatures, is a useful point from which to start, the theories briefly discussed here about the necessary limits to fan fictions, as a product of collective cultures or as a stimulus to reader creativity, provide a better analytical focus for this chapter.

Over the following pages, I will rely on David Brewer’s theory of community, limit play and readerly creativity, which he develops in the notion of ‘imaginative expansion’, accompanied by the metaphor of the textual commons. I am drawn to Brewer’s idea of the commons because, like Derecho and Stein and Busse, he recognises the creative motivation of other people. In his study of eighteenth-century readers, perhaps the earliest fan fiction writers, he notes that readers who felt themselves to be part of a virtual community of interest around a character and its expansion were more likely to engage in imaginative expansions themselves (Brewer 2005: 14). Still, Brewer goes further, emphasising the closed nature of this community and the quasi-policing role they have on creativity. After all, the textual commons, like any material commons, is not a free-for-all; to have access to the commons one must be a commoner, a recognised member of a group of interest. This emphasis on the role of the group and its members in controlling or policing imaginative expansions - in ensuring that readers do not stray too far from Doyle as they explore and build the Sherlockian commons - is particularly notable among Sherlockian expansions, as I shall now discuss.

**At the Rough Edges of the Canon**

Sherlockian traveller and travel writer David Hammer begins *A Deep Game* (2002), his travellers’ companion to Holmes’s London not at Doyle’s south London home in Norwood; nor on Baker Street. Rather, he begins his tour of the city’s Sherlockian sites on Trafalgar Square, near the former site of Cox and Co. Bank (fig. 4.2). This bank holds a special significance among Sherlockians. As Watson says at the beginning of *The Problem of Thor Bridge*: ‘Somewhere in the vaults of the bank of Cox and Co., at Charing Cross, there is a travel-worn and battered tin dispatch-box with my name, John H. Watson M.D., Late Indian Army, painted on the lid’. (Doyle 2009: 1054) This is crammed with ‘records of cases to illustrate the curious problems which Mr. Sherlock Holmes had at various times to examine’ (Doyle 2009: 1054) This Watsonian archive has been the launching point for many
Sherlockian expansions of Holmes’s world, inspiring and justifying readers’ investment in the collectively-held idea that Holmes’s life is larger than the adventures related in Doyle’s texts.

Figure 4.2 David Hammer’s photograph of the site of Cox and Co., in whose vaults Watson deposited his battered tin dispatch-box, filled with his archive of case notes.

Throughout the Canon, Watson made many references to the contents of his ‘travel-worn and battered tin dispatch-box’ (Doyle 2009: 1054). This is because Doyle framed his fifty-six short stories and four novels about Holmes and Watson’s adventures to appear as if part of a larger collection of published and unpublished case notes. This effect was presented most clearly in The Adventure of the Veiled Lodger, one of the last stories to be published and later collected in The Case-Book of Sherlock Holmes. In the opening line of that story, Watson says: ‘When one considers that Mr. Sherlock Holmes was in active practice for twenty-three years, and that during seventeen of these I was allowed to cooperate with him and to keep notes of his doings, it will be clear that I have a mass of material at my command’ (Doyle 2009: 1095).
In order to whet readers’ appetites for more, Doyle emphasised enticing and suggestive details of these imagined cases. *The Adventure of the Golden Pince-nez*, for instance, opens with reference to Watson’s difficulty in choosing a publishable story from his ‘wealth of material’. He presents a short survey of the cases available to him, which include: ‘the repulsive story of the red leech and the terrible death of Crosby, the banker. Here I also find an account of the Addleton tragedy, and the singular contents of the ancient British barrow... [and] the tracking and arrest of Huret, the Boulevard assassin – an exploit which won for Holmes an autograph letter of thanks from the French President... Each of these would furnish a narrative’ (Doyle 2009: 607). These references were not always to cases past and trails gone quiet. A similar oblique reference at the opening of *The Veiled Lodger*, which follows from Watson’s claim to have ‘a mass of material at my command’, hints at intriguing current events offstage: ‘I depreciate, however, in the strongest way, the attempts which have been made to get at and destroy these papers. The source of these outrages is known, and if they are repeated I have Mr. Holmes’s authority for saying that the whole story concerning the politician, the lighthouse and the trained cormorant will be given to the public. There is at least one reader who will understand’ (Doyle 2009: 1095).

As a pioneer of the monthly serial story in which the same characters recur in different adventures, it is understandable that Doyle would make cross-references to other stories, particularly in the early days of Holmes and Watson’s outings in *The Strand Magazine*. One Sherlockian has calculated that there were twenty-three references to existing published cases in the first twenty-four short stories alone (Herbert 1974: 99). In *The Adventure of the Blue Carbuncle*, for instance, which was collected into *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* (1892), Holmes says to Watson, ‘You allude to my attempt to recover the Irene Adler papers, to the singular case of Miss Mary Sutherland, and to the adventure of the man with the twisted lip’ (Doyle 2009: 245). Herbert suggests that ‘the Holmesian faithful could indulge in pleasurable reverie’ through reading statements such as these, which reminded them of enjoyable stories already read. We might also speculate that Doyle used this technique to remind continuing readers of the stories they had read before, and to perhaps prompt fresh audiences to seek out his other writings on these characters (Herbert 1974: 102).
The same could not, perhaps, be said for similar references to other cases made in later stories, published after 1900. In these, Watson is quicker to refer to cases that have not and would not ever be published. In *The Problem of Thor Bridge*, for instance, after referencing the contents of his ‘battered tin dispatch-box’ (Doyle 2009: 1054), Watson goes on to write that some of these unpublished cases ‘were complete failures, and as such hardly bear narrating, since no final explanation is forthcoming... Among these unfinished tales is that of Mr. James Phillimore, who, stepping back into his own house to get his umbrella, was never more seen in this world. No less remarkable is that of the cutter Alicia, which sailed one spring morning into a small patch of mist from where she never again emerged’ (Doyle 2009: 1054-55). As with the cross-references to earlier cases, Doyle likely used these references to other cases to legitimate his new additions to the Holmesian Canon: particularly those stories collected in *His Last Bow* and *The Case-Book of Sherlock Holmes*, both published long after the date at which Holmes’s is said to have retired to the Sussex Downs. Since the very beginning, Doyle had represented these stories as being from the ‘*Reminiscences of John H. Watson M.D. Late of the Army Medical Department*’ (Doyle 2009: 15, emphasis added); references to cases yet unwritten simply carried on this tradition.

In *Mapping Men and Empire: A Geography of Adventure*, Richard Phillips argues that incomplete maps ‘invite geographical fantasies... Generations of adventure writers, heroes and readers have been inspired by them’ (Phillips 1997: 2). The actions of Sherlockians who have imaginatively expanded Holmes’s world into the unchartered territories of the Watsonian archive suggests that, geographically speaking, these readers have considered the kinds of rough edges in Doyle’s texts as carrying the same suggestiveness as an uncompleted map of Holmes’s world. We might think of these ‘rough edges’ as almost the very opposite of what Suzanne Keen calls ‘narrative annexes’ (Keen 1998: 9), being incomplete, unaccomplished, and merely indicating more of the same rather than serving to contain cultural anxieties or solve problems of plotting through sometimes jarring changes of locale, tone or characterization. In another register, we might feel however that these gaps invite the kind of expansion that is the focus of this thesis, add to the story-world, precisely by taking it out of the hands of the author and into the work of the reader, potentially confronting the ‘improbable, awkward, unsuitable, or downright threatening’
(Keen 1998: 9) though more often than not in less challenging ways. Whilst the wilder elements of what we now call ‘fan fiction’ might be considered as narrative annexes written by the reader, the focus of the mainstream Sherlockians I am interested in here fall into the relatively benign and undisruptive padding out of the canon – creative extensions, but of a relatively modest and disciplined kind, lighting out for the territory of the literary commons but being careful to anchor themselves to the author and his authority even when as they seek to displace him. A very large proportion of Sherlockian readerly expansions, in the form of fan fictions or the quasi-scholarly articles which, as Shreffler argued, are ‘often the main-stay of scion society meetings, and, of course, publications both great and small’ (Shreffler 1986: 37), are concerned with imagining or analysing the geographical extent of Holmes’s adventures into the rough edges of his world.

Taking the idea of the rough edges as an incomplete map in a pleasingly literal sense is Julian Wolff’s The Map That Was Wanted from his 1952 collection, The Sherlockian Atlas. The map is an imaginative expansion on a single sentence, which appeared at the beginning of The Five Orange Pips. Doyle wrote that ‘The year ’87 furnished us with a log series of cases of greater or lesser interest, of which I retain the records. Among my headings of this one twelve months I find an account… of the singular adventures of the Grice Patersons in the Island of Uffa’ (Doyle 2009: 218). Wolf’s map (fig. 4.3) presents itself as a literal exploration of the Island of Ufa (as he chooses to spell it), in the form of a US Navy chart of the island and its surrounding waters. Marked, towards the bottom, as ‘H.O. Field Chart No. 1023’, the map has its own history - it was, so says the small print, ‘Published December 1943 on board U.S.S. PATHFINDER under authority of the SECRETARY OF THE NAVY. Reprinted at the Hydrographic Office Fb 1944’ (Wolff 1952: Plate IV) - which is presumably how, we are encouraged to imagine, Wolff got hold of it for the sum of 20 cents. As realistic as the map is made to seem, Wolff marks it as a fictional expansion of Holmes’s world, within the aegis of one playing the Sherlockian game, by including as an epigraph a quotation from The Adventure of the Golden Pince-Nez: ‘It only deals with the points which seem to me to be essential’ (Wolff 1952: Plate IV). These essential points, which allow Wolff to chart this part of Holmes’s world, include the information that Ufa is itself an archipelago, that it is in the South Seas, and that it is a part of the Solomon Islands.
Perhaps the most famous rough edge sits forever outside of the reach of Watson’s archive. It is the period of Holmes’s absence from Britain, between his supposed death at the Reichenbach Falls, in Switzerland, in *The Final Problem*, to his return to London in *The Adventure of the Empty House*. Sherlockians dub this period the Great Hiatus, and the only information that Doyle’s text provides for Holmes’s whereabouts in these years is this one paragraph, in which Holmes says to Watson:

I travelled for two years in Tibet, therefore, and amused myself by visiting Lhassa, and spending some days with the head lama. You may have read of the remarkable explorations of a Norwegian named Sigerson, but I am sure that it never occurred to you that you were receiving news of your friend. I then passed through Persia, looking in at Mecca, and paid a short but interesting visit to the Khalifa at Khartoum, the results of which I have communicated to the Foreign Office. Returning to France I spent some months in a research into the coal-tar derivatives, which I conducted at a laboratory in Montpellier (Doyle 2009: 488).
Like Doyle’s references to Watson’s archive of unwritten cases, one can read this brief survey of Holmes’s activities abroad and imagine Doyle giving an exaggerated wink to the reader, calling for their connivance in the joke that Holmes has just completed what I like to think of as ‘five impossible diplomatic things before breakfast’. However, just like Doyle’s references offstage to the Watsonian archive, this paragraph also gestures to large blank spaces on the map of Holmes’s life and world, that all but demand to be filled in. Holmes’s two years’ travels in Tibet inspired John Ball, for instance, to pen a fictional account of his travels with his son on ‘The Path of the Master’ (1971). ‘In the cool of a certain early spring California evening’, he writes, ‘I sat down with my son to discuss with him his coming manhood and some of the responsibilities which his soon-to-be-achieved maturity would entail’ (Ball 1971: 26).

This conversation is the frame for a Sherlockian pilgrimage that takes Ball and his son from their Californian home first to London, then to Switzerland and finally, to Tibet. Their imagined journey (and Ball’s account in the *Baker Street Journal*) helps to chart this part of Holmes’s world for others, for as the son remarks from a vantage point overlooking the Reichenbach Falls, ‘In all of the Writings on the Writings [Sherlockian fan articles] that I have read, I have seen nothing. I honestly believe, dad, that none has ever gone before us’ (Ball 1971: 28). Ball’s highly descriptive text is one part of this effort; in one passage, which describes the pilgrim’s car journey across the Tibetan plateau, he writes: ‘All of the afternoon had been spent in a long climb, beginning in the hot, baked plains and then crawling slowly in a lower gear up tortuous roads which fought their way up through the foothills of seemingly endless mountains… At last we had struggled up a final grade which had touched the base of the clouds and had found ourselves in a largely native village which hung crazily on the slope of a mountain side and needed only to turn over in its sleep to plunge thousands of feet into the burning valley below’. (Ball 1971: 29) Like Wolff’s map, Ball’s travel narrative represents an attempt, through imaginative expansion, to chart the geographies at the rough edges of Holmes’s fictional world.

Ball’s account of his fictional Sherlockian pilgrimage is not the only example of readers’ creative engagement with Holmes’s Great Hiatus. The University of Minnesota’s Sherlock Holmes Collection, for instance, holds at least two book-length fan fictions dealing with

Taken together, these various Sherlockian writings speculating on Holmes’s activities during the Great Hiatus and in Tibet speak to the iterative nature of Sherlockian readers’ fictions. Though the stories discuss common themes - Holmes’s attempts to find himself, and discourses on Buddhism are perhaps to be expected - they each present a unique creative interpretation of the rough edge presented by Holmes’s rather sketchy account of his wanderings given to Watson. Together, they speak of the Sherlockian practice of, in Brewer’s words ‘imagining those books as but instalments from a larger fictional reality: what I would like to term “the fictional archive”’ (Brewer 2005: 26). The creative potential of the Watsonian archive, so aptly demonstrated by Doyle’s free use of it to justify his own repeated extensions of Holmes and Watson’s adventures, has been harnessed time and again by Sherlockians to legitimate their creative appropriation and expansion of Holmes’s life and world. We might understand these different iterations of Holmes’s Great Hiatus (for example) as various drafts, sheafed together by a bulldog clip and stuffed into Watson’s dispatch-box. Or, we could perhaps understand Sherlockians’ relationship to the Watsonian archive as similar to that which Brewer identifies between eighteenth-century readers and Gulliver’s fictional archive, where Gulliver was thought of as ‘a bundle of possibilities held together by... the “magnetic field” of the proper name’ (Brewer 2005: 41). What is important is that the mechanism of the Watsonian archive keeps these creative engagements, these acts of textual commoning, tethered, however loosely, to the Canon from which their inspiration came.

In fact, the Watsonian archive stands as a trope of legitimacy among Sherlockian readers-writers, particularly those for whom the act of readerly creativity can so readily tip from
warranted engagement into wanton commoning. Often the trope of the found manuscript or the excerpt from the Watsonian archive has functioned to assert a fictions’ claim to be more authoritative or legitimate than others. This aim is noticeable, even when references to archives, found manuscripts and lost memoirs are made somewhat in jest. Steve Hockensmith’s recent short story ‘Excerpts from an Unpublished Memoir Found in the Basement of the Home for Retired Actors’ (collected in Greenberg et al. 2009: 49-80) (which will be discussed in greater detail in the next section) is a case in point. In presenting his story as a found manuscript, Hockensmith taps into the idea that the archive of material about Holmes’s life is perhaps infinitely broad, whilst also calling attention indirectly, through using words such as ‘excerpts’ and ‘memoir’ to the original, Watsonian archive and thus to the canon. Yet, he does not shy from gently mocking the apparent inexhaustibility of these archives as a source of iterations of Holmes and Watson’s lives, having his fictional persona, in the guise of the manuscripts editor, exclaim:

Sherlockian lore is replete with tales of dusty manuscripts in musty vaults that, when found, shed surprising new light on the Great Detective. I myself have enjoyed reading many such “discoveries”, even while (no offence to the discoverers) finding their provenance highly suspect. If there really were so many heretofore unknown Holmes chronicles floating around, there could hardly be a cellar, attic, or cupboard in the world that wasn’t holding at least one, if not several (Greenberg et al. 2009: 49).

As I shall demonstrate in the next section of this chapter, the iterability that is felt by readers regarding the canon, and the possible places of Holmes’s world, has an equally strong pull on readers’ characterisations of Holmes himself. However, as the looming presence of Watson’s archive holds the Sherlockian commons by a thread to the canon, so Sherlockians’ various depictions of Holmes are all bound in to a shared vision of Holmes’s ‘true’ or perhaps ‘canonical’ character by the idea that Holmes’s life if greater than the contents of Watson’s battered-tin dispatch box.
Writing Holmes: Pieces of a whole life

Among the illustrations which adorn Michael Harrison’s *The World of Sherlock Holmes* (1975) is something rather surprising. A small, black and white photograph shows a young boy, no more than six or seven years old, dressed ‘in the Scotch dress made fashionable by Queen Victoria’s young sons’. The caption underneath claims this real boy to be, impossibly, ‘Sherlock Holmes, aged six’ (Harrison 1975: Plate 7) (fig. 4.4). The picture illustrates a book whose focus is, in large part, on fleshing out the life and times of Sherlock Holmes, from his youth to his old age. Of course, Harrison has not been alone in this desire to give Holmes a life outside of Doyle’s texts (or, to put it in other words, to reveal the life he lived outside of Watson’s case notes). Sherlockiana is most famous for those fan writings that expand Holmes and Watson’s lives beyond the boundaries of the canon. In this section I will argue that while readers’ have written their own versions of Holmes outside canonical characterisations, the collective belief in Holmes and Watson’s larger-than-canonical lives ensures that these versions do not stray too far into capricious commoning.

Figure 4.4 Michael Harrison’s photograph purporting to show ‘Sherlock Holmes, aged six’
Although the image of a young Sherlock Holmes is arguably the most striking departure from Doyle’s canonical detective, American Sherlockians have through their writings pushed the boundaries of Holmes’s life beyond Doyle’s texts at all stages of the Great Detective’s development. In *Sherlock Holmes: The Man and His World*, H.R.F. Keating insisted that the ‘only authentic record left to us of the world’s first and greatest consulting detective’ is Watson’s words at the end of ‘His Last Bow’; ‘The rest is silence’ (Keating 1979: 149). Despite this, Sherlockians have sought to give life to Holmes beyond this point. Many of these fan writings imagine some form of war service. David Smith’s ‘A re-examination of Sherlock Holmes at the Marne’ (1988), for instance, suggests that Holmes’s war service involved high-level espionage on Britain’s behalf. David Hammer’s ‘Sherlock Holmes: Secret Agent’ (1986) made a similar claim and laid the ground for his later book *The Twenty-Second Man: In Regard to Sherlock Holmes - German Agent* (1989). This book drew on actual-world historical events, namely the fact that the British were able to capture all but one of the German agents operating undercover in Britain prior to the war’s outbreak, to argue that Holmes was the ‘22nd Man’: though secretly operating as a triple-agent for Britain. Outside of mainstream Sherlockian circles, Michael Chabon’s *The Final Solution: A Story of Detection* (2004) and Neil Gaiman’s ‘The Case of Death and Honey’ (2011) similarly push the boundaries of Holmes’s post-1917 life.

The idea that Holmes’s life is not bound by Doyle’s stories has also been popular among Sherlockians in relation to earlier periods of Holmes’s life. The debates among various self-styled chronologists over the true dates of the adventures detailed by Watson, for instance, speak to the idea that Holmes and Watson’s lives can be larger than the texts in which they appear. According to Michael Saler, William Baring-Gould’s ‘full-length biography *Sherlock Holmes of Baker Street* (1962) cautioned readers that “No characters in this book are fictional, although the author should very much like to meet any who claim to be”’ (Saler 2012: 107). Former *Baker Street Journal* (BSJ) editor, Philip Shreffler, has suggested that Doyle’s canon does not represent the last word on the life, times and character of Holmes either. In a piece he wrote for the BSJ, in which he provided a guide to suitable questions for budding Sherlockians to ask, he argues that not every Doyle story is of necessity a true reflection of Holmes’s life. It is acceptable to question, he writes, ‘whether or not a given story actually belongs to the Holmes Saga. The obvious example here is *The Three Gables*
[sic] with its racial slurs and uncharacteristic lack of civility... It is hard to believe that this is actually a true story' (Shreffler 1986: 39). Shreffler’s stance presupposes (and so creates by suggestion) a life for Holmes that is larger than Doyle’s stories.

However popular these readerly contributions to Holmes’s adulthood and old age may be, I would argue that it is creative writings about his youth that provide the key to understanding Sherlockian imaginative expansions of Holmes’s character (and Watson’s, too). There are many examples of readerly imaginative writing where Sherlockians have been content to write new adventures for the adult character that Doyle presented to them. The idea of Holmes as a British spy during the Great War, for instance, draws heavily on Doyle’s own characterisation of him as an undercover Irishman in ‘His Last Bow’ (1917). As creative as Hammer’s The Twenty-Second Man is, the leap from Holmes as clever British double-agent to crafty Anglo-German triple-agent is a matter of degree, not kind. However, the image of Holmes as a child, yet to fully develop the faculties for which he is famed by fans, is different.

The difference is noticeable if we look again at Harrison’s The World of Sherlock Holmes (1973). Alongside the portrait of Sherlock Holmes as a young boy, Harrison’s book builds a story of young Holmes’s travels with his family across Europe. In this, he expands on his earlier In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes (1958), a fan fiction-type account of Holmes’s young adulthood in London, which begins by tracing Holmes’s first steps in the capital as an eager young detective. Harrison’s claim that Holmes had had an upbringing particularly marked by travels around Europe is not simply a bit of readerly fancy. It was an attempt to understand the many inconsistencies in Doyle’s Canonical representation of his character. ‘Holmes, brought up partly in the agricultural North Riding of Yorkshire and partly on the Continent, with his half-French mother’, he writes, ‘could not have escaped that curiously ambivalent development so noticeable to him as a fully grown man’ (Harrison 1975: 28, emphasis added).

Later on, Harrison remarks that, ‘Travel, they say, rightly “broadens the mind”; and so it does; but there is also little doubt that children whose early years are marked with frequent changes of residence do tend to grow up to be restless, even neurotic, adults. And that
Sherlock Holmes was both restless and neurotic, his friend Watson’s carefully delineated portrait, taken over a period of more than thirty years (1881-1914), makes unambiguously evident’ (Harrison 1973: 33). Fascinatingly, Harrison’s work of fan fiction attempts to locate reasons for Holmes’s character not in Doyle’s thoughts or in the pages of the canon, but in Holmes’s life beyond the originary texts. It suggests an ability or willingness on the part of Harrison and other readers who write stories like this to imagine a life for Holmes that is ‘prior to and apart from the text’; in other words, it suggests that readers consider Holmes to be ‘fundamentally detachable’ from Doyle’s texts (Brewer 2005: 81).

David Brewer, who coined these ideas of character detachability and of readers’ inventing lives for characters outside of the text in a study of eighteenth-century reading practices, argues that there is one simple mechanism which can prompt readers to follow this line of thinking - to imagine a character can and does exist outside of the text they are reading. It is caused, argues Brewer, by ‘a number of inconsistencies’ in the representation of a character over time, ‘each of which necessarily invites further readerly speculation’ (Brewer 2005: 80). These contradictory representations of a character and a lack of any resolution in the text spur on readers to look for (or more likely to invent) means to explain them. They often, achieve this by writing their own accounts of a character’s life that break beyond the bounds of the originary text. The belief that Sherlock Holmes and John Watson have lives greater than Doyle’s texts is axiomatic among Sherlockian readers. As Philip Weller writes of ‘the Holmesian Game’: it ‘is to accept the premises that Holmes and Watson were, and to most still are, ‘real, living persons’, and that Dr. Watson wrote the narratives from ‘real’ events’ (Weller 1991: 4). Ironic or ludic as it may be, this Sherlockian belief is clearly inspired, I would argue, by this feeling of character detachability that Brewer describes.

For Sherlockians, Holmes’s detachability stems from the sense that Watson has a life larger than the text. This is because Holmes presented his stories as coming from the pen of Holmes’s closest friend - and because Doyle’s slapdash writing practice resulted in so many inconsistencies throughout the Canon. Watson’s bullet wound migrates from his shoulder to his leg in the interval between A Study in Scarlet and The Sign of Four (Doyle 2009: 15 and 90). When he wrote ‘The Adventure of the Noble Bachelor’, Doyle did not apparently have the time or the will to go back and check his old stories, so he had Watson ambiguously
locate the wound in ‘one of my limbs’ instead (Doyle 2009: 287). Watson’s wife Mary got his name wrong in ‘The Man with the Twisted Lip’, calling him ‘James’ instead of ‘John’ (Doyle 2009: 230) - leading to a fan theory that the ‘H’ in ‘John H. Watson, M.D.’ stands for ‘Hamish’, the Scottish equivalent of ‘James’. Watson even forgets his own landlady’s name in ‘A Scandal in Bohemia’, calling her ‘Mrs. Turner’ instead of ‘Mrs. Hudson’ (Doyle 2009: 170). Doyle was famous for writing around 3,000 words each day and for his belief that ‘in short stories it has always seemed to me that so long as you produce a dramatic effect, accuracy of details matters little’ (Gillies 1969: 215). These mistakes, along with the various nods towards Watson’s archive of materials discussed earlier, have led Sherlockians invested in the stories to speculate that Watson kept making errors when writing up his case notes. If these inconsistencies are simply mistakes, so the logic goes, then there must have been true versions of the stories prior to the published version, which in turn means that Watson (and with him, Holmes) must have lives which are ‘prior to and apart from the text’ (Brewer 2005: 81). As Brewer states, ‘any effort to resolve or explain away’ these inconsistencies must invoke a larger conception of... “character”, one which necessarily stands apart from and so exceeds’ a character’s manifestations in text (Brewer 2005: 81).

For fans exploring through their own writings the idea that Holmes and Watson possess a larger conception of character, their youths have provided particularly fertile ground. There are two reasons for this. The first is, as we have seen with Harrison, that depictions of Holmes’s childhood provide means for readers to explore alternative sides to Holmes and Watson’s characters, thickening their representations and so making them seem more life-like. The second reason is the direct suggestion made in Doyle’s writings, particularly in ‘The Musgrave Ritual’ and ‘The “Gloria Scott”’, that Holmes had a career as a detective before he met Watson, so before Watson’s case notes began. In ‘The Musgrave Ritual’, for instance, Watson describes Holmes’s ‘large tin box… already a third full of bundles of paper tied up with red tape into separate packages. “There are cases enough here, Watson” he said’ (Doyle 2009: 386). Outside of Sherlockiana this premise has been used in adaptations such as Mitch Cullin’s A Slight Trick of the Mind (2006) and the related motion picture Mr. Holmes (2015). Whereas these adaptations are content to use the trope of Holmes’s pre-Watsonian cases to tell their own story, Sherlockians have created tales from Holmes’s youth to explain the inconsistencies in Doyle’s texts and to explore different iterations of Holmes’s character.
At the same time they use this extended biography to suggest that these iterations could fit in his complete and whole larger-than-textual life.

Lyndsay Faye’s ‘The Case of Colonel Warburton’s Madness’ (collected in Greenberg et al. 2009: 1-23) takes a similar line to Harrison, that youthful travel might explain the adult character, and applies it ingeniously to Watson. Her story, framed as Watson telling Holmes about an old experience of his, in the sitting room of 221B Baker Street, moves Watson from his domestic life in Paddington to a youthful bachelorhood in the bustling heart of boomtown San Francisco. The narrative is simply told. Young Watson, after a day at his practice, walks from the waterfront into a middle-class district called Nob Hill. There he stumbles into a family melodrama involving many of the hallmarks of a canonical Holmes case: a middle-class household, an inheritable fortune, and a wily scheme to cheat someone out of it.

As in The Hound of the Baskervilles, where Holmes sends Watson alone to Dartmoor to discover who is threatening the life of Sir Henry Baskerville, Watson turns detective. However, unlike Doyle’s depiction of Watson’s efforts as somewhat irrelevant to Holmes’s own secret sleuthing, in Faye’s tale Watson shows a flair for detection. She illustrates this with a scene in which Watson follows his chief suspect, a ‘swarthy fellow’ with ‘long handlebar moustache [and] unkempt black hair’ (Greenberg et al. 2009: 12) from the genteel district of Nob Hill to the dangerous part of town known as the Barbary Coast. In this journey Watson shows his skill at tracing a suspect is every bit as good as Holmes’s:

My quarry went nearly as far as the waterfront before he descended [from the streetcar], and in a trice I paid my driver and set off in pursuit toward the base of Telegraph Hill... inside of ten minutes, I found myself passing gin palaces that could have rivalled St. Giles for depravity. The gaslights appeared sickly and eager, and riotous men stumbled from one red-curtained den of thieves to the next, either losing their money willingly by gambling it away, or drinking from the wrong glass only to find themselves propped insensate in an alley the next morning without a cent to their name (Greenberg et al. 2009: 16).
It is a scene reminiscent of Holmes’s encounter with McMurdoo, the prize-fighter, at the gates of Pondicherry Lodge in Doyle’s The Sign of Four. In that tale, Holmes’s ability to move between social worlds - vital to his role as detective - is illustrated by his equal association with the bourgeois Mary Morstan and the burly gatekeeper, who has fought alongside Holmes in an underground boxing circuit. Faye’s Watson possesses a similar skill, as his near-fatal confrontation with a group of ruffians in the Barbary Coast is averted by his relationship with one of the men – found through his role as a doctor:

Three men, who had been sitting at a round table several yards away, stood up and strode towards us. Two carried pistols in their belts, and one tapped a short, stout cudgel in his hand. I was evaluating whether to make do with the bowie knife I kept on my person, or cut my losses and attempt to escape, when one of the men stopped short.

‘Es el Doctor! Dr. Watson, yes?’ he said eagerly.

After a moment’s astonishment, I recognised a patient I had treated not two weeks before even though he could not pay me, a man who had gashed his leg so badly in a fight on the wharf that his friends had carried him to the nearest physician (Greenberg et al. 2009: 17).

Faye’s depiction of Watson, I would argue, seeks to resolve an inconsistency in Doyle’s portrayal of the doctor. First is the question of why Watson, who appears, in A Study in Scarlet, The Sign of Four, ‘The Man with the Twisted Lip’ and other stories, to be comfortable in his domesticated life, is so ready to drop everything and follow Holmes at very short notice, as he does in ‘The Red-Headed League’. Related to this is the question of why Holmes seems so ready to partner with Watson, when the good doctor often seems, in Holmes’s eyes, incapable of handling a case, as in The Hound of the Baskervilles. Faye’s tale of Watson’s detection and derring-do in San Francisco provides a possible answer to both these questions, as it proposes that Watson, like Holmes, had the nose and flair for detection and handling danger in his youth. Memories of this, perhaps, jostle in his later adult mind with his cravings for the comforts of home. That Faye seeks to present her Watson as a continuation of Doyle’s character, and not an alternate iteration, is apparent from the many canonical tropes with which she furnishes the tale: not the least of which is
the way she presents her story as coming from a kind of hidden Watsonian archive – collected not in sheets of browning paper in the vaults of an old bank but in the doctor’s own memory.

Looking at other examples of American Sherlockian fan fiction which deal with the character of young Holmes, I would suggest that moving Holmes and Watson into new narrative places is a device that allows these readers to move Holmes (in this case) away from Doyle’s characterisation. Again, as with Harrison and Faye, writing about Holmes’s youth allows these fans to suggest that their characterisations may be fitted back into the Canonical Holmes – the Holmes whose life exists ‘prior to and apart from the text’ (Brewer 2005: 81).

Steve Hockensmith’s *Excerpts from an Unpublished Memoir Found in the Basement of the Home for Retired Actors* (collected in Greenberg et al. 2009: 49-80) and Lloyd Rose’s *Ghosts and the Machine* (collected in Greenberg et al. 2009: 25-48), both describe periods of American travel undertaken by a young Holmes, to playfully engage with certain aspects of Holmes’s character outside of Doyle’s texts. In its setting and theme, Hockensmith’s story builds not on anything written by Doyle, but on the claim first made by William Baring-Gould, perhaps the most famous biographer of Sherlock Holmes, in *Sherlock Holmes of Baker Street* (1962) that Holmes’s uncanny abilities of disguise were likely honed by a period spent as an actor in America (Hockensmith 2009: 50). Hockensmith takes this idea and runs with it, quite literally, creating an iteration of Holmes who trod the boards in countless towns across the American West, as part of a travelling theatre group.

Though the events around which the story turns (a crude attempt by the unnamed narrator to make Holmes feel stupid) take place in a small, isolated town in the Colorado Rockies - described by Hockensmith’s narrator as ‘Gomorrah in the Alps’ (Greenberg et al. 2009: 53) - the narrative keeps one eye on the journey Holmes and his fellow actors have taken to get there. The unnamed narrator’s description of the journey to Leadville, Colorado, emphasises its location on the geographical and social periphery, at a distance from the metropolitan centre. ‘After enduring nerve-racking rides along gaping gorges on rocky, hole-pocked roads plagued (the cackling driver delighted in telling us) both my bandit gangs and bloodthirsty bands of Native warriors, we finally arrived at our destination... Surrounding the town on all
sides were shoddily built shacks, tree stumps without number, and the yawning black mouths of the silver mines’ (Greenberg et al. 2009: 54). This emphasis on the distance of Leadville from any metropolitan centre, I would argue, works also to distance Hockensmith’s youthful iteration from Doyle’s Holmes, who operates in a time ‘when the distance between city and frontier, civilisation and savagery, has all but disappeared’ (McLaughlin 2000: 40).

Rose’s *Ghosts and the Machine* (collected in Greenberg et al. 2009: 25-48) adopts a similar tactic to emphasise the distance between his iteration of Holmes and Doyle’s Canonical version. He frames his tale of young Sherlock and Mycroft Holmes’s part in uncovering an elaborate, spiritualist hoax, set up by two brothers in a small town in New Hampshire’s Green Mountains, as excerpts from Mycroft’s travel diary. As such, in a similar vein to Hockensmith, whilst the events of the story’s ‘case’ take place in one location - the Eddy brothers’ house - the narrative pays particular attention to the journey that Holmes and Mycroft take to get there. This is partially for comedic effect, as Rose makes much of Mycroft Holmes’s canonical disdain for travel of any kind. When still lodging at the luxurious Green Mountains hotel, the base for the family holiday that has brought the Holmes brothers to New Hampshire, Mycroft says, ‘29 September – I managed to talk my way out of a ‘delightful’ hike to a local waterfall today while Sherlock did not. This was amusing’ (Greenberg et al. 2009: 26). Mycroft’s discomfort rises to fever pitch on the carriage journey to Chittenden, the small town which is the site of the Eddys’s spiritualist fraud, to which he and Sherlock have been invited by one Colonel Olcott. ‘9 October - it [the journey to Chittenden] was appalling. The train was primitive and the journey sooty - and as to the carriage ride, all I can say is that the American understanding of what is meant by “road” varies considerably from the English definition of the word’ (Greenberg et al. 2009: 31).

Mycroft’s travel diary, like Hockensmith’s unnamed narrator, also serves to emphasise the physical distance between Chittenden, at the rural periphery of New England society, and the metropolitan centre, in this story represented by the comfortable a Green Mountains hotel, where ‘the guests are almost exclusively members of the upper-middle classes from New York and Boston’ (Rose 2009: 26). Like Hockensmith, Rose’s emphasis on the physical distance travelled by Mycroft and Sherlock in the story, into spaces well outside of Holmes’s
Canonical world, works to suggest a distance between this iteration of Holmes and Doyle’s characterisation. Rose and Hockensmith’s versions of Holmes are literally far from home.

Both Rose and Hockensmith move the narrative point of view. Virtually every Doylean Sherlock Holmes story is told by the same narrator: John Watson, save for two occasions when Holmes narrates his own story. The exceptions to this are the narrative annexes in A Study in Scarlet and The Valley of Fear, which both tell of relevant events in America before the involvement of Holmes and Watson. As I discussed earlier on in this chapter, most Sherlockians who write their own Sherlock Holmes stories write from Watson’s point of view, often claiming authenticity through a connection to the fictional, Watsonian archive. Hockensmith and Rose both depart from this tradition, coming closer to the kinds of ‘narrative annex’ described by Keen (1998: 9). They show Holmes through the eyes of an unnamed, bitter British actor and Holmes’s brother Mycroft, respectively.

By moving the narrative perspective, both Hockensmith and Rose provide different viewpoints on the Holmes character. This technique allows them to play with aspects that are familiar to readers of the adult Holmes - as when Rose has Mycroft emphasise Holmes’s energetic nature: ‘11 October - much against my will, Sherlock inveigled me into accompanying him on a walk. I could tell that he had something on his mind and was perfectly willing to hear him out, but I saw no reason we could not sit comfortably, possibly enjoying cigars, while he unburdened himself. He, however, was restless and tense and no sooner would he sit then he would be up and pacing’ (Greenberg et al. 2009: 45-46). Yet, by employing a different viewpoint, each author allows that these literary experiments in Holmes’s character, these attempts to show the Great Detective in development, do not contaminate the main series of canonical stories - in each case Watson’s role as Holmes’s chief narrator is not compromised, merely cast into the future.

Arthur Conan Doyle’s Literary Agency

Buried in the footnotes of Joseph Gillies’s article ‘Where is Eyford? (Of the Adventure of the Engineer’s Thumb)’ (1969), a straightforwardly Sherlockian investigation into the errors made by Watson in recording this episode in his and Holmes’s lives, is an unexpected
reference. Between a footnote referring to unnamed Sherlockian authorities about the true date of this case, and a citation of Julian Wolff's *Sherlockian Atlas* (1952), appears the following quotation, designed to explain to the reader why ‘Eyford’ is so hard to locate on a map: ‘A. Conan Doyle said, “in short stories it has always seemed to me that so long as you produce a dramatic effect, accuracy of details matters little.”’ (Gillies 1969: 215).

It is popularly imagined that Sherlockians in America and Britain and elsewhere have long believed, as G.K. Chesterton once complained, ‘that Sherlock Holmes really existed and that Conan Doyle never existed’ (Saler 2012: 106). However, Gillies’s article suggests that the relationship between these two figures - author and character - is not simply the ‘contestatory zero-sum game’ (Brewer 2005: 203) that many have imagined. In the final section of this chapter I will discuss this Sherlockian tendency not to cast Doyle out but rather to write him back in: as a new character; as the Literary Agent. I will demonstrate that this reframing of Doyle’s role in relation to the Sherlock Holmes stories stands for a reframing of the relationship between Doyle and Watson and Sherlockians, which enables the latter to claim legitimacy for their imaginative expansions of Holmes’s world. As the Literary Agent, a liminal figure who stands between and links together the work and the world, Doyle continues to roam the margins of many Sherlockian writings as a symbol of the dispersed agency of literary creation.

Though associated most strongly with Sherlockian reading, the tradition of displacing Doyle from his authorial role into that of editor or agent has deep roots. As early as 1891, J.M. Barrie, Doyle’s old university friend the author of *Peter Pan* (1911), anonymously wrote what was perhaps the first Sherlock Holmes parody, *An Evening with Sherlock Holmes* (collected in Penzler 2015: 215-217). He described Doyle as the man who was ‘now editing in the *Strand* magazine’ Holmes’s adventures (Penzler 2015: 215). In the story, Barrie’s unnamed, first-person narrator, uses his contacts with Doyle to set up a meeting with Sherlock Holmes. In that encounter, due to his being ‘the sort of man whose amusement is to do everything better than any other body’ (Penzler 2015: 215), Barrie’s narrator proceeds to use Holmes’s method of observation and deduction against him, making Holmes look foolish. At this first meeting the narrator, much to Holmes’s annoyance and Doyle’s amazement, correctly deduces from observing ‘the dent in Mr. Holmes’s hat’ (Penzler 2015:
that Holmes had recently been in the countryside. Decades later, in the early days of
the first Sherlock Holmes appreciation society in New York, the Baker Street Irregulars, as
Doyle’s son Adrian found to his chagrin, it was already common among members to refer to
Doyle not as author but as ‘Watson’s friend and literary agent’ (Saler 2012: 107).

Barrie’s story gives an indication that Doyle’s relationship with his literary creation has been
seen to be messy from the very beginning. Attention has long been focused on the
similarities and slippages between Doyle and Holmes; ‘after Conan Doyle ran for Parliament,
a newspaper ran a story headlined “How Holmes Tried Politics”. When Conan Doyle
announced his belief in fairies, one headline read “Poor Sherlock Holmes, Hopelessly
Crazy?”’ (Saler 2012: 115). However, An Evening with Sherlock Holmes suggests that the
relationship between Doyle and Watson has had more of an impact on Sherlockians and
their imaginative expansions. Barrie’s story achieves its parodic comedy by moving actual-
and fictional-world persons into each others’ shoes. Thus, Holmes takes on the role of an
ersatz client; Barrie’s narrator becomes a Holmes-figure - and Doyle, his lines limited to
exclamations of befuddlement and surprise, becomes Watson (Penzler 2015: 216).

Barrie has not been alone in identifying Doyle with Watson. In The Field Bazaar (collected in
Penzler 2015: 3-5), written as a contribution to the programme for Edinburgh University’s
fundraising event of the same name, Doyle himself suggested a blurred identity with
Watson. He wrote the piece in the manner of the Baker Street conversations between
Holmes and Watson that often open his Holmes stories, and, reversing Barrie’s move, puts
Watson into his own place, as the one who must write a contribution to the programme for
Edinburgh University’s fundraising Field Bazaar. Sherlockian Cornelius Helling, writing in the
Baker Street Journal has also used comedy to blur the line between Doyle and Watson. In a
piece simply titled ‘Dr. Arthur Conan Doyle: Was He Dr. John H. Watson?’ (1972) argues
that, despite the common connection drawn between Doyle and Holmes, ‘as there were
numerous similarities in their characters and habits’ (Helling 1972: 10), the truth is rather
more surprising. ‘I have now made a discovery’, he writes, ‘a very startling and unexpected
discovery indeed, namely that Dr. Watson’s so-called Literary Agent was Dr. Watson
himself!’ (Helling 1972: 10). Helling revels in the joke, making faux-amazed comments such
as ‘Paradoxical though it seems, there never was a Literary Agent’ (Helling 1972: 10) and
asking ‘How it is to be explained that for so many years Conan Doyle contrived to hide his second identity, even from his nearest relatives and his closest friends?’ (Helling 1972: 11). As his article progresses the line between Doyle and Watson becomes so entangled that the reader is left wondering which man Helling is claiming to be the original - the author or the narrator?

This conflation of Doyle and Watson as *people*, moving the latter into the actual world and the former into the realm of fiction, has not proven terribly popular among readers. This is despite Sherlockians’ persistent claim that Sherlock Holmes and John Watson have lives beyond the text, in the actual world. This is likely because such a conflation leaves little room for readerly engagement. The work of literary sociologist Adam Reed, who has studied the motivations and experiences of a similar readers’ community, the British Henry Williamson Society, suggests a possible reason. He argues that for devotees of Henry Williamson, reading involves strong identification with the author. Quoting one reader who says, ‘I get so detached from reality when I’m reading’ (Reed 2004: 114), Reed argues that ‘the crucial experience of fiction reading is all about the impression of occupying a subject position that is not one’s own’; that is, ‘the event of reading [is] an occasion when they are overtaken or colonised by the author’s consciousness’ (Reed 2004: 114). This kind of total identification is rarely seen among Sherlockian readers, who, as Alexander’s dedication to Doyle’s ‘Literary Agency’ (Alexander 1999: 10) indicate, prefer to stand at a distance.

Far more often, readers have invested in the fiction that Doyle, as Barrie first claimed, was merely the editor of Watson’s stories, thus moving him out of his position as sole author and creator of the Sherlock Holmes stories and into a new place, as ‘Watson’s friend and literary agent’. I would argue, that this movement is reflective of the dynamic, collaborative *happening* of fiction on a grand and collective scale – that Sherlockians as a community of readers have jointly fashioned the character of the literary agent to represent the coming together of spaces, of worlds of co-production and narrative, that occurs when they read; it is also a deliberate act on the part of these readers to represent the intentional ambiguity which drives Sherlockians’ approach to the truth-value of the Sherlock Holmes stories and their playing of the Great Game itself.
As with their expansions of Holmes’s world into uncharted territories, readers have responded to Doyle’s own textual rough edges. I have already discussed that Doyle commonly included references throughout his earlier stories to other, published Holmesian cases. Often, as in the beginning of ‘The Adventure of the Blue Carbuncle’, these references are simply to Holmes and Watson having been involved in other cases: ‘You allude to my attempt to recover the Irene Adler papers, to the singular case of Miss Mary Sutherland, and to the adventure of the man with the twisted lip’ (Doyle 2009: 245). However, on certain occasions, Doyle has Holmes or Watson allude to the latter’s own burgeoning success as a writer. So, ‘The Yellow Face’ begins with a short note from Watson which mentions his previous success in ‘publishing these short sketches based on the numerous cases’ in his archive (Doyle 2009: 350). However, readers who go looking for ‘Watson’s’ published manuscripts will find only stories presented under Doyle’s name. In the same way that readers have responded to the rough edges of Doyle’s stories by expanding Holmes’s world into the spaces indicated, and they have responded to the rough edges of Holmes and Watson’s characters by expanding their lives beyond the confines of Doyle’s texts, so readers have responded to this ‘rough edge’ by altering the relationship between Doyle and Watson, from ‘author and creation’ to ‘literary agent and writer’.

Paul Herbert’s ‘Canonical References and the Literary Agent’ (1974) provides a good illustration of this. In true Sherlockian style, Herbert’s article is dripping with irony from the beginning. His full subtitle is ‘Correlative Speculations Plus Disjecta Membra; Being a Prologomonous (sic) Disquisition on the Authenticity of Certain Prefatory Passages in The Sacred Writings’. However, his point is a serious one for Sherlockiana (or as serious as a Sherlockian can get): how reliable are the references to other cases, which pepper the early published stories, as means for dating the lives of Holmes and Watson? He notes that there is dissension among the community over how much weight to give these ‘references to prior cases’ (Herbert 1974: 100), with some readers choosing to order their biographies by them, others arguing that they were simply ‘added to the script for effect’ (Herbert 1974: 100). Herbert’s conclusion, relying on the ‘often-overlooked fact... that Dr. Watson’s published efforts became reality only through the assistance of a third hand, namely Dr. Arthur Conan Doyle’ (Herbert 1974: 101), is that Doyle used his position as literary agent to insert these references. Herbert’s description of Doyle’s role as the literary agent, the in-
between figure who made Watson’s work reality, gestures towards the literary agent’s fundamental role as a bridge between actual and fictional worlds.

Other Sherlockians have also used a recasting of Doyle as Watson’s literary agent to explain inconsistencies in published texts. Irving Kamil, for instance, compared the British and American versions of the hand-drawn map featured in The Adventure of the Priory School, noting the presence of a signature reading ‘John H. Watson’ in the lower-right corner of the Strand Magazine version of the British map that was no longer there in the version published in The Return of Sherlock Holmes in 1905 (Kamil 1984: 12). Discovering that ‘there is certainly no reference to such a sketch-map in the text’ Kamil decides that ‘Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, in reading Watson’s report, must have recognised that a sketch-map would be very helpful to the reader in following the action. No doubt the literary agent set out to draw such a map, using Holmes’s original ordinance (sic) map to guide him in its construction’ (Kamil 1984: 14). Again, Kamil’s recasting of Doyle as Watson’s literary agent effects to recast his relationship with Holmes and Watson, allowing for both their felt detachability and Doyle’s name appearing on the cover of the stories he references.

In both instances, Herbert and Kamil rely on the unquestionable reality of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle to disrupt the apparently solid fictionality of Watson’s existence. Unlike Reed’s readers, who occupy ‘a subject position that is not [their] own’ through being ‘overtaken or colonised by the author’s consciousness’ (Reed 2004: 114), these Sherlockians appear to retain their own subject position - in this case that of the inquisitive critic - yet still enter some way into the space of literature. We can think about this readerly movement in two ways. First, from a psychological point of view, Pierre Bayard has suggested that there is such a thing as the ‘Holmes Complex’ (Bayard 2008: 135). He argues that the ‘notion that literary characters are confined inside the books they inhabit is a dangerous illusion’ (Bayard 2008: 133) and asks how ‘shall we account for the pathological relationship that can develop between these inhabitants of the real world the inhabitant of a fictional world?’ (Bayard 2008: 135). His answer is that readers and characters ‘meet’, or rather collide, ‘within the intermediate space each reader constructs between himself and the work’ (Bayard 2008: 135). In Bayard’s understanding, both Herbert and Kamil have created their own, intermediate spaces between themselves and the Sherlock Holmes stories, in which they
reside alongside Holmes and Watson, and into which - importantly - they have brought an image of Doyle as the Literary Agent.

As powerful as this idea of an intermediate space is, it does not fully capture the dynamic relationships that Sherlockians have with Watson and with Doyle and the changing places that drive them. Alternatively, Hones suggests that readers encounters with fiction create not intermediate spaces between themselves and the novel, outside of themselves, but rather that the spaces of reading and the spaces of narrative are brought together to become the space of the novel. In this collaborative space ‘author and reader, connecting with each other and with their cocreated [sic] fictional world, together inhabit “a body we didn’t know”’ (Hones 2014: 94). In Hones’s understanding, unlike Bayard’s, the spaces of author, text and reader are all connected, contaminated with each other, rather than standing apart. In this understanding, it is easier to see the channels along which actual and narrative spaces combine to create new iterations of Watson, now as actual-world writer, and Doyle, now as fictional agent.
Yet, it is important to recognise that Sherlockians’ tendency to include Doyle in the fictional spaces of Holmes’s world is not simply an effect of the collaborative fictional event. It is also a deliberate action on their part, which reflects the intentional ambiguity with which they approach Doyle’s creative agency. Indeed, the very euphemism by which they refer to Doyle – the literary agent – at once keeps him at arms length from the stories’ creation and still recognises his agency in that creation. This allows Sherlockians the freedom to play the game of believing in Holmes and Watson as living, historical people whilst also celebrating Doyle’s authorial role. By such means does Doyle enter many Sherlockian writings, as I have already demonstrated with respect to Herbert and Kamil’s articles. David Hammer’s A Deep Game: A Travelers’ Companion to the London of Sherlock Holmes (2002), is a case in point.

Mere pages after Hammer links his journey to Holmes’s world, by referring to Watson’s battered tin dispatch-box, sitting in the vaults of Cox and Co., Doyle-the-author appears. Hammer finds him walking along Northumberland Avenue, for instance, to stay at the Metropole whilst in town (Hammer 2002: 11). A few pages later, discussing The Strand Magazine, he writes that ‘it was Doyle who not only offered the characters but the new theory of the serial’ (Hammer 2002: 16).

He is not alone in speaking of Holmes’s world and Doyle-as-author in the same breath. Fellow American Sherlockian Ronald Burt de Waal, in his report of a tour of European Holmesian sites published in the Baker Street Journal in 1975, readily conflated his belief in Holmes’s actual-world existence with his respect for Doyle’s authorial role. His trip begins with a visit to the site of 221B Baker Street where, ‘Holmes was not at home, but his new secretary, Leslie Whitson… spoke to me at length about the numerous letters still being written to the Master Detective’ (de Waal 1975: 10). However, the highlight of his tour appears to be his visit to the Chateau de Lucens, formerly owned by Adrian Conan Doyle, Arthur Conan Doyle’s son, and the site of the ‘Sir Arthur Conan Doyle Museum’. De Waal’s delight at seeing ‘Conan Doyle’s library!’ and his contact with ‘first editions of the books he wrote along with the books he read and used in his research’ (de Waal 1975: 13) is as palpable as the excitement he feels at the Reichenbach Falls, in sight of the spot where the ‘epic encounter’ (de Waal 1975: 14) between Holmes and Moriarty took place. De Waal called his account ‘Holmes Away From Home: Highlights of a Sherlockian Trip to Europe’ (de Waal 1975: 10). His title playfully folds Doyle-as-author into the Sherlockians’ world.
There is another side of the intentional ambiguity with which Sherlockians’ approach Doyle’s creative role in the Sherlock Holmes stories. Arthur Alexander’s *Hot on the Scent* (1999) is dedicated to Doyle, ‘without whose Literary Agency this work would not be possible’ (Alexander 1999: 10). Like Hammer and De Waal, Alexander’s words play on the idea that Doyle has *agency* in the creation of the Sherlock Holmes stories. Yet, they also put Alexander at a relation to Doyle, playfully suggesting that Doyle might have been *Alexander’s* own literary agent. This dedication reflects what the character of Doyle as literary agent signifies to Sherlockians, eager to ‘participate actively in the Holmes Saga’ (Shreffler 1986: 37): it signifies that the creative agency that made these stories is dispersed, not concentrated in one author. The *in-betweenness* of the literary agent’s role is important here. In the business of actual-world publishing, literary agents go between the author and the publishers, indicating the relational, collaborative nature of fictional creation. In Sherlockian lore, Doyle the literary agent plays a greater role than this – not only does he act as a go-between, connecting an unknown author (Watson), to a fledgling literary magazine (*The Strand Magazine*), he also plays a minor but significant role in shaping the stories themselves.

This in-betweenness is often commented on by Sherlockians who, like Herbert’s case-references, or Kamil’s map notation, find Doyle’s influence in between authorship and publication. Ben Vizoskie’s ‘Who Wrote the American Chapters of *A Study in Scarlet*?’ (2000), for instance, looks for Doyle, and almost finds him, in the first such ‘visible’ instance of the space in-between author and publisher in the Sherlock Holmes stories – the narrative annex in *A Study in Scarlet* containing the story of Lucy Ferrer and Jefferson Hope. In answer to his opening question – ‘When you first read *A Study in Scarlet*, were you confused when you reached Chapter VIII?’ (Vizoskie 2000: 29) – he offers a second: could Doyle, ‘the literary agent’, ‘have fashioned a fictional life history for Jefferson Hope and inserted into Watson’s narrative?’ (Vizoskie 2000: 29). After considering the sheer number of factual errors in this narrative – likely abhorred by a historical fiction author such as Doyle – Vizoskie decides it could not have happened like this:
Here is how I believe Chapters VIII through XII came to be written. Imagine the young Doctor Watson taking his manuscript to Arthur Conan Doyle... [he] recognises the potential value of a story about the mysterious detective whose name is being whispered around London. However, he sees the story as incomplete (Vizoskie 2000: 33).

He tells Watson to ‘flesh out the history of Hope and the Ferriers’ (Vizoskie 2000: 33). For Vizoskie, as for other Sherlockians, imagining Doyle as the in-between figure of the literary agent encourages the idea that these stories were a collaborative creation.

Sherlockians’ evidence for a relationship between Doyle and Watson is often nothing more than the evidence of Doyle’s own redrafting process. Thus, Herbet argues that the title changes between drafts of many short stories suggest the literary agent at work to polish Watson’s original drafts (Herbert 1974: 103). There is also the famous case of ‘The Second Hand in the Second Stain’, where Sherlockians have claimed that a small amount of handwriting on this manuscript belonged to Watson, when in fact belonged to Doyle’s secretary. These instances point towards the Literary Agent-Watson relationship as a manifestation of the collaborative effort which is involved in all writing. Nigel Thrift’s point, about the ‘banal but still important’ idea that ‘all work is joint’ seems relevant here: ‘All books seem to me to be... full to the brim with the thoughts of a host of others, alive and dead’ (Thrift in Hones 2014: 24). Perhaps guided by their communal need to manifest their reading experiences in textual form, Sherlockians seem to have learned to manifest these ‘thoughts of a host of others’ coursing through Doyle’s work as actual, living persons – the author and his literary agent.

The idea that the creative agency which gave literary shape to Holmes’s adventures is not concentrated in one individual but rather dispersed, open and liable to be picked up and utilised by many takes us right back to the beginning of this chapter, to Sherlockians’ idea that the life of Sherlock Holmes rests not in the canon of Doylean short stories and novel – a seemingly bounded entity – but rather in the case notes contained within Watson’s battered tin dispatch-box. In both instances, readers have collectively given a shape – Watson’s box – and a name – the Literary Agent – to the idea, made tangible through this
textual community, that literary creation is a relational, collaborative, dynamic enterprise, not the property of one individual. They have created symbols, recognisable to the initiated, that at once signify and legitimate this particular kind of imaginative expansion, this textual commoning. Brewer’s notion of ‘felt iterability’ comes perhaps closest to explaining this impulse among Sherlockians: the sheer number of iterations of stories in which a character appears can legitimate readers’ desires to produce their own, because there cannot be said to be one, ‘true’ version (Brewer 2005: 41). For Sherlockian readers, the deliberate act of moving Doyle into the fictional spaces of Holmes’s world, of displacing from his position as author, folds the spaces of production, of co-production, and of narrative together into one and the same. The end result is that the ‘true’ version of the story is the entire ‘Holmes Saga’ itself.

Conclusion

This chapter has focused on this characteristic of Sherlockian creative writings - that while they often go their own way, the pull of Doyle’s canon, in some form, is always present. I set out to explore the role that readers have played in creating the characters of Sherlock Holmes and, perhaps to a lesser degree, John Watson as larger than the texts in which they originated - perhaps even as actual-world, historical people. I wanted to correct the popular perception that Sherlockians are content to believe, as one detective fiction author put it, ‘that Sherlock Holmes really existed and that Conan Doyle never existed’ (Saler 2012: 106). I demonstrated that just as readers have never strayed too far from the Canon, so Doyle has not been disregarded, either.

As such, this chapter has been held together by two key arguments. First, that Sherlockian readers’ belief in their license to create their own stories is inextricable from their investment in the truth and value of Doyle’s originary canon. Secondly, that these reader-writers have signalled their movements away from Doyle’s characterisation of Holmes by imaginatively and geographically making Holmes move. These points are tightly intertwined. The truth-value of a realist fiction like Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes stories is advertised by the various points of crossover or transition between the actual and the fictional worlds – by the variety of loose ends or rough edges that insist on readers’ own explanations – for the text
will not provide them. As I demonstrated, such rough edges or points of crossover, suggestions of a world outside of or larger than the text, can be found in Doyle’s references to a Watsonian archive or more and more case notes, or in the inconsistencies of characterisation caused by Doyle’s rapid and sloppy pen, or in the hazy distinction between Doyle and Watson as author and creation. The fictions that Sherlockians have written to deal with these rough edges, or to explore these points of transition are at once inspired by, and work to create, a sense of Holmes and Watson’s lives as ‘prior to or apart from the text’ (Brewer 2005: 81). To keep the belief in these characters’ reality alive and yet to signal their own creative engagement, readers have often moved Holmes and Watson around the world - their narrative geographical distance representing the relational distance from Doyle’s originary position. Such a relational distance nevertheless implies a connection, a draw back home, all the same.

Among American Sherlockians, Watson is the character around whom a large part of the Sherlockian commons appears to revolve. It is Watson’s archive that provides the basis for many Sherlockian imaginative expansions, acts of readerly creativity which push the boundaries of this fictional world beyond the confines of Doyle’s texts. Even in cases, such as that of Steve Hockensmith (Greenberg et al. 2009: 49-80) where reader-writers do not claim their story as coming directly from the contents of Watson’s battered tin dispatch-box, the idea of the archive of memoirs frames and legitimises many readerly expansions of Holmes’s world. It is Watson’s ‘real’ life that gives rise to Holmes’s own. The canon’s textual errors and inconsistencies, one of the many kinds of rough edges and loose ends which point to potential answers outside of the originary text, are attributed to Watson’s hand. Thus, from the writings examined here at least, Sherlockians’ belief in Holmes’s reality is predicated on his narrator having a life outside of the text – that is, a position from which he could make errors or conceal truths from his narrative. Finally, it is the relationship between Doyle and Watson that blurs the boundaries between fiction and actuality, that suggests a dispersed creative agency, and that legitimises readers’ actively creative textual engagements.

This chapter has sought to explore the agency that readers have claimed in the creation of the Sherlock Holmes stories, the characters and their world, and finds that things are more
messy than expected, the lines between the fictional and the actual blurred by authors, readers and fan fiction writers alike. In the next chapter I will move on to discuss the role that readers have playing in shaping the world of Sherlock Holmes as a literary space combining fictional and actual dimensions. Prompted by the observation that Sherlockian travel writings are often framed as arguments about the shape of Holmes’s world, I will suggest that this stems from the overarching practice of debate or argument, that affects all Sherlockian writings, however fictional or apparently factual. I will discuss how this process of arguments about the ‘true’ nature and shape of the geography of Holmes’s world brings together different readers’ own memories and experiences, which imported into the text through individual encounters with fiction and shared among the group as articles, as fan fictions or in other forms of creative writing. From these encounters, Sherlockians have created a communal idea of Holmes’s world that blends the narrative spaces of Doyle’s texts with the various fictional and actual, textual and extra-textual spatial dimensions of their own (and others’) lives.
Chapter 5 – Experience and memory: debating Holmes’s world

Introduction

The University of Minnesota’s Elmer L. Anderson Library sits high on a bluff overlooking the fast-flowing Upper Mississippi. It appears small from the outside, yet beneath the surface lies an expanse of atmosphere-controlled storage space, hollowed out of the cliffs. When I visited in May 2015, the Curator of Special Collections, Tim Johnson, proudly showed me the library’s vast holding space. The rooms are far too big for all the books that the University of Minnesota could store there. So, much of the shelf-space has been rented out to other universities, some as far away as Texas, to store their overflow collections. Many of the Elmer’s books have also contributed to Google’s long-term project to create a massive online digital library - Google Books - accessible by billions of people from computers around the world. This collection appears to be bound by the heavy metal doors and bedrock which surrounds it, yet is connected digitally and physically to libraries and readers in far-flung places and digital spaces.

One of the jewels of the University of Minnesota’s Sherlock Holmes Collection, housed on these shelves, is a hand-drawn map of the Reichenbach Falls (fig. 5.1). It was created by Philip S. Hench, physician, Nobel laureate and a member of Minnesota’s Sherlockian society – the Norwegian Explorers. (So great a devotee was Hench that he liked to claim his initial ‘S’ stood for ‘Sherlock Holmes’.) From 1950, when he joined the Norwegian Explorers, until 1957, Hench took part in what Tim Johnson calls ‘a Holmesian project of international scope’ (Johnson 2004: 131). It was the quest to discover the exact spot at which, as Doyle writes in The Final Problem, Holmes and Moriarty ‘reel[ed] over, locked in each others arms... [into] that dreadful cauldron of swirling water and seething foam’ (Doyle 2009: 480). This map was Hench’s contribution to that project.

This map and its accompanying documents – a series of tables showing precise geographical and environmental measurements around the falls and an enumerated list of his
observations – are an extreme and rather serious contribution to what Sherlockians call ‘the
Great Game’. As British Sherlockian Philip Weller explains, the Game requires readers
to accept the premises that Holmes and Watson were, and to most still are, “real,
living persons” and that Dr. Watson wrote the narratives from “real” events... Having
accepted these premises, attempts are then made to fit all the events of the
narratives into the real historical and geographical world (Weller 1991: 4).

Figure 5.1 Philip S. Hench’s hand-drawn map of the Reichenbach Falls as Holmes could have seen them
(from the Philip S. Hench Collection, University of Minnesota Library)
Hench’s cartography is, indeed, one such attempt to fit canonical events into an actual-world place. Moreover, it met with some success. The map, and Hench’s later decision to mark with a plaque the spot where the fictional Holmes and Moriarty fought for their lives, did influence contemporary and future Sherlockians. The evidence is there in the irregular pilgrimages made by members of the Sherlock Holmes Society of London to that site, every few years. It is there in the memories of individual Sherlockians such as Ronald Burt DeWaal or John Ball (whose fictional travels I discussed in Chapter 4), who included a visit to ‘the actual spot’ of this struggle as a major highlight of their own pilgrimages (De Waal 1975: 10-15; Ball 1971: 28). As such, Hench’s project exemplifies Sherlockians’ willingness to use personal experience of actual-world spaces to interrogate and (re)create the World of Sherlock Holmes, something that is common to many of these readers.

In this chapter I will continue my exploration of Sherlockian expansionary literary geography by turning to the on-going debates which are characteristic of how many Sherlockians play the great game. I will demonstrate the extent to which, like Hench’s project, Sherlockians’ collective investigations into Holmes’s life, world and stories have folded personal experience and memories of actual-world places and events into the literary spaces of Doyle’s texts. Readers’ individual investigations, and the environment of collective debate surrounding them, has shaped the world of Sherlock Holmes as a literary space into something far exceeding Doyle’s designs. I will end this chapter with a view on Sherlockian spaces which reveals them as a messy blend of the actual and the fictional, whose exact form and topography is difficult to pin down, changing depending on who is viewing it and when.

In making these claims I am indebted to recent work in literary geography and literary theory on the idea of intertextuality. In Literary Geographies: Narrative Space in Let the Great World Spin (2014), her manifesto for a set of approaches to critical literary geography, Sheila Hones suggests that spatial readings of literature demand an expanded notion of intertextuality. Drawing on the idea that ‘cultures, practices and places [are also] forms of text that can be read, interpreted and performed’ (Anderson 2015: 124-125) she argues that ‘The reader’s encounter with fiction involves multiple spatial dimensions mixed together: not just places visited and maps used but also books read, stories overheard, and many
more’ (Hones 2014: 102). In this chapter I will consider how Sherlockians’ relations to other readers, in the form of their engagement in the ‘Holmesian Game’ (Weller 1991: 4) shape their encounters with fiction. Engaging with these ideas, I will demonstrate that readers such as these, encountering fiction together, do not draw unconsciously on personal memories and experiences when reading. Rather, they actively and intentionally marshal specific memories, experiences and reading experiences as ‘evidence’ for their own imaginings of Holmes’s world. In this manner, Sherlockians seek to expand the world of Sherlock Holmes beyond the boundaries set by Doyle through bolting on, and weaving in, the memories and experiences of their own, actual-world lives.

Further, I will argue that through these debates, Sherlockians have co-produced an intertextual Sherlockian space in which Holmes’s world sits and of which it is made. This socioliterary Sherlockian space is made of all the various spaces of experience, memory and texts brought to bear by these readers on their encounters with Doyle’s stories. Following David Coughlan’s theory of ‘the intertextual’, I will demonstrate that this Sherlockian space, ‘is not a means by which we can link one textual space with another, or move from one to another, but is itself a part of that space is, in fact the whole of that space’ (Coughlan 2002: 208).

Sherlockian space sits at the borders of two kinds of literary spaces identified by Hones. First, the “unending library” of intertextual literary space... the uncontained intertextual space which opens out from [a text with] every literary reverberation the reader senses’ (Hones 2014: 8); secondly, the ‘sociospatial dimension of the collaboration’ of various actors involved in many the event of fiction (Hones 2014: 8). It is Sherlockians’ overt reliance, in debate, on personal experiences and encounters with texts and with the world which helps to turn the intertextual into the socioliterary; which bridges the divide between the textual and the actual. Further, these intertextual and socioliterary spaces, opening out from and shaping readers’ encounters with Doyle’s stories, are deliberately shared among the Sherlockian community, through books and journals, creating a communal, intertextual and socioliterary space of Sherlockiana.
As I have written before, my own thesis supports Hones’s argument that ‘literary-geographical space in which fiction happens is a real space’ (Hones 2014: 9) because it is, like all spaces, the product of social interrelations. In this case, the relations are those between readers and authors, and between readers and readers. Coughlan, drawing on Foucault’s describes literary (intertextual) space as ‘never completely of its own time, though always of the present’ (Coughlan 2000: 76). While this well evokes the Sherlockian attitude to the living world of Sherlock Holmes, I have also found theoretical inspiration in his later invocation of Lefebvre’s l’espace. Coughlan writes, ‘Like Lefebvre’s l’espace, textual space is a space made up of spaces... a wider horizon is always available (Coughlan 2002: 208). In this understanding, the world of Sherlock Holmes is produced in the same way – it is as real a space – as the world outside of Sherlock Holmes. Indeed, as I will demonstrate over the following pages, the relations between readers’ encounters with fictional spaces and their own spatial ‘dimensions of experience and memory (Hones 2014: 102), alongside readers’ relations with other readers, mediated primarily through the circulation of Sherlockian journals, have produced the world of Sherlock Holmes as a living space – as a literary space that is fractured, yet whole.

Dimensions of Experience and Memory

The reader looking more closely at Hench’s map and its accompanying notes is likely to be struck by how personal this material is. Most of the documents are executed in pencil, the marks in graphite, igniting, in this reader at least, a sense of affective connection more heightened than could be achieved by a typed paper (fig. 5.2). Signs of life abound: Hench’s tight, neat script is overlaid from time to time with comments and marginalia, given urgency by his use of red pen. The map itself, hand-drawn and shaded in pencil on a large single sheet of paper, is presented as a panorama that conjures a memory of the Apollonian perspectives of old pictorial maps, whilst insisting on the first-hand experience of the cartographer. A small text-box near the bottom-right corner reads: ‘Reconstruction by P.S. Hench (March 1957). The Various Segments of the Upper Reichenbach Falls and the surroundings. Reconstructed on the basis of 1) my memory of two visits here (could be faulty); 2) current tourist data; photos and booklets; post-cards; 3) my old Baedeker guide-book, 1907-1909’ (Hench 1957). Dotted across the map are encircled numbers, each
referring to an elaborate key, again hand-written in pencil, listing Hench’s many observations.

Figure 5.2 A sample of Hench’s precise, hand-written topographical observations  
(from the Philip S. Hench Collection, University of Minnesota)

Together, Hench’s map of the Reichenbach Falls, its accompanying key, and the various other documents make one simple claim: I, Philip S. Hench, experienced this place. In this section I will demonstrate that Sherlockians often make the claim to have personal experience of parts of Holmes’s world. I will argue that the Sherlockian ‘Game’, the driver of many readers’ encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories, encourages this by bringing readers’ experiences and memories to the fore in debating, shaping and expanding the spaces of Holmes’s world.

Attempts to ‘fit all the events of the narratives into the real historical and geographical world’ (Weller 1991: 4) are common among Sherlockian writings. These are the results of what former Baker Street Journal editor Philip Shreffler called ‘Investigations into the literature and world of Sherlock Holmes’ (Shreffler 1986: 37). He cites some worthy
antecedents for these investigations. He says that, ‘the writing of monographs and papers on canonical arcana has as its precedent Holmes’s own fourteen monographs’ (Shreffler 1986: 37). It appears that the ideal Sherlockian paper is one that takes a suspicious, detective-like view of the canon, in a manner similar to mainstream literary critics (see Felski 2015: 1-2).

Notwithstanding the seriousness of the stakes in Holmes’s own investigations, it is often the sheer silliness of Sherlockian papers that stands out. Sven Ranild’s ‘Doorstep and Wallpaper’, published in the BSJ in 1989, wants, for instance, to understand ‘how on earth would it have been possible for [Inspector Gregson] to take three steps at a time on that particular staircase?’ (Ranild 1989: 226). He is referring to the staircase from the street up to 221B Baker Street, which ‘as all the world knows... had seventeen steps’ (Ranild 1989: 226). Ranild imagines that ‘Gregson started his run in the street’. From this position, once the door was opened, Gregson could launch himself over the doorstep and the first step of the staircase, landing on the second step up (Ranild 1989: 227). (Ranild does not speculate as to what the person who opened the door of Baker Street did while all this was happening.)

Figure 5.3 Sven Ranild’s illustration of Inspector Gregson’s three-step trajectory at 221B Baker Street

Carol Woods, in ‘The Curious Matter of the Congratulatory Telegrams’, takes Watson’s comment at the beginning of ‘The Reigate Puzzle’, that Holmes’s Lyon hotel room was
‘literally ankle-deep’ with telegrams congratulating him on ‘the matter of the Netherland-Sumatra Company’ (Woods 1992: 16), at face value. She calculates that Holmes’s room had to contain 270,000 flat telegrams, or, at 49.9 per square foot, 10,741 crumpled ones. The latter, she says, would have taken 29 days to read. ‘Try to get some rest now, Holmes’, she advises (Woods 1992: 17). In a more mischievous tone, Donald Higby lampooned Sherlockian Margaret Nydell’s sober suggestion that Sherlock and Mycroft Holmes, given certain clues in the Canon, had Middle Eastern heritage (Nydell 1996: 34-37). Using numerology, Higby demonstrates that ‘Sherlock Holmes was an African-American Woman’ (Higby 1996: 39). Higby’s article is an indication of just how far this Sherlockian silliness can go: and more importantly where boundaries might be crossed. He began his article with an attack on Nydell that might be considered cruel, even though it appears to have been made in jest. ‘Nydell, as those who know her can attest’, he wrote, ‘is incapable of programming an electric coffee maker, and collapses into a pitiful blubber of confusion when asked to turn on a VCR. But I digress’ (Higby 1996: 39).

This kind of silliness - and its darker edges - are not actually the target of Shreffler’s guidelines for Sherlockiana. Though the serious Holmesian investigation forms one pillar of Sherlockiana’s foundation, the other, Father Ronald Knox’s ‘Studies in the Literature of Sherlock Holmes’, is entirely silly. As Shreffler has it, this essay ‘lampooned stolid academic criticism in analyzing the Canon, but still made quite a number of valid observations about the Saga along the way’ (Shreffler 1986: 37). No, what Shreffler would rather curb is the apparent Sherlockian tendency to write aspects of their own lives, their own experiences, their own interests into the Saga and onto Holmes. He makes withering remarks about Sherlockians who draw Holmes in their own image. ‘Sherlock Holmes is a universal character... This means that we can often see ourselves mirrored in him (or in other canonical characters)’. This pattern of thought, Shreffler states, is ‘a faulty syllogism’. He says, ‘we should not, as critical writers, adopt the following kind of illogic: 1) I am a professor of college English; 2) Holmes’s own writing is documented in the Canon, and he quotes major literary figures frequently; 3) therefore, Holmes also has a degree in English literature’ (Shreffler 1986: 37).
Shreffler’s comment is illuminating because it suggests that many Sherlockians’ encounters with these fictions are heavily influenced by their own memories and experiences – enough, at least, to have annoyed the editor of the BSJ! It is not my purpose here to say whether Shreffler was correct. I am not interested in whether these readers should bring their own lives to bear on these stories; rather I want to know what they do with them, and what this practice says about how they engage with these stories. In any case, Shreffler was fighting a losing battle. All readers to some degree or other rely on information from their own, actual-world lives, to make sense of literary texts. Writing not long after Shreffler, though in the comforting mainstream of literary criticism, J. Hillis Miller explained that readers do much of the work in filling in - or creating - the details of fiction, particularly of realist stories, from their own recollections and imaginations (Miller 1995: 20). More recently, narratologists such as Marie-Laure Ryan have written about the ‘gaps’ that proliferate in texts and the feats of readerly imagination which fill these in. Writing about Doyle’s The Hound of the Baskervilles, Pierre Bayard argued that all texts are unfinished, and only become completed when the reader fills in ‘the rifts’ in the text - achieves a state of ‘subjective closure’ (Bayard 2008: 66, emphasis in original).

Is this what Sherlockian debates do? If we believe Ranild’s claim that ‘the problem [of Gregson’s climbing the 221B stairs three at a time] is freely offered as subject matter worthy of at least one monograph’ (Ranild 1989: 227) the answer must be no. Of course, Ranild’s suggestion that a fellow Sherlockian could get a monograph’s worth of study out of his problem was made in jest. But the idea that his subjective reading could lead to others’ own readings was not a joke. The same impetus is noticeably at work in Philip Hench’s Reichenbach map. (Hench’s investigation was far less silly than Ranild’s own - though it was still ludic in its own way.)

Though Hench’s task was to site precisely Holmes and Moriarty’s struggle above the Reichenbach Falls, from Doyle’s The Final Problem, to close off the debate, he was not in search of any kind of subjective closure. His project did not end the story. Rather the opposite. As Tim Johnson, curator of special collections at the University of Minnesota Library and keeper of the Sherlock Holmes collection, wrote, in 1957, ‘members from Minnesota and London gathered at the funicular station at the Reichenbach Falls in
Switzerland to unveil a plaque’ (Johnson 2004: 131). This plaque was intended to mark the spot for tourists. Hench’s work was, in the end, aimed at incorporating this spot into new stories, played out by future generations of Sherlockians. As he himself said, the site was ‘a historic spot, the end of a rocky path, a few square feet of blackish soil kept forever soft’ (Hench quoted in Johnson 2013 n.p.). The black soil forever soft is symbolic of the many readers and fans who came after Hench, engaging with his investigation, keeping his results from serving the subjective closure of a single, Holmesian tale.

I would argue that the investigations and debates by which Sherlockians rely on their own knowledges and experiences to engage with the Holmes stories can be better understood through Hones’s understanding of intertextuality as a spatial event. Hones argues that the experience of reading, ‘involves multiple spatial dimensions mixed together: not just places visited and maps used but also books read, stories overheard, and many more’ (Hones 2014: 102). This understanding challenges the idea that intertextuality is limited to relationships between written texts, whether these texts communicate via the agency of a reader or, like the books in the Library at the centre of Eco’s The Name of the Rose, whether they appear to talk to each other unaided by human hands (Coughlan 2000: 76-80). Her syntax puts the expected sources of literary intertextual connections - ‘books read, stories overheard’ - on the back foot, elevating ‘places visited and maps used’ - artefacts of what might be considered the ‘extra-textual’ world, the actual world, to the foreground. The effect of this is not to diminish the importance of books and stories as sources of the ‘uncontained intertextual space that opens out from [the text]’ with every reference the reader senses (Hones 2014: 8), rather it puts all of these multiple spatial dimensions - actual world places, cartographical representations, books and stories - on a par. In this, she echoes Yates’s ‘flat ontology’ of story, which I mentioned in Chapter 2 (Yates 2013: 43). In other words, just as readers bring to their encounters with fiction references from the other literary texts they have read, they also bring references from their own, actual-world lives.

With this insight in mind we can better understand many Sherlockians’ interjections into the ongoing debate about Holmes’s world. Take John Shelton Reed’s ‘A Note on “The Long Island Cave Mystery” Mystery’ (1969). The odd repetition in his title is a reference to a rough edge in Doyle’s text of ‘The Adventure of the Red Circle’. Reed’s article provides a
quotation of the relevant passage: ‘Gregson “struck his stick sharply upon the ground, on which a cabman, his whip in hand, sauntered over... ‘This is Mr. Leverton, of Pinkerton’s American Agency’. ‘The hero of the Long Island cave mystery?’ said Holmes. ‘Sir, I am pleased to meet you’”’ (Reed 1969: 112). Holmes’s reference to the Long Island Cave Mystery seems to have been intended by Doyle as an open-and-shut reference: Holmes mentions the case to show Leverton’s standing in the detective community and to indicate that he is familiar with him (as he wants to appear to be familiar with everything). However, as Reed’s title demonstrates, this rough edge has tantalised Sherlockians with its vagueness: what exactly was the ‘Long Island Cave Mystery’?

Reed was not the first American Sherlockian to ask this question. His article is, in fact, directed at Christopher Morley’s idea that Holmes was referring to Long Island, New York. Reed suggested it was not because Long Island, New York was more famous and therefore more likely to be a name available to Sherlockian readers. No, Morley had chosen that place because he was a New Yorker himself. He wrote, ‘Mr. Morley, with the charming parochialism which New Yorkers exhibit on occasion, seems to have assumed that Holmes had reference to the Long Island which abuts on New York City’ (Reed 1969: 112, emphasis added). The consequence of Morley not looking beyond his backyard is that Long Island, New York could not be the place Holmes refers to as there are no caves there. Reed underscores this point with an empty map, sardonically titled ‘Locations of caves on Long Island, N.Y.’ (fig. 5.4). Having undone Morley’s argument for Long Island, New York, Reed advances his own for Long Island, Tennessee. Perhaps Reed should not have have been so quick to dismiss Morley’s ‘charming parochialism’, for the reasoning he gives to support his reading of this rough edge in ‘The Adventure of the Red Circle’ also relies on his own actual-world experiences, just like Morley.

[N]ear the present town of Kingsport, in upper East Tennessee, the Holston River... forms two channels. The smaller, known locally as The Sluice, runs... beneath an intermittently sheer limestone face for three or four miles... Scattered about the limestone face are the entrances to a number of smallish caves in which, as a lad I undertook - as had my father thirty years before - various speleological and archaeological researches (Reed 1969: 112).
The highly personal nature of both Morley and Reed’s readings of this part of ‘The Adventure of the Red Circle’ challenges the idea that reading completes a text in some finalised way. It suggests that individual encounters with fiction are subjective, dynamic and influenced by a variety of voices. The fact that Morley and Reed have produced different readings of ‘The Long Island Cave Mystery’ is not itself problematic. Rather, it speaks to the fact that different readers’ encounters with texts produce different fictions, due to their incorporation of different actual-world experiences into that text. Reed’s detective Leverton, wandering the sands of the banks of the Holston River in Tennessee, is a very different figure to Morley’s, on America’s Atlantic shore.

Reed’s article suggests something further: his understanding that readers’ encounters with fiction do not complete a story; that readings can be made fresh again; that encounters with fiction are living and not dead. His article is written to persuade his fellow Sherlockians to drop their loyalty to Morley’s idea that Long Island, New York is right - and to pick up his own memories of Tennessee in its place. His article also works against the idea that readers’ subjective closure, as Bayard argues makes it impossible ‘to truly communicate with other readers of the same book - precisely because they are talking about the same book’ (Bayard 2008: 67, emphasis in original). Reed’s shared belief in the dynamism of Sherlockians’ living readings of these stories extends to his faith in the power of the Game, of the debate, to communicate his own idiosyncratic reading of this common text.
Further, Hones’s talk of ‘mixing multiple spatial dimensions’ (Hones 2014: 101, emphasis added) is not simply a geographer’s tic. Hones’s theory is that intertextuality involves readers bringing together a variety of spatial experiences. The archives of the *Baker Street Journal* indicate that this is evident in Sherlockian readings, particularly in the way Sherlockians bring their phenomenological encounters with actual world spaces to bear on their readings of Doyle’s texts. This mixing of spaces – narrative and actual-world – is often used to interrogate or challenge Doyle’s literary geographies. Evan Wilson, for instance, a long-serving United States diplomat, wrote many articles for the *Journal* in which he highlighted the importance of his own ‘dimension of experience and memory’ (Hones 2014: 102) to his reading of these fictions.

His first such article, ‘The Trip That Never Was, or Sherlock Holmes in the Middle East’ (1970), showcases best his experience of relational distance between himself and the narrative of ‘The Adventure of the Empty House’. Holmes’s account to Watson, in that story, of how he spent his time between escaping the clutches of Moriarty and the projectiles of Colonel Moran and turning up on Watson’s doorstep dressed as a book seller, reads like a laundry-list of foreign adventures for a late-Victorian genius. He claims to have successfully entered Tibet; to have traversed Persia; and to have undertaken a secret diplomatic mission to Khartoum. After reading this, Wilson asserts: ‘It is my conviction that the journey Holmes described was an impossible one, and that he never made it’ (Wilson 1970: 68). His challenge to Doyle’s narrative is based on ‘an association with the Middle East running back over thirty years’ (Wilson 1970: 67). More specifically he adds: ‘By way of explanation, I might say that during the three years I spent as Consul General at Calcutta my consular district immediately joined Tibet; that I served in our Embassy in Persia, or Iran; and that I have visited, more than once, both Arabia and the Sudan’ (Wilson 1970: 68).

Of course, reading events change depending on the situation of the reader and the particular mix of spatial dimensions the reader brings with them. A later article by Evan Wilson describes a rather different encounter with another Holmes story. In ‘With Sherlock Holmes and Karl Baedeker in Farthest Cornwall’ (1982), Wilson frames his interest in the ‘description of the countryside of Cornwall’ found in ‘The Adventure of the Devil’s Foot’
Wilson 1982: 7) in terms of his habit of reading historic *Baedeker* guidebooks. ‘I possess a collection of old *Baedeker* numbering over twenty-five, and I make it a practice when going abroad always to take the appropriate volume with me’ (Wilson 1982: 7). In contrast to the distancing effect of Wilson’s dimension of *professional* experience and memory, his experiences reading *Baedeker*’s guidebook for Cornwall arguably brings him closer to Doyle’s text. At least, it adds a new intertextual space to his reading: *Baedeker*’s guidebook and Wilson’s readings of that book.

Watson’s description of the countryside conforms so closely to that of *Baedeker* that we must assume that Holmes and Watson took the guidebook with them on their trip to Cornwall. I can almost see them walking together along the coastal path or over the moors, with Holmes striding ahead and Watson plodding behind, with the little red book under his arm (Wilson 1982: 9).

Not all Sherlockian reading experiences mix together the spatial dimensions of narrative and actual-world experience in such an organic way as Reed and Wilson. For these men, their experiences of the actual world came first - Reed’s childhood explorations and Wilson’s diplomatic career - and informed their later readings of the Sherlock Holmes stories. This a simplified version of the process Hones seems to have in mind, when she argues that ‘just as tourists actually visiting New York [the place of her study] *find themselves* in their own version of a real-and-imagined city, so readers who encounter the fictional New York of *The Great World* [her case study text] experience that city as an entanglement of experience, expectations, and associations’ (Hones 2014: 101, emphasis added). This mixing of spatial dimensions is subjective and automatic - readers do it out of desire to create believable worlds, thicker characters and to forge affective connections with texts. Yet, for many Sherlockians this process is more deliberate. Sherlockians seem to go out into the world to gain new experiences that can be used as evidence in the on-going debate that is the Game.

Understanding that many readers have gone out into the world deliberately to gain new spaces of memory and experience, which they can then insert in to their arguments, helps make sense of odd articles. Howard Brody’s article, ‘The Location of Baskerville Hall’ (1979), starts for instance with an apology to his readers. He notes that his argument for the
location of Baskerville Hall, the seat of the eponymous Baskerville family from Doyle’s *The Hound of the Baskervilles*, is based on his imaginative travels via the pages of ‘an 1892 [and a] 1966 map [and] three guidebooks’ to Dartmoor (Brody 1979: 230). Yet, he still seems somewhat shamed that he has not travelled to Devon itself. He says that it might ‘seem presumptuous to offer such a theory [that Baskerville Hall was located in south eastern Dartmoor], as I cannot claim to have made any on-the-spot reconnaissance of Dartmoor’ (Brody 1979: 229). The idea that a fan, engaging in an imaginative game about a fictional world, should apologise for not having travelled thousands of miles just to check his theories, makes more sense in the light of what we now know: that Sherlockians have placed great weight on their own actual-world experiences and memories to interrogate Doylean geographies.

Similarly, Richard Foster’s reading of *The Adventure of the Red-Headed League*, as recounted in ‘John Clay and Lebanon, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.’ (1971), seems less eccentric when read in the light of this deliberate practice of gaining actual-world experiences. To understand why the fictional founder of the eponymous Red-Headed League, an invention of the story’s master criminal, John Clay, is claimed to be from Lebanon, Pennsylvania, Foster reasoned that ‘a visit to Lebanon, Pennsylvania seemed in order’ (Foster 1971: 98). As with Brody, the leap from textual interrogation to actual-world experience is made within the context of the Sherlockian game and its hidden rules. His visit in search of Holmes-connected experiences opens up his reading of this particular story to include his impressions of this ‘typical southeastern [sic] Pennsylvania town: much red brick, no architecture worth seeing, but some pleasant, shaded streets’ (Foster 1971: 98).

Tellingly, his experience of the town also opens up his reading of ‘The Red-Headed League’ to the space of Doyle’s *The Valley of Fear*. As Foster presents it: ‘Lebanon is possibly not more than 25 miles from Vermissa Valley. It is not in the coal region, but south of it. And yet it is close enough to have supplied a Scowrer [the notorious villains of that novella] or two’ (Foster 1971: 99). As such, he imagines that, while Moriarty’s men searched out the Pinkerton detective Birdy Edwards on behalf of Scowrer Ted Baldwin, as Holmes surmises at the end of *The Valley of Fear* (Doyle 2009: 866), Baldwin ‘made friends with those of his own ilk’ in England, including John Clay (Foster 1971: 99). ‘And during one of their talks, Baldwin
mentions his boyhood town, Lebanon, Pennsylvania’ (Foster 1971: 99). Given that the detail of this reading could have been achieved via the imaginative transport of book and map, Foster’s actual-world exploration of Pennsylvania speaks to the imperative of actual-world memories and experiences as a means of geographically playing the Sherlockian Game.

Communal Reading

Sherlockians do not read alone. Sherlock Holmes fan culture is rooted in the membership of clubs and societies and the social gatherings they afford. In the last section I argued that Sherlockian encounters with fiction, with their ‘mixing of multiple spatial dimensions’ (Hones 2014: 102) have been shaped by their attempts to ‘participate actively in the Holmes Saga’ (Shreffler 1986: 37). In this section I will demonstrate that an awareness of a wider community of Sherlockians has also influenced readers encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories. This community, expressed most readily in the fan journals which almost every Sherlockian society, large or small, produces, plays a role in shaping many readers’ encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories. It has created an environment in which individuals’ encounters, with their manifest ‘mixing of multiple spatial dimensions’ (Hones 2014: 102), are intertwined with other readers’ own dimensions of experience and memory, as communicated in their Sherlockian writings.

Philip Shreffler’s essay on ‘Writing the Sherlockian Paper’, which I discussed briefly earlier in this chapter, provides insight into the fact that Sherlockian journals, more than published fan fictions, or group play-acting, have been the most influential driver of relations between readers, within a necessarily textual community. Shreffler’s opening puts it, in full:

Investigations into the literature and the world of Sherlock Holmes that are presented in written form are a major way in which every Sherlockian can participate actively in the Holmes Saga and celebrate the Master at the same time. Such papers are often the main-stay of scion society meetings, and, of course, publications both great and small, dedicated to seeing into print what we call our Higher Criticism, proliferate today (Shreffler 1986: 37).
We can get a better understanding of the importance of Sherlockian journals in holding the community together, and in bringing readers into a relationship with one another, if we look again at Richard Warner and the naming of Holmes Peak in Oklahoma. In Chapter 1, I discussed Warner and his successful attempt to name a small hill, little more than a mound, in the prairie outside of Tulsa, Oklahoma. Unlike almost all the Sherlockian travellers and writers discussed throughout this thesis, Warner was not content to know and broadcast the Sherlockian connections to the land through which he travelled – he had to make it official. In early 1983, he set out to convince the U.S. Board on Geographical Names to officially name the hill – which did not, yet, have a name – Holmes Peak. By the autumn of 1984 he had been successful. Aware of the wide reach of the premier Sherlockian magazine, Warner announced this success in the *Baker Street Journal*, in an article called ‘The Naming of Holmes Peak’ (Warner 1985: 29).

The power of the *Baker Street Journal* - as the oldest and most widely circulated Sherlockian journal - has also been called on to cement relations between older and newer sections of the community. In December 1983, a small Sherlockian scion society (that is, a local fan group that has associated with the Baker Street Irregulars in New York) called Boss McGinty’s Bird Watchers, celebrated its first anniversary. The society’s name was a pun on the adversarial relationship between the two main characters of Doyle’s *The Valley of Fear* (1914), Scowrer Boss McGinty and undercover detective Birdy Edwards. Ray Albany, the editor of their own journal, called *The Daily Herald*, writing of the club’s rapid rise in membership and prospects said, ‘The future of the society looks very bright’ (Albany 1983b). Among the connections Albany credited for the Bird Watchers’ foundational success was the *Baker Street Journal*. ‘The article that was placed in The Baker Street Journal [sic] of March 1983 by Frank Vacante told of the groups [sic] beginnings and the first dinner meeting’ (Albany 1983b). Indeed, in the June 1983 issue of *The Daily Herald*, Albany has written that Vacante’s words ‘will be read by many Sherlockians throughout the world’ (Albany 1983a). The implication is that, alongside the personal mediation between the Bird Watchers and the wider Sherlockian community provided by ‘well known Sherlockians such as Ron DeWaal and Peter Blau’ both ‘experts in the field of Sherlock Holmes’ (Albany 1983b), the *Baker Street Journal* was a crucial platform for creating a relationship between the members of the Bird Watchers and other Sherlockians further afield.
On a different scale, *The Daily Herald*, like many parochial Sherlockian journals, works to create relationships among its own community of devotees. Its chief means of forging these relationships between readers is through reports of the society’s regular meetings. These reports often appear to have been written to instil a sense of inclusion, even among those members who could not be there in person. *The Daily Herald*, for instance, carried in its June 1983 issue reports of ‘our last dinner meetings’ (Albany 1983a). Written in a lively and engaging manner, these reports create (in the mind of this reader, at least) a sense of the camaraderie and warmth that membership of Boss McGinty’s Bird Watchers seems to have entailed. Introducing the society’s main topic of debate at their recent dinner meeting, for instance, Albany deftly uses rhetorical questions and a dry tone to draw the reader into a simulacrum of the night’s discussion. ‘At our last dinner meeting there was... a very peculiar discussion, dealing with the existence of Sherlock Holmes. Can you imagine anyone questioning the existence of Sherlock Holmes?’ (Albany 1983a, n.p., emphasis in original).

Having set out his own stall (and perhaps brought the reader along with him), Albany proceeds to paint a scene of the debate room itself: ‘Well, immediately an uproar of shouts and boos filled the room’ (Albany 1983a). He ends this report not by summarising the night’s conclusions but with a rhetorical question which attempts to draw the reader into a continuing argument: ‘Holmes lived and still lives. He currently resides in Sussex keeping his bees. Where do you think the strain of killer bees derived?’ (Albany 1983a, n.p.).

It is possible to get an idea of the power of parochial or ‘scion’ journals to bring their disparate readers together, in a community that is at once actual and virtual, by looking at the *Grimpen Mire Gazette*, the newsletter of Chicago’s Hugo’s Companions, in 1989. After a long struggle, that year saw Susan Rice, a champion of the rights of women Sherlockians, gain partial membership to the Baker Street Irregulars, Sherlockiana’s most prestigious society and, hitherto, an all-male club. As one might expect, that move caused much consternation in the remaining all-male Sherlockian societies, including Hugo’s Companions of Chicago. Illustrating the importance of their journal as a means of communication and building relations among members, it was to the *Grimpen Mire Gazette* that the Companions turned to vent their opinions about all-male societies.
In a special edition of the journal published in 1989, with the subtitle ‘Women’s Membership Issue Flares!’ (Davis 1989: 1), the editors included a ‘Note to Correspondents - Concerning Correspondence’: ‘We are prepared to relax (within reason) our limits upon the length of correspondence for publication, if such correspondence relates to the question of restrictions upon membership in Hugo’s Companions’ (Davis 1989: 2). It would seem the issue of whether there was a space in America for all-male Sherlockian societies drew a great many lengthy letters from members of the Hugo’s Companions (fig. 5.5).

Figure 5.5 This front page from the 1989 special issue of the Grimpen Mire Gazette, illustrates how journals like these hold communities together, in a similar manner to the newspapers the front page is emulating (from the John Bennett Shaw Collection, University of Minnesota Library)

This demonstrates the importance of local journals, alongside the nation-wide scope of the Baker Street Journal, in bringing Sherlockians into contact with one another, and with other readers’ ideas.

Like many Sherlockian fan magazines, the journal’s name - the Grimpen Mire Gazette - speaks to a world rather different to the vast geographical and social distances that might separate membership of a literary society in a metropolis such as Chicago. It suggests the conviviality of a community joined by a small community newspaper. The Hugo’s Companions of Chicago are not the only Sherlockian society to name their journal in this
way. Their fellow Chicago society named its journal *The Devon County Chronicle*, a paper which, the reader is told, serves ‘the Parishes of Grimpen, Thorsley and High Barrow’ (1972). Further afield, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, the Royal Berkshire Regiment society called its newsletter *The Berkshire Bulletin*. The Great Alkali Plainsmen of Kansas City, Missouri, looked closer to home for its own title, *The Kansas City Daily Journal*. Finally, the New York state society named after An Irish Secret Society at Buffalo, founded in Buffalo, New York, drew on a more sinister variant of this theme, calling its newsletter *Covert Notes*.

How can we think about this tendency of Sherlockian societies, to name their circulating journals after local newspapers (or sinister society missives)? These titles, particularly the Chicagoan publications, are redolent of an historic, urban, British community. *The Devon County Chronicle* speaks of ‘counties’ and ‘parishes’ – perhaps creating a mental image among its readership that is a far cry from the realities of Cook County, Illinois. David Brewer’s theory of literary commoning is worth returning to, here. I discussed this theory in Chapter 4, and briefly referred to the Sherlockian notion of their own societies as being akin, perhaps, to gentlemen’s clubs. Brewer argues that the sense of ‘customary right’ felt by the eighteenth-century readers he discusses to imaginatively expand on an author’s work or character lay, for many, in a sense of being like ‘cottagers on the textual commons’. (Brewer 2005: 13). That is, this right was not automatically given to anyone who read, but reserved only for those who participated in this loosely defined, community. Indeed, Brewer places great emphasis on the role of communities – virtual or otherwise – in inspiring and patrolling readers’ acts of imaginative expansion (Brewer 2005: 13-14). In Chapter 4 I argued that the textual community of Sherlockiana could be seen to act in a similar way.

Here, I would add to that argument by noting the particularly local, perhaps even cosy, associations of journal or newsletter titles such as *The Devon County Chronicle* and the *Kansas City Daily Journal*. Such titles speak to a circumscription of circulation, a limited membership, a virtual community held together by text, imagined to be in place, and thus licensed to practise the kinds of expansionary literary geography that I have discussed.
Mixing multiple spatial dimensions

The environments created by these Sherlockian journals are ones in which textual and extra-textual spaces rub shoulders with each other, in a reflection of the ‘mixing of multiple spatial dimensions’ (Hones 2014: 102) that is present in the readers’ encounters with the stories, discussed earlier. The December 1989 special edition of the Grimpen Mire Gazette, which carried the notice about letters concerning society membership, also printed on its letters page short pieces relating to: the separation of Britain’s Princess Anne and Captain Mark Phillips; a U.S. Attorney, Anton Valukas, ‘a past winner of the Baker Street Tankard Award’, and his stellar convictions record; and a collection of literary references to Sherlock Holmes from modern detective and thriller fictions (Davis 1989: 2).

Lest one might think this combination of Royal scandal, literary reference and society news was simply Norman Davis’s idiosyncrasy, looking at other Sherlockian journals supports the idea that in their pages, actual and fictional, textual and extra-textual spatial dimensions mingle. Take, for instance, The Morning Post, ‘a newsletter for The Noble Bachelors of Greater St Louis’ (Hapner 1980: n.p.). This society takes its name from Doyle’s 1892 short story, ‘The Noble Bachelor’. Volume 1, number 4, published in 1980, carries on its front page a report of a recent meeting between members of The Noble Bachelors and their fellow Missourian Sherlockian society, The Great Alkali Plainsmen of Kansas City. Following that report of an actual-world event is a short story written by Mary Schroeder, in the style of ‘found fiction’ common to many Sherlockian writings. ‘Letter from Mary Morstan Watson’ attempts to answer the long-held question among Sherlockians as to why, after marrying in The Sign of Four and moving in with his wife (as recounted in ‘The Adventure of the Engineers Thumb’ (Doyle 2009: 273-287), for instance), Watson seemed to be unmarried with no recollection of his wife in later stories. In Schroeder’s ‘Letter’, the answer comes in the form of a tragic tale of death, madness and an illegitimate marriage which forces Mary Morstan (the woman whom Watson married after The Sign of Four) to leave England and make a new life for herself - and her unborn child - in India. The final article in that edition of The Morning Post is an essay by Michael Hardwick on ‘Sherlock Holmes and Radio’. In a break from the earlier two pieces, this article presents itself as part-criticism, part-panegyric.
for the power of radio to encourage readers’ desire to ‘step through the looking-glass’ into Holmes’s world (Hapner 1980: n.p.).

This mixing of different kinds of spaces within the pages of the same journal, in the hands of the *Baker Street Journal* (BSJ), the pre-eminent vehicle for ‘seeing into print what we call our Higher Criticism’ (Shreffler 1986: 37), appears to send the message to readers that it is legitimate to draw on evidence from a variety of narrative, literary and actual-world spatial dimensions when ‘Playing the Game’. Take an example from around the same time as the scion magazines I have discussed so far - volume 33 number 1 from 1983. In the first three articles, which run over ten pages, the BSJ veers from a literary discussion of the source of the ‘Island of Uffa’, mentioned in ‘The Five Orange Pips’ (Doyle 2009: 217-229), to a report on a meeting of New York-based Sherlockians, to an article which expands Holmes’s world into twentieth-century Chicago by attempting to graft actual-world historical evidence onto the skeleton of detail taken from ‘His Last Bow’.

In ‘Uffa’s Midnight Visitor’, Ruth Berman attempts to put to rest the long-running Sherlockian argument about the location of the Island of Uffa. This place has been variously speculated to be a Hebridean Island visited by Johnson and Boswell, a burial mound in Norwich, or an island in the south Pacific. Berman’s contribution to the debate rests on her ‘uncovering’ a ‘little island named Uffa’ (Berman 1983: 7) in a short story written by Doyle that predates the publication of ‘The Five Orange Pips’.

Alongside this piece of literary sleuthing is Ann Byerly’s review of ‘Autumn in Baker Street’ – ‘a weekend of scholarly and convivial delight’ (Byerly 1983: 9) involving members of The Three Garridebs, The Adventuresses of Sherlock Holmes, Altamont’s Agents, and The Men on the Tor – all Sherlockian societies in the American northeast. Byerly’s report noted the blending of actual-world and fictional spaces caused by the discussions during the retreat: ‘The specialists’ attention to the detail of the stories and the Victorian era kept us close to the characters of Holmes and Watson, to their adventures, and to their world, so that for two days our minds never left Baker Street’ (Byerly 1983: 9). This image of being bodily situated though mentally mobile could be applied to the reading of Sherlockian journals in general. The thrust of Byerly’s report is that this group of sixty Sherlockians looked both to
‘Sherlockian history’ (Byerly 1983: 9) and Victorian history, to better understand the world of Sherlock Holmes.

The final article in this review of the March 1983 issue of the *Baker Street Journal* makes this mixing of spatial dimensions more explicit, in its pursuit of knowledge about Holmes’s world. In ‘The Adventure of the American Interlude’, Norman Davis (he who edited the *Grimpen Mire Gazette*) attempts to flesh out the story of Holmes in Chicago, when he lived under the pseudonym ‘Mr. Altamont’. Davis’s article notably weaves back and forth over the blurred boundary between the fictional and the actual. He sets the tone with a dramatic prose opening that draws the actual-world pre-First World War British Foreign Minister and Prime Minister, Earl Grey and Herbert Asquith, into Holmes’s literary space. He writes ‘It began in England, with a wiry, elderly gentleman who had lived in his quiet cottage in Sussex for nine years’ - until Grey and Asquith strode to his doorstep (Davis 1983: 10). Continuing this tone, Davis sets out to tell ‘the full story’ of Holmes’s time as ‘Mr. Altamont of Chicago’ (Davis 1983: 10) by digging through contemporary phone records, and applying his own knowledge of the city’s geography to the supposed needs of this deep-cover agent. In Davis’s hands, the actual-world and literary histories of Holmes’s movements, as with Byerly’s Sherlockian and Victorian histories, become equal fodder for ‘Investigations into the literature and world of Sherlock Holmes’ (Shreffler 1986: 37).

It is difficult to say definitively whether this mixing of different spatial dimensions in the pages of Sherlockian journals has been a cause, or simply a reflection, of readers’ tendency to invest their own experiences and memories into their appreciation of the Sherlock Holmes stories. What can be said, however, is that the instances of readers’ encounters with these stories carried in the various Sherlockian journals have influenced other readers’ own fictional encounters. In 2000, Ohioan S. Amjad Hussain, for example, wrote ‘You Have Been in Peshawar, I Perceive’. It is a speculative account of Watson’s time recuperating in the city of Peshawar, now in Pakistan following his wounding at the Battle of Maiwand, as told in the opening paragraphs of Arthur Conan Doyle’s *A Study in Scarlet*. Hussain, born in Peshawar, drew heavily on his own spatial ‘dimensions of experience and memory’ (Hones 2013: 102) to create a reading which vividly brings to life the months of Watson’s stay on the frontier of British India, swept over by Doyle in a sentence or two. Hussain’s reading
emphasises the mix of spatial dimensions he brings to the co-production of this fiction, including his encounter with Doyle’s text, his own memories and experiences of Peshawar, and other texts read specifically to inform this reading. In a passage about the possibility of Watson ‘learning about the cruelty of the Sikh governor of Peshawar, an Italian mercenary named Avitabile, who ruled the area with an iron fist’, he mentions how the governor’s ruthless cruelty has passed into local folklore. Even today mothers in the inner city of Peshawar scare their naughty children from the wrath of Abu Tabela, the local corruption of Avitabile (Hussain 2000: 34).

Mixed in with Hussain’s own experiences and memories of Peshawar are the experiences of H. Paul Jeffers, an American Sherlockian and aid worker who worked with Afghan refugees in Peshawar during the Afghan-Soviet war in the 1980s. This is because, as an editor’s note to Hussain’s article makes clear, it was written in response to Jeffers’s own speculative account of Watson’s time in Peshawar, itself titled ‘You Have Been in Peshawar, I Perceive’ (Jeffers 1991). As his article suggests, Jeffers’s reading of the relevant passages of A Study in Scarlet drew on his experience of being in Peshawar as a foreigner. As such, he frames Watson’s encounter with the city in particularly colonial terms. Of present-day Peshawar he writes, ‘it is a wild and woolly capital where weddings are celebrated with AK-47 automatic rifles being fired in the air, bombings are frequent, kidnappings are commonplace’ (Jeffers 1991: 83), and: ‘As large as a modern football stadium, Balahisar looms over Peshawar today as it did in 1880 while in its shadow a visitor can explore the Old City and find its narrow streets and bazaars much as Watson discovered them’ (Jeffers 1991: 84).

Jeffers’s spatial ‘dimension of experience and memory’ (Hones 2014: 102) makes its way into Hussain’s reading event in a variety of ways. Most notably in those instances when Hussain’s own experiences and memories directly contradict Jeffers’s. Thus, Hussain writes, ‘If Watson visited the city from the fort, he would have gone into the city through the Asamai Gate (2), the nearest gate to the fort, not through the Gunj Gate [as Jeffers suggests] (3), which happens to be on the opposite (eastern) side of the city’ (Hussain 2000: 34). The numbers in parentheses in this quotation refer to a map which Hussain drew himself, in
order, as I argued in relation to Philip Hench’s Reichenbach Map, to convince his readers of the credibility of his geographical ‘evidence’ - that is, of his reading of Doyle’s text.

The spaces of Jeffers’s experience of Peshawar, described in his article, are present throughout Hussain’s reading, though often in more subtle ways. Hussain is at pains to represent Peshawar as homely and familiar - a direct result, I would argue, of his encounter with Jeffers’s image of wild Otherness. Of Watson’s time in the Balahisar Fort, for instance, where Jeffers’s imagines its dark shadow looming over the town, Hussain’s narrative wanders inside, to conjure the ‘fantastic panoramic view of the city and the surrounding countryside’ its veranda could have afforded Watson during his recuperation (Hussain 2000: 34). Hussain’s description of the Kissa Khani Bazaar, the Street of Storytellers, using the words of ‘Lowell Thomas, the famous American traveller’ as ‘the Piccadilly of Central Asia’ (Hussain 2000: 35) seems (to this reader at least) to be informed by his encounter with Jeffers’s description of ‘the bustling bazaar today’ which smacks of a kind of Orientalism: ‘one needs little imagination to visualise Watson listening raptly to the yarns [on the Street of Storytellers] while sipping green tea [and] eating mutton kebabs’, he writes (Jeffers 1991: 84).

In some cases, readers have actively harnessed the broadcasting power of these circulating journals to press their own ‘dimensions of experience and memory’ (Hones 2014: 101) onto other Sherlockians as a quasi-definitive context in which to understand Doyle’s stories. Take Henry Potter’s ‘Reflections on Canonical Vehicles and Something of the Horse’ (1971), for instance. Potter’s ‘reflections’ represent a particular encounter with the Sherlock Holmes stories, involving the texts he has read, television commercials he has seen and his own, actual-world, equine experiences. As he explains in his opening paragraph, this reading event was inspired by an apparently dispiriting encounter, for an ‘equiphile’ with ‘a colour story on New York City, in a recent edition of an evening paper’ in which ‘the decrepit horse-drawn victorias at the entrance to Central Park were blithely misidentified as “hansom cabs”’ (Potter 1971: 200). Potter characterises his reading, spatially, as borne out of a relation to William Baring-Gould’s encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories, as represented in his Annotated Sherlock Holmes (Baring-Gould 1968), and therefore
producing ‘a more three-dimensionalised picture... of that by-gone but still fascinating world’ of Holmes’s England (Potter 1971: 200).

Importantly, it is Potter’s own actual-world experiences that play a central role in that picture. Writing about the Hansom cab, ‘the next vehicle mentioned by Watson [after the dog-cart of ‘The Musgrave Ritual’], which reappears throughout the Canon’, he writes emotively of its ‘two folding doors’, saying: ‘Those folding doors!... when entering the cab, it was wise to sit as quickly as possible to avoid getting pinched between them when they closed’ (Potter 1971: 201). Further on he adds another ‘vivid recollection: the feeling one had sitting down that one’s weight, so far abaft the centre of gravity, was about to lift the horse from the ground!’ (Potter 1971: 201). By including these spaces of Potter’s own life may have been intended to provide flesh to the bone of his otherwise perhaps dry examination of the horses and carriages of Doyle’s stories, yet in doing so, he also left traces of the ‘multiple spatial dimensions’ (Hones 2014: 102) involved in his encounter with those stories. It is Potter’s personal experiences of horses and carriages which give his narrative the richness of detail and the three-dimensional thickness to which he aspires.

**Weller’s Dartmoor: Unmappable, Contingent Spaces**

In the last section of this chapter I want to draw out the strands of my argument - that through debates about the life and world of Sherlock Holmes, readers have expanded it with their own memories and experiences, mixing together actual-world and fictional spaces. In this way, the literary spaces of Holmes’s world are produced not only through relations between characters but by relations between all those actors involved in fiction’s co-production, particularly readers and other readers.

I will substantiate this claim with a close reading of a rather peculiar guide to a Holmesian place - Philip Weller’s *The Dartmoor of The Hound of the Baskervilles: A Practical Guide to The Sherlock Holmes Locations* (1991). Weller’s *Dartmoor* does seem rather odd at first, a vision of a place that seems unstable and unfixed, a place where ‘although the sometimes-cruel weather can quickly dissolve the more transient signs of man, it will be a very long time before some impressions are destroyed’ (Weller 1991: 2); yet, as I will demonstrate
here, it is highly representative of the ways in which Sherlockian debates with their inclusion of readers’ own spatial ‘dimensions of experience and memory’ (Hones 2014: 101) have collectively expanded the literary space of Holmes’s world beyond Doyle’s text. I will perform this reading of Weller’s *Dartmoor* through David Coughlan’s theory of intertextual literary space. Hones glosses Coughlan’s theory in this way:

> the space of any particular text has to be understood in terms of its existence within an uncontained (in fact, uncontainable) textual dimension, in which the intertextual “is not a means by which we can link one textual space with another... but is itself a part of that space is, in fact the whole of that space”. This uncontainable literary space... is unmappable - its distances and proximities, its absences and gaps are contingent and unfixed (Hones 2014: 117).

Weller’s *Dartmoor* brings that unmappability, that uncontainable element of Holmes’s geography as a Sherlockian geography, to the fore. It originally circulated among members of the British Sherlockian group, the Franco-Midland Hardware Company, as a supplement to the April 1991 issue of their magazine, *The Baker Street Pillar Box*. I found a copy in the Library of Congress, lodged on shelves with work by Weller’s American cousins. It provides a good illustration of the ways in which readers’ encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories and with other readers’ own encounters, and the resulting ‘mixing of multiple spatial dimensions’ (Hones 2014: 102) has expanded and folded the literary space of Sherlock Holmes. Weller’s stated aim is to ‘provide a practical guide to the locations of most of the important sites proposed by various Holmesian [used here as a British term for Sherlockian] specialists as candidates for place mentioned in “The Hound of the Baskervilles”’ (Weller 1991: 4). However, from the outset, Weller’s encounter with Dartmoor produces a space of fiction and fact which, to borrow a phrase, ‘cannot in any sense be fixed or explained by reference to particular times and places’ (Hones 2014: 33). The tension neatly encapsulated in Weller’s notion of a *practical* guide to places of the imagination is evident throughout the book.

Weller’s characterisation of Dartmoor as a ‘Land of Atmosphere and Imagination’ threatens its stability as a unified place. He explains that ‘After several decades... on Dartmoor, I feel
that I can, like Holmes, find my way about. The one thing that I have never done, however, is to exhaust the moods which the Moor possesses’ (Weller 1991: 2). This idea that the moor is inexhaustible reflects, perhaps unintentionally, Coughlan’s argument that ‘textual space is a space made up of spaces... a wider horizon is always available’ (Coughlan 2002: 208). Further, for Weller it sets up well the guidebook’s image of Sherlockians’ Dartmoor: made of shifting spaces and sites that come into view, only to blink out again, like Selden’s candle viewed from the window of Baskerville Hall.

To continue the encounter between these two men writing a decade apart, Weller’s representation of Dartmoor as a space that is both literary and actual, made of both textual and extra-textual spatial dimensions, further reflects Coughlan’s description of literary space as being ‘like Lefebvre’s l’espace’ (208). As Hones puts it, more forcefully, ‘the literary-geographical space in which fiction happens is a real space’ (Hones 2014: 9). Like actual-world spaces, literary spaces, argues Hones, are products of social interrelations. ‘It is real in the same way that Soja’s simultaneously material and symbolic “third space” is real’ (Hones 2014: 9). In terms of intertextuality, this implies that,

just as [an actual place] happens for people variously in a mixture of the physical and the social - the real and the present mixed in with the anticipated and the remembered - so the fictional [place] emerges in the collaborative writing-reading text event as a complex combination of many copresent [sic] fictional and factual’ places (Hones 2014: 101).

In Weller’s Dartmoor, as in the broader Sherlockian community it represents, people encounter other people, as well as their own memories and experiences, and the environment, over and again, creating and recreating real spaces that mix together into the unstable, fractured and whole environment of the Holmesian moor.

What, then, does this space of contingent spaces look like? The guide’s section to the locations of ‘The Villages’, particularly the village of Grimpen, provides a good representation of Weller’s Dartmoor. The key feature of Weller’s ‘practical guide’ is his inclusion of multiple, actual-world candidate sites, for each location featured in Doyle’s The
*Hound of the Baskervilles* (1902). There are six such candidate sites for the village of Grimpen. As with each *Hound* location, Weller begins his section on Grimpen with ‘General Information’, setting out the parameters of Doyle’s fictional place. For Grimpen, he writes:

This small village provides several reference points for other locations in the narrative. It should be approximately four miles around the edge of the Moor from Baskerville Hall, and have a house for Dr. Mortimer, an inn and a post office-cum-grocery shop. The first two of these buildings should be higher than any others in the village. There should be a short-cut directly from Merripit House directly to the road between Grimpen and Baskerville Hall (Weller 1991: 24).

Given Doyle’s tendency to ‘exaggerate or decrease distances and [bring] together selected elements of various locations and buildings in order to increase the dramatic effect of the narrative’ (Weller 1991: 5), this list of requirements seems too detailed to fit any one actual-world Devon site. Indeed, Weller confirms that: ‘it is very difficult to find anywhere which meets all these requirements’ (Weller 1991: 24). Nevertheless, Weller ensures his reader that the game remains afoot: ‘candidates will be given for each of the three buildings required in the village, even when other specifications are not met’ (Weller 1991: 24).

This brief introduction to Weller’s quixotic hunt for the fictional village of Grimpen reveals much about his image of a Sherlockian Dartmoor. From the opening line, Weller announces the importance of geographical relations between different sites, as the key to proving their place in Holmes’s Dartmoor. As an avowed contribution to ‘The Holmesian “Game”’, Weller’s aim is to ‘fit all the events of the narratives into the real historical and geographical world’ (Weller 1991: 4). In the case of *The Hound of the Baskervilles*, the key aspect of Doyle’s narrative space is the relations between different people and different geographical sites – Holmes’s ability to spy on Watson from the Tor; Frankland’s ability to spy on everyone from his telescope at Lafter Hall; the Barrymores’ watching for a candlelight message from Selden to the east of Baskerville Hall (Doyle 2009: 667-766). It is these close geographical relations which create in this part of Dartmoor, in the *Hound*, the same cloying feeling that attends to later country house murder mysteries. For Weller, the relations...
between prospective *Hound* locations are the key to expanding this literary space beyond the confines of Doyle’s text.

Yet, although the relations *between* candidate locations are the most important element of Weller’s search, his guide still includes places that *look or feel* like they should belong in Holmes’s world. This is because his guide does not simply draw on his own actual-world sleuthing - although the ‘practical’ element of his subtitle (*A Practical Guide to The Sherlock Holmes Locations*) stems from his own embodied experience of the area. He draws chiefly on the suggestions of his fellow Sherlockians. As he says in the introduction: ‘It is intended that this monograph provide a practical guide to the locations of most of the important sites proposed by various Holmesian specialists as candidates for places mentioned in “The Hound of the Baskervilles”… Some locational candidates will be strong ones, and others less so’ (Weller 1991: 4). I argued earlier in this chapter that what passes as ‘evidence’ or ‘scholarship’ among Sherlockians playing the game of investigating Holmes’s world is often their own spatial ‘dimensions of memory and experience’ (Hones 2014: 102) brought to bear on their reading events. The propositions of ‘various Holmesian specialists’ highlighted by Weller often support this case.

His first candidate site for Baskerville Hall, for instance, is Lewtrenchard House. Weller admits that, although it is ‘a magnificent building’, ‘many of its additions [that make it look like Baskerville Hall] are recent’ and, crucially, ‘it is unfortunately on the wrong side of the Moor, and at such a distance that the Moor cannot even be seen’ (Weller 1991: 14). Why, if it is so unlikely a candidate, is it included in this list? The answer is that the house was suggested by eminent British Sherlockian William Baring-Gould, and as Weller writes ‘this was his family’s ancestral home’ (Weller 1991: 14). Unfortunately, although Weller claims to have compiled his list of locations from the suggestions of other Sherlockians, and although he says that ‘Some points of Holmesian scholarship will inevitably be mentioned’ (Weller 1991: 4), he is not entirely forthcoming with his source material. This omission, made for the sake of his general reader, unfortunately makes further analysis on this point more difficult.

Connected to the idea of geographical relations between sites that underpins Weller’s expanded literary space of Holmes’s Dartmoor is the power of contingency in shaping how
that Dartmoor appears. In the same way that literary space is described by Hones and Coughlan as ‘contingent and unfixed’ (Hones 2014: 117), so Weller’s image of Holmes’s Dartmoor depends on the situation of the viewer/reader and the relations between locations that that situation or location or position engenders. That contingency is best expressed by Weller’s repeated use of the indefinite article when talking about the relations between various candidate sites. It is a repeated use whose cartographic uncertainty unsettles this reader, at least. In his discussion of candidate sites for Lafter Hall, for instance, Weller raises the merits of actual-world Greendown Farm thus: ‘This farm is to the South of a Baskerville Hall <22>, and on a possible route from a Coombe Tracey <59>’ (Weller 1991: 19). While Greendown’s candidacy depends on its relations to other candidate sites, it is only reliable if the reader (or the tourist following Weller on-the-ground) invests in the candidacies of those other sites. Additionally, his description of the route from Greendown to ‘a Coombe Tracey’ as ‘possible’ suggests that the route does not, entirely, exist until it has been trod by a tourist in situ, copy of Weller’s guidebook in hand.

Elsewhere, writing about the actual-world Pupers Hill as a candidate site for Cleft Tor, ‘the location from which Selden made his candle signal to Baskerville Hall’ (Weller 1991: 10), Weller states that: ‘This hill can be seen from two Baskerville Hall candidate sites <22, 23>, although a signal from Pupers Rock would be difficult to see from one and almost impossible from the other’ (Weller 1991: 11). In this brief summation, the mention of two Baskerville Hall sites, as well as the use of an alternative name for Pupers Hill, creates a sense of disorientation and unease.

Like Greendown, the existence of Pupers Hill on a map of Holmes’s Dartmoor depends on the relative situation of the reader/tourists and whether they invest in Hayford Hall or Brook Manor, respectively, as an actual-world Baskerville Hall. It also depends, arguably, on the viewer’s vantage point from these two locations towards Pupers Hill, as Weller’s assertion that a requisite candle signal would be difficult to see is entirely subjective. This contingency raises the spectre that Weller’s Sherlockian Dartmoor is as unmappable as Coughlan and Hones’s literary spaces. Despite its existence, the rough, hand-drawn map provided by Weller (fig 5.6), with its reliance on his own excursions and decisions, and the
overlapping of all actual-world candidate sites, arguably suggests as much (Weller 1991: 26-27).

Finally, perhaps unusually for a literary space that is made of contingent, slippery and imaginative spaces, Weller’s image of Holmes’s Dartmoor is entirely accessible. Implied throughout his book, from the emphasis on geographical relations between candidate sites, to the descriptions of each site, and even the contingency that proscribes whether or not they are acceptable candidates, is the understanding that a final decision can and should only be made by a Sherlockian on the ground. This is the message contained in the book’s subtitle, which proclaims it to be A Practical Guide to The Sherlock Holmes Locations. Weller’s willingness to offer his ‘own preferences and prejudices’ (Weller 1991: 4) is based on his strongly-made claim to expertise and experience of Dartmoor. In the preface, he writes: ‘After several decades of teaching survival and navigational techniques on Dartmoor, I feel that I can, like Holmes, find my way about’ (Weller 1991: 2). By presenting his work as a guidebook, rather than an article or a thesis, Weller seems to be saying to his fellow

Figure 5.6 Weller’s idiosyncratic map of Sherlockians’ Dartmoor
Sherlockians: the final decision lies with you and your own experience. In this sense, ‘the quest to discover suitable locations to match those given in’ Doyle’s *The Hound of the Baskervilles* (Weller 1991: 2) returns full circle. The Sherlockian propositions that frame this guidebook were based on readers drawing on their own spatial ‘dimensions of memory and experience’ (Hones 2014: 101) to augment and interrogate the narrative spaces of Doyle’s story. These literary spaces can, in turn, only be interrogated and debated through other readers’ embodied (or perhaps textual) experiences of Dartmoor and its surroundings.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has demonstrated the extent to which Sherlockian readers’ expansion of the world of Sherlock Holmes, beyond the boundaries of Doyle’s texts, has been due to the ‘mixing of multiple spatial dimensions’ (Hones 2014: 102) taking place as readers encounter these fictions. At the heart of Sherlockian reading practice is an activity they call ‘playing the game’. Philip Weller has described the Game as the attempt to ‘fit all the events of the [Sherlock Holmes] narratives into the real historical and geographical world’ (Weller 1991: 4). Despite the sense of geographical absolutism that springs from this idea of ‘fitting’ the Holmes narratives into the world - perhaps of locking them into place - Weller’s image of Holmes’s Dartmoor as fractured and contingent yet also real and accessible neatly encapsulates the actual effect of this practice on Sherlockians’ collective imagining of Holmes’s literary spaces.

My argument in this chapter has turned on an understanding of the Sherlockian game as an inherently intertextual practice. The readings I discussed in Chapter 4 dealt with their encounters with the rough edges of Doyle’s texts by inventing from a putative fictional archive the narratives and textual spaces they believed must be out there, somewhere, waiting to be explored. The reading events (often by the same people) I have looked at in this chapter have taken a different approach. Like John Shelton Reed’s enquiry into the ‘true’ location of the Long Island Cave Mystery, they have followed those Doylean rough edges and references that point off the page, intentionally or not, to existing objects, ideas and spaces outside of the text in their hands. Although many have been content to limit their exploration of these references to other texts, most have, as Hones’s theory of
intertextuality as a spatial practice predicts, looked not only to ‘books read [and] stories overheard’ but also to ‘places visited and maps used’ (Hones 2014: 102). Their approach reveals the literary space of Sherlock Holmes’s world to be ‘a complex combination of many copresent fictional and factual’ places (Hones 2014: 101).

Of course, as a community of devotees, Sherlockians have gone further than the mixing of different experiences, memories, readings and spaces - a process which seems almost automatic and whose idiosyncrasy might actually prevent the kinds of communal exchanges about the structure, topography and feel of a literary space in which many voices are invested. Indeed, Hones notes the very real risk that such subjective mixings of ‘multiple spatial dimensions’ run the risk of ‘opening up of a relational distance between reader and text’ (Hones 2014: 102). By framing the comparison of their multiple extra-textual spaces and the ways in which they affect individual readers’ encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories as contributions to a broader debate, or series of investigations into Holmes’s world, Sherlockians have moved recognition of the differences between each others’ encounters with fiction to the front and centre of their ludic engagement with Doyle’s stories. Whether, like Potter, Reed or Wilson, these readers highlighted others’ reading experiences in order to counter them; or whether, like Hussain and Weller they were more content to admit that different imaginings of Holmes’s world could (and perhaps should) sit side by side; the result was the same. A celebration of the collective, communal, corporate and social endeavour to (re)create the literary spaces of Holmes’s world out of Sherlockians’ own lived experience: to breathe life into the stories; to ‘participate actively in the Holmes Saga and celebrate the Master at the same time’ (Shreffler 1986: 37).
Chapter 6 – Sherlockian travels: walking Holmes’s world

Introduction

In early January 2015, I participated in the Baker Street Irregulars’ (BSI) annual Christopher Morley walk, around New York City. It combines a tramp around many of Morley’s personal and professional haunts, with brief forays into one or two of the city’s architectural highlights. In 2015, the walk took us to the basement of the Cooper Union, on Cooper Square in Manhattan, where on February 27th 1860, Abraham Lincoln addressed a crowd ahead of his nomination as Republican candidate for president. In 2016, the same walk took us, instead, to the Flatiron Building, on Fifth Avenue.

Though a recent addition to the annual Birthday Weekend, the most popular event in the Baker Street Irregulars’ calendar, the Morley walk hails from a much longer tradition of Sherlockian walking, as a means of exploring worlds connected to Sherlock Holmes. The walk’s spiritual ancestor is arguably one of the earliest instances of Sherlockian walking: Gray Chandler Briggs’s 1921 perambulation through the back streets of Marylebone, on the hunt for Holmes and Watson’s footsteps (Redmond 2000: 70-71). Of course, the city through which I moved, temporarily part of a Sherlockian group, was not London as Doyle described it. The Morley walk further indicates that Sherlockian embodied mobilities have developed over the course of nearly a century, pushing at the edges of the known Holmesian world, to encompass new social and geographical territories. In this case, the history of the BSI in New York City.

In this chapter I will bring my study near to its end, with an exploration of the ways in which Sherlockians have used literary tourism as a means of practising expansionary literary geography: that species of encounter with fiction in which readers harness the creative agency of literary production to consciously add to and extend the literary space of the story. I will expand on an idea which I raised in the introduction to this thesis, and challenge the understandings that readers who go out into the world are doing something less than, or perhaps supplementary to, reading.
I will do this by reading three exemplary Sherlockian texts - each a record of a literary
touristic experience by a Sherlock Holmes devotee - as manifestations of expansionary
literary geography. Together, Arthur Alexander’s *On the Scent* (1984), David Hammer’s *A
Dangerous Game* (1997), and Richard Warner’s *Guide Book and Instructions for the Ascent
of Holmes Peak* (1985b), show that Sherlockian practices of walking in and through
locations, whether they are in Baker Street, or at the Reichenbach Falls, or even over a
lonely hill in Oklahoma, are precisely forms of creative encounters with fiction which
actively seek to inscribe new spaces into fictional geographies. Each of these texts has been
produced by a self-identifying devotee of the Sherlock Holmes stories. Each is presented as
a response to Doylean geographies and as a guide for literary tourists. As I will demonstrate
here, these readers are readers on the move, rather than sedentary consumers of fiction.
They have used the act of walking in and between places associated with Holmesian
narratives as a means of experiencing those geographies whilst also creatively expanding
them beyond the bounds of Doyle’s authorship and authority. Indeed, in the hands of these
Sherlockians acts of literary tourism cannot be uncoupled from readers’ creative acts of
fictional construction.

My challenge to the idea that literary tourism might be less than reading - or at least,
represent simply a supplement to the originary and sedentary act - comes from a reading of
current studies in literary tourism. Nicola Watson’s influential history of literary tourism, for
instance, draws a line between reading and literary tourism, which she defines as readers’
efforts to ‘recapitulate through the protocols of tourism... the sensibilities implied in the
text’ (Watson 2006: 13) by suggesting that this practice is always less satisfactory than more
sedentary reading practices. Literary tourism, she argues, is ‘typically defined and
constructed by nostalgic belatedness, and by a constitutive disappointment which returns
the reader-tourist back to the text’ (Watson 2006: 13): albeit that their proper reading is
now ‘garnished’ with experiences of things from the world. Inspired by Nicola Watson’s
assertion that the story of literary tourism is a tale of reading becoming ‘progressively and
differentially locked to place’ (Watson 2006: 1), studies in literary tourism have looked to
touristic encounters with place, through fiction, as the defining characteristic of this
practice. These encounters have been understood in one of three ways: as an act of marking
and connecting to literary celebrity (Trubek 2010; Watson 2009; Wells 2011; Zemgulys 2008); as an appurtenance of heritage and memory (Hendrix 2008; James 2013; Plate 2006; Reijnders 2011, 2016; Westover 2012), or, thirdly, in order to ‘concretize a narrative’ (Lee 2012: 53; see also Beeton 2008; Crang 2008; Reijnders 2009, 2011, 2013; Reijnders and Van Es 2016). Yet, useful as this is, it hardly exhausts the meanings we might ascribe to ‘literary tourism’, and it is hard to place the productions of Sherlockians into these categories – without doing violence to what they are, or ignoring them altogether.

For, Alexander, Hammer and Warner do engage in ’endeavour[ing] to recapitulate through the protocols of tourism’ (Watson 2006: 13) the adventure, discovery and enchanting of the familiar and mundane that underpin the excitement of Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes stories. Just as pleasing is that their own narratives reproduce the formal features of the genre into which these stories belong. Their strategies of looking for, rather than simply looking at, actual-world locations that belong in Holmes’s world reflect the generic origin of the Sherlock Holmes stories as detective fiction. Hammer’s act of chasing Holmes’s ghost across Europe, for instance, consciously mirror’s Holmes’s chasing after a place of greater safety from Professor Moriarty in ‘The Final Problem’ (Doyle 1930/2009: 469-80).

Yet we should be careful not to suppose too much on the part of these readers - to fall into the trap of labelling them as simply shadowing or copying their source material. For, as one editor of the Baker Street Journal wrote, ‘Investigations into the literature and world of Sherlock Holmes... are a major way in which every Sherlockian can participate actively in the Holmes Saga’ (Shreffler 1986: 37). Rather than simply write about their encounters with established Holmesian places, such as 221B Baker Street, or the Reichenbach Falls, these reader-tourists deliberately convey ‘personal details of the search’ in an attempt to ‘mak[e] the reader a fellow passenger’ (Hammer 2001: 13). Their recapitulation of ‘the sensibilities implied in the text’, their acts of detecting literary locations, are here intended to oil the engine of participation in a collective endeavour to make new the Sherlock Holmes stories, drawing on Sherlockians’ own readings and embodied experiences. Unlike Nicola Watson’s literary tourists, these Sherlockians imagine an active and creative participation in literary space, and the production of novel literary landscapes.
Each of the texts discussed here represent their readers’ encounters both with Doyle’s textual world and the actual world through narratives of discovery, mediated in whole or in part by walking. Each of these terms is critical. Acts of discovery are indeed an important theme in Sherlockian textual encounters, as they lend a sense of vitality to the readers’ collective depiction of Holmes’s life and world. Through representing their literary tourist encounters as acts of discovery, on the edges of Doyle’s texts, Sherlockian travel writers engage in the act of legitimising their contributions to the collective mission of expanding Holmes’s literary spaces – building on what they call ‘the Saga’ (Shreffler 1986: 37) with acts of readerly creativity. References to ‘saga’ implicitly suggest not an authorial canon consonant with the age of copyright but a world of shared stories whose authorship is held in common.

Further, as Rebecca Solnit has argued, ‘[w]alking is a state in which the mind, the body and the world are aligned’ (Solnit 2002: 7). Through this power of walking to combine embodied experience of the actual world with acts of memory and imagination – and perhaps to spark creative thinking (Oppezzo and Schwartz 2014: 1142) – the three authors’ travels work to inscribe the Sherlock Holmes texts into the world. Thacker has argued that ‘travel writers must produce space as an undiscovered entity before the narrative commences, in order to justify their journey’ (Thacker 2005: 64). Yet, for Sherlockians, travelling and writing is about more than producing space as a writer’s commodity; rather we must view these acts of walking and writing through the understanding that, ‘texts are part of the cultural production of spaces, and spaces are part of the cultural production of texts’ (Ogborn 2005: 146). In my terms, Sherlockian practices of ‘reading’ and ‘walking’ cannot easily be separated: most importantly, they describe a fictional world and its referents but also, by physically getting out into the world, they co-produce it.

**Baker Street and Beyond**

In this section I will discuss *On the Scent: A Visitor’s Guide to Sherlock Holmes’s London* (1984), a walking guide written by Californian academic and Sherlockian Arthur Alexander, under his *nom de plume* Arthur Axelrad. I will demonstrate that Alexander employs walking – his own, his presumed readers’, and the fictive peregrinations of Holmes and Watson – to
celebrate Holmes’s London as a pre-existing place while also legitimising his own imaginative expansions of Doyle’s geography. At the centre of this dual-faceted enterprise is his visit to 221B Baker Street. Alexander’s journey requires as much cartographic ingenuity as slavish devotion to Doyle’s text. I want to focus on Alexander’s approach to that famous address (fig. 6.1). This walk affirms the importance of places as the foundation of readers’ affective connection to literature. Yet, it also challenges the idea that literary tourists’ visits work to lock literature into place, by emphasising the ways in which places are made manifest by the flows of people and meaning which pass through them. Mobility, as a vital element in the reader-tourist’s experience of Holmes’s London, is foregrounded in Alexander’s guidebook through his decision to divide his readers’ experience of London into thirty-six walking tours (or, as he calls them, adventures). This pedestrian mobility serves to enliven Holmes’s London by emphasising the relations between places, as much as it acts as the preferred vehicle to shuttle Alexander’s gazing tourists from one to another. The importance of pedestrianism is reflected in the seemingly-overblown way in which Alexander encourages his readers to walk to 221B Baker Street. He argues that ‘neither a fast walk nor an even faster Underground ride straight to Baker Street will do’ (Alexander 1984: 15): because both short cuts will obscure the relations between places, and between the literary tourist and London, which is essential to Alexander’s co-produced, creative vision of Holmes’s London.

In this way, Alexander’s first six walking tours are instrumental in defining 221B Baker Street as a point-of-entry into Holmes’s world. They follow Dr. Watson’s story, literally step-by-step, as it is recounted at the beginning of Doyle’s first Sherlock Holmes novel, *A Study in Scarlet* (Doyle 2009: 15-86): from the University of London, where ‘I took my degree of Doctor of Medicine’ (Alexander 1984: 1), via a walk along the Strand and a cab ride to St. Bartholomew’s Hospital. Walking in Dr. Watson’s footsteps brings Alexander’s readers into, or perhaps in on, Holmes’s world by aligning their respective rhythms. As ‘synchronicity gives meaning to otherwise meaningless mobility’ (Adey 2010: 28), so for Alexander and his readers, the meaning of their walking comes from knowing that their movements on this path are aligned with Holmes and Watson and with other members of their textual community. The walk recapitulates two related instances in Doyle’s stories: when Dr.
Watson first enters and later when he re-enters Holmes’s world, both presaged by an approach to Baker Street.

The first approach, from *A Study in Scarlet*, follows on from Dr. Watson’s walk around London and is the route that brings Alexander’s reader-tourists to the start of this particular ‘Adventure’ (Doyle 2009: 19). The second instance is from ‘The Adventure of the Empty House’, when Dr. Watson re-enters Holmes’s world, after a long hiatus, by accompanying Holmes through the back streets of Marylebone, coming to witness Colonel Sebastian Moran’s attempt to murder the great detective – an attempt which is foiled by a well-placed mannequin of Holmes in the sitting-room window of 221B Baker Street (Doyle 2009: 488-9).

In both cases, Dr. Watson’s journey to Baker Street signifies his stepping outside the everyday world of seemingly orderly, law-abiding middle-class London and into Holmes’s liminal city of disorder, crime and intrigue. By understanding their approach to Baker Street not as a simple act of crossing the city from one literary site to another, but rather as the act of *recapitulating the rhythms* of these particular journeys, Alexander’s readers give meaning to their walk, by seeking a similar psychological transition into Holmes’s London.
Alexander uses his narrative representation to harness the creative power of walking, representing a Holmesian London, rather than ‘Holmes’s London’, as a space where fact and fiction meet on equal terms. His flowing narrative, which guides the reader-tourist along The Strand in real time, deftly blends actual-world places with their fictional and real-and-fictional meanings to prime his readers with a variant of the flâneur’s gaze so that, while ‘playing the detective or observer of behaviour’ (Adey 2010: 64) they can uncover particular social relations: namely, those of the half-mythical, Holmesian past. By including ‘the offices of The Strand Magazine’, for instance, as the place where ‘almost all of Watson’s tales were published’ (Alexander 1984: 6, emphasis mine), in the same breath as the out-and-out fictional associations of Covent Garden in the story of ‘The Adventure of the Blue Carbuncle’, Alexander relies on his reader’s movements to disrupt any easy division between what is ‘historical’ and what is ‘fictional’, and lets the Sherlockian belief that Holmes was simultaneously real and yet not real come right to the fore.

As Rebecca Solnit argues, ‘each walk moves through space like a thread through fabric, sewing it together into a continuous experience’ (Solnit 2002: xv). The following walk along The Strand reveals the individual places of Holmes’s world ‘to be continually ephemeral, (re)composing, and emergent’ (Anderson 2016: 122), coming into the reader-tourist’s view as they move towards them and receding into the distance behind just as quickly; and yet bound together, ultimately, through the work of feet and pen.

As we continue west we pass many sites that play prominent roles in the Saga and which we’ll examine in detail in later Adventures. On our right is Wellington Street (where we find the Lyceum Theatre, important in The Sign of the Four), which becomes Bow Street as it extends north to the Covent Garden Theatre (where Holmes enjoyed Wagner) and the Bow Street Police Court (where Holmes revealed the shocking truth about Hugh Boone, the Man with the Twisted Lip). On the left side of the Strand at number 100 is Simpson’s-in-the-Strand (where Holmes and Watson took something nutritious on occasion). We pass Southampton Street on the right (the offices of The Strand Magazine, in which almost all of Watson’s tales were
In Alexander’s telling, a Holmesian London has four heterarchical components - Dr. Watson’s original walk, Alexander’s own secondary journey, the reader-tourist’s recapitulation of both – and the implicit presence of the journeys – on foot or in the imagination - of other members of the Sherlockian collective. Being mobile helps the reader-tourist to piece all four together into one experience. Prefiguring the Empty House walk, as an event where the reader-tourist is drawn into Holmes’s world, this walk along The Strand acts draws the reader-tourist into this city as a space where fiction and fact meet, in the form of the revealed past and the implied present.

Furthermore, Alexander’s long walk to Baker Street articulates an understanding that Holmes’s London is built not only by drawing Doyle’s text into the world, but rather from a variety of knowledges blended by the reader-tourist’s mobility. Though he describes the route to Baker Street as ‘the Canonical route of Holmes and Watson’, which ‘leaves no doubt whatever in the mind of the true believer as to the current location of the fabled suite of rooms’ (Alexander 1984: 15), the passage from Doyle that Alexander quotes does not have enough detail to support such a claim. Dr. Watson writes,

> Holmes’s knowledge of the byways of London was extraordinary, and on this occasion he passed rapidly, and with an assured step, through a network of mews and stables the very existence of which I had never known. We emerged at last into a small road lined with old, gloomy houses... (Doyle 2009: 489).

The four subsequent pages of detailed, step-by-step narration of Holmes and Dr. Watson’s route are possible because Alexander relies on other Sherlockians’ imaginative expansions; in particular the earlier sleuthing by British Sherlockian Bernard Davies, who scoured historical maps and street directories of London to produce a likely route for Holmes and Dr. Watson through the ‘network of mews and stables’ behind Marylebone. Davies’ map of The Empty House Walk (fig. 6.1) is respectfully reproduced opposite page 16 of Alexander’s guide (Alexander 1984: 16).
Through the narrative of his walk, Alexander deftly blends together the multiple, heterarchical geographies of this part of Holmesian London, reflecting the importance of readerly co-production to the creation of Holmes’s world. As with Alexander’s walk down The Strand, his (and his implied readers’) mobility is the mechanism by which different geographies and temporalities are brought into relationship with each other. We can see this at work in the following two passages.

We now go north on Harley Street, which begins at the northwest corner of the square, entering the realm of England’s most prestigious and highly paid consulting physicians and specialists (consulting *detectives* must content themselves with the comparative economy of Baker Street)... The Master Sleuth would certainly have been a familiar sight to residents here since he and Watson used this street on occasion... If we turned right on Wimple Street and continued north a short distance we would come to Devonshire Place where Dr., later Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, Dr. Watson’s literary agent, [once] had a “practice”. (Alexander 1984: 16-7, emphasis in original)

‘The older residences, consisting of a ground floor, three storeys and an attic, all surmounted by charming little nineteenth-century chimneys, are probably very similar to those which Holmes and Watson hurried past on that dark April night in 1894... With its iron-railinged *sic* areas miraculously preserved, Harley Street still looks very Victorian, the jarring of an occasional television antenna the only reminder that we are just a century too late to share the original walk (Axelrad 1984: 16).

The interpellation of ‘just’ here serves both to collapse the distance between us and Holmes and to compound the bathetic feeling of belatedness, as if one had ‘just’ missed the train. Yet the performance of Holmes’s London that Alexander and his reader-tourists take part in, their embodied mobility blending Sherlockian reader knowledges with Doyle’s textual geography, and assuming that none has a prior authority, suggests that, in actuality, the reader is not ‘too late’ at all: Holmes’s London is still being built of readerly imaginations.
and actual world experiences. Alexander’s lament that he is ‘just a century too late’ may thus be an example of the familiar Sherlockian irony, because in the next walk he readily includes a twentieth-century motorbike parked outside No.22 Baker Street, Alexander’s choice for the ‘true’ 221B, in his justification for picking that site, describing it playfully as ‘a modern version of Holmes’s getaway Hansom cab’ (1984: 20).

‘It was a way station, one of many’

At the centre of David Hammer’s A Dangerous Game: Being a Travel Guide to the Europe of Sherlock Holmes is the story of Hammer’s own, ambiguous relationship to the Sherlockian credo that Holmes is the man ‘who never lived and so can never die’ (Fleischhack 2015: 4). More than his peers, Hammer’s Sherlockian travels made the implicit case that the fictional geographies and characters of the Sherlock Holmes stories can be traced to actual world places, trajectories and histories. Yet, in his memoirs, Hammer admits that

I never really believed that Holmes had lived. I still don’t, but I do believe that he was real; so real, in fact, that if he has not become a figure of history, he has of heritage, which surely constitutes a significant form of reality. Besides, as I once wrote in the same context, there is meaning in myth and fact in fiction (Hammer 2001: 10).

In A Dangerous Game, Hammer mobilises this ambiguous belief (and ‘irony’ here is surely not the apposite term) by presenting his tour of continental European Holmesian places as a form of literary pilgrimage, to the Reichenbach Falls in Switzerland. This site is arguably the most important place in the Sherlockian world. Yet, as with all the examples of Sherlockian travel writing in this paper, for Hammer being on the move is arguably as important as arriving at his destination, perhaps even more so. His continual movement along the streets and roads of Western Europe, punctuated by momentary stops in railway stations, hotels and other places of transience, chasing after Holmes and Dr. Watson create the impression that Hammer is chasing a spectre which lies always just ahead, outside of his reach. He relies only on fragmentary evidence as his guide - an old Baedeker guidebook, the text of ‘The Final Problem’, and his own hunches. Indeed, his destination never draws nearer, even as he reaches the celebrated Falls, for as he writes, ‘Meiringen [the village near the falls]
was not intended as a goal... It was a way station, one of many’ (Hammer 1997: 63). In any case, Holmes had already fled his putative grave site, en route for Florence, eluding Hammer’s grasp once again.

Although Hammer describes his tramping around Europe as a quest to locate the significant places of Holmes’s Europe (he refers to himself as a ‘site-maven’ and references to Holmesian places or sites pepper his foreword) (Hammer 1997: 3), the paratextual elements of A Dangerous Game create a frame which works to foreground a sense of continual mobility and onward travel. Hammer’s use of photographs is particularly powerful in this respect. With only a few exceptions the photographs in this section of his book depict tropes of mobility. The photograph illustrating Chapter 3, entitled ‘A Charming Week and a Lovely Trip’, is a good example (Hammer 1997: 30) (fig. 6.2). Taken at eye-level, it shows a path running straight ahead, flanked on left and right by low bushes, with fields beyond. In the distance, stand two trees, their relationship to the path made indistinct by their distance from the photographer. In the far distance, framed to rise from the horizon, stand the Swiss Alps, veiled in shadow. Many of Hammer’s photographs show similar scenes, or suggest mobility in other ways (such as that of ‘The Grindelwald Station’ viewed in such a way so that the tracks lead away from the camera, pulling the viewer’s eye towards the station in the middle distance and, ultimately, the mountains beyond) (Hammer 1997: 90). Hammer’s images reinforce the twin ideas that his journey is one of continual movement and that Holmes lies just over the horizon.

Hammer’s opening comments about Holmes’s existence (‘the deliberate confusion of fantasy with reality is supreme idiocy... [yet] if Holmes was not real, why then do so many people regard him as such?’) (Hammer 1997: 1) suggest that he is ambiguous about his literary pilgrimage’s capacity to bring closure. Were Hammer to find Holmes’s grave, it would weaken his careful construction of Holmes’s world as a place that is at once of the imagination and wholly actual. Therefore, while Hammer does engage in activities that are redolent of literary pilgrimage, such as photographing the statue to Holmes at the Hotel du Sauvage in Meiringen (Hammer 1997: 67), which acts as a kind of memorial site, his persistence in replicating Holmes’s forward momentum ever frustrates his ersatz attempts at a communion with the departed. We might contrast the notion of texts like this as
‘compelling’, with its sense of compelling attention and stilling our movement – as the synonyms ‘captivating’, ‘riveting’, ‘transfixing’ attest – with the alternative of ‘impelling’ or propulsive, the urge to drive us forward, to drive us on.

Hammer’s treatment of the Reichenbach Falls is illuminating in this context. There is, in fact, a form of grave site - a plaque which commemorates the struggle of Holmes and Moriarty at the Falls. It was placed there in 1957 by the combined efforts of two Sherlockian societies, the Sherlock Holmes Society of London and, gloriously, the Norwegian Explorers of Minnesota. It records the place from where Holmes fell, not where his body might have lain, had he in fact died, had he in fact existed in the conventional sense. *A Dangerous Game*, however, though published forty years later, makes no mention of it. Rather, Hammer uses the ‘protocols of tourism’ to ‘recapitulate’ (Watson 2006: 12) a particular sensibility of ‘The Final Problem’ (Doyle 2009: 469- 80) and ‘The Adventure of the Empty House’ (Doyle 2009: 483-96): ceaseless forward motion. For, on his approach to Meiringen, the town beneath the Falls where Holmes and Dr. Watson stayed, Hammer muddies the waters around the purpose of his pilgrimage, saying, ‘it is easy to conclude that Meiringen was a destination - the destination - of Holmes and Watson’ yet one should not, because, once again,
‘Meiringen was not intended as a goal, much less an Armageddon [sic], for it was a way station, one of many, on a Swiss walking trip’ (Hammer 1997: 63).

Once in Meiringen, having known all along that he would find only the pilgrim’s equivalent of an empty grave, Hammer rushes past the site of Holmes and Moriarty’s embracing fall to dwell instead on the possible routes through the mountain that might have facilitated Holmes’s escape from death. He calls on the services of the one of the Hotel du Sauvage’s walking guides, to imagine the route that Holmes took over the alps. Herr Gerber confirms that ‘the guides had discussed Holmes’s route among themselves’, suggesting that Hammer is not alone in his interest in Holmes’s movement. This conversation and its aftermath - Hammer falling asleep over his own attempts to prove that Holmes took the Grimsel pass out of Reichenbach - indicate that even in the calm quiet of the Alpine night, Hammer remains in motion, imaginatively and narratively, in search of Holmes (Hammer 1997: 70-73).

This relentless focus on forward movement shapes Hammer’s representation of Europe as criss-crossed with trajectories of departure, of places haunted by what they once were - and what they might yet be. Thrift’s reminder that places are not things-in-themselves but rather dynamic ‘stages of intensity, traces of movement, speed and circulation’ (Thrift 1994: 212-213), the points where movements slow and leave their mark, finds expression here. This sense of liminality haunts the places, the traveller and the book itself, which is ‘peripheral, being after all only a sort of travel book’, whose author is ‘essentially time-travell[ing]’ (Hammer 1997: 2). The hazy, interstitial nature of the places he passes through is apparent as Hammer describes them as part of Holmes’s ‘penumbra’ (5) - that is, being at the very edge of his shadow. As Hammer describes it, Holmes’s Europe is filled with places that are, themselves, always on the move. In Brussels, his trusty Baedeker guide apparently helps him to locate the former site of the Station du Midi - when he arrives he discovers it was ‘demolished a year before my visit’. (If Hammer experiences the sense of nostalgic belatedness characteristic of literary tourism, he is careful not to dwell on it.) His next stop, to the Place du Trone, is equally unsatisfying, as ‘new Mies-square buildings surrounded the area, looking like glass excrescences rising from the ground’, while the nearby Grand Hotel Britannique, one of his candidates for Holmes’s temporary abode in Brussels, has ‘been
commercially supplanted’ (Hammer 1997: 17). The literary tourist, like the tourist in general, is almost by definition doomed to various degrees of disappointment.

There is nevertheless a small side-path or sidetrack, opening out from this analysis of Hammer’s spectral Europe. This is perhaps the most exciting ‘haunting’ that arises out of Hammer’s spectral Holmesian Europe, but also the most oblique. In all the eighty-three pages of Hammer’s literary pilgrimage through Holmes’s Europe, there are only three pictures taken indoors. They show, respectively, the dining room, entrance hall, and reading room of the Hotel du Savage, which Hammer argues is the hotel at which Holmes and Dr. Watson sojourn in ‘The Final Problem’ (Hammer 1997: 65-6). (In the story the hotel’s name is given as the Englisher Hof, though no such place has ever existed.) These pictures seem to offer the reader experiences similar to that promised by vicarious of actual visits to authors’ homes, namely the feeling that ‘the writer might at any point re-enter’ the room (Robinson and Andersen 2002: 19). The power of this feeling is perhaps so strong because, although Hammer slyly declines to mention it, the Hotel du Sauvage was the very place where Doyle and his first wife, Touie, stayed during a vacation in 1893. It was during that stay that Doyle conceived of the idea to kill off Holmes at the nearby Falls. These photos, then, represent a double haunting: by Holmes and by his author. And this ‘haunting’ prevents Hammer’s search for the site of Holmes’s putative death ending up in a final ‘resting place’.

‘A willed waking dream’

For both Arthur Alexander and David Hammer, acts of literary tourism which ‘recapitulate through the protocols of tourism’ the ‘sensibilities implied by the texts’ (Watson 2006: 12) are constitutive of an encounter with literature that drags Holmes’s travels out of their captivity in Doyle’s texts. That is, they indicate the practice of expansionary literary geography. Both travellers focus on shadowing a particular moment of Holmesian mobility, whether a hurried passage to Baker Street or a flight across the Swiss Alps, as a way to engage creatively with the spaces of Holmes’s world. The third and final example of Sherlockian travel writing that I will consider goes further. Its attempt to bring Holmes into the actual world involves far more than the mere recapitulation of Holmesian textual sensibilities. Richard Warner’s *Guide Book and Instructions for the Ascent of Holmes Peak*
written to celebrate the official naming of a small hill outside of Tulsa, Oklahoma in honour of the Great Detective, foregrounds mobility as a method to recreate this place as a literary tourist site: a heterotopic space of imagination and folded geographies.

Warner’s Guide Book makes lavish use of the protocols of a particular kind of American tourism, not to recapitulate the contents of any specific Sherlock Holmes story but rather to lay the foundations of this ‘prominent and historical hill’ (Warner 1985a: 29) as a tourist site. In the process, Warner shapes it into a place that is tied to Holmes, but given its peculiarly American frontier location, at a tangent from Doyle’s texts and those of the fans. In the nineteenth century, American guidebooks were central in opening up the country to cultural and material appropriation by middle-class, white Americans, principally from the educated east coast. Herbert Gottfried notes that the kinds of travel these guidebooks promoted was ‘grounded in the pursuit of landscape experiences, and practiced within a framework that included comfortable accommodations and adequate travel infrastructure’ (Gottfried 2013: 10). By framing the spaces outside of current settlement through a focus on untamed landscape and wilderness, Gottfried argues that guidebooks ‘shaped perceptions of American landscapes and enabled Americans to develop “an image of their own land”’ (Gottfried 2013: 10).

Warner’s own Guide Book knowingly recapitulates many of the sensibilities of this kind of American tourism, in an effort to present Holmes Peak as a place worthy of being claimed by American Sherlockians for the world of Sherlock Holmes. It is as if Warner has planted a flag on a new territory for Sherlockian colonists or emigrants, rather than revisiting a part of the Old World of the Holmesian Canon (fig. 6.3). The first sections of his Guide Book, which provide a general introduction to the hill, cover such aspects as ‘Location’, ‘History’, ‘Geology’ and ‘Flora and Fauna’. In each category, Warner’s writing privileges the eye of the explorer or frontiersman, rather than the urban, twentieth-century literary tourist. Under ‘Location’, for instance, Warner leads with the Peak’s latitude and longitude, before noting that it ‘can be found in the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 17, Township 20 N, Range 12 E of the Indian Meridian in Osage County, Oklahoma’ (Warner 1985b: 1). Warner’s language, with its sections and townships, echoes the orderly partition of the American Midwest that was imposed by Jefferson on the Louisiana Purchase lands;
Warner is explorer – a Lewis or a Clark – but also land surveyor, land agent, and booster (see Raban 2013: 53). Yet, in line with Gottfried’s tourist framework of ‘comfortable accommodations and adequate travel infrastructure’ (Gottfried 2013: 10), Warner is hardly recommending roughing it on the frontier. Warner’s language of exploration and land claiming is peppered throughout with references to luxurious travel, including: a nearby private airport capable of handling ‘private planes up to the size of small jets’ (Warner 1985b: 7); the availability of ‘berthing arrangements for personal yachts’ (Warner 1985b: 7) at the local Mississippi river port; and the option of arriving in a private rail car, in lieu of standard passenger services.

References to private train cars, private jets and personal yachts indicate the droll tone that permeates Warner’s Guide Book - a tone which establishes a particular, Sherlockian way of seeing the Peak. As Michael Hardwick, Warner’s fellow Sherlockian and the author of the Guide Book’s foreword suggests, this use of ‘deadpan humour’ is intended to ‘present the serious detail with style and flair’ (Warner 1985b: n.p.). It also works to keep the idea of ‘Holmes Peak’ and the hill that carries that name at a slight and constant distance from each other. As Watson has written, literary tourism involves ‘a willed waking dream that converts the fictive to the real and back again, a potent mix of skepticism and belief’ (Watson 2006: 212). We can see both skepticism and belief at work in the way Warner’s text presents Holmes Peak as a genuine literary site, with a peculiarly American history, steeped in Native American settlements, European exploration and American literature, yet all the while undoing his own claims by keeping his tongue firmly in his cheek.
While his wry tone is employed throughout, a few such instances indicate the power of this comedy in ensuring the reader does not fall too far into the trap of truly believing in Holmes Peak. In the section on ‘Flora and Fauna’, for instance, Warner notes the local abundance of poisonous snakes, but says, ‘it is very doubtful that any of these snakes will be encountered, because, even in Oklahoma, the snakes are aware of the dangers of attacking a Sherlockian who has read ‘The Adventure of the Speckled Band’. If a visitor does get bitten, it is obligatory to mention this to the other members of the party’ (Warner 1985b: 5-6).

Discussing transportation options, he warns: ‘Assuming the identity of freight and having oneself shipped to Tulsa or riding the rails is frowned upon’ (Warner 1985b: 7). Finally, in a section on medical care he says: ‘For those who want that extra bit of security they can send one dollar (US) and a clean handkerchief to the Society. The Society will have the handkerchief processed and returned prior to the visit’ (Warner 1985b: 8). This ever-present humour, which is a common practice among Sherlockians who maintain an ironic belief in Holmes’s real existence, erects a secondary Holmes Peak, made of rhetoric and humorous
language, that sits at a distance from the actual world Holmes Peak, as recognised by the
United States Board on Geographic Names.

Most importantly, however, central to Warner’s creation of Holmes Peak as a literary tourist
site is his employment of a mobile, Sherlockian gaze as a method for claiming and shaping
the space through which it moves. The European gaze has long been recognised as a tool for
claiming the world. Gottfried reminds us that ‘[t]ravel is linked to appropriating things’
(Gottfried 2013: 5) and the traveller’s eye plays a large role in this appropriation. For
Warner, this gaze is doubly important because much of the pleasure of literary tourism
comes from what Watson, after Philip Pullman, describes as ‘cut[ting] windows through
from this world to other worlds’ through the act of ‘double-seeing’ – ‘an ability to see both
[actual and fictional] worlds at once’ (Watson 2006: 210). As he is creating Holmes Peak
from the ground up, Warner must create these double meanings from scratch. Tellingly, he
does this by creating a walking route, from ‘Base Camp’ to the hill’s summit. By traversing
this route, Warner’s text implies, the Sherlockian tourist imprints new, alternative meanings
into the landscape. In keeping with his desire for Sherlockians to claim the hill for their own,
Warner’s description of the route comes not as disembodied direction but in the form of a
guided walk, by which the reader-tourist sees the Peak through Warner’s eyes. His
instructions for walking from the Base Camp onwards, for instance, read in part: ‘Camp
No.1, called Paddington for convenience... can be recognised by a blackjack oak that grows
nearby’ (Warner 1985b: 10). Later on in the walk he writes, ‘[f]rom Marylebone, the climber
can see the challenge of the ascent to Camp No.3’ (Warner 1985b: 11).

This act of double-seeing and thus of claiming the site crucially depends on the reader-
tourist’s imaginative enactment of mobility. Each of the three ‘camps’ that divide the
walking route into shorter stages have two names which suggest a tension between stillness
and mobility: they are Camp No. 1, or Paddington; Camp No. 2, or Marylebone; and Camp
No.3, or St. Pancras. These camps (in reality, a clearing next to a stunted tree, another
nondescript clearing, and a false summit) come into being in relation to each other, through
the reader-tourist’s imagination, ignited or impelled by the reading-walking of Warner’s
route. His choice of alternative names for the camps provides a further indication that this
imaginative act is entirely intentional and thoroughly considered. Paddington, Marylebone
and St. Pancras are of course three major north-west London train termini, all built in the nineteenth century, and in the general vicinity of Baker Street. Following Warner’s guide, the Sherlockian reader-tourist is encouraged to imaginatively traverse nineteenth-century London, from west to east, in the same action as traversing the hill, from base to summit. Warner’s use of train station names also suggests, after Schivelbusch, that these imaginative camps act as transition points, between one kind of space (Holmes Peak/the city) and another (Holmes’s London/the railway itself) (Schivelbusch 1986).

Out of these American tourism protocols, this wry approach and the mobile, Sherlockian gaze with its imaginative dimension, Warner shapes Holmes Peak as a new site for Sherlockian literary tourism, one which is not a fixed place but rather a heterotopia, a site where space, time and imagination fold into each other through acts of reader-tourist perception. Camps Paddington, Marylebone and St. Pancras are one example of the heterotopic space of Holmes Peak. Sitting at Marylebone, for example, the reader-tourist is presented as likely aware both of the ‘damnable prairie grass’ (Warner 1985b: 11) and the associations with Holmes’s London, of fog and rain, of dark gas-lamps and darker alleyways. With these ‘camps’, Warner folds the physical geography of the Oklahoma plains with the reader-tourist’s literary geography of Holmes’s world, and, perhaps, experiences of the actual world, because these three stations are real places which can be visited as sites in themselves.

Beyond his instructions for ascending the Peak, Warner has also produced a section titled ‘Future Plans for Holmes Peak’, which enacts again the ‘potent mixture of skepticism and belief’ that forms the ‘willed waking dream’ of literary tourism (Watson 2006: 212). The section lays out the supposed ‘plans for future improvements’ harboured by the ‘Holmes Peak Preservation Society’ (an entirely fictitious association) (Warner 1985b: 12). Among these is a hotel, called the Englisher Hof, in honour of the last hotel at which Holmes and Dr. Watson stayed in Switzerland, before Holmes’s apparent death in the Reichenbach Falls. The hotel will include ‘overnight accommodations, gourmet restaurant, gift shop, sauna, swimming pool, tennis courts, golf links and cricket pitch’, all to be built ‘near the summit of Holmes Peak’ (Warner 1985b: 12). Other projected improvements include a scenic highway over the Peak, from Base Camp to the hotel, a condominium building also near the summit,
an extensive Holmes theme park and a ‘Doyle Ski Basin’ - a seasonal attraction, naturally
(Warner 1985b: 12). Together, these ‘improvements’ create a dream-like image of Holmes
Peak, as a heterotopic space of ludic possibility, unfixed in space and time, fact and fiction.
Yet, the reader is brought down to earth through the ever-present knowledge that these
‘improvements’ would be impossible to build on such a small hill as Holmes Peak, barely
three hundred meters as it is from base to summit.

Moreover, these ‘improvements’ are Warner’s way of making a wry commentary on the
idea that literary tourism necessarily involves the direct ‘recapitulation of the sensibilities’
of the original text (Watson 2006: 12), with a particular emphasis on the ‘commodification
of the imagined and the imaginers’ (Robinson and Andersen 2002: 15, emphasis added). In
Robinson and Andersen’s understanding, the ‘imaginers’ are only ever the authors. Yet,
Warner’s Guide Book, as an attempt to create a wholly new literary site, demonstrates that
readers can be just as creative as authors at creating fictional worlds and the bridgeheads to
the actual world. Each component of his ‘Future Plans for Holmes Peak’, for instance, takes
its inspiration from Doyle’s stories but uses the idea in an original way. The ‘Bee Farm
Village’, for instance, proposes a collection of retirement homes, modelled on Holmes’s
cottage in Sussex, at the base of the Peak; the ‘Violet Smith Velodrome’, a cycling track for
professionals and amateurs, takes its name from the protagonist in ‘The Adventure of the
Solitary Cyclist’ (Doyle 2009: 526-38). The ‘Doyle Ski Basin’ looks outside of the text, to a
recreate a favourite activity of Doyle, known to Sherlockians not as the author of the stories,
but in the secondary position as ‘Dr. Watson’s literary agent’ (Warner 1985b: 12). (I have
written at length about this relationship in Chapter 4.)

Conclusion

From 221B Baker Street, where Holmes did not live, to the falls at Reichenbach, where he
did not die, and on to Holmes Peak, Oklahoma, where no-one had previously imagined
Holmes had ever set foot. These are three examples of sites and spaces produced through
the practices of expansionary literary geography. This chapter has sought to provide a
window into the practices of the textual community of American Sherlockians, as they have
sought to prevent Holmes and Watson from becoming closed off from the world, inside the
covers of Doyle’s texts. I have focused on uncovering the role that Sherlockian travels, as contributions to Sherlockian expansionary literary geography, have played in moving Holmes into the world, our world, without fixing him in place.

The main theme that emerges from these three sources is that of *discovery*. By framing their encounters with the fictional world of Sherlock Holmes as something more than acts of re-treading the paths of fiction, and instead as acts of discovery in the actual world, Alexander, Hammer, and Warner aim to minimise the sense of nostalgic belatedness that often attends to literary tourism. They do this by representing the world of Sherlock Holmes and the stories by which it is known not as an already-existing place, but as a work-in-progress, a space where fact and fiction, the past and the present meet through readerly encounters with text and the world. In this way, their different approaches to expanding Holmesian geographies reinforce the chief assumption of the textual community from which they arose: that readers have a role to play in the creative co-production of fictional worlds – worlds that are very real.

Each example of Sherlockian writing discussed here foregrounds mobility through representations of walking. For each reader-tourist walking is the method by which they expand the world of Sherlock Holmes beyond the confines of fiction, book and building, into the ‘network of mews and stables’ of everyday life. This is because ‘on foot everything stays connected, for while walking one occupies the spaces between those interiors the same way one occupies those interiors’ (Solnit 2002: 9). As I said at the beginning of this chapter, rather than facilitate mere acts of ‘literary fanship’ (Eco 1994: 84), these fans’ pedestrianism echoes Holmes and Watson’s walking through narrative spaces, and aims to continue those footsteps off the page and into new literary spaces. These new peregrinations are creatively constructed out of the fans’ own literary tourism experiences. They thus combine the actual-world experiences of Alexander, Hammer and Warner into an expanded Holmesian literary geography.

These mobile literary tourists move ‘through space like a thread through fabric, sewing it together into a continuous experience’ (Solnit 2002: xv). Walking mobilises both the literary-tourist gaze and the readerly imagination to produce new readings of places, whether
London streets or Oklahoman hills, that are as convincingly dynamic as they are necessarily fleeting. As it is represented here, the act of walking is a way to recapture a sense of connection to a landscape of fiction and fact where every seemingly solid place - whether 221B Baker Street, or the site of Holmes’s apparent death at the Reichenbach Falls, or the playfully projected theme park at Holmes Peak - continually slips out of the traveller’s grasp, being ultimately impossible, not to place, but rather to pin down.

This is the last of four chapters in which I have demonstrated Sherlockians’ collective tendency to practise a form of reading that I have termed ‘expansionary literary geography’. I have defined this as a species of encounter with fiction in which readers harness the creative agency of literary production in order to consciously add to and extend the literary space of the story. Over the past four chapters I have exhibited the effects of such a practice (via an analysis of Sherlockian mapping) and explored three mechanisms by which Sherlockians have performed it: creative writing; criticism and debate; and, in this chapter, literary tourism. In the next and final chapter I will offer a conclusion to this work, and suggest points of engagement and intersection with current literary geography, as well as avenues for further research.
Chapter 7 – Conclusion

Endings

This thesis has traced the role of Sherlockian encounters with fiction, in the expansion of the literary spaces of Holmes’s world beyond the boundaries of Arthur Conan Doyle’s texts. Building on recent, relational work in literary geography, I have demonstrated that Sherlockian writings provide evidence of these readers’ encounters with Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes stories, that these writings come out of individual reading events; further, I have explored how these individual events have spilled over into still more collective, collaborative, and co-productive happenings. Together these have driven the cultural production of the Sherlock Holmes stories. My argument has been that Sherlockian writings indicate a tendency to practise what I have called ‘expansionary literary geography’.

In this final chapter I plan to draw together the findings of my research, and to reflect on what these might mean for the study of popular fiction, of reading, and for literary geography in general. As a starting point I will remind the reader briefly, of where this journey began. I started this thesis with a text which exemplified a more general problem or position: Richard Warner’s Guide Book and Instructions for the Ascent of Holmes Peak (1985b). I proposed to look at Warner’s hill walking and his guidebook as both products of his encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories. More precisely, I argued that we might understand his practices of walking and writing as being produced by, and providing evidence of, respectfully, his encounters with Doyle’s texts. This position led to my thesis research question: ‘what can Sherlockian writings reveal about how readers encounter fictions’? My answer is that Sherlockian texts demonstrate the tendency for some readers to practise what I am calling expansionary literary geography. In short, I have followed the reasoning that the spaces and times in which Sherlockian readers encountered Doyle’s texts produced new fictions for each reader; as a community, Sherlockians have brought these new and changing fictions together to consciously expand Holmes’s world and to continue their collective co-production of these stories.
Over the next few pages I will briefly restate my findings and discuss the limitations of this research, before anticipating two broad fields in which my research can make an impact. First, in terms of academia’s new-found interest in Sherlockiana and Sherlockian sources; secondly, in terms of the future of literary geography as a field of study.

**Expansionary literary geography**

I began this thesis, in Chapter 1, by arguing that many of the behaviours of American Sherlockian readers, such as the desire to visit new places and to talk about Sherlock Holmes exemplified by Richard Warner’s *Guide Book and Instructions for the Ascent of Holmes Peak* (1985b), cannot be wholly explained by the most expected literatures. It is not enough, as Umberto Eco and Terry Eagleton have done, to simply dismiss these practices as ‘different from the reading of text’ (Eco 1994: 84). Different they may be, but they are certainly connected, and deserve more than our briefest consideration. Yet, neither might we think about it as another form of geographical criticism of Doyle’s stories, for places like Holmes Peak, Oklahoma, fall far outside of Doyle’s ken, and readers like Warner are doing more than interpreting old texts, they are creating new ones. Even literary tourism, a body of work patently suited to explain the actions of readers who write literary guidebooks, cannot answer for everything done in the name of American Sherlockiana. If literary tourism celebrates authors and locates fiction in place, what must we make of a book like Warner’s, which relegates Doyle to a tertiary position, and which keeps the reader moving?

My answer, which I have unfolded across the pages of this thesis, is that we cannot hope to separate Sherlockians’ reading, their encounters with Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes stories, from their experiences of the wider, material world that sits just outside the covers of every book. I have argued, through a close reading of a select group of Sherlockian travel writings, that we can discern a reading practice, a type of encounter with fiction, which I have termed expansionary literary geography. This is a type or a species of reading, in which readers harness the creative power of their dialogic relationship to texts, in combination with the multiple dimensions of memory, experience and text through which they move, to consciously expand on or add to the literary spaces in which Holmes exists.
My thinking has been influenced by literary geographers’ approach to reading as a spatial practice. Reading is a dialogic practice – books do not simply tell us what to think or believe, readers’ own thoughts and ideas help to shape the fiction that is produced in the act of reading. In this way, reading is a performance. To this idea, literary geographers have added that reading does not, can not, happen in a vacuum. Reading always takes place somewhere and somewhen. These wheres and whens also find their way into the finished fiction. In this way, literary geographies are not set in stone by originary authors, they move and shift as books live in the world. Sheila Hones describes this process well, when she writes that each encounter with ‘fiction can usefully be understood as a geographical event, a dynamic unfolding collaboration, happening in time and space’ (Hones 2014: 33). Thinking of this ‘collaboration’ which makes literature in spatial terms, we can understand any reading encounter, however individual and isolated it seems, as produced by a series of spatial relations whose ripples shoot out beyond the immediate reader, to encompass the author, other versions of the text, and other readers. Further, as reading happens in space, it also creates space: space is the product of interrelations, it is made by interactions between people and the social and material world. The dialogism found between reader and text is one such relationship which creates the world. Yet fictions include many others, such as those among readers.

Expansionary literary geography builds on these thoughts, taking them further and into more specific conditions. The relational approach to literary geography describes an almost automatic experience of combining real-and-imagined geographies to produce literary spaces. Expansionary literary geography describes deliberate acts by a group of readers, encountering fictions together, to collectively and collaboratively co-produce and expand on a shared, favourite fiction. At the risk of hyperbole, I must emphasise again the importance of the shared aspect of these encounters with fiction. Readers, approaching the Sherlock Holmes texts as part of a reading community, deliberately utilise this co-productive element of fiction as a means of ‘mentally inhabiting this geography of the imagination’ (Saler 2012: 107). It is the deliberate nature of their act which makes the practices ‘expansionary’. In the situation described by literary geographers quoted here, readers build the world of the story to hand from the text in front of them and from their own memories and experiences. The expansionary practices of Sherlockians are different: reading together, they work to
expand on Doyle’s stories, often using their own memories and experiences, or claiming actual-world spaces for this fictional realm, in order to make a literary character and literary world that is larger, more complex, and more wholly theirs than the author had ever imagined.

I have identified four ways in which Sherlockian expansionary literary geography manifested, in the period between 1970 and the late 1990s: maps, creative writing, debate and literary tourism. I dealt with examples of each in turn, yet, as I will briefly demonstrate here, the methods and the lessons I draw from them, cut across chapters and across media. Mapping is the first method. Perhaps influenced by Holmes’s own demands for exactitude, or perhaps inspired by Watson’s frequent geographical inaccuracies, Sherlockians have mapped Holmes’s world in order to better orient themselves within it. Julian Wolff’s first five maps of London, England, Europe, America and the world according to Doyle, or Philip S. Hench’s pencil sketch map of the Reichenbach Falls, exemplify this. In many cases, these maps expand on the literary spaces that Doyle created unwittingly: Thomas Bruce Wheeler, for instance, meant to accurately represent the world as Doyle made it, yet, through his association with collected Sherlockiana, drew on Sherlockian geographical imaginations which push these spaces beyond their Doylean boundaries. In other instances, Sherlockians have created maps which purport to accurately reflect Holmesian geography – as a living experience made by Sherlockians, made of more than the narrative spaces of Doyle’s texts. Arthur Alexander’s narrative map of the backstreets of Marylebone, which overlays Doyle’s enigmatic description of ‘a network of mews and stables’ (Alexander 1984: 15) with his own footsteps and words, is one example; Philip Weller’s ‘practical’ map showing all the possible locations for the events of *The Hound of the Baskervilles* at once, is another.

Further, the Sherlockian cartographic practice demonstrates a remarkably developed sense of the processual and ontogenetic nature of mapping – as a practice which is always evolving and which creates space as much as recording it. Examples of this awareness include Julian Wolff’s *The Sherlockian Atlas* (1958), whose early maps set out to accurately record the world of Sherlock Holmes as Doyle described it, and yet which incorporates a mock United States Navy chart of the Island of Ufa – a fictional place mentioned on the very edges of Doyle’s canon, not visualised until Wolff drew his map. They also include David
Hammer’s three travel guides to Sherlock Holmes locations in England (of which here I discussed two) - each one representing a development in Hammer’s relationship to Doyle’s books, to England, to his own past and to his fellow Sherlockians. Further, they include Arthur Alexander’s walking through the back streets of Marylebone. Not only did Alexander add to Doyle’s minimalist directions with his own footprints, he saw his embodied mapping as part of a relationship with Sherlockians who had mapped that route before him and, through the maps he left blank in his guidebook, with those who would follow him.

The second means by which Sherlockians practiced expansionary literary geography is creative writing. Fictions about Holmes and Watson and their canonical and extra-canonical lives demonstrate well this group’s attempts to negotiate their relationship with Doyle, as originary author, and to harness fiction’s creative powers for themselves. Despite the stereotype, that Sherlockians have since their earliest days been eager to rid themselves of Doyle’s connection to the stories, perhaps to drive Holmes out into adventures ever-more detached from his starting point, the fictions I discussed here demonstrated that reports of Doyle’s authorial death have been greatly exaggerated. Rather, Sherlockians have relied on Doyle’s creative agency as a means to legitimise their own. Sherlockians such as Steve Hockensmith claim their entirely fictional stories are in fact old manuscripts, newly discovered, in order to tie their act of literary creation in to that first begun by Doyle himself: the never-ending Watsonian archive. Elsewhere, fans’ re-positioning Doyle as the literary agent, connected to yet distanced from the writing of the Holmes adventures, justifies their desire to write new stories without treading on Doyle’s authorial toes. Yet, it also reflects a much older practice, ironically embraced by Doyle and his friends, of muddying the creative and existential waters between himself and his fictional productions.

These twin foundations on which much Sherlockian creative writing rests - the recasting of Doyle as literary agent, and an emphasis on the importance of Watson’s infinite archive of cases – reinforce among Sherlockians the idea that the creative agency to produce and reproduce Holmes, his life and his world is not bound up to one person. Rather, like the imagined relationship between Doyle and Watson, it is dispersed, locatable only in the abstract and among the multitude of readers and re-writers. If Doyle, as he claimed, simply pulled more and more stories from Watson’s archive, so his readers can do the same. If the
canonical stories were forged in a relationship between Doyle and Watson, then other voices, other writers, may participate, too. Yet, this participation is not a free-for-all; it is self-policied by the membership of the Sherlockian commons, that self-selecting group bound by their devotion to the Great Detective and his literary agent.

Criticism and debate, perhaps the most famous Sherlockian practice, is the third means by which these readers have practiced expansionary literary geography. What was once known as the ‘Higher Criticism’, the practice of ‘Investigations into the literature and the world of Sherlock Holmes that are presented in written form’ (Shreffler 1986: 37), is arguably the oldest form of Sherlockiana. Sometimes known, inside and outside the Sherlockian community, as ‘pseudo-scholarship’, these debates over the literature, life and world of Sherlock Holmes are the most prevalent way in which Sherlockians play their game.
Motivated by desires similar to those which underpin Sherlockian maps and creative writings, these readers have used debates over questions such as ‘where exactly is 221B Baker Street?’ or ‘where did Holmes go to university?’ in order to better orient themselves within his life and world. Often, they have couched their interventions into these debates in terms of searching for definitive answers to these questions. However, the evidence most often marshalled in these debates comes from readers’ own knowledges, own memories, and own experiences.

By employing their own memories and experiences – necessarily spatial dimensions outside the narrative spaces which make up Holmes’s originary world – Sherlockians are doing two things. They are further entrenching the idea that this fiction’s creative agency is dispersed and shared, by expanding on Doyle’s texts with their aspects on their own lives and their own imaginations. They are also contributing to the creation of a shared, intertextual and socioliterary space of Sherlockiana – a wellspring of readers’ memories, experiences and intertextual references which couch and contextualise other readers’ later encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories. Tellingly, many Sherlockians are aware that their investigations have such results. Weller’s messy map of Dartmoor, for instance, emphasises the personal memories and experiences which underpin Sherlockians’ arguments about the fit of certain locations into Holmes’s world - such as Baring-Gould’s candidate for Baskerville Hall – and combines these into a multi-perspectival representation of Dartmoor as Sherlockians’ know
it. Elsewhere, David Hammer, in the travel writings I discussed in Chapter 3, self-consciously uses his own memories and experiences of England, subjective and idiosyncratic as they are, in order to ‘put the Canon to the acid test’ (Hammer 1983: 7).

The final means discussed here by which Sherlockians have practised expansionary literary geography is literary tourism. This practice is more specific and rather more limited in its uptake among American Sherlockians than mapping, creative writing, and certainly than textual debates. As I wrote in the introduction to this thesis, in Chapter 1, literary tourism, or at least the desire to physically visit sites of Sherlockian significance, though recorded as early as 1921, really took off in the years between 1970 and the end of the twentieth century. Nevertheless, it was a practice with much expansionary power. Like mapping, creative writing and debate, literary tourism was used by many readers as a means of locating Holmes – and orienting themselves - in this fictional world. And much like mapping, literary tourists often, wittingly or no, expanded that world beyond the boundaries of Doyle’s texts. The three tourists I discussed in Chapter 6 – Alexander, Hammer and Warner - but also others scattered throughout the book, represent their acts of orientation, in the Holmesian heartland of London, in Europe, or in their new, American territories, as acts of discovery.

For each of these walkers, movement is the key act which at once recognises and creates Holmes’s world around them. Alexander’s walking through London, Hammer’s pilgrimage across Europe, and Warner’s hike, each work to create new experiences and new spaces for these readers which are, through the imaginative potential which walking holds, simultaneously woven into the narrative and socioliterary spaces of Holmes’s world. I chose to write of these findings last because they help to illuminate a crucial facet of Sherlockian expansionary literary geography, common to mapping, creative writing, debate and literary tourism alike. That is, they emphasise, through performance, the joint textual and extra-textual dimensions of Holmes’s world, dimensions which are at once recognised and created anew with each performance or re-performance of the Sherlockian’s encounter with the text.
Limitations

No thesis, however hard the author may try, can be the final word on its subject. My research has left some aspects out, for reasons of space, time or scope. Perhaps the most glaring omission in this thesis, one which would become apparent after talking for any amount of time to Sherlockians who are women, is the issue of gender in Sherlockiana and its practices of expansionary literary geography. Almost all the sources I consulted in the making of this thesis – in the Library of Congress and in the University of Minnesota’s Sherlock Holmes collection – were created by men; certainly the majority of the sources I have quoted in this thesis were. This is because men could be a more active force in Sherlockiana and its shaping and co-production of Sherlock Holmes, in the years under study here. From its inception in the mid-1930s, through its rebirth in the middle of the century and on to the early 1990s, the Baker Street Irregulars, American Sherlockiana’s premier society, was off limits to women members. This changed with the admission of Susan Rice, a long-time campaigner for gender equality among Sherlockians, a move which shocked the membership of at least one all-male society, as I wrote in Chapter 5. All-male societies are mostly a relic of the twentieth century by now, although some, such as Hugo’s Companions of Chicago, remain. The male-dominated atmosphere of late-twentieth century Sherlockiana is naturally reflected in sources at my disposal for this project.

Where women have been a part of the making of Sherlock Holmes in this period, it has often been on the edges. Philip S. Hench’s wife, for instance, accompanied him on his repeated visits to Switzerland and the Reichenbach Falls, perhaps enjoying the experience of Europe’s mountainous centre yet also perhaps suffering under the weight of Hench’s obsession. Years later, David Hammer’s wife Audrey accompanied him on his travels around Britain and America. Unlike Hench, Hammer did include Audrey’s presence in his written accounts - although for the most part Audrey acts in a secondary capacity to Hammer’s leading man, often doing little more than navigating their car. Her part in the role of the still-sceptical convert to Sherlockiana also enables Hammer, who holds genuine doubts about believing in Holmes’s existence, to fly the flag for the active adoption of ironic belief.
In putting readers such as Hench and Hammer and their fellow male Sherlockians at the forefront of my thesis, I am at risk of repeating the assumptions made more than twenty years ago by cultural geographer Tim Cresswell. In ‘Mobility as Resistance: A geographical reading of Jack Kerouac’s On the Road’ (1993), Cresswell argues that Kerouac’s novel of movement, freedom and jazz ‘is both deeply antagonistic to and deeply rooted in the dominant mythology of America’ (Cresswell 1993: 260). He reads On the Road within contexts which, as Linda McDowell later observed, universalise the male experiences of mobility, home and culture. Cresswell does note that ‘he [Kerouac] reinforces accepted gendered distinctions of women as private and men as public’ (Cresswell 1993: 260). Yet, according to McDowell, the relationship between men and women’s roles is much more closely entwined, and of greater importance to this book, than Cresswell makes it seem. She noted that the women of the beat movement, such as Carole Cassady, practiced countercultural lives at home, as much as men like Kerouac roamed abroad. Further, the roaming of Kerouac, Neal Cassady, and others was not always in rejection of the idea of home (McDowell 1996: 414). McDowell’s essay is a reminder that men’s voices, and the traditional gendered distinctions which they still often reflect and maintain, should not wholly define practices which shape the lives of both men and women.

This lesson is applicable to Sherlockiana, too, because despite how it may appear from the archives, and from this thesis, women are deeply involved in co-producing Holmes’s literature, his life and his world. In the period I have studied this was truer among small, local scion societies than on the national stage. However, widely read publications such as the Baker Street Journal, the crucible that shaped much of Holmes’s world as Sherlockians made it, did feature contributions from women though not as often as those from men. Examples from my archive of Baker Street Journal articles include Carol Woods’s analysis of the number of telegrams Holmes had to have received in order to justify Watson’s claim that his bedroom was ankled-deep in them (answer: 270,000 flat telegrams or 10,000 crumpled ones) (Woods 1992: 16-17). Also, Barbara Pearce’s suggestion that Elsie Patrick, from Doyle’s ‘The Adventure of the Dancing Men’, was in fact the estranged daughter of actual-world Chicago gang leader Michael McDonald (Pearce 1989: 223-225). And Pamela Clark, who traced the apparent discomfort Holmes faces in the company of women back to
an horrific incident in his childhood, when his father murdered his mother for her alleged infidelity (Clark 1985: 153-156).

From a conversation with Washington, D.C.-based Sherlockian Carla Coupe, I learned more about why women’s contributions are so important to Sherlockiana. Coupe, who is connected to the online fan fiction site Archive of Our Own (AO3), argues for a general trend among fan communities and their textual engagements with originary stories: that as community membership skews increasingly younger and more female, its fan fiction appears to become more adventurous and innovative (Carla Coupe 2015, personal communication, April 8). This is, of course, conjecture. Yet, there are signs that something like this is happening and may continue to happen among American Sherlockians. Certainly, due in large part to the work of the New York-based Adventuresses of Sherlock Holmes (ASH), the world of Sherlockians is growing younger and more female. Increasingly more women are attending Sherlockian groups or writing for outlets like the Baker Street Journal. How they behave in those settings and what they write is noticeably more innovative, too.

The annual Baker Street Irregulars’ Sherlock Holmes Birthday Weekend, for instance, has in recent years gained more attendees who dress up (previously considered a quirk of British Sherlockians), and more events which revolve around dressing up, than before. Writings by newer, younger, female Sherlockians show marked innovative tendencies too: Lyndsay Faye’s ‘The Case of Colonel Warburton’s Madness’, which puts Watson in the centre of the action, moves him to San Francisco and bestows on him many of the talents often attributed to Holmes (and which I discussed in Chapter 4), is a case in point. Unfortunately my thesis has not been able to discuss these issues as it might have. This is due to the long-standing bias among Sherlockians against women in their higher echelons, and due to the prevalence of male voices among the cohort of Sherlockians who wrote travel writing and other geographic texts expanding on Holmes’s world.

A second glaring omission to this research project is the lack of any real interrogation of the notion that Sherlockian practices of expansionary literary geography create actual-world spaces and geographies as much as those on the page. Throughout this thesis I have emphasised the idea that Holmes’s world, as it has been co-produced, shaped and
performed by Sherlockians, combines textual and extra-textual dimensions. Readers’ dimensions of memory and experience sit alongside Doyle’s and readers’ narrative spaces, which in turn are made new by Sherlockians walking through the world. Thinking back to an argument by Miles Ogborn (which I drew on in Chapter 2), that ‘texts are part of the cultural production of spaces, and spaces are part of the cultural production of texts’ (Ogborn 2005: 146): if Sherlockians’ spatial experiences make and remake the Sherlock Holmes stories anew, their encounters with fiction must also make and remake the spaces of their world(s) anew as well. In the preceding chapters I have talked about how the blurring of the fictional and the actual is a central characteristic of the socioliterary spaces of Sherlockiana, I have discussed how lives are made into art and how art leaks into the world, yet I have not really shown both sides.

In my travels, researching and writing this thesis, I have encountered situations and people which exemplified this idea. The gathering of Sherlockians to celebrate the Sherlock Holmes’s birthday in New York City, for instance, is one. Each year, in January, hundreds of fans from America and the world beyond travel to New York for a long weekend to celebrate their love of Sherlock Holmes. Joined by their encounters with Doyle’s stories, these people conspire to remake New York City in a Sherlockian mould. Places which might appear to the traveller to sit on the edge of everyday Manhattan life - such as Staten Island, birthplace of founding Sherlockian Christopher Morley - are pulled into positions of importance due to their connections to the great game. Iconic historic landmarks, from the Roosevelt Hotel to the Cooper Union Building or the Flatiron Building, have their stories rewoven into a larger Sherlockian tale. Obscure Irish pubs in Tribeca and Midtown Manhattan become, for a few nights only, the centre of the Sherlockian world.

David Hammer’s journey across America, which he recounted in To Play the Game (1991) and which I have drawn on in this thesis, is another. Hammer’s tour included not only the canonical Holmesian sites that one might expect, such as the Colorado home of the Pinkerton detective who inspired Doyle’s character, Birdy Edwards. He also visited new sites, those claimed for the world of Sherlock Holmes by American readers, following their encounters with the stories. Thus, Hammer climbed Richard Warner’s Holmes Peak, in Oklahoma, a site of Sherlockian significance which had only existed since 1985, not 1895. He
also visited Moriarty, New Mexico, a town put on the map by Sherlockian and collector John Bennett Shaw, who lived nearby and who created a local Sherlockian society in the town, chiefly due to its name. Without Warner’s or Shaw’s readings of the Sherlock Holmes stories, without the personal dimensions of memory and experience – of Oklahoma, of New Mexico – which they brought to bear on those encounters, these sites would not have the same place in the world of Sherlock Holmes or its wider, extra-textual counterpart.

A third example was revealed to me in conversation with Monica Schmidt, an American Sherlockian whom I met at the 2015 Sherlock Holmes Birthday Weekend. In the course of our conversation, Schmidt, who lives in Iowa, admitted that she spent part of her honeymoon in Cardiff, due to that city’s role in the filming of the BBC’s *Sherlock* and *Dr. Who* television series, both of which inspired her wedding itself. As president of her local Sherlockian society, the Younger Stamford’s of Iowa City, Schmidt regularly travels around Iowa and the Midwest – and often further afield – to talk about Sherlock Holmes and to meet with her fellow readers. Her mental map of the American Midwest has a distinctly Sherlockian impression to it, reflecting those journeys, which began with her own encounters with Doyle’s stories. Further, when I asked Schmidt to describe the world of Sherlock Holmes to me, her answer was surprisingly local and immediate: it is the bar, she said. The bar is where Sherlockians meet, after hearing talks at their local societies or when meeting up in New York. The bar is where they socialise. Schmidt’s specific encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories have created for her an unusually specific and universal geography of Sherlockiana.

These examples are merely the tip of a much larger iceberg of instances in which Sherlockians’ encounters with the literary spaces of Holmes’s world have influenced their participation in the broader cultural production of space. As I have demonstrated in this thesis, the Sherlockian tendency towards repeated performances of their original encounters with fiction, in the form of discussions, debates and the crafting of new fictions and new journeys based on them, offer ample textual evidence to pursue this problem further. It is, however, a problem that has been simply too large to address in a study of this size.
Thirdly is a limitation more than an omission: the question of whether and how my findings are generalisable. I raise this because I understand that it may appear, due to my study’s reliance on an approach based in case studies, that my findings in relation to expansionary literary geography have only a limited applicability. True, Sherlockians have used a variety of textual and embodied practices to actively expand on the world of Sherlock Holmes, taking it beyond the boundaries that Doyle created. Yet, what does that tell us about encounters with fiction in general? Might it be enough to find another group of readers who think and behave differently, to nullify or at least limit the impact of this research? Certainly, Adam Reed’s ethnographic studies of the reading behaviours of members of the Henry Williamson Society (which I discussed in Chapter 2), where members read in splendid isolation, wholly taken over, they believe, by the mind of the author, might do so.

However, I would argue that, specific as my findings may seem in relation to Sherlockiana, there was a point to my case study approach beyond my desire to make an argument about Sherlockian practices. My aim was to demonstrate, through specific sources, that reading practices of this kind do exist, they are happening and have been going on for longer than the internet has been around. I chose to look at Sherlockians in part because their practices and their co-productions of Holmes, his stories and his world, have been so deliberately ignored by academics for so long. I was further motivated by the sheer visibility and transparency of Sherlockian reading practices, laid bare by the sheer weight of textual material they have collectively produced and exemplified by the open and welcoming manner in which they received me and other researchers and journalists into their midst. I would argue that for these reasons, we can regard Sherlockian expansionary literary geography as simply the most prominent of a probable sea of similar practices, performed by groups of readers large and small, temporary and longer-lasting, across the vast realm of literatures in English.

**Impacts: taking Sherlockiana seriously**

In the final two sections of this thesis I will discuss the impact that I expect my research, and the publications which are coming out from it, will have on relevant academic debates. First, my research contributes to the recent growth in academic interest around Sherlockiana, as
a source of literary insight. As one peer reviewer commented in relation to an article of mine, published in late 2016, ““Sherlockian” writings are only beginning to attract serious critical attention’ (Angharad Saunders 2016, personal communication, 14 July). I discussed a major reason why these literary sources have been ignored by many academics for so long in Chapter 1 - they have often been considered sub-literary: at best a form of ‘pseudo-scholarship’, trying but failing at critical rigour; at worst a kind of literary fanship, set apart from ‘proper’ reading. As Philip Howell argued in his contribution to the study of crime fiction, ‘Crime and the city solution’ (1998), academic knowledges are not the only source of truths about the world. I would argue that, similarly, other knowledges, produced by ‘ordinary’ readers, can provide different insights into the study of literature.

There remains, to date, an unwillingness among many academics to cross the divide which still separates the study of Sherlockians as fans from the analysis of the Sherlock Holmes stories themselves. The recent blooming of new fandoms around the BBC’s Sherlock (2011) television series and, to a lesser extent, CBS’s Elementary (2012), for instance, has provided fertile ground for new scholarship relating to media and fandom. Collected volumes such as those by Catherine Wynne and Sabine Vanacker (2012) or Tom Ue and Jonathan Cranfield (2014), on the behaviours of twenty-first century fandoms, or Ashley Polasek’s doctoral study of adaptations of Holmes (2014), are examples of this ongoing work.

Despite this work, recent studies of the Sherlock Holmes stories have focused almost exclusively on situating Doyle’s originary texts within their Victorian and Edwardian contexts as a means of explaining these stories. Rosemary Jann argues that the whole aim of the Sherlock Holmes stories is to legitimate the desires and values of the English middle-classes (1990). Srdlan Smajic suggests that Holmes’s tendency towards social and geographical stasis is a form of psychological balm for Victorian and Edwardian readers (2013). Laura Otis grounds Holmes’s role as a form of national auto-immune system in Doyle’s own medical training and contemporary thinking about imperial decline (1999). Reading these academics alongside Franco Moretti’s ‘invasion’ map of Doyle’s Holmes adventures set along the English coast (Moretti 1998: 137), I began to believe that the truest image of a Sherlock Holmes reader was of a middle-aged, grumpy Englishman, in a bowler hat, carrying a Union jack umbrella and toasting the Queen.
This image came to my mind because, unlike those scholars who increasingly see the activities of fans in this multimedia age as dynamic and lively, scholars of the Sherlock Holmes stories continue, for the most part, to regard them as dead books firmly rooted in their Victorian and Edwardian contexts. Even Michael Saler’s recent work on the rise of Sherlockiana as a cultural phenomenon embraces this historicist concept in order to explain why Sherlockians act as they do, attempting to ‘mentally inhabit this geography of the imagination’ (Saler 2012: 107, emphasis mine). Saler argues that contemporary readers of Doyle’s stories embraced wholeheartedly his real-and-unreal world due to the opportunities Holmes’s scientific use of the imagination offered for what Saler calls ‘disenchanted enchantment’. That is, Holmes offered rationally-minded men and women, living in an age when science seemed to have rendered everything explicable and killed all magic, the chance to be enchanted without having to be fooled by fairy stories. As true as this may be for early Sherlockians, Saler projects this explanation forward to all of Sherlockiana through the twentieth century. The image which much current academia presents is that internet-age fandom is interesting and lively and the literature of Holmes is the stuff of history.

In thinking about this quiet division between different readers and their stories, we should be mindful of Miles Ogborn’s advice, cited earlier in this study, that ‘reading is undertaken in fundamentally different ways in different places’, and that the ‘same text takes on quite different meanings, and is put to very different uses, as readers interpret and appropriate texts through distinct reading practices’ (Ogborn 2005: 148). The everyday realities of life in imperial, metropolitan Britain at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth produced certain personal and social anxieties, relating to crime, the maintenance of social order and the social system, and supporting the Empire. All of which contributed to the kinds of readings of the Sherlock Holmes stories demonstrated by academics such as Jann, Otis and Smajic. Yet, these were the realities of one time and one place. Other readers, in other places, such as the Sherlockians living in late-twentieth century America I have presented here, appropriated these texts in different ways and found different meanings in them. The fun had by David Hammer as he jaunted across Britain and Europe in Holmes’s trail, or the delight taken by his friend and colleague Michael Harrison in recreating the Victorian social contexts on Holmes’s world, are a step or two
removed from the sinister imaginings of urban life attributed to these stories by earlier readers (and academics).

Going further, what these stories mean to people, in the sense of the explanations about the world they provide, is only one possible literary insight that paying attention to Sherlockians’ reading practices offers. In her challenge to the all-pervasive academic practice of critique, or what she calls the ‘hermeneutics of suspicion’ (Felski 2015: 1), Rita Felski aims to convince her fellow scholars that looking for the hidden meaning embedded in every text is only one possible way of looking at literature. She argues passionately for a practice she calls neophenomenology - ‘a sustained attention to the sheer range and complexity of aesthetic experiences, including moments of recognition, enchantment, shock and knowledge’ which can come from reading (Felski 2015: 191). She argues that literature is not only a matter of smuggling grand truths about the world past readers, it is also ‘a matter of connecting, composing, creating, coproducing, inventing, imagining, making possible’ (Felski 2015: 18).

The Sherlockian writings that I have analysed here demonstrate all of these qualities and positions at work in their readers, creators and (re)readers. Arguably the primary function of the Sherlock Holmes stories among American Sherlockians has been not to calm their anxieties over their place in the social world, or to help them see the world of reason as enchanted again; it has been to help them create social bonds with fellow readers. Their shared love of the Sherlock Holmes stories is, for many Sherlockians, merely the starting point for the creating of lasting friendships. I saw many of these bonds forming and being rekindled during my time at the Sherlock Holmes Birthday Weekend in New York in January 2015 and 2016; I participated in some myself. When Richard Warner sought a reason to convince the United States Board on Geographical Names to officially name Holmes Peak, a connection between Holmes and the place in question, he relied not on any literary significance to the hill or its place in any text - rather, he noted the good work that Tulsa’s two Sherlockian societies do in their communities (Warner 1985a: 29-31).

Finally, as historians of the book have long warned, accessing what goes on inside a person’s head when they read – accessing the primary material of the reading experience itself – is
notoriously difficult. So far ethnographic methods have offered scholars a good window into the practices of reading. Adam Reed’s ethnographic study of the British Henry Williamson Society, or Jon Anderson’s autoethnographic description of the literary geography of Cardiff, are good examples. By beginning the process of gathering together and sorting through the written materials left by Sherlockians, I have sought to show that Sherlockians have a role to play in this game. These sources can provide scholars with an alternative and as-yet-untapped means of discerning the ‘multiple traces of other writers and readers’ (Hones 2008: 1301) that are theoretically inherent in every reading experience.

Impacts: literary geography’s broader horizons

The second contribution my research makes is to the development of literary geography as a discipline or field of research. Recent years have seen a marked acceleration of the development of this long-standing, if little-noticed, body of work. In 2015 an interdisciplinary journal was established to provide a home for academics working in literary geography in a range of fields. Recent years have seen increasing numbers of panels at international conferences, such as the annual meetings of the American Association of Geographers and the Royal Geographical Society. The first in what is expected to be an annual series of literary geography roundtables was held in 2017 in Cambridge, co-organised by Sheila Hones and myself.

Despite these strides forward, there remains an underlying anxiety among many literary geographers about the classification of this subject. In her 2014 study, Hones spends a large part of her conclusion replaying these anxieties and questioning the place, and the future, of literary geography. She notes that ‘literary geography has been and currently still is defined in very different ways by different practitioners, in different disciplines, and in different locations’ (Hones 2014: 165). Further, she laments that ‘In the current moment, as I write, studies in literature and geography as a whole are neither generating nor (as a result) collaborating in a coherently common academic space’ (Hones 2014: 166). I noted in Chapter 2, that with its foundational ideas found in texts produced by scholars dispersed among different fields, literary geography has had a markedly nonlinear history. Particularly noticeable is the tendency of scholars to call for, or to enact its repeated re-establishment.
From Marc Brosseau to Franco Moretti, and from Andrew Thacker to Angharad Saunders to Barbara Piatti, literary geography apparently has many (co-)founders. Equally apparent is the anxiety expressed by many as to whether literary geography is an extension of literature’s spatial turn or the development of cultural geographers taking literature seriously.

As a corrective to the potentially diluting effects of literary geography’s practiced multiplicity, Sheila Hones suggests that literary geographers ‘cite, present, and publish adventurously, thereby locating their own work in multiple contexts, promoting cross-border thinking, and enabling the development of unprecedented by productive alliances and interactions’ (Hones 2008: 1311). Over the course of my research for this doctoral thesis I have sought to do just that. I have presented ideas at conferences on topics as diverse as detective fiction, heritage and migration histories, and travel writing. Some of the research for this study, relating to David Hammer’s quest to establish in Britain sites of Sherlockian heritage linked to a Holmes-inspired image of Britain’s past, will be published later in 2017 in an interdisciplinary, edited volume on heritage tourism. My research will further contribute to the ongoing conversation between what Hones, after Donna Massey, has called the ‘simultaneous multiplicity’ of current literary geography practices, with the forthcoming publication of a review of pedagogical approaches to the subject. I am co-writing this review (and an associated syllabus) with an American literary geographer, Rob Briwa, who works in the humanistic tradition founded by Yi-Fu Tuan.

In relation to these debates, my thesis has sought to contribute to the idea that literary geography is necessarily an interdisciplinary practice, sitting at the point where literature and geography (or, perhaps, literary studies and cultural geography) cleave – in both senses of the word. I have argued through this study that Sherlockians’ encounters with fiction and their social lives are inextricably intertwined. To seek to understand one it is necessary to enquire after the other. Ashley Polasek, a Sherlockian and academic with whom I conversed at the Sherlock Holmes Birthday Weekend in New York City in January 2016, told me a story which neatly encapsulates this idea. Living in what Americans would call a ‘red state’ - an area that is politically conservative – Polasek noticed these ‘actual-world’ concerns were affecting her experience of Sherlockiana. As she told me ‘We were talking about Sherlock
Holmes, which was like ten per cent of the time, and the other ninety percent of the time they were talking about things that just made me angry’ (Ashley Polasek, 2016, personal communication, 18 January). To get around this, Polasek travelled further afield, to meet up with Sherlockians who shared more of her extra-textual interests. Literary geography, with its methodological stance towards exploring the social and literary geographical as one, facilitates findings which illuminate a larger part of the whole experience of reading the Sherlock Holmes stories – like Polasek’s own.

My thesis further contributes to the development of literary geography through its finding that Sherlockians have long practised forms of reading which define academic work in this area. In the first editorial to the new journal *Literary Geographies*, the editors describe their practice as ‘an approach to literary texts, a geographically-attuned way of reading fiction or poetry or drama’ (Hones et al. 2015: 1-2). From the attempts of Julian Wolff and Philip Weller to map literary spaces as they have encountered them, to David Hammer’s quest to pin-point canonical locations in the world, and the many other readers who have asked ‘where did it happen?’, geographically-attuned reading has been a popular practice among Sherlockians for many years.

As I have shown, this practice goes beyond what could be thought of as a basic or rudimentary geographical focus, exemplified by *Baker Street Journal* articles with titles such as ‘Where is Eyford?’.

Instead, Sherlockian mappers, debaters and creative writers have expanded Holmesian geography, have made Holmes move in time and in space, to claim connection to the character and to better participate in his co-production. Talking about these geographic interventions into the shaping of Holmes’s world, Ashley Polasek told me, ‘I think it’s a matter of people claiming Sherlock Holmes’ (Ashley Polasek, 2016, personal communication, 16 January). Sherlockian practices of moving Holmes around, as a part of their communal co-production of the stories, emphasise the sophisticated ways in which these ‘ordinary’, non-academic readers have practiced geographically-attuned reading.

Finally, this research and its focus on readers of popular fiction represents a call to literary geographers to expand the horizons of their research beyond the self-consciously literary works that have dominated the field in recent years. In many recent works of literary
geography, the definition of ‘literature’ has remained rather selective. Examples of work published in the journal *Literary Geographies* include articles on Samuel Beckett, James Joyce and a special issue on J.G. Ballard. Other forums of this kind offer work on Jonathan Swift, Emile Zola, and Milan Kundera. Although moves are being made to push the boundaries of what ‘literature’ means for literary geography, such as Ceri Price’s recent study of picture postcards as fictional forms (2015), there is still a way to go.

As I have demonstrated in this thesis, with my study of ordinary readers, literary geography can have much to say about the relevance of the academic study of the arts and humanities. Despite the recurrent claims of many that the novel is dying, despite the frequent spate of articles which seek to reaffirm why literary studies matter, people are still reading. They are just more likely to be reading the kinds of books that academics have traditionally ignored. As Jonathan Gottschall writes, ‘whenever you hear that the novel is dead, translate as follows: “I don’t like all of those hot-selling novels that are filling up the bestseller lists - so they don’t count”’ (Gottschall 2012: 180). If literary geographers wish to demonstrate the role that literature and encounters with fictions play in the wider production of space - if the field which is still finding its feet wishes to contribute to the broader aims of human geography - it should turn its attention to the kinds of reading practices I have focused on here. For, these are the readers who are out there, creating literary spaces in everyday lives - the Harry Potter fans, the followers of Dan Brown, and yes, the Sherlockians.
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