Feeling Out of Time: Phenomenal Bodies and Temporality in the *Fin de Siècle*

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Wesley Holmes Burdine

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Tony C. Brown

December 2016

©Wesley Holmes Burdine 2016

Acknowledgements

This dissertation could never have been completed without the support of my wife, Dr. Lydia Garver, who provided not only material support, but who offered endless advice on long walks as these ideas came to shape. I am additionally grateful to the University of Minnesota for materially supporting this work. The assistance of the University's Departmental Dissertation Fellowship and numerous grants from the University's English Department provided the space and money for researching these ideas. I received inspiration and support from *L'Institut Métapsychique International* in Paris, particularly from Renaud Evrard, Bertrand Méheust, and Luc Fraisse. My research was also aided by the Cambridge and Oxford Universities' libraries and archives and the Bibliothèque Littéraire Jacques Doucet in Paris.

Dr. Tony Brown provided a tremendous amount of support and guidance to help bring the ideas out in this text. A host of other advisors and faculty members helped in numerous ways: Drs. Jani Scandura, Siobhan Craig, Lois Cucullu, Stuart McLean, Timothy Brennan, Rebecca Krug, Katherine Scheil, and Joe Hughes. Most of all, this dissertation could also not have been completed without the genius of my colleagues: Mike Rowe, Andrew Marzoni, Robb St. Lawrence, Michael Phillips, Stephen McCulloch, Valerie Behrer, Aaron Apps, Caitlyn McHugh, Katie Sisneros, Hyeryung Hwang, Ben Utter, Isaac Butler, Marie Balsley-Taylor, Dana Meade Cason, and Jennifer Awes-Freeman. Additional thanks to Drs. Joey Horstman and Daniel Taylor and in memory of Dave Roper. Thanks and gratitude also go out to my family, the Burdines and the Garvers.

A version of chapter two previously appeared as "'What Was It?': The Immaterial Self

and Nineteenth-Century American Panic." *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance* 61.3 (October 1, 2015): 441–73. Print.

Abstract

This dissertation shows the often-overlooked role that psychical research, or the study of unexplained phenomena, played in the literature of the Transatlantic *Fin de Siècle*. Examining the works of Fitz-James O'Brien, Henri Bergson, Bram Stoker, and Marcel Proust, I argue that the crises of temporality often discussed in literary modernism can be understood through the parallel theories proposed by psychical research. Alongside these literary primary texts, I examine psychical research from Edmund Gurney, Charlotte Anne Moberly, and Eleanor Jourdain as theoretical texts on temporality and the human self. More than contextualizing fiction with its coeval psychical research, I read these texts—fictional, philosophical, and scientific—as questioning and countering hegemonic forces of modernity.

My project argues that questions of temporality and the human self that were the hallmarks of the *Fin de Siècle* were reactions to the homogenizing forces of capitalism and modernity. Almost every author discussed lived in a marginal position in society for one reason or another—queer, Jewish, Irish, or female. These marginal bodies felt out of sync with the dominant culture of modern society and the theories of time and the self reflect their existence within that society. By paying attention to the heterodox theories of the *Fin de Siècle*, we can understand the ways in which feeling out of time becomes rendered literarily, philosophically, and scientifically in texts.

Table of Contents

List of Figures v
Introduction:
"I Feel Like a Perfect Monster" 1
Chapter One:
"Phantasms of the Living:" Henri Bergson and Psychical Research 21
Chapter Two:
"'What Was it?': The Immaterial Self and Nineteenth-Century American Panic" 62
Chapter Three:
"'Up-To-Date With a Vengeance': Dracula and Prosthetic Bodies of Text" 102
Chapter Four:
"Feeling Out of Time: Bergson, Proust, and An Adventure" 154
Conclusion:
A Meeting in Paris 200
Bibliography 211

List of Figures

Figure 1 Tables of responses from "Report on the Census of Hallucinations" 31

Figure 2 from the SPR archives: summary notes from Hallucination Census 33

Figure 3 close up of summary notes from Hallucination Census 33

Introduction

"I Feel Like a Perfect Monster"

> My impression is that it is a part of some monstrous animal, probably a part of a tooth. I feel like a perfect monster, with heavy legs, unwieldy head, and very large body. I go down to a shallow stream to drink. (I can hardly speak, my jaws are so heavy.) I feel like getting down on all fours.
>
> -Elizabeth Foote Denton

Literary modernism, we have been taught, can best be understood as crises of human self-hood and temporality. As Bill Brown, Bruno Latour, and others have pointed out, we can also recognize literary modernism through the conflicts of things: animate and inanimate, subjects and objects, and people and tools.[1] Of course, the human self, time, and human/object relations do not belong to literary modernism alone. Neither do they belong to the narrow category of aesthetics that defines literary modernism. However, in and around the period of the 1890s through the 1930s, the thing called literary modernism drew these conflicts to the surface.

In 1863—decades before the birth of what we now call literary modernism—a geologist named William Denton and his wife Elizabeth Foote Denton published a book called *The Soul of Things*. In it, William Denton argues that the animate and inanimate things carry the influences of one another; people and objects retain traces of time and memory so that a "sensitive" body might experience the feelings of another in the memories congealed onto those things. On its face, the theory of psychometry—later to be called "morphic resonance"—from 1860s United States could not be further than the

[1] In chapter three, I discuss Bruno Latour's *We Have Never Been Modern* and the way he describes the growing objectivity of the scientific laboratory. Bill Brown has written extensively on his "Thing Theory" (see *A Sense of Things*), which despite never being discussed explicitly in these chapters is an influence heavily felt.

literary modernism of the *Fin de Siècle*. And yet, *The Soul of Things* contains theoretical germs of temporality and human self that will resonate throughout the Transatlantic *Fin de Siècle*.[2] Time and memory, William believes, are written in the world around us.

William and Elizabeth's research was on the early cusp of what would eventually be called psychical research, or the study of unexplained phenomena. Obsessions with spiritualism—its ghosts and rappings—abounded throughout the Anglophonic Transatlantic. But the Dentons represented a different take on the phenomenal world, a take that would bring empirical research to bear on the unseen world. That *The Soul of Things* might appear on its face so far removed from *Fin-de-Siècle* fiction and yet contain so many similar threads of its philosophical interests draws us to the question: why is it that the birth of modernism coincides with the emergence of psychical research? It is no coincidence that a literary period defined by questions of the human self and temporality intertwined with similar questions from the scientific world. In the coming pages, I argue that the crises of temporality that marked the *Fin de Siècle* cannot be understood outside the context of psychical research of the period. Reading psychical research as theorizing temporality allows us to understand the broader transatlantic histories of thought and science as well as portraying conflicts of racialized, queer, and gendered bodies as "feeling out of time" with Western modernity.

The Soul of Things

She took upon her prostrate palm, a hard, mineral sliver. There, rigid against her taut skin, she felt her body drawn through the gulf of thousands of years, as if through a

---

[2] Indeed, "the soul of things," a phrase from William Wordsworth's *Prelude*, appears in Milton Pottenger's *Symbolism*, subtitled "A Treatise on the Soul of Things."

needle's eye, all through a tiny chard of mastodon tooth. Elizabeth Foote Denton had received the tooth fragment from her husband, William Denton, as one would a communion wafer—expectant of some transfiguration. Elizabeth was a psychometric medium, someone who professed the ability to channel the affect and memories charged in objects. William was a geologist who believed that psychometry, or the study of "morphic resonance," allowed scientists to see into the deep past of nature.

William believed that memories were inscribed on the world and in people and things. He writes, "Not a leaf waves, not an insect crawls, not a ripple moves, but each motion is recorded by a thousand faithful scribes in infallible and indelible scripture" (31). The book goes on to explain that the world acts like a daguerreotype, registering, trapping, or clinging to all the movement from throughout time. William drew his inspiration from the daguerreotype because the device's discovery, he explained, only made manifest the lingering, unproven suspicions about how images worked in the world. William quotes at length a letter from Sir Isaac Newton to John Locke. In the letter, Newton recounts how he would look upon the sun and, upon turning away, the image remained on his retina. "I could make the phantasm return without looking any more upon the sun" (12).

Newton was not staring at the sun to illustrate the hiddenness of memory and time. However, for William, the discovery of the daguerreotype echoes this earlier experiment. William asks of the daguerreotype: "If the process of making these images visible had never been discovered, who could have believed that an image was formed upon a plate under such circumstances, and lay sleeping there till art should awaken it?" (26). The invisible made visible, the sleeping made to wake: science in the nineteenth

century was opening doors to the unknown. The daguerreotype, however, only worked on the image and William believed that sound, image, emotion, and every type of agitated movement left lasting impressions on the things of the world.

William Denton conducted his experiments on his wife, Elizabeth, and his sister, Anne Denton Cridge, both of whom were "highly sensitive." Inspired by Joseph Rodes Buchanan's 1849 book *Journal of Man*, William first turned to his sister. He tasked her first with taking unopened letters in her hands and describing the authors. She began to "read character [personality of the authors] from letters," but at other times she came to see the writers as they wrote and described their surroundings as well as hair and eye color. William's interest in geology led him to other objects: limestone, lava rock, meteoric stone, and fossils. In *Soul of Things*, he asks the question: "why could not rocks receive impressions of surrounding objects, some of which they have been in the immediate neighborhood of for years, and why could they not communicate this in a similar manner to sensitive persons; thus giving us the clue to the conditions of the earth and its inhabitants during the vast eras of the past?" (36).

William's experiments lead to various kinds of results for the percipients. Anne and Elizabeth saw ancient landscapes, described feelings upon their bodies, and felt emotions not their own. At the end of *The Soul of Things*, Elizabeth writes to answer common questions that had been asked of her and she explains that the experiences embedded in objects are not always the same: "In some instances they pass before the observer as a panorama, moving with the velocity of lightning… At other times, everything around one seems immovably fixed" (312-3). Upon the touch of a piece of lava, Anne says, "Now I am turned from where I saw the vessels, and am looking at

something most terrific. It seems as if an ocean of fire was pouring over a precipice, and boiling as it pours. The sight permeates my whole being, or the terror which it inspires. I see it flow into the ocean, and the water boils intensely" (38-9). Here, she has traveled back to a long-distant past to witness the volcanic formation of Kilauea. The fragment of lava offers a magic ticket to the terrific spectacle of nature in the past, where Anne watches from an objective perspective.

In another experiment, William hands his wife a "pebble of Trenton limestone, with glacial scratches upon its surface." Without looking at the rocks, Elizabeth begins: I feel as if I were below an immense body of water." Unlike Anne's experience with the lava, Elizabeth is situated inside the landscape; she feels it weigh upon her. She continues:

> Now I am going, going, and there is something above me, I cannot tell what. It is pushing me on. It is above and around me. It must be ice; I am frozen in. The motion of the mass I am in is not uniform; it pitches forward, then halts and pitches again, then goes grinding, pressing, and crushing along, a mountain mass.

She describes the feelings of being glacial rock, the abrasive toil of ice grating upon rock. And more: "All is dark. Now, I see a tinge of crimson, mixed with purple. What can it be? How beautiful! I feel water again, as if I were drenched with it" (51). Elizabeth's emotions here seem to be her own as she watches and feels from the position of the glacier.

Deep Time

In the cases of Anne and Elizabeth's experiences with lava and limestone, the women move out of their own bodies to objective (in the case of Anne and the lava) and subjective (Elizabeth's encounter with the glacier) positions. They do so by moving outside of their own temporality, into a non-human experience of time. The grind and halt of glacial shift would not be registered in a human flow of time—minutes, days, or years—but rather a longer flow of time—centuries or epochs. One of the few literary critics to discuss Denton's book, Dana Luciano writes, "The 'soul' invoked in *The Soul of Things* (whose title is drawn from Wordsworth) is hence not an aspect of mind, spirit, or character, but an energetic sedimentation of human as well as nonhuman sensation—visual, sonic, and affective data etching histories of experience across deep time" (721).

The invocation of "deep time," offers a unique juxtaposition between the human and non-human experiences of time. Coined by James Hutton in the late eighteenth century, "deep time," is a non-human duration of temporality, one that spans centuries. The foundation of Hutton's discovery was "Hutton's Unconformity," a name for locations in Scotland where Hutton observed the juxtaposition of two very different kinds of rock formations were exposed. Time, it seems, is layered upon itself, stratigraphically laid out in legible records of time. Hutton's colleague John Playfair would reflect back upon the discovery: "The mind seemed to grow giddy by looking so far into the abyss of time." He continues, "We became sensible how much farther reason may sometimes go than imagination can venture to follow" (81). From Playfair's descriptions there can be two observations about the discovery of deep time. First, Hutton's concept is predicated upon the monumental encounter between the human and non-human (and the elation experienced). Second, that this experience defies imagination; the mind simply cannot

fathom the depths of temporality implied and experienced by the geological world.[3] Only reason, it seems can begin to allow the human to comprehend the non-human world of geology.

For Playfair the imaginative task of comprehending deep time is impossible. Encountering deep time requires adopting an objective, non-human position. To comprehend the non-human temporality of rock, the human mind must ignore, negate, or transcend human embodiment. It must imagine its body to be lava or limestone. It must also imagine that body to slow its internal rhythms to an infinitesimal crawl. William Denton, however, felt that deep time could be not only encountered, but embodied through psychometry. He believed his experiments could open up a new avenue of exploration. He writes:

> As the telescope came to the assistance of the astronomer… so the science of psychometry will shed new light upon many extinct animals and plants of which we have some knowledge, and reveal to us innumerable organic forms of whose existence, without its assistance, we should be as ignorant as the world was of the existence of Uranus and her moons before the telescope was invented. (43-4)

Psychometry allows William to bridge the human, non-human divide by causing the human to enter the body of another, even the body of a glacier. Thus, William evades the

---

[3] Playfair's discovery of deep time, of course, immediately brings the Kantian sublime to mind. For Kant, the sublime can only be defined through the failure of the mind's faculties of estimation: "the feeling of the sublime is a pleasure that only arises indirectly, being brought about by the feeling of a momentary check to the vital forces followed at once by a discharge all the more powerful." Kant defines the sublime according to the discharge of positive emotions preceded by the blockage of the mind's efforts to grasp the totality of the object. It springs from the distance between the "striving for progress *ad infinitum*" and the object which defies the mind's efforts to grasp its totality (91). For more on Playfair, Kant, and the sublime of deep time, see Tom Furniss' "A Romantic Geology: James Hutton's 1788 'Theory of the Earth.'" Marjorie Hope Nicolson's *Mountain Gloom, Mountain Glory* offers a broader examination of the sublime in eighteenth-century English poetry and the drastic shift in how writers came to view the human self in relation to geological grandeur.

impossible problem of needing to be disembodied to encounter deep time. Instead, *The Soul of Things* presents a theory of time as duration experienced from different vantage points. Moreover, a human's particular vantage point is arbitrary, only existing because of its human embodiment. A human can experience a different vantage point of duration by embodying another.

Like a Perfect Monster

The most remarkable case from William's book is Elizabeth's experience of the fragment of mastodon tooth. A tiny shard that Williams describes as "cut off so that it might not be recognized," the tooth fragment measured just .05 inches by .3 inches (54). Since the text is not widely available, I quote this section at length:

> My impression is that it is a part of some monstrous animal, probably a part of a tooth. I feel like a perfect monster, with heavy legs, unwieldy head, and very large body. I go down to a shallow stream to drink. (I can hardly speak, my jaws are so heavy.) I feel like getting down on all fours. What a noise comes through the wood! I have an impulse to answer it. My ears are very large and leathery, and I can almost fancy thy flap my face as I move my head. There are some older ones than I. (It seems so out of keeping to be talking with these heavy jaws.) They are dark brown, as if they bad been completely tanned. There is one old follow, with large tusks, that looks very tough. I see several young ones; in fact, there's a whole herd.
>
> My upper lip moves strangely. I can flap it up. It seems strange to me how it is done.

> There is a plant growing here higher than my head; it is nearly as thick as my wrist, very juicy, sweet and tender, something like green corn in taste, but sweeter. (Is that the taste it would have to a human being?) Oh, no (appearance of disgust on the countenance); it is sickish, and very unpleasant. (55)[4]

Unlike in the experiments with the lava or glacial rock, Elizabeth describes herself as in the body of the mastodon. Transfigured and transported through time, she slowly becomes a mastodon as it lived centuries ago. We witness the transfiguration punctuated: she first has an impression of an animal, then suddenly "I feel like a perfect monster."

As Elizabeth continues, she gradually reckons with new bodily sensations: "with heavy legs," "my ears are very large," "my upper lip moves strangely." These new sensations, then, move beyond the external changes to new internal sensations—she fees *as* a perfect monster. When she hears a noise from afar, she says "I have an impulse to answer it." She follows the new bodies desires for water and food, describing the taste of the latter as "something like green corn in taste, but sweeter." William Denton interrupts: "Is that the taste it would have to a human being?" No, she replies, "it is sickish, and very unpleasant" (55). This double-consciousness of the taste for the mastodon and the taste for her own human body shows that this is a bizarre sort of disembodiment. Elizabeth remains in her body and yet feels overtaken by the body of another; she has the taste buds of a mastodon and those of a human.

William Denton uses this experiment to comment upon the "complete identification at times of psychometer with the thing psychometrized, or the animal with whose influence it is imbued" (55-6). He writes: "Some forms of insanity appear to a

---

[4] In this quote, William offers his parenthetical explanations and questions.

present condition produced by intense sensitiveness, resulting in the overpowering of the mind by surrounding influences, so that the individual ceases to be himself, and becomes the tool for those influences unconsciously to use; the individual supplying the power, but influences directing and spending it, instead of the will of the individual." He calls it an insanity, but it has very little to do with consciousness, or thinking at all. Affect from humans and animals imbues itself into their surroundings.[5] Or, as William expresses: "You cannot sit upon a chair but the chair receives from you that which can convey to some sensitive persons the idea of your presence and your mental peculiarities" (56).

The Soul of Things hypothesizes a concept of soul as pervading and transferable and the bodies of humans, animals, and objects as simultaneously emanating soul and receptive to the souls of others. William's theory imagines these bodies as constantly communicating and influencing one another. But he goes further, claiming that one can step into the influence of another; Elizabeth can encounter the affect contained in a mastodon's tooth and find herself in the body of a mastodon, centuries previous. Elizabeth's transition into feeling "like a perfect" monster demonstrates the paradox of William's theory. The juxtaposition between her human body and the mastodon's is monstrous and other, yet there is a familiarity and sameness that can be bridged through the encounter.

Unseen Influences

[5] Denton never uses the term "affect" and that term is anachronistic to his writings. He instead uses phrasing such as "influence" or "ideas." I use the term here for continuity for the following chapters since the concepts described in *Soul of Things* is indistinguishable from what we will see as affect in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

William largely confines his experiments to non-human, geological objects. Doing so, he wants to direct his attention to the ways a human can encounter deep-time as registered in an environment. However, on a few occasions throughout his text, he glances upon the issues of human bodies encountering one another that racialize and mark those bodies as different. The marginal, fleeting appearances of these peripheral figures will become a repeated feature of this dissertation. Through these appearances, we can observe how the *Fin de Siècle*'s crises of temporality emerged out of the conflicts between normative and marginalized bodies.

In his observations on the mastodon tooth, William notes that human-made objects retain the influences of thousands of people:

> Hence our houses—made of brick, from clay over which the Indian passed and repassed; with their letters from hundreds of persons, some living, some dead; with objects in them handled at some time by men of many races; arrow-heads made by Indians, tea fingered by Chinese, coffee and cotton by negroes, ivory-handled knives and forks, the ivory which passed through the hands of Samoides [Samoyeds] and Russ; with influences proceeding from all person who have visited them—are conventions of unseen influences representing thousands of diverse individuals. (56)

The Indians, Chinese, the Samoyeds, and negroes: "our houses" (thus constructing the domestic space as Anglo) contain objects and influences from bodies throughout the nineteenth-century trade networks. William Denton's passing glance toward the reification of global labor into the domestic spaces of the colonial powers is jarring, particularly since he conceives of it in terms of his concept of "influence." This domestic

space is composed of things, things with souls, the souls of the marginal bodies of the colonized and enslaved.

The Soul of Things appeared at the height of the American Civil War. In the 1860s, the United States government as it were magically transformed the black bodies of slaves from property to persons just as—for hundreds of years—shackles worked at transforming those Africans into things. The passage above registers a similar phenomenon, the phenomenon of reification in ever-expanding global trade networks. Every day, the lord or lady of a domestic space runs his or her fingers over a thousand things carrying the unseen influences of bodies rendered marginal by the capitalist modes of production (or in the case of the "Indians" and slaves, genocidal erasure).

William recounts another story that offers another brief glance into how his theories imagine marginalized bodies. He quotes a story from Catherine Crowe's 1848 *The Night-Side of Nature* of a Lieutenant-General Robertson, who fought the Americans during the revolution, and brought a slave home with him after the war named Black Tom. In the General's English home, Tom often complained of a headless lady holding a child who came from the hearth. Crowe writes:

> Of course nobody believed this story, and it was supposed to be the dream of intoxication, as Tom was not remarkable for sobriety; but, strange to say, when the old mansion was pulled down to build Gillespie's hospital… there was found under the hearthstone, in that apartment, a box containing the body of a female, from which the head had been severed; and beneath her lay the remains of an infant, wrapped in a pillow-case trimmed with lace.

William's conclusion from this story is: "through the hearthstone came the influence of mother and baby, and their images appeared to the terrified Tom, who appears to have been the natural professor of considerable psychometric power" (259). The conclusion quickly elides Black Tom's enslavement and the general dismissal of his account. However, if we pause and look at Black Tom, we see a man first rendered inhuman by slavery, then stigmatized for the alcoholism induced by this trauma. This is a story of multiple erasures: a woman and child calling out to be discovered and a black man—the only one who can recognize them—all of them ignored and dismissed.

The Soul of Things is a book of psychical phenomena and a book of geology. However, in flickering moments the reader's eyes can glance upon the marginalized bodies of his theories. I begin with this book because it first offers us an example of an unorthodox theory of being and time. However, as with the examples in the coming chapters, a close reading of this theory reveals itself to be inextricable from bodies marginalized by capitalist production, sexism, racism, and heteronormativity.

William Denton offers a unique understanding of a human's relationship with its environment. He imagines first that *things* have souls. In that first gesture, he ontologically levels the world by making things—a chair, a lava specimen, a slave, and Elizabeth Denton—having equal souls. These things leave their influences upon one another. Next, he imagines that a "sensitive" body can feel these influences in such a transfiguring manner that it enters another's body. This theory is fantastical and one of the many psychical theories that have no weight in our current scientific community (and, as we will see, they had fraught positions in the *Fin-de-Siècle* scientific communities). However, on closer examination William seems to offer a more extreme and almost

literal example of current affect theory. In *Transmissions of Affect*, Teresa Brennan writes that the individual does not "experience themselves as containing their own emotions," but that "the state of experiencing both the 'living attention' and the affects of others is both the originary and in some way the natural state" (25, 24). That is, affect theory currently understands bodies as autonomically affecting one another and interacting in ways that transcend consciousness.

The Soul of Things also provides a useful lesson on directing our attention toward the ways in which marginalized bodies flit in and out of these psychical theories. William Denton's theory rests upon acknowledging the power of some non-normative bodies; only women, in his experiments, have a sensitivity to psychometry. Black Tom has a "considerable psychometric power," perhaps because his entire existence is predicated upon his status as "thing." To be a thing that feels the feelings of other things is his status rather than power. William's theory also allows another avenue for tearing away the veil of reification that occurs in the capitalist plunder and reaching tentacles of global trade. To be "a sensitive" is to be able to feel the influences of those erased by reification.

Fin de Siècle

In the coming pages and chapters, I will argue that the roots of literary modernism's crisis of temporality that critics observe in *Fin-de-Siècle* fiction, cannot be understood without the broader context of contemporary psychical research into unexplained phenomena. I juxtapose fiction and psychical research to understand the ways in which they hypothesize theories of the human self and its engagement with temporality. Analyzing key texts by Henri Bergson, Fitz-James O'Brien, Bram Stoker,

Marcel Proust, Charlotte Anne Moberly, and Eleanor Jourdain to constitute a Transatlantic *Fin de Siècle* that has been saturated with the concepts and theories of psychical research during the period. On the surface, drawing together texts from the American 1860s to turn-of-the-century England and early twentieth-century France might seem jarring. However, psychical research, as we will discover, is predicated on the conflict between the anachronistic and synchronistic.

These texts—and the tag "Transatlantic *Fin de Siècle*"—do not constitute a period. In fact, to make such a claim of distinction and duration would be antithetical to the philosophies and theories proposed in these texts. As I explain in my first chapter, I approach the Transatlantic *Fin de Siècle* (and literary modernism contained within) according to Raymond Williams' concept of "Structures of Feeling." That is, eschewing the tendency toward coagulating time into finished and fixed products of cultural moments, I instead read these texts through what Williams calls "the whole social process, in its living flux and contestation" (179). The feeling, in this case, is phenomenal: the currents, affects, and sensations of bodies (influence, as William Denton would say) escape measurement and defy gestures toward objectivity. My argument employs a deeply omnivorous sense of bodies—texts, human selves, and the *things* that surround them are all bodies and none of them are fully contained by the physical boundaries of those bodies.

So it is that I approach the concept of Transatlantic to stretch beyond the often Anglophonic back-and-forth of the United States and England. As we will see in chapter four, the ideas that accumulate and collect are born of a muddied and confused genealogy. In that chapter, the philosophy of a French philosopher (Bergson), the account

of phenomenal experiences by two English women (Moberly and Jourdain), and the quintessentially French modernist writer (Proust) are all tied up in interrelated questions of temporality and the human self. These chapters, then follow the pattern of psychical research by themselves coalescing into a body, a permeable body that for a time gathers together to feel.

In chapter one, I begin with the founding of the Society for Psychical Research (SPR) as one of the points during the nineteenth century when people turn their attention to phenomenal feelings. The SPR was founded, in part, to legitimize interest in psychical phenomena like ghosts and telepathy by bringing it into a more empirically scientific context. The SPR's methods were, however, paradoxical. The SPR simultaneously embraced the subjective feelings of phenomenal bodies while adopting empirical methods that are predicated upon the objective bodies of a laboratory. In this chapter, I argue that the SPR's research created concepts of temporality and the human self that resonated throughout the philosophy and literature of the *Fin de Siècle*.

I examine Edmund Gurney's "Report of the Census of Hallucinations" as offering a theory of humans as being able to feel one another in a very specific way. Gurney's expansive census tries to document testimonies of those who claim to have knowledge and experience of another's death from a distance (such as the sudden appearance of a relative after their death and before the witness could have knowledge of their death). The witnesses' feelings and their testimonies were marginalized by orthodox scientific circles and thus demonstrate the ways in which subjective, phenomenal experiences become shunted to the side during the *Fin de Siècle*.

And yet, these phenomenal feelings find voice in the literature of the period as we see in the widely popular philosophy of Henri Bergson. Bergson served as president of the SPR

and gave a presidential address “Phantasms of the Living” that has become an obscure footnote in scholarship of his work. Despite Bergson’s sincere and sustained interest in psychical phenomena, the subject is largely an after-thought in current scholarship, particularly in the Deleuzian renaissance of his work. In the second half of chapter one, I observe the ways in which the SPR’s theories find their way into Bergson’s work (and by extension the broader movement of literary modernism). Like the SPR, Bergson promotes theories that imagine human selves as thoroughly intertwined and permeable to one another. Further, his work demonstrates the ways in which the marginalized, feeling bodies of the *Fin de Siècle* become so important to literary modernism. These bodies come to embody the ways in which literary modernism tries to capture the ways in which the phenomenal, heterodox feelings causes alienation from society.

In chapter two, phenomenal feelings find expression in the interrogative title of Irish-American writer’s short story “What Was It?” O’Brien’s text tells the story of a man who wrestles with an invisible body (a “monster,” he calls it) that falls from his bedroom ceiling. I compare O’Brien’s horror story to the prototypical horror of Edgar Allan Poe to show the increasingly fraught concepts of the human self and bodies. “What Was It?” presents the reader with the recognition of one’s own spectrality. I contextualize the story first within the mid-nineteenth-century economic revulsion of the United States to argue that O’Brien confronts the ways in which capitalism renders human bodies as spectral. I also turn to O’Brien’s own early-childhood experience of the Irish Famine to register the legacy of the racialized marginalization and genocide of the Irish people. The invisible monstrous body of the text and the famished body the Irish Famine reflect the ways in which colonized bodies are marked as non-synchronous with modernity.

Chapter three picks up this thread of non-synchronicity to observe the ways in which the center and margins of modernity are marked in Bram Stoker’s *Dracula*. Criticism of

Stoker's novel has long emphasized its panoply of anxieties (of sexuality, colonialism, and capitalism). I argue that these anxieties are rendered as temporal phenomena and that *Dracula* is a novel not just about time, but draws attention to the conflicting temporalities of its storytelling. But *Dracula* demonstrates that during the *Fin de Siècle*, time is a horrifying thing. The feeling of modernity as being "up-to-date" is fundamental to the expanding mission of empire and to feel "out of time" is to be a monster. The protagonists of *Dracula'*s body of texts (since the novel is presented as an assemblage of texts) embody modernity and the synchronous feeling of the normative bodies of the empire. Thus, the villain must be the heterodox and atavistic bodies of those left behind by such a modernity.

I read the telepathy in Stoker's novel through the SPR's contemporaneous research into the same psychical phenomenon. Telepathy offered a theory of synchronicity that opposed the synchronicity of modernity. The latter uses the objective bodies of the laboratory to create an objective, modern "now" tied to the center of British Greenwich Mean Time. Telepathy for psychical researchers and Dracula, however, imagines human bodies as sharing a networked synchronicity by being permeable to one another's feelings. *Dracula*, then, is the dramatic conflict between the centralized objectivity of modernity's now and those phenomenal, feeling bodies marginalized by modernity.

In the fourth and final chapter, I return again to Henri Bergson to read his philosophy in the context of the psychical phenomenon describe in Charlotte Anne Moberly and Eleanor Jourdain's *An Adventure*. Moberly and Jourdain's book recounts their journey to Petit Trianon at Versailles, where the two women claim to have traveled through time by walking into the memory of Marie Antoinette. *An Adventure* offers a theory of temporality (called "retrocognition" by psychical researchers) that imagines bodies to be so permeable to the affects of others that they can be overtaken—a theory

not far removed from William Denton's morphic resonance. Henri Bergson, I show, was well-aware of Moberly and Jourdain's story. I turn again to his writings on hypnosis and aesthetics to argue that Bergson offers an aesthetics of psychical research. Bergson situates his own aesthetics within the self-forgetfulness of hypnosis; aesthetic experience blurs the boundaries between the self and the aesthetic object so that the self can be overtaken.

Later in the chapter, I turn to Marcel Proust's *À La Recherche du Temps Perdu* to demonstrate a psychical aesthetics at work. Retrocognition, I argue, is essentially a theory of reading since it posits bodies (textual, human, or otherwise) as influencing one another and being able to overtake each other. The saturated feelings of Proust's novels demonstrate the overwhelming and overtaking of the reader by the unmoored affect of the narrator. All the bodies discussed in this and other chapters have been marginalized in some form for being Jewish, queer, female, or Irish. Thus this aesthetic theory of how bodies of human selves and texts interact shows how they pose a threat to the hegemonic, objective body of modernity.

Literary modernism has often been defined through its crises of temporality. And yet, though psychical research was a powerful force of the *Fin de Siècle*, very little scholarship ties it to its coeval philosophy and literature. In these chapters, I seek to read psychical research as more than just historical context. Instead, I read texts by Gurney, F.W.H. Myers, and Moberly and Jourdain as primary texts, theorizing alongside Bergson and Proust. *Feeling Out of Time* presents a reading of the Transatlantic *Fin de Siècle* through questions and anxieties over how a human self experiences time. To "feel out of time" is to experience the world through polytemporality and anachronistic affects. But it

is also this ability to feel out of time (synchronicity) that causes those bodies to be marginalized by a synchronic, orthodox modernity. Thus, those heterodox bodies that feel and experience phenomena then feel out of time by feeling out of sync with that modernity. To feel as a "perfect monster" is to both feel as another feels and to be marked as monstrous for it.

Chapter One

Phantasms of the Living: Henri Bergson and Psychical Research

I. Phantasms of the Modern

Modernism has been overrun by a legion of crises. It has had a crisis of the self, a crisis of time, a crisis of colonial bodies: the multiplication of crises in critical discussions of modernism emphasize the crisis as a primary mode for understanding literature of the period. As Samuel Hynes writes, "The Edwardian period was a time of undifferentiated rebellion, when many rebellious minds seem to have regarded all new ideas as adoptable if only they were contrary to the old order" (qtd in Gillies 36). The fractured, many-faces of modernism have proliferated, in part because it coincided with the development of the industrial literary complex of the twentieth-century university English department. New theoretical fields, college departments, and careers were built upon single cracks in the modernist edifice. And modernism has proved so useful to English literary theory because both are based in an emphasis upon breaking with the past and opposition.

Much of our contemporary understanding of modernism's crises comes from the modernists themselves (rather, from a particularly loud canon blast that still echoes). Jean-Michel Rabate describes a modernism particularly obsessed with itself, "a modernity that is by definition never contemporaneous with itself since it constantly projects, anticipates, and returns to mythical origins" (3). It is a period of self-obsession, terrified and enthralled by its own face, and comparing it constantly to those of others. The obsession is dialectical, traced from the oppositional language of breaking with the past and subsequent tangled hairs with that past. Rabate continues: "If indeed the main

thrust of high modernism… has been to link the wish to 'make it new' with an awareness of the primitive nature of ritual, then their modernity can no more escape the return of the repressed than preempt its unforeseeable effects" (3-4). A period like literary modernism, so preoccupied with asserting its own difference, then, must do so through staging and restaging the primal scene of rebellion. To be a modernist, it seems, one must choose a Goliath and draw one's sling. This rebellious scene casts figures of the past in roles of hegemonic forces to differentiate themselves from that past. And the scene repeats: Einstein versus Newton or Woolf versus Galsworthy. A problem with this understanding of modernism, however, is that when we think of modernism through its own performance of newness it can tend toward a non-dialectical understanding of the period. Modernism, for example, characterizes itself as fragmentary, as opposed to the supposed unity the Victorians or Romantics. One thinks of the quintessential modernist assertion of Virginia Woolf that the post-Impressionist exhibit in London ("on or about December, 1910") drew a line in the sand, differentiating between the old and the new (Woolf 2). It was, by then, a practiced gesture of the *Fin de Siècle*, but Woolf's is emblematic.

This chapter begins with the acceptance of modernism's crisis narratives, but directs its attention to the ways in which modernism's rebellions fail to capture many marginalized figures and how they ironically create new hegemonic forces of standardization. I take up a few of these crises as part of a period of turmoil, a period that tries to set itself apart through stark contrasts. However, I work in the spirit of thinkers such as Raymond Williams, who take literary and cultural production as in flux. In *Marxism and Literature*, Williams coins his most famous concept, "structures of feeling," to shift attention from literature as production, as finished. He writes, "The strongest

barrier to the recognition of human cultural activity is this immediate and regular conversion of experience into finished products" (128). Instead, Williams emphasizes "the whole social process, in its living flux and contestation" (179). It is in this spirit of viewing modernist literature "in flux" that I use the term *Fin de Siècle*, a term that captures a particular transatlantic attitude (or feeling), but also indicates an excerpted parenthesis of time. Modernism *in flux* is a very modernist concept, echoing the most modernist of philosophers, Henri Bergson. In fact, Williams' "structures of feeling" has as much to do with Bergsonism as it does with Marxism. For Bergson, as we will see, conceiving of time as duration (*durée*) is inextricable from the conceiving self; one views time in flux from within that flux.

This chapter takes up the story of two interrelated *Fin-de-Siècle* crises—of materialism and temporality—as they played out on a particular stage. The founding of the Society for Psychical Research (SPR) in 1882 marked a turning-point in the shift from spiritualism to an empirical approach to unexplained phenomena.[6] The SPR theorized the human self and temporality through the ways in which experience overflows and escapes consciousness. Its engagement with orthodox science illustrates *Fin-de-Siècle* conflicts between forces of standardization (colonial, industrial, commercial, and scientific) and increasing emphasis upon subjectivity. By telling the story of the SPR and close-reading the ways its members at times theorize temporality, I want to argue that, within SPR practice, these conflicts rear their heads. But I also want to

[6] Spiritualism's role in nineteenth-century culture and literature has been explored in-depth of the last decade or so in a way that has not quite carried over to its *fin de siècle* counterpart. For more on spiritualism, see Alex Winter's *Mesmerized: Powers of Mind in Victorian Britain*; Bown, Burdett, and Thurschwell's *The Victorian Supernatural*; Ruth Brandon's *The Spiritualists: The Passion for the Occult in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*; and two of the books to bridge the gap between spiritualism and psychical research, Janet Oppenheim's *The Other World: Spiritualism and Psychical Research in Victorian Britain, 1850-1914* and Alex Owen's *The Place of Enchantment*.

argue that the theories of the SPR were intimately connected to the philosophical and cultural trends that came to define what we now view as literary modernism.

In the second half of this chapter, I turn to Henri Bergson, whom John Mullarkey calls, "the first and foremost modern philosophers of time" (1). Bergson's career—not coincidentally I think—follows the arc of the SPR's popularity and also the period of the *Fin de Siècle* that produced the particular attitude of *feeling* time I want to discuss in the coming chapters. Bergson's philosophical production began with the publication of *Time and Free Will* in 1889 and ended in 1934 with *The Creative Mind*. Henri Bergson's philosophies of temporality emerged out of and shaped the *Fin de Siècle*'s discourse. However, both his legacy and the intellectual history of temporality during the *Fin de Siècle* has been severed from its deep engagement with psychical research. By tracing the interwoven threads of Henri Bergson's philosophy and the psychical research, I argue that the two reveal the pervasiveness of psychical thinking on temporality. Both imagine a human self as phenomenally engaging with temporality in ways that contradict the trends of western scientific practice. Finally, this scientific practice causes another sort of haunting in modernism, that of bodies alienated from their own feelings and phenomenal encounters with the world.

Phantasms of the Living

The SPR announced itself to the world as follows: "It has been widely felt that the present is an opportune time for making an organised and systematic attempt to investigate that large group of debatable phenomena designated by such terms as mesmeric, psychical, and Spiritualistic" ("The Society for Psychical Research" 3). That

opportune time was 1882, a time that led to the SPR merging orthodox empiricism and the popular clamor for spirits, rappings, and mediums. The period leading up to the SPR's foundation had witnessed the proliferation of unexplained phenomena like many other fashion trends; "spirit rappings" traveled from the parlors of New York to large theaters and meeting halls, coming to rest in the salons of England. Mediumship, in particular, was a thoroughly domesticated popular phenomenon as Janet Oppenheim observes: "Particularly striking is the number of middle-class housewives who discovered powers of trance communication, clairvoyance, and furniture relocation during the 1850s, 1860s, and 1870s…. Mediumship could be, in its fashion, as domesticated and feminine an art as embroidery" (9). Indeed, the phenomenon that sparked the mid-nineteenth-century explosion of spiritualism came from the fourteen and twelve year-old Fox sisters in New York.

Psychical research, however, can trace its roots more to the backlash against the pervasiveness of spiritualism. Excitement over spiritualism had reached such a fever pitch as to be extremely divisive. Alan Gauld writes, "By the mid-eighteen-seventies…. Either one had to accept the occurrence of astonishing and incredible physical phenomena… or one had to admit that the senses or the memories of seemingly sane people could deceive them in preposterous and unprecedented ways" (83). Those who joined the backlash responded to the way in which spiritualism had risen to such popularity with a high prevalence of women. T.H. Huxley once famously responded to calls to investigate spiritualism's veracity, saying, "Supposing the phenomena to be genuine—they do not interest me. If anybody would endow me with the faculty of listening to the chatter of old women and curates in the nearest cathedral town, I should

decline the privilege, having better things to do…. The only good that I can see in a demonstration of the truth of 'Spiritualism' is to furnish an additional argument against suicide" ("Report on Spiritualism" 578). These responses to spiritualism mean that the SPR needed to reintroduce its phenomena in a more serious setting, a masculine setting.

The world that birthed the SPR was submerged in a multitude of competing and interwoven trends: Darwinism and the decline of religion; spiritualism and the rise of phenomena; industrialism and increased regulation; empiricism and the emergence of the modern laboratory. It should not surprise us, then, that the SPR itself would be founded out of the phenomena of spiritualism while at the same time approaching it with a deep skepticism and at times disdain. Though the SPR was founded by Professor W.F. Barrett, the ruling core consisted of F.W.H. Myers, Edmund Gurney, and Henry and Eleanor Sidgwick. Even among these core leaders and the rest of the "Sidgwick Group" there were conflicting levels of skepticism and belief. The Sidgwicks, for example, approached phenomena with a deep suspicion, while Myers and Gurney adopted more romantic and at times religious perspectives. Even before the SPR was imagined, Henry Sidgwick and Myers had begun informal investigations into mediums, only to find themselves disappointed by repeated encounters with frauds. By the time the SPR was founded, Gauld writes that Henry Sidgwick, the SPR's first president, was shifting from mediums (spiritualism's chief interest) to the new idea of thought-transference: "Sidgwick, remembering the many dreary hours which he had already passed to no avail in psychical investigations, was likewise pessimistic; but he felt that recent experiments in thought-transference gave fresh grounds for hope" (138). Though the SPR maintained a serious

interest in mediumship and the communication with the dead, much of its literature turned to communication with the living rather than the dead.

Outside the inner circle, the conflict of opinions and theories differentiated even further, drawing distinct camps of the spiritualists and those such as the Sidgwick Group who seemed to dismissive of spiritualistm. Myers voiced his camp's central mission in Henry Sidgwick's obituary in 1900:

> We must remember that our very *raison d'être* is the extension of the scientific method, of intellectual virtues--of curiosity, candour, care, --into regions where many a current old tradition, of heated emotion, even of pseudo-scientific prejudice, deflects the bark which should steer only towards the cold, unreachable pole of absolute truth. We must recognise that we have more in common with those who may criticise or attack our work with competent diligence than with those who may acclaim and exaggerate it without adding thereto any careful work of their own. We must experiment unweariedly; we must continue to demolish fiction as well as to accumulate truth; we must make no terms with any hollow mysticism, any half-conscious deceit. (Gauld 143)

The strain between the spiritualists and the skeptics was pronounced from the beginning and led to a mass exodus of the former between 1886-7 (Gauld 138).[7] The Sidgwick Group emphasized skepticism and empiricism as a tactical maneuver to—perhaps quixotically—gain acceptance from the broader scientific community. Where the SPR did succeed was in gaining respectability amongst high society. Gauld notes that this is

[7] The Sidgwick Group could only be called "skeptical" from the stance of someone with a predisposition toward the subject. Psychical research of course had a great number of skeptics who simply dismissed the phenomena altogether. Nevertheless, there were a good number of SPR members who adopted critical and questioning attitudes, often dismissing phenomenal encounters as we will see in chapter four.

where Henry Sidgwick as president particularly helped as his position of professor of moral philosophy at Cambridge gave the group an air of authority and connections to bring in other prominent members.

Bodies with Authority

The core of the SPR's mission was to transfer the excitement of spiritualistic phenomena to a more serious environment. In its most romantic light, its members viewed themselves as intrepid explorers, approaching ancient mysteries with the tools of modern science. But as Myers wrote, the SPR's *raison d'être* was the application of the scientific method to phenomena, the demolition of fiction, and the accumulation of truth. This process could only be done in serious and modern environments. This, of course, meant transporting the phenomena from the feminine domains of parlors to the masculine laboratory. The new SPR colonized that feminine space through the authoritative language of empiricism. Roger Luckhurst writes, "The field of psychical research was one in which there were no 'supernatural' phenomena. There were only anomalous events which awaited inscription within natural law" (57). Psychical research modeled itself on orthodox science by demarcating a clear center and margins. In the "First Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research," they announced their aim "To approach these various problems without prejudice or prepossession of any kind, and in the same spirit of exact and unimpassioned inquiry" of orthodox scientific practice (4). The SPR would seemingly eschew the personal for the de-personalized and feeling for exactitude.

To categorize the SPR and its research according to this binary, however, fails to understand psychical research's oscillation between the center and margins (of the broader scientific community and of its own definition of empiricism). While its language and methods at times reinforce the dominant drive toward the objectivity and depersonalization of empiricism, the fundamental force of psychical research was founded in the human self's encounter with phenomena that escaped cognition. The SPR might have made a clarion call for the "unimpassioned," but it did so while soliciting personal testimony from the general population. Their approach was to organize massive censuses of phenomena, such as the Hallucinations Census of 1889. It was organized after the 1889 International Congress of Experimental Psychology in Paris in an effort to circumvent the problems with the singular and un-trustworthy nature of a single testimony. The Hallucination Census was an extension of the research done for Edmund Gurney's magnum opus *Phantasms of the Living*.

Both the "Report on the Census of Hallucinations" and *Phantasms* focused on the phenomenon of a dying or sick person appearing to a friend or relative from across a great distance. These are referred to as "coincidental" and "veridical" hallucinations to indicate their difference from those experienced during a brain-fever or from madness. The Census Committee explains:

> We regard the phenomenon as a 'hallucination,' because it is an apparent perception of a body occupying a portion of space, under conditions which render it unreasonable to suppose that this portion of space really was so occupied: at the same time, we call it a 'veridical hallucination,' because, so far as it suggests that

> the person in question is dying or passing through some other crisis at the time, it represents a real fact otherwise unknown to the percipient. (30)

The phenomenon of veridical hallucination overlapped with existing SPR interests in telepathy, but the coincidental aspect of these apparitions offered researchers a unique ability to verify the events externally. If a percipient witnessed the apparition of a relative before death and had no previous knowledge or reason to think the relative ill, one might be able to prove that such an apparition was more than just the imagination of the percipient. The cases that were particularly effective were those that recorded the occasion before knowledge of the death. If, for example, the percipient wrote a letter indicating what they had seen before they learned of the relative's death, the letter would testify to the state of the percipient and to the phenomenon. Psychical research, though chiefly concerned with the phenomenal experiences of the human body, turned to textual substitutions for that body. The textual body of the testimony took preeminence in these investigations.

Philosopher C.S. Peirce criticized the Gurney's methods of collecting personal testimony in *Phantasms*.[8] Peirce claimed that all of the cases Gurney presented violated at least one of the sixteen criteria set out by Gurney and the SPR to make the evidence acceptable. Alan Gauld recounts some of those criteria:

> That the percipient should not have had any other hallucination than the one concerned; that he should have been in good health; that he should not have been suffering from anxiety; that his testimony should not be loose or inaccurate; that

[8] Much like other philosophers who remain relevant to contemporary thinkers, Peirce's interest in psychical research has been largely ignored. Stephen Braude provides a useful summary of Peirce's engagement with psychical research. In "Criticisms on 'Phantasms of the Living,'" Peirce says the numbers Gurney relies upon will "captivate the ignorant, but repel thinking men" (150).

he should have confided the story to a third party before news of the agent's death arrived; that the apparition should have been clearly and immediately recognized; and that it should have undoubtedly have occurred within the twelve-hour limit. (173)

Most of these criteria seem reasonable. For example, if one wants to verify that the percipient saw a dying person before their death, a third party's knowledge of the apparition *before* hearing of the death would make for compelling evidence. However, there are some criteria that betray an unnecessary skepticism in the individual's phenomenal experience. Discounting the experiences of those who have previously experienced hallucinations seems to marginalize those with dispositions toward such phenomena. And the emphasis upon the body's good health, while it excludes say feverish hallucinations, marks the body as a suspicious and untrustworthy instrument of research.

TABLE I.

Showing the number of negative and affirmative answers and the proportion of affirmative answers to the whole.

	Number answering "No."	Number answering "Yes."				Total number of answers.	Percentage of affirmative answers.
		Particulars given at first-hand.	Particulars given at second-hand.	No particulars given.	Totals.		
MEN.	7,717	496	83	76	655	8,372	7·8
WOMEN.	7,599	753	162	114	1,029	8,628	12·0
Totals	15,316	1,249	245	190	1,684	17,000	9·9

NOTE.—The answers included in the third column of figures in Table I. are given at first hand, but the particulars about the experiences which led to the answer "yes" in these 245 cases are given at second-hand, or in 7 cases at third or fourth-hand. The second-hand accounts are usually written by the collector, who received them orally from the percipient. We have, of course, always obtained the accounts at first-hand when it seemed possible to do so. All the accounts in the succeeding chapters are given at first-hand, except one or two in which the opposite is expressly mentioned.

AFFECTED AND ACCORDING TO THE KIND OF PERCEPT.

(7) Grotesque horrible, or monstrous apparitions.		(8) Animals.		(9) Definite inanimate objects.		(10) Lights.		(11) Indefinite objects or touches.		(12) Insufficiently described for classification.		(13) TOTALS.		(14) TOTALS.		(15) Corrected Totals.	(16) Number of Hallucinations per cent. of persons answering.
1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st hnd.	2nd hnd.	1st & 2nd hnd.	
23	6	22	11	10	2	14	1	14	—	8	12	912	161				
1	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	87	5				
7	—	3	—	3	—	1	—	2	1	—	—	67	3				
2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	31	5	1120	175	1422	8·4
—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	19	1				
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—				
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	377	116	388	116	553	3·3
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	—				
—	—	2	1	2	—	—	—	35	14	—	—	108	29	114	29	157	·9
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	6	—				
33	6	27	12	16	2	17	1	53	15	8	12	1622	320	1622	320	—	—

answers relating to which no particulars have been given (see Table I.) are divided in column (14) and added to these totals. The percentages in column

Figure 1 Tables of responses from "Report on the Census of Hallucinations"

The Hallucination Census was organized in such a way to respond to criticisms such as Peirce's by marshalling such a large collection of individual testimonies as to create an unimpeachable body of evidence. The SPR created a census questionnaire and

asked its members to pose the following question to friends and strangers: "Have you ever, when believing yourself to be completely awake, had a vivid impression of seeing or being touched by a living being or an inanimate object, or of hearing a voice, which impression, so far as you could discover, was not due to any external physical cause?" ("Report on the Census" 33). The census resulted in an overwhelming mass of data, over 17,000 people resulting in 2,272 positive responses. Figure 1 breaks down the data, but also shows the SPR's additional efforts to try to isolate data to only the most trustworthy cases. The Census Committee eventually winnowed the cases down to only 32 for proper investigation after the others failed to live up to their high standards (a remarkably low 1.4% of positive responses).

Figures 2 and 3 (below) come from the store of SPR archives at Cambridge University and represent just a fraction of the data that the members of the census committee poured over. These large sheets collated the testimonies mailed in by volunteers, labelling and categorizing them. The first entry in Figure 3 records the response of Mr. Hazzard, a 40 year-old canal boatman, who on three separate occasions witnessed phenomena (bed violently shaking, clock striking nine at 7:15 PM, and a "thing like a white cat") that corresponded to terrible events (wife's brother dying and two separate children dying). The canal man's repeated encounter with psychical phenomena would have rendered his testimony suspicious.

Figure 2 from the SPR archives: summary notes from Hallucination Census

Figure 3 close up of summary notes from Hallucination Census

The committee emphasized their data's statistical importance so as to redirect criticism from the individual bodies of those testifying (and those bodies which experienced phenomena) toward a larger *body of evidence*. Gauld notes that

> The methods by which the Census were conducted were of course antiquated…. None the less it was work on a considerable scale…. The "Report on the Census of Hallucinations" without doubt threw the onus on the critic. It was no longer up

> to the psychical researchers to give reasons for supposing that there is a correlation between deaths and crisis apparitions. (184)

This extended Gurney's original principle guiding *Phantasms of the Living*: "the cases strengthened each other like the sticks of a faggot. Some few of the sticks might be weak; but since they were not to be made into a chain of evidence, that did not matter" (165). In the collation of a large data set, Gurney wanted to redirect attention to the critics themselves. He writes:

> The work is, no doubt, wearisome; but there is no avoiding it, for anyone who wishes to form a fair independent opinion as to what the strength of the case for telepathy really is. The narratives are very various, and their force is derived from very various characteristics; the endeavor to account for them without resorting to telepathy must, therefore, be carried through a considerable number of groups, before it produces its legitimate effect on the mind. That effect arises from the number and variety of the improbable suppositions, now violent, now vague—contradictory of our experience of all sorts of human acts and human relations-that have to be made at every turn. Not only have we to assume such an extent of forgetfulness and inaccuracy, about simple and striking facts of the immediate past, as is totally unexampled in any other range of experience. Not only have we to assume that distressing or exciting news about another person produces a havoc in the memory which has never been noted in connection with distress or excitement in any other form. We must leave this merely general ground, and make suppositions as detailed as the evidence itself. We must suppose that some people have a way of dating their letters in indifference to the calendar, or making

entries in their diaries on the wrong page and never discovering the error; and that whole families have been struck by the collective hallucination that one of their members had made a particular remark, the substance of which had never even entered that member's head.… Common-sense persists in recognising that when phenomena, which are united by a fundamental characteristic and have every appearance of forming a single natural group, are presented to be explained, an explanation which multiplies causes is improbable, and an explanation which multiplies improbable causes becomes, at a certain point, incredible. (164-5).

Gurney has cleverly turned the burden of evidential common sense onto those who would dismiss psychical research so that to *not* believe in the truth of telepathy is crazy, a complex conspiracy theory of unmanageable proportions.

The SPR recognized that their central problem lay not in the phenomena themselves, but in the bodies of evidence. The *Fin de Siècle* was already obsessed with invisible or hidden phenomena involved with ether theory and wireless telegraphy. And even though the examples of ether and wireless telegraphy emerged directly from research into concepts such as telepathy, these subjects were deemed orthodox while telepathy was not. The SPR had to deal with bodies like that of the canal man and, though there is nothing in the sheet of data that makes us suspicious of someone like Mr. Hazzard, an individual’s testimony is subject to memory lapses and tricks of the imagination. This is not to suggest that the SPR and its methods discounted the experiences of individuals and the truth of phenomenal encounters. Rather, the shift away from spiritualism to psychical research was marked by the management of phenomenal data. Gurney and the others learned to collate the individual bodies that encountered

phenomena into a single body of evidence, a textual body to be interrogated. This textual, "unfeeling" body could stand in for the suspicious feeling bodies of individuals.

Conjured Bodies

Researchers such as Gurney shifted the rhetoric of phenomena from testimony to data. The language of statistical probability turned critics away from the body that witnessed phenomena to a more vague probability that many more bodies exist. It was not erasure of the witnessing body, but a conjuring of sorts. Psychical researchers believed their target phenomena to be elusive, but also ubiquitous. Texts like *Phantasms of the Living* and the "Report of the Census of Hallucinations" conjured far-flung witnesses invoked by the testimonies of those captured in the studies. These voices recorded stood in for the myriads of voices that may never be heard or may not have the same level of empirical certainty.

Conjuring carries with it other connotations, such as those Derrida uses in *Specters of Marx*. To *conjure*, Derrida reminds us, is to swear. He gives its definition as two-parted:

> On the one hand, the conspiracy (*Verschworung* in German) of those who promise solemnly, sometimes secretly, by swearing together an oath (*Schwur*) to struggle against a superior power…. "Conjuration" signifies, on the other hand, the magical incantation destined to evoke, to bring forth with the voice, to convoke a charm or a spirit. Conjuration says in sum the appeal that causes to come forth with the voice and thus it makes come, by definition, what is not there

> at the present moment of the appeal. This voice does not describe, what it says certifies nothing; its words cause something to happen. (50)

Psychical research during the *Fin de Siècle* relied completely upon the testimony of its percipients. These percipients, then, conjured in the second sense of the word; they brought forth the phenomena and gave it form. The "spirits" invoked in *Phantasms of the Living* or the "Report," were the translations from the bodies of witnesses to their testimonies. The spirit of a relative moments before his death must be conjured by the percipient to give the phenomenon a visible form to those not present. The SPR's conjurings also invoke Derrida's first sense of the word, as its researchers marshal data for a particular fight. The tactical shift to language of data and statistics was intended as a response, the amassing of troops to oppose dismissal from the scientific orthodox community. Conjuration, for the SPR, called upon the ethereal (in the true sense of in the "ether," since "ether theory" informed much of the SPR's work for a time) sensations to take the form of textual bodies that could help navigate the divide between the psychical researchers and their skeptics.[9]

The SPR adopted the scientific orthodoxy's shift to the objective testimonies of non-human bodies in the laboratory (e.g. thermometers or scales).[10] Phenomena moved through a series of translations through bodies: from the percipients experience to the written testimony to a collation into data of a census. But psychical research remained

---

[9] I make only a passing reference to ether theory here, but it played an important part in the SPR's work for a time, especially since it was both accepted by orthodox science and was a channel for explaining some of the psychical research's phenomena. For more on ether theory, see Joe Milutis's *Ether: The Nothing That Connects Everything*, Roger Luckhurst's *The Invention of Telepathy*, and Courtenay Grean Raia's "From Ether Theory to Ether Theology."

[10] Bruno Latour discusses this shift in his *We Have Never Been Modern* and this will be discussed at length in chapter three.

ambivalent to this process. Gurney certainly did not distrust the human body. Describing the process of writing *Phantasms*, he wrote to William James:

> I cannot describe to you the effect on my own mind which my hundreds of personal interviews have had…. I have against & again & again come away with a real feeling of irritation & discontent at having been the only outsider who was present, & the only one who had had a chance of getting the impression which deserved to be got. (qtd in Gauld 166)

Each stage of the phenomenon's translation loses some of this impression and Gurney knows that by the time these testimonies have reached their audience, they have been completely extricated from a feeling, human body to the unfeeling body of data. The central paradox of psychical research is precisely this conflict between the human and non-human, between believing in the reality of invisible phenomena and the desire to make that phenomena objective. Gurney experienced this paradox in feeling the power of the personal testimony of these phenomena and translating that phenomena into the statistical body of *Phantasms*. It was an exercise of power and authority over the phenomena, subjecting it to the measures and scales of orthodox empiricism.

II. The Material Modern

While the SPR's work appears far removed from literary modernism as commonly conceived, I argue that it intimately participated in the conflicts of modernism. Psychical research and modernism emerged from a culture of materialism that pervaded the latter half of the nineteenth century. R.C. Grogin describes the dominant world-view of the time as "a static one, allowing for no changes or progress; a world in which

freedom and growth were considered mere illusions."[11] He cites Thomas Huxley as demonstrating this materialism:

> It is no less certain that the existing world lay, potentially, in the cosmic vapor, and that a sufficient intellect could, from the knowledge of the properties of the molecules of that vapor, have predicted, say, the state of the fauna of Great Britain in 1869, with as much certainty as one can say what will happen to the vapor of the breath on a winter's day. (3)

The post-Darwinian rise of modern scientific practice had created a pervading certainty of external reality and the human's ability to understand and control it. Jonathan Crary argues that this certainty rose out of biology and a better understanding of human senses:

> The rapid accumulation of knowledge about the workings of a fully embodied observer disclosed possible ways that vision was open to procedures of normalization, of quantification, of discipline. Once the empirical truth of vision was determined to lie in the body, vision (and similarly the other senses) could be annexed and controlled by external techniques of manipulation and stimulation.…Vision, conceived in this way, became compatible with many other processes of modernization, even as it also opened up the possibility of visual experience that was intrinsically nonrationalizable, that exceeded any procedures of normalization. (12)

The *Fin de Siècle*'s materialism, read in this way, brings us to that other great crisis of modernism: temporality.

---

[11] Grogin's *The Bergsonian Controversy in France* is one of the most thoroughly biographical texts on Bergson in English and I am indebted to it and Philippe Soulez and Frédéric Worms's biography of Bergson for much of this section.

The scientific domination of the human senses and its drive toward objective and material reality conceived of temporality as mechanistic. Psychical researchers can thus be seen as reacting against the Scylla and Charybdis of materialism and chronology. Alex Owen writes that "Some psychical researchers undoubtedly were seeking proof of the immortality of the soul, and possibly all were searching for either consolation or meaning in an otherwise bleakly materialistic world" (27). The search for spirit was a search for freedom from what felt like the bounded trap of being trapped within bodies themselves slaves to the mechanical clock of biology. In this context, Henri Bergson's fame appears as the panacea of materialism. Here was a philosopher of the spirit, a philosopher of feeling. Bergson became the philosopher-laureate of modernist temporality, but the SPR also viewed his philosophy as laying much of the groundwork for its theories. The second half of this chapter argues that Bergson's philosophy and thus modernist temporality must be understood through its engagement with psychical research.

Phantasms of the Living, Part Two

On May 28, 1913 Henri Bergson appeared before the SPR to accept its presidency. The speech, also entitled "Phantasms of the Living," situates Bergson's philosophy in relation to the SPR's work. However, the speech concerns itself largely with negotiating the conflict between psychical research and orthodox science. Bergson was not the only prominent name associated with SPR. On one hand, the SPR boasted some of England's most prominent scientific figures such as Oliver Lodge, Alistair Hardy, and William Crookes. Interest in psychical research was by no means relegated to the fringes of society. And yet, among the staunch scientific circles, psychical research

represented a threat. The threat was vague, but pernicious, particularly because the lines between “serious” science and the dangerous science of the SPR was so blurred. Astronomer Camille Flammarion (who also served as president of the SPR) tells the story of that blurred line in his book, “The Unknown”:

> I was present one day at a meeting of the Academy of Sciences. It was a day to be remembered, for its proceedings were absurd. Du Moncel introduced Edison’s phonograph to the learned assembly. When the presentation had been made, the proper person began quietly to recite the usual formula as he registered it upon his roll. Then a middle-aged academician, whose mind was stored—nay, saturated—with traditions drawn from his culture in the classics, rose, and, nobly indignant at the audacity of the inventor, rushed towards the man who represented Edison, and seized him by the collar, crying: “Wretch! We are not to be made dopes of by a ventriloquist!” (3)

Flammarion’s anecdote reminds us of the pervasive suspicion of the *Fin de Siècle*, but also the subsequent whack-a-mole of snubbing out frauds. Technologies and scientific inquiries shifted in and out of acceptability and groups of researchers found their studies moved from the center to the margins or the other way around.

Members of the SPR were well-aware of their embattled position in the ranks of science, yet felt themselves to be at the vanguard of scientific discovery. Their rhetoric—reflected in Bergson’s speech—often likens themselves to Galileo or Copernicus. Theirs is a field at its birth, whereas physics and mathematics were in full adulthood. In his speech, Bergson imagines, what if:

> Instead of bringing all its forces to converge on the study of matter, had begun by the consideration of mind—if Kepler, Galileo and Newton, for example, had been psychologists. They would have produced a psychology of which today we can form no idea, just as before Galileo no one could have imagined what our physics would be,—a psychology which probably would have been to our present psychology what our physics is to that of Aristotle. (98)

There is a positivism underlying much of the SPR's work, imagining itself as moving humans into the future with technologies and laws of psychical behavior. However, Bergson's defense of psychical research is not just protecting its legitimacy. Rather, it is ontological in nature: psychical research reveals and reflects aspects of human existence that simply cannot be understood according to the existing empirical paradigm. As such, the argument for psychical research is the same as the arguments of *Time and Free Will*, *Matter and Memory*, and his other works that attempt to tear down a mechanistic conception of the universe.

Bergson's speech centers on scientific methodology by asking, what it is about psychical research that certain scientists object to it? "Contagion," he answers. The proper scientist worships his methodology as the pure mode of creating scientific reality. An experiment exists only through the objectivity of the method that distances it from the subject conducting the experiment. Bergson points to the tenuous pretenses of this sort of scientific objectivity. Psychical phenomena cannot be understood by this method, because Bergson fundamentally rejects the premise that the self can be so cordoned off from the environment as the empirical method promises. That is not to say, however, that Bergson suggests nor that the SPR eschews empiricism. Rather, Bergson reaffirms the

SPR's emphasis of methodological testing of these phenomena and, more importantly, the testimony of these phenomena. He takes telepathy as an example, starting first with the phenomenon of the veridical hallucination that was very common during the *Fin de Siècle*: a friend halfway the world away appears in the form of a vision. If this apparition is real, it will have a basis in a fundamental law just as gravity. But the method of discovering this law cannot rely upon the objectivity of instruments. One must examine testimony. Bergson says, "You proceed to a kind of judicial inquiry; you examine the witnesses, confront them with one another, and weigh the value of their evidence" (ME 80). The only difference, as Bergson sees it, is the setting: "Arrange for the fact to be produced in a laboratory, they will receive it gladly; till then, they hold it suspect" (ME 81-2).

"Modern science," as Bergson calls it, has winnowed down experience by excluding the human self from reality and the culprit, the mode by which modernity has become limited, is "measurement." He writes: "'Law,' in the modern sense of the word, is rightly the expression of a constant relation between magnitudes which vary. Modern science, then, is the offspring of mathematics, begotten on the day when algebra had acquired sufficient force and pliability to be able to enfold reality, to draw it into the net of its calculations" (ME 87). The result is that mental phenomena become inextricably linked to the physicality of the brain and the "parallelism" of the mental and cerebral begins to exclude all phenomena that occur outside this paradigm.

Bergson and Psychical Research

During the spring of 1913, Bergson's fame exploded onto the Anglophonic world. He had just returned from a tour of the United States. In England his works had been widely circulated after a rash of translations just a couple of years previous. Though English literary and philosophical circles were slow to catch on to Bergsonism, when he finally made the leap across the channel he was greeted with excitement.[12] His acceptance of the SPR's presidency, then, is curious for its unambiguous embrace of the marginalized group of researchers of the SPR. One can compare it, for example, to Sigmund Freud's eschewing any public relationship to psychical research.[13] Unlike Freud, Bergson took the risk that his philosophical work would suffer amongst the intellectuals who would come to associate him with the fringe element of heterodox scientific inquiry. His philosophy, with its emphasis upon "intuition," already suffered for what some considered its disregard for empiricism. Bertrand Russell, one of Bergson's most emphatic English critics, criticized him for this fault, writing, "[Bergson's] imaginative picture of the world, regarded as a poetic effort, is in the main not capable of either proof or disproof" (346).

Prior to his appearance before the SPR in 1913, Bergson traveled to England in 1911 at the beginning of what Floris Delattre calls the "Bergson boom" in the country (204). *The Times* reported from his series of lectures on spirituality and philosophy at University College in London, saying that the "theatre… was again filled to overflowing" ("Professor Bergson" 955). This fame, however, suffered a backlash and as a result

---

[12] Bergson's biographers Philippe Soulez and Frédéric Worms observe that Bergson's work moved more quickly to other European countries. Some of his work, for example, had been translated into German in 1908.

[13] In chapter two, we will discuss Freud's fraught relationship with psychical research and his desires to keep psychoanalysis safe from the "black tide" of mysticism.

Bergson's relationship to modernism as well as his philosophy largely disappeared from English literary criticism for much of the latter half of the twentieth century. Bergson's work has reemerged in English literary criticism in two distinct cultural contexts. In the first context, critics such as Mary Anne Gillies and Tom Quirk begin to emphasize Bergson's critical role in English language modernist literature and art. In the second context, Bergson's philosophy serves as foundational for contemporary continental theory as a result of Gilles Deleuze return to Bergson with his 1966 *Le Bergsonisme* (not translated into English until 1991). The intervening fifty years of relative silence in English language criticism between Bergson's death in 1941 and the translation of *Le Bergsonisme* has limited the windows through which English language critics read Bergson.[14] Bergson tends to be largely read backwards, according to specific aspects of his work that influenced later works. Thus Bergsonian concepts such as "virtuality" or "*durée*" (particularly important for writers like Deleuze) have augmented through time to dwarf other concepts such as free will in Bergson's work.

In discussions of the SPR, Bergson's presidency has drawn little remark—in Bergson studies it has been discussed even less—in part because it seems that he was largely viewed as a figurehead.[15] The minutes of the SPR have only scant mentions of the president. He was first offered the position of president in 1912 with Reverend Bishop Boyd-Carpenter named as an alternate. Whether Bergson turned down the presidency in 1912 or why he was not elected in 1912 no longer lives in the SPR's archives at Cambridge University. But in 1913 he was asked again and this time accepted. At first

[14] Need to note the intervening criticism that did actually occur.

[15] In email exchanges with SPR's historians they take this position as the explanation for why very little information about Bergson's presidency remains in the SPR's archives.

glance, Bergson's relationship to SPR appears arm-length as he describes in his speech. "Phantasms" begins with a sort of surprise at the election. "I am conscious I have done nothing to deserve it," he says, adding, "It is only by reading that I know anything of the phenomena with which the Society deals; I have seen nothing myself, I have examined nothing myself" (ME 75). In his description, Bergson feels an affinity for the SPR, but does not share its methodological interest in examining the phenomena. But as we will see, Bergson is not telling the truth. In his first publication, "De La Simulation Inconscient dans L'État D'Hypnotisme," Bergson discusses a case in France where a man claims that hypnotized school children can read a book open in front of his eyes, but hidden from their view. Bergson asks the man, M.V., to demonstrate the experiments so he can draw his own conclusions. This is to say that Bergson is being liberal with his characterization of his relationship to psychical research. He was most certainly present at séances and had more than just a reading knowledge of psychical phenomena. Bergson's involvement with psychical research and his speech before the SPR is important because his philosophy, which greatly affected so much of modernist literature, emerged from the discursive context of theories of psychical research.

Bergson's work joined the transatlantic backlashes against the mechanistic universe that popped up in disparate places, but eventually came to intermingle. Critics (though few in English) have pointed out Bergson's tenuous position in the lineage of nineteenth-century philosophical currents of "Spiritualisme" from the likes of Jules Lachelier and Félix Ravaisson.[16] It is important that we note the difference between the English connotations of "spiritualism" and the philosophical tradition of essentially the

---

[16] In addition to Gillies, Grogin, and Soulez and Worms, see Pernot's "Spiritualisme et Spiritisme chez Bergson."

same name. Spiritualism in the anglophic transatlantic context is associated with mediums, "rappings," and other such supernatural experiences. France's "Spiritualisme," on the other hand, revolved around phenomena as more broadly conceived—as the soul sensing and interacting with the world. In 1874, John Mears summarized the shift from eclecticism to spritiualism as being catalyzed by the rediscovery of Maine de Brian. Mears writes: "The fundamental idea of this great thinker is that the soul is not only conscious of the phenomena which take place within it, but that it has a conciousness [sic] of itself considered as force; that is, that it feels in itself a power superior to the phenomena and capable of producing them, a power which subsists as a unit and ever identical with itself in the variety of its effects" ("French Spiritualism" 679).

Though Bergson certainly must be considered according to his relationship to his nineteenth-century predecessors, as Mary Anne Gillies notes, this relationship must be complicated. "To argue that Bergson was simply the successor to these nineteenth-century thinkers," she writes, "is to present a corrupt account of both his work and his academic training" (9). That training was in physics and mathematics and throughout Bergson's career he directly engaged with a post-Darwinist world. The discursive field out of which Bergson's work develops takes spiritualism as a starting point and directs it in opposition to the scientific materialism that had taken root in the Transatlantic *Fin de Siècle*. There is an obvious correlation between French spiritualism's conception of the human spirit as feeling and sensing the world around it. Consciousness and the unconscious, as they related to this spirit, represented the ways in which materiality and the world as real (in a physical sense) spilled over the well of human comprehension.

From the outset of *Matter and Memory*, Bergson also attempts to navigate a channel between idealism and realism. Thus, he opens the book:

> This book affirms the reality of spirit and the reality of matter, and tries to determine the relation of the one to the other by the study of a definite example, that of memory. It is, then, frankly dualistic. But, on the other hand, it deals with body and mind in such a way as, we hope, to lessen greatly, if not to overcome, the theoretical difficulties which have always beset dualism, and which cause it, though suggested by the immediate verdict of consciousness and adopted by common sense, to be held, in small honour among philosophers. (xi)

Bergson does not reject realism, Darwinism, or science. Rather, he points to their limits. Gillies writes, “Bergson’s express aim in this book… is not to exile rationalist thought or determinism in favour of an equally unidimensional and exclusive spiritualist tradition.” Rather, he moves toward a theory “that the world consists of physical and spiritual that necessarily work in consort to define human beings and their existence” (10).

Bergson formed his philosophy during a period where the French concept of “L’Inconscient” was popular with the “Ecole de Paris.” The ideas of the unconscious, subconscious, or subliminal self all emerged as accepted realities—not just hypotheses—during the final decades of the nineteenth century, however, transient or mysterious the realities were. They offered an avenue of imagining the human self outside of the mechanistic constraints of the biological emphasis upon brain’s materiality. That a portion of the human self existed in submerged state, cordoned off from the quotidian became an accepted thought even if it lacked certainty. Grogin explains that, as opposed to Freud’s unconscious, “L’Inconscient… posited a static subconscious, comprising

habits and memory, and generically containing all organized knowledge; and a dynamic subconscious which was in a latent state of incubation, and which was the source for the creative and inspirational work of human beings." SPR founder F.W.H. Myers proposed a similar concept in his "subliminal self." As Grogin describes, Myers's subliminal self,

> Embraced everything that took place beneath the threshold of consciousness: sensations, thoughts and emotions…. They form themselves, he said, into a complex and coherent psychical system which thinks, feels, remembers and wills on its own accord. However, it is not a completely separate psychic entity; it often influences our conscious self and together with it forms a larger self. (23)

The unconscious of French philosophy and Myers's psychical research shared a common germ in imagining a part of the human that had a more complete knowledge and perception, a part that only tangentially connected to the active perception of consciousness. Variations of the unconscious would thrive and multiply during the *Fin de Siècle*, but a few found coherent iterations defined by the likes of Myers, Freud, and Bergson. Though perhaps not as explicitly as Freud, Bergson kept the concept of the unconscious at the center of his philosophical inquiries.

The close resemblances of the unconscious in Bergson, Myers, and French philosophy at the time was hardly coincidental and resulted in part from the rise of psychical research. Soulez and Worms note that Bergson first became interested in "métapsychique" or parapsychology when he was teaching in Clermont (56). He encountered it not only in books such as *Phantasms of the Living*, but he also attended séances with Père Baron (57). Perhaps Bergson's closest connection to psychical research was through his close friend, Charles Richet, who taught at the Sorbonne and was one the

France's most foremost psychical researchers at the time. Bergson also participated in the French studies of the most famous *Fin de Siècle* medium, Eusapia Palladino. Grogin reports that several times he served with Marie Curie as "controllers," holding Palladino's hands to prevent cheating. Grogin also writes, "It is a little known fact about Bergson's career that he was a member of the 'Thirteen Club.' This was an exclusive club of thirteen members which met on the thirteenth of each month to discuss psychic matters. Richet was a member, and so was Eugène Osty, the Director of the Institut Métapsychique Internationale. It almost certainly included Emile Boirac, [Camille] Flammarion and the other great names of French psychical research" (65). When Bergson tells the SPR in his speech that "It is only by reading that I know anything of the phenomena with which the Society deals; I have seen nothing myself, I have examined nothing myself," he is dissembling. At times Bergson deals explicitly with psychical phenomena, but this chapter examines the seamlessness between Bergson's philosophy and his interest in hypnosis or telepathy. I argue that one cannot understand Bergsonian concepts such as *durée* or virtuality except within the context of *Fin-de-Siècle* research into unexplained phenomena.

Contagious Bodies

Bergson tells us that modern science fears contagion and then turns to measurement for the cure. Scientific unease with contagion is precisely why Bergson is so interested in psychical phenomena and why it serves an important role in his philosophy. Orthodoxy shifts the authority of evidence outside of a single human body onto the instruments of measurement. Once a force can be measured on an instrument, it

is a force that belongs not to that body, but to the instrument. Empiricism, then, offers an exorcism of sorts of a human body's experience of phenomena. Bergson sees those phenomena as intrinsically part of a human's experience of itself and reality.

Perhaps the best and most famous example of phenomena as foundational for Bergson is his concept of *durée* (duration). Like "Phantasms," Bergson's *Matter and Memory* takes aim at measurement, but for the purposes of showing how it distorts our image of temporality. In *Matter and Memory* Bergson claims that his purpose is to discuss the relationship between the reality of spirit and the reality of matter. In "Phantasms," Bergson's purpose is to ostensibly speak to the philosophical concerns of an organization devoted to the scientific study of unexplained phenomena. And yet both arguments pivot on the human self's dynamic relationship with the world.

Bergson writes that the self is the unique entrée into perception of the world, but it is not solitary and closed off. In *Matter and Memory*, he begins by situating the human self distinctly in matter and bodily form: "My *body, an object destined to move other objects, is, then, a centre of action*" before he adds that "*it cannot give birth to a representation*" (5). The tension Bergson tries to negotiate is that between idealism and realism and it leads him to a paradox:

> Here is a system of images which I term my perception of the universe, and which may be entirely altered by a very slight change in a certain privileged image, - my *body.* This image occupies the centre; by it all the others are conditioned; at each of its movements everything changes, as though by a turn of a kaleidoscope. Here, on the other hand, are the same images, but referred each one to itself; influencing each other no doubt, but in such a manner that the effect is always in proportion to

> the cause: this is what I term *the universe.* The question is: how can these two systems co-exist, and why are the same images relatively invariable in the universe, and infinitely variable in perception? (12)

Bergson's negotiates this paradox by simultaneously acknowledging the human self's privileged and distinct position as well as emphasizing that this does not represent a limitation.

His mediation between these two positions returns us to the emphasis upon measurement brought up in "Phantasms." There is a fundamental problem in how dynamic concepts of the self become externalized and spatialized. Keith Ansell Pearson notes this as he writes: "The difference [is] between extensity and intensity: the space traversed is a matter of extension and quantity (it is divisible), but the movement is an intensive act and a quality" (5). Duration is time in intensity, undifferentiated and undivided by consciousness. Bergson defines duration as "the continuous progress of the past which gnaws into the future and which swells as it advances" (CE 4). Elsewhere it is a snowball, accumulating as it rolls into thicker and deeper layers. As Mary Ann Gillies explains, "Bergson's view of time removes the external standard and replaces it with what the internal sense of time reveals: real time is that in which people live; it is qualitative, not quantitative, in nature" (12). Thinking time without space removes the "fiction" of "imaginary homogenous time" that constitutes ideas like historical time (MM 275). Bergson does not deny the spatialization of time, instead arguing that it is a fundamental process of human consciousness. The human experience of time consists in

the oscillation between the virtual and the real.[17] To exist in pure memory would be to separate oneself from one's body, its needs, and sensations.

Though duration indicates time as undivided and unmeasured, this does not mean that duration is limited to a human body as a purely internal state. The concept of duration is based on the heterogeneity of one's own consciousness, the "many different rhythms, slower or faster, measure the degree of tension or relaxation of different kinds of consciousness" (MM 275). Bergson wants to avoid the "mistake of ordinary dualism [that] starts from the spatial point of view: it puts on the one hand matter with its modifications in space, on the other unextended sensations in consciousness" (MM 294). What Bergson calls the problem of space is the substitution of external, homogenous states of temporality for one's own internal, lived time. In *Matter and Memory*, Bergson concerns himself with navigating the space between Realism and Idealism. Realism, specifically Kantian realism, presents "homogeneous space as a barrier between the intellect and things" (307). However, this is the same problem Bergson runs into when he speaks before the SPR. In both *Matter and Memory* and "Phantasms," Bergson objects to the articulation of the quality of internal states by the measurable quantity of objective states.

A human's drive toward spatialization and extensity comes from its socialization and desire for homogenous space to live in common. But the human self in intensity is what John Mullarkey describes as "radically heterogenous" while at the same time continuous. That is, Bergson imagines a "qualitative multiplicity," a wholeness of experience comprised of the atomized feelings and actions of the mind and body.

---

[17] It is important to continue to note that Bergson's use of real does not mean that virtual connotes "unreal" or "fake." Rather, it is more properly understood as actualized versus unactualized.

Mullarkey explains that this continuity "is not a sameness between isolated tokens of some general type… each feeling is particular, individuated by borrowing an indefinable colour from its surroundings" (19). The resulting pairing of extensity/homogeneity and intensity/heterogeneity is not necessarily intuitive, imagining the space between human and non-human bodies as unified by sameness and the intensity of the human self as composed of heterogeneous elements. Bergson does not necessarily define the opposition between extensity and intensity by the limits of the human body. The difference is perhaps most clearly seen in his usage of virtuality, which relies upon the same opposition.

Over the last few decades "virtuality" has become an important concept of criticism, but in Bergson's work it shows the porousness of the human self in subject/object relations. Katherine Biers notes that Bergson's virtuality:

> A virtual experience… is one that both belongs to the self and extends beyond, occupying a liminal position at the fringes of self and world. It both exists and does not exist: the subject can grasp it, via introspection or intuition, but only fleetingly, just before it becomes assigned to the position of subject or object. Most important, it is an experience that cuts across spheres of experience defined separately from one another within modernity—religious, aesthetic, narrowly empirical—and that offers a route back to a shared life world (3).

Biers's reading of Bergsonian virtuality tries to navigate between the traditional definitions of virtuality as "fake" (or unreal) and as "potential" (Aristotelian). Bergson's employment of the virtual takes various forms, at times being used against its partner "actual" or in "virtual action" being opposed to embodied action. What Biers wants to

emphasize is the virtual as prehistory to subject-object relations. It is potential, but not in the way a rock posed at the top of a hill has potential energy. Rather, it is potential as amorphous and waiting for a shape to actualize it.

As Biers reads it, virtuality expresses the overflowing nature of the human self. Bergson, William James, Sigmund Freud, and countless others during the *Fin de Siècle* sought to draw back from a strict materialism that tethered the human self to its physical limits. Biers describes Bergson's (and others') efforts to "restore a lost totality of experience" to the human (11). For Bergson, that totality appears in perception as virtual in the sense that it overflows consciousness. If a human were to perceive fully, she would be overwhelmed with experience and incapacitated. A human body acts as a sieve, filtering and canalizing perception so as to serve the central function of the human, which is to direct it toward action. But in the moments where the human consciousness relaxes, in moments of "inattention to life," those perceptions on the fringe of the self and that exceed the self, slip into consciousness (ME 96).

Like duration, the virtual belongs to the undifferentiated intensity of the human self. Its paired concept "actual," however, does not fall along the oppositional lines of the extensity and intensity. Virtual memory, as Biers notes, is indeterminate and unactualized. The process of actualization transfers that virtual memory into a body's action. Mullarkey notes that "virtual and actual are best interpreted as phases of a continuous process rather than localities" (36). That is, we cannot say that the virtual belongs to the internal and the actual belongs to the external. To do so would make the two concepts each other's limits, contradicting Bergson's belief that virtuality does not end at the tips of a human body.

Empiricism is based upon the substitution of the external for the internal. In the case of temporality, empiricism and "modern science," as Bergson calls it, historical time replaces the multivalent and heterogeneous time of subjective experience. In *Creative Evolution*, Bergson discusses science as artificial and unable to fully comprehend the natural, writing, "The only question is whether the natural systems which we call living beings must be assimilated to the artificial systems that science cuts out within inert matter, or whether they must not rather be compared to that natural system which is the whole of the universe" (30-1). Science relies upon the reducibility and fragmentation of human experience to measurable units. When science looks at duration, then, "Instead of a flux of fleeting shades merging into each other, it perceives distinct and, so to speak, *solid* colors, set side by side like the beads of a necklace" (CE 3 emphasis original). Those beads offer reducible and discreet units of experience that make them legible to the scientific method, but alien to the human's experience of itself and of time.

In his speech before the SPR, Bergson points to the fringes of experience as its domain. Psychical research looks beyond the human body to the interstitial connections between human bodies. This is where he returns to telepathy as a virtual phenomenon. Space—as is often the case with Bergson—tricks us into seeing divisions and limits. He says, "Our bodies are external to one another in space; and our minds, in so far as they are attached to those bodies, are separated by intervals. But if the mind is attached to the body only by a part of itself, we may conjecture that for the other part of the mind there is a reciprocal encroachment" (ME 96). Bergson proposes that human minds share some connection whereby unconscious thoughts and feelings pass between them. If this is the case, however, the human will have developed a mechanism for limiting the conscious

actualization of these thoughts. He says these thoughts might be "embarrassing," but the far greater problem for such thoughts in Bergson's philosophy is that they complicate and distract the human self from the primary activity of life. As with any fence, consciousness cannot always keep these perceptions at bay and "one of these images might pass through as contraband," leading to the sort of "veridical hallucination" of the dying friend appearing from halfway around the world (ME 97). Reading Bergson's virtuality through "Phantasms of the Living," reveals the two inquiries—Bergsonism and psychical research—to be fundamentally related. Bergson seems to treat psychical research as a natural corollary to his own philosophical questions. He begins *Matter and Memory* with: "This book affirms the reality of spirit and the reality of matter, and tries to determine the relation of one to the other" (vii). As he sees it, psychical research extends beyond this question to ask "what are the physical manifestations that would emerge from such a paradigm?"

Bergson's emphasis upon consciousness as overflowing brings psychical research to bear upon the larger philosophical trends of post-Darwinism. Both the philosophical "spiritualisme" that opposed a mechanistic and solely-biological explanation of the human self and psychical research's adaptation of "spiritualist" phenomena imagine the human's interaction with the world through spirit. In his speech Bergson draws the simple conclusion: "The more we become accustomed to this idea of a consciousness overflowing the organism, the more natural we find it to suppose that the soul survives the body" (97). The conclusion is simple, but it is one that others (e.g. Freud) could not make. To Bergson it seems obvious that accepting the unconscious leads logically toward

the afterlife, spirits, and telepathy. It is a conclusion that follows from thinking of human consciousness in its extensity and turning to intensity.

Phantasms of the Modern, Part Two

Jean-Michel Rabaté describes the "ghosts of modernity" as haunting modernists' attempts to forge newness. Modernism has commonly been discussed accordingly, through the voices of those such as Edwin Muir's *We Moderns: Enigmas and Guesses*. Muir imagines modernism as the exorcism of ghosts, as breaking from the past and launching into the future. "Our problem is still that of a clearing a domain of freedom around us," Muir writes, "of enlarging our field of choice, and so making destiny itself more spacious…. Greater freedom, and therefore greater responsibility, above all greater aims, an enlargement of life, not a whittling of it down to Christian standards" (92-3). While this modernism does not feel alien to the texts of psychical research and Bergson, it fails to account for the phantasms of the living.

Psychical researchers coined the phrase "phantasms of the living" to describe the phenomenon of the present haunting itself. The phenomenon they describe was one of simultaneity, but also of marginality. Gurney's *Phantasms* collects the experiences of those who experienced a sudden collapse of space, witnessing the apparition of a dying relative who should be separated by a great distance. This research explores and emphasizes human experience as spilling over the container of a human body. That body can feel with other bodies and share experience. This is quite different from researching ghostly phenomena. While I don't want to ignore the SPR's extensive research into actual haunting phenomena, the first large body of research the SPR produced explicitly focused

on synchronic rather than anachronistic phenomena. And though Bergson's research might be said to be more focused on haunting—that is, the non-contemporaneity contained within the contemporaneous, or the past as presented—his speech doesn't try to draw this comparison. Instead, he explicitly compares his research in *Matter and Memory* to *Phantasms of the Living*. The SPR's usage of phantasm, rather than language of haunting or ghosts, is also telling. A phantasm indicates an illusion, hallucination, a counterfeit, and an imposter. It is a work that invokes the attempt to supplant reality with falsity. For an organization desperately seeking orthodox acceptance, designating their phenomena as counterfeit seems an interesting choice. However, it also indicates the marginalized position of such phenomena.

Modernism was haunted not only by the past, but by the bodies shunted to the side by hegemonic forces, forces of materialism, of orthodox scientific practice, and of standardization. Richard Terdiman describes modernism's crisis of temporality through the lens of reification. The forces of capitalism and standardization cause temporal breaks by erasing the history of subjects and objects. He writes, "Reification is a memory disturbance: *the enigma of the commodity is a memory disorder*…every reification is a forgetting" (12-3). But we can take this further by recognizing the spread of reification into scientific practice. The mistrust and subsequent displacement of human experiences from scientific study reifies human bodies as no longer participating in reality. Instead, human experience and sensation are spatialized and measured. And in the reification of modern scientific practice, a human body becomes a thing unto itself, or rather a thing unto instruments.

The SPR's conflicted efforts to adopt orthodox scientific practice while at the same time testify to a human body's phenomenal experiences were fundamentally impossible. But they also registered another way in which modernism was haunted by its own present. The SPR brought to light the feeling bodies of psychical research that were driven to the margins by orthodox science. They gave voice to the phenomenal experiences that were laughed off by many in the scientific academies. By presenting them as phantasms, the SPR could draw attention to counterfeit realities and thus the threat to the singular reality presented by *Fin-de-Siècle* materialism. As the OED indicates, "phantasm" can be "a thing or being which apparently exists but is not real." By adopting the language of orthodox science, the SPR can present the paradox of a veridical hallucination: something cannot seemingly be simultaneously true and a hallucination. Yet, the SPR's research seeks to present bodies of evidence to the contrary. Bergson and the SPR offer up a thread of modernity that directs our attention to the ways in which processes of modernity alienate and "ghost" human experience from bodies and sensation. They begin with phenomenal experiences as not counter to reality, but as central to a human's experience of reality.

Bergson's philosophy of temporality simultaneously occupies the canonical center of literary modernism while stalking its margins. Criticism has left Bergsonism without "Phantasms" as well as modernism without Bergson's "Phantasms." Modernist studies and Bergson studies have both largely ignored the ways in which theories of temporality began with phenomenal experiences of human bodies: appearances of a dying relatives or shared emotions between two people. Bergsonism starts with these phenomena and develops theories that account for them. Bringing "Phantasms" to bear on modernism and

Bergsonian temporality recognizes the spectral and marginalized figures of the *Fin de Siècle*. It accounts for the non-Einsteinian revolutions in thinking about time as structures of feeling. Phantasms of the living emerged out of those non-hegemonic, embodied theories of temporality that were marginalized in the *Fin de Siècle*, but have become embarrassing or laughable a century later.

Chapter Two

"What Was It?": The Immaterial Self and Nineteenth-Century American Panic

"What was it that so unnerved me in the contemplation of the House of Usher?" asks Edgar Allan Poe's narrator in his 1839 "The Fall of the House of Usher." The narrator finds himself inundated with sensations of "insufferable gloom… an utter depression… an iciness, a sinking, a sickening of the heart—an unredeemed dreariness of thought which no goading of the imagination could torture into aught of the sublime" (365). He attributes these feelings to various sources: the feelings appear to come from the stones of the House, at other times from the objects in the house, and finally Roderick Usher seems to infect the narrator with his feelings. However, the narrator's question emphasizes that the feelings result from his contemplation; as he thinks of the House, his nerve fails. Twenty years later, the narrator's question would be echoed in Fitz-James O'Brien's 1859 short story "What Was It?" In these stories the question is both a diegetic and metafictional discussion of terror that is directed by narrators toward the source of their feelings and directing the reader to contemplate the nature of writing. "What was it?" becomes a larger question of what is terrifying in a text. For both authors, their text's terror emerges from the persistence of the question's enigma, which the texts never satisfy. Poe asserts the bodily role of terror—a failure of narrator and reader to comprehend the terror. O'Brien, on the other hand, questions the reality and materiality of those bodies. "What Was It?" presents bodies as inherently spectral, things which can be investigated to no avail.

Both stories appeared within two years of two major nineteenth-century American financial crises, the Panic of 1837 and the Panic of 1857. Previous criticism has linked

Poe's brand of gothic grotesque to economic instability. Jill Lepore's "The Humbug: Edgar Allan Poe and the economy of horror" contextualizes Poe's writing within what she refers to as "the pit and the pendulum of the antebellum economy." Gavin Jones describes "The Fall of the House of Usher" as an explicit allegory of "an era when rapid social and economic collapse was becoming the norm" (4). In response to economic insecurity, Jones argues that Poe's "literature of revulsion" presents an "aesthetics of social failure" that reveals "how modern social relations have always been defined by… uncertainty" (15). Both Poe and O'Brien react to the economic revulsions of their times by offering literary revulsions of their own. Poe's response to economic revulsion is to offer the text as an imaginative space of immateriality, one which constitutes the relationship between the bodies of authors and readers.

Fitz-James O'Brien, on the other hand, writes within the context of not only the Panic of 1857, but his experience of the Irish famine as a youth. These experiences lead him to trouble the assumptions of the realities of bodies—authorial, textual, and readerly. At the center of the narrative is an invisible body, the body of a *thing*. The narrator, Harry Escott, calls it "our enigma"—a riddle to be shared (93). O'Brien's short story does not just feature one enigmatic body, but numerous bodies. Many of the bodies—"unknown hands… Invisible feet… viewless hands… a corpse in the dark"—serve in the text to haunt the characters and the reader. But O'Brien's narrator tells a story of bodies beyond just "afreets, ghouls, and enchanters" (87). The other bodies in "What Was It?" include that of a dead New York merchant. "What Was It?" tells the story of an encounter with an invisible body that forces recognition of one's own spectrality. Through that body's

liminal status as monstrous, primal, and invisible, O'Brien suggests that capitalism renders all bodies spectral.

"What Was It?"

Fitz-James O'Brien's short story is frequently anthologized in collections of Victorian ghost or horror stories, but has largely escaped critical attention. While many of O'Brien's works are unmemorable, he wrote a few fascinating short stories such as "What Was It?", The Diamond Lens" (1858), and "The Pot of Tulips" (1855). O'Brien was wildly popular in his time and was part of a group of writers and artists in 1850-60s New York City called "The Bohemians." Among their ranks were writers such as Walt Whitman, Thomas Bailey Aldrich, Henry Clapp, and John Swinton. O'Brien's popularity came about mostly through periodicals such as *Harper's Weekly* and this is perhaps one reason for the lack of scholarship, since having "electrified magazine literature" leads to a different level of critical interest than having published a novel (Wolle 155). "What Was It?" tells the story of a man attacked by an invisible being and the man's attempts to discover the nature of the body after he ties it to his bed.

"What Was It?" opens with Harry Escott's description of how he came to live in the haunted house at "No. --- Twenty-Sixth Street" in New York City.[18] Mrs. Moffat, the landlady of his boarding house, proposes that she and the lodgers move into the large house, rumored to be haunted after the death of its previous owner, a New York merchant

[18] O'Brien names the narrator in his original publication of the story, but his friend and posthumous editor, William Winter emended this name from the text. Winter's version, published in 1881 in *The Poems and Stories of Fitz-James O'Brien* has become the most commonly anthologized version of the text. Jessica Amanda Salmonson's two volume, 1988 edition of *The Supernatural Tales of Fitz-James O'Brien* is the best source for the stories as they were originally published and I cite it here.

named Mr. A-----. The boarders accept the idea excitedly and they begin to share ghost stories and nervously anticipate the unexplained footsteps of the ghost.

One evening, Escott and his friend, Dr. Hammond, spend the night in the courtyard smoking opium, their shared vice. Escott assures his readers that usually the two of them took great care to keep their conversation and minds on positive thoughts: "those hours of opium happiness… were regulated with scientific accuracy" (85). However, no matter how much they try to prevent it, their conversation turns toward brooding and terrible ideas. Hammond asks Escott: "What do you consider to be the greatest element of Terror?" Escott answers with three possibilities: walking into a dead body in the dark, helplessly watching as a woman drowns, or seeing a listless ship floating upon the ocean without any visible human life. These answers, though, don't satisfy Escott and he remains convinced that "there must be one Something more terrible than any other thing" (87).

Having worked himself into an excited state, Escott retires to his room and attempts to sleep. As he lies in the dark, something drops onto him from the ceiling. It is a naked body that then begins to choke him. Escott wrestles with the body and pins it to the bed. When he turns on his gas burner he shrieks with terror, "I absolutely beheld nothing! Not even an outline—a vapor!" (89). His cries draw his fellow lodgers to his room and they try to suppress laughter at seeing a man yelling for help as he struggles with the air. Escott calls Dr. Hammond over to touch the thing and verify its existence. Touching the invisible thing strikes horror into Hammond and he helps tie the thing to the bed. Escott again turns to his fellow lodgers, who stand incredulously at the edge of the

room. He pleads with them to touch the body and believe in its reality, but they will not touch it and they will not believe.

The second half of the story turns to the seemingly less terrifying question of what does one do with an invisible thing? Escott and Hammond attempt to find a way of knowing the shape of its body. They also try to feed the thing to no avail. Boarders begin to move out of the house and the landlady threatens legal action if they don't get rid of it. Eventually, the creature starves to death and Escott and Hammond bury it in the garden. A plaster of Paris cast of its body gets sent to a museum and Escott anounces that he is leaving for a long journey from which he may never return.

In most editions of the story, Escott remains unnamed. O'Brien's friend, William Winter, anthologized O'Brien's work posthumously in 1881 and made numerous changes to the text. Fitz-James O'Brien previously used this character in the well-received "The Pot of Tulips," first published in *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* in November 1855. In this story, Harry Escott also claims to be telling his readers a true tale based on his experience. In "The Pot of Tulips," Escott recounts solving the mystery of a missing inheritance. He had fallen in love with a woman, Alice, whose grandfather, Alain Van Koeren, had disowned along with her father. Van Koeren had been rich and jealous of his young wife, believing her to be unfaithful to him. He drove his wife to an early death and treated his son (Alice's father) terribly. Van Koeren repented on his death bed, but he was unable to tell his family where to find all of his money. After his death, he left his family penniless, since no one could discover where he had hidden all his money.

As in "What Was It?" Harry Escott takes up residence in the haunted house of a dead tycoon. He meets the ghosts of the miser and his wife in the middle of the night and

reads their clues to the location of the inheritance.[19] Now that his lover is no longer penniless, Escott marries Alice and publishes his true account in *Harper's*. He tells his readers that he plans to give a lecture on "the ghostly theory" in the coming winter. He adds that "Any one… who wishes to investigate this subject, will find an opportunity by addressing a note to Mr. Harry Escott, care of the publishers of this Magazine" (55). The editors surely didn't thank O'Brien for this ending since they received numerous notes from those who took it as real. They responded by publishing a disclaimer assuring readers that the story was a work of imagination.

When Escott returns in "What Was It?", he is unmarried and living in a boarding house. He explains the change by admitting that he is a writer and "The Pot of Tulips" was a work of fiction. This new story, however, he assures us is a true story. Escott's shared narratorial role in the two stories plays little role in "What Was It?", merely indicating that his fellow lodgers view him as something of an expert in ghostly matters because of the story. But the ending of the story indicates that perhaps O'Brien intended to carry Escott's role into future stories. Before signing his name, he closes with the cryptic note: "As I am on the eve of a long journey from which I may not return, I have drawn up this narrative of an event the most singular that has ever come to my knowledge" (94). Escott never appears again in Fitz-James O'Brien's work, so it is unclear why he makes only these two appearances. It does, perhaps, explain why William Winter chose to emend the narrator's name from the story. In Winter's 1881 version of

---

[19] While I have noted that "What Was It?" serves as the question driving the reader forward and then looking back upon the text, "The Pot of Tulips" preemptively answers the text's question: the inheritance is behind the engraving of the pot of tulips. Rather than seeing these as at opposite purposes, we can read "What Was It?" not just as a question, but as itself the answer. That the body draws us to further questions is as much the final clue as the pot of tulips.

the text, Escott's first name appears once, but he does not sign the text and only refers to having "once written a story the foundation of which was a ghost" rather than describing "The Pot of Tulips" (393). In both cases, the important aspect of the narrator for our purposes is his role as narrator/author. Unlike in "The Pot of Tulips," Escott is not just any person writing his true ghost tale for the effect of truth. Instead, he is an author very similar to O'Brien who claims to write a terrifying story that will be in part a commentary on the nature of terror.

Mr. A-----

The events of "What Was It?" and its haunting (if we can loosely call it so) begin with the curious detail of the house's owner. Escott tells us that the hauntings of the house at "No. --- Twenty-Sixth Street" began with the death of its previous owner, Mr. A-----. As Escott describes it, Mr. A was the "well-known New York merchant, who five years ago threw the commercial world into convulsions by a stupendous bank fraud." Afterward, Mr. A fled to Europe and "died not long after a broken heart" (83). Mr. A----- was likely inspired by the real-life figure of Robert Schuyler, President and transfer agent of the New York and New Haven Railroad. In 1854, Schuyler became infamous for perpetrating one of the first stock frauds in American history. Given their close resemblances and O'Brien's own familiarity with Schuyler's story, it is likely that O'Brien had him in mind in this story.

Though the historical details of the Schuyler case do not feature in O'Brien's story, the close association between the economy and haunting follows a tradition

common to ghost stories.[20] Andrew Smith argues that the link between nineteenth-century capitalism and the ghost story is no accident. Throughout the nineteenth century, what he calls a "Gothically inflected evaluation of the economic system" draws together the ghostly images of fragmented and displaced subjectivity with the invisible, untethered, and predatory nature of capital (19). Of course, this will strike no one familiar with Marx as surprising. In Marx's *Capital*, he describes commodity fetishism in explicitly ghostly terms.[21]

The tradition of reading spectral bodies through a Marxian conception of commodity fetishism can help us understand the relationship between Mr. A and the appearance of the invisible body. As Terry Eagleton writes,

> Capital is a phantasmal body, a monstrous Doppelgänger which stalks abroad while its master sleeps, mechanically consuming the pleasures he austerely forgoes. The more the capitalist forswears his self-delight, devoting his labours instead to the fashioning of his zombie-like-alter ego, the more second-hand fulfilments he is able to reap. Both the capitalist and capital are images of the living dead, the one inanimate yet anaesthetised, the other inanimate yet active. (200)

For Eagleton, the separation between the capitalist and his Doppelgänger emphasizes not their double nature, but their inverse correlation to one another. To read Eagleton's concept of spectral capital in "What Was It?" means defining the relationship between

---

[20] "What Was It?" is not strictly speaking a "ghost story" since the haunted house turns out to have not a ghost, but a monster. However, Julian Wolfreys points out that ghost stories are not necessarily about ghosts. "Haunting is irreducible to the apparition," he says, adding "The haunting process puts into play a disruptive structure" (6). In this case, I consider various sorts of stories that are phantasmal, monstrous, or ghostly, not for their apparitions but for the sorts of disruptions they cause.

[21] Derrida's 1993 text *Specters of Marx* and the field of hauntology which followed it draw attention to the spectrality involved in Marx's language of historical materialism.

Mr. A and the invisible body as not causal, but reciprocal. We can say Mr. A's death has released this "zombie-like-alter-ego," the ravenous body of capital that will stalk about his old house. Escott notes, "It looked as if it was capable of feeding on human flesh" (93). It resembles what Karl Marx describes in *Capital*: "By incorporating living labour-power into the material constituents of capital, the latter becomes an animated monster and it starts to act 'as if consumed by love'" (1007). But if Marx, here, imagines capital as a thing animated and monstrous, he also notes that the monster comes from a living thing. He writes, "But the production is also a process of *valorization*, and here the capitalist devours the labour power of the worker, or appropriates his living labour as the life-blood of capitalism" (1007 emphasis in original). The invisible and ravenous body that stalks about the house on Twenty-Sixth Street is capital, but more importantly the product of capitalist devouring the labor of his workers. In addition, it shows us the transference of ravenous attributes from the capitalist to the body of capital. Escott tells us that the body looks "capable" of feeding upon human flesh, but this is a projection and a redirection from the human agent's (Mr. A/Schuyler) own power rather than an inherent attribute of the body.

A Body Unrepresentable

"What Was It?" ties the riddle of its title to the invisible body in the text when Escott calls it "our enigma." The word "enigma" indicates more than an inert thing to be comprehended or a mystery to be solved. Its etymological roots indicate a directionality.[22] An enigma is a question or a taunt put toward another person with the

---

[22] Roland Barthes also discusses the word "enigma" in *S/Z* as in motion like a fugue: "Both contain a *subject*, subject to an *exposition*, a *development* (embodied in the retards, ambiguities, and diversions by

Greek *αἴνιγμα* indicating in some senses an ambush.[23] Its roots, then, indicate an inherent relationship between two bodies. Accordingly, "What Was It?" does not present its readers with a mystery; it stages a contact zone between the bodies of characters and readers. It does this by offering the invisible thing as an answer to a central question in the narrative: "What do you consider to be the greatest element of Terror?" Escott cannot quite answer Dr. Hammond's question at the time. In fact, his replies (a corpse in the dark, a drowning woman, and an abandoned ship) do not actually answer the question. They do not indicate a "greatest element." Rather, they offer examples of terrifying encounters with bodies or the absence of bodies. Escott's narrative also offers its own answer with the invisible body falling from the ceiling.

Dr. Hammond's question sets up a meta-commentary on the nature of terror and story-telling. The meta-commentary of horror can be compared to that of Henry James's narrator in *The Turn of the Screw* (3) explaining to his readers that if the ghostly visitation to one child "adds a particular touch," a visitation upon two children "gives the effect another turn of the screw." James's narrator explains to his audience that the effect-production, or screw-turning, can be multiplied; having more children in the text corresponds to an equal ratio of effect upon the reader. For O'Brien, though, drawing attention to the effect-production of the narrative increases that effect not through the multiplication of screw-turning, but through the limits of the text. At the time of the question, Escott imagines "Something" more terrible than his imagination could provide. He fails to define his intuition, saying "I can not attempt, however, even the most vague

---

which the discourse prolongs the mystery), a *stretto* (a tightened section where scraps of answers rapidly come and go), and a *conclusion*" (29).

[23] It is interesting to note that the word, "fear," also has its roots in being ambushed. The OED tells us that the Old Saxon word *fâr means ambush.*

definition" (87). Terror, then, does not result from a particular ratio of characters and phenomena, where more of one results in more of another. Escott's original answer indicates that the feeling emerges from its frustration of his imaginative faculties.[24]

Escott presents the invisible body and the narrative in epistemological terms. Here is an enigma to be solved. The invisible thing's persistent refusal of meaning presents the chief difference between Poe's and O'Brien's metafictional terror. If O'Brien directs readers to a failure of meaning as well, he also points them to the body of the invisible thing as a presence to answer the metafictional question of terror. This is, of course, an impossible gesture since, as we will see, the body is completely inaccessible to the readers. Harry Escott recognizes his own imaginative limitations in responding to Dr. Hammond's query. The appearance of the thing corporealizes these limits by presenting a body that literally cannot fully be comprehended. This is the ontic nature of the text's "enigma," that the enigma is not just a question, but a contact zone of bodies. Escott overtakes the invisible body, grasping it, and holding it down. But when he lights his lamp, he is shocked by his inability to see the thing; its invisibility makes for a body that cannot be read. Despite this, Escott attempts to read the body for his audiences, both diegetic and readerly. He reads it first for himself, but describes the process for his audience: "Hammond and myself had racked our brains during the long night to discover some means by which we might realize the shape and general appearance of the Enigma" (92). To read the enigmatic body, Escott and Hammond run their fingers over its features.

[24] The failure of imaginative faculties certainly relates to longstanding questions of terror and the sublime in the Burkean tradition. Indeed, Poe and "The Fall of the House of Usher" have often been discussed according to Burke's sublime. In his "The Power of Terror: Burke and Kant in the House of Usher," Jack Voller argues that Poe is hostile toward Burke's conception of the sublime. In the case of Fitz-James O'Brien, I will argue that the "imagining" of the terror is not the greatest element of terror. Rather, it is the embodiment of that terror in the invisible thing and is thus more an ontological than epistemological question.

From this rough reading, they deem the body to be human-like in form. They think of another method, drawing its outline, but they discard it because it offers nothing but its most superficial shape. Finally, Escott and Hammond use plaster of Paris to give them a "rough *fac-simile* of the Mystery." This facsimile body only gives them the outer mold of the body, revealing its features through the negative space in in the plaster. This negative allows Escott to read the body as ghoulish: "It looked as if it was capable of feeding on human flesh" (93).[25] Here, he imagines its possible actions and interprets its motives as inhuman: a thing in human form that would feed upon humans.

Poe's Panic

The ghastly register of economic revulsion runs throughout nineteenth-century American literature, but has been commonly remarked upon in Poe's writing. The Panic of 1837 threw the American economy into revulsion as a result of anxieties over dwindling specie reserves in banks.[26] The six years of downturn to follow saw the launch of Poe's writing career with the publication of "The Fall of the House of Usher" (1839), "Tales of the Grotesque and Arabesque" (1839), "The Murders in the Rue Morgue" (1841), and "The Gold Bug" (1843). Economic revulsion enters into these early Poe stories to varying degrees, but each reflects to some degree what Jill Lepore calls an "economy of horror." Where Andrew Smith ties economic anxieties to the ghost story, Poe and a larger tradition of grotesque and horror writers reflect those anxieties through

---

[25] It is remarkable that four years after O'Brien imagines making a plaster of Paris mold of an unthinkable body, Giuseppe Fiorelli invented the method of using plaster casts to realize the bodies at Pompeii. Fiorelli's plaster molds inverted the process used in "What Was It?" by filling the negative space in the hardened lava with plaster to replicate the bodies of the victims.

[26] For economic details of the Panic of 1837, see Peter Rousseau's "Jacksonian Monetary Policy, Specie Flows, and the Panic of 1837." Rousseau describes the Panic as one of the worst financial crises of nineteenth-century American economics.

what Gavin Jones refers to as “weird sociology… one that wires class insecurity into the quality of aesthetic experience itself” (15).

So it is that post-Panic stories such as “The Fall of the House of Usher” can be read through the particular anxieties of the Panic of 1837. In 1837, the American economy was thrown into convulsions due to a sudden shortage of specie in East Coast banks. This crisis developed from a conjunction of westward expansion (and the need to shift bank reserves westward) and continued anxieties over paper money and fraud. “The Fall of the House of Usher” registers the threat of the economy’s growing immateriality through the vulnerability of class to economic collapse. Jones argues that not only the House’s collapse, but the collapse of meaning in the story reflects the post-1837 anxieties.[27]

Chief among the nineteenth-century anxieties was the growing immateriality of the American economy. The 1837 revulsion resulted from the gap between real estate expansion into the west and politicians’ desires to prevent paper money—seemingly immaterial—from proliferating and allowing for fraud. In 1836, President Andrew Jackson issued the “Specie Circular” that required all public lands must be bought with gold or silver “to repress alleged frauds, and to withhold any countenance or facilities in the power of the government from the monopoly of the public lands in the hands of speculators and capitalists.” Westward expansion had drastically increased following the forced removal of American Indians from their native lands. Thus, the Panic of 1837 resulted, in part, as an effect of the violence upon human bodies rendered by the spectral

[27] Kevin McLaughlin reads Poe’s response to the economy by arguing that rather than fearing the immateriality of paper money, Poe embraces the immateriality of paper’s (more broadly construed) mutuality.

nature capital. Poe's writing is well within this tradition of anxiety. However, as Kevin McLaughlin argues, Poe stands in opposition to the tradition that "projects paper exchange onto some foolish foreign…other in order to [prevent]… economic and aesthetic inflation" (43). Instead, Poe offers the paper of a text as an alternative system of exchange, one with assurance of bodies in relationship with one another.

Poe's critical theory reveals a confidence in the reality of bodies—authorial, textual, and bodily. One particular tradition emphasizes a reading of Poe's literary theory that champions the unity of the text—a unified and singular body.[28] That unified body does what the author asks of it. While many critics now read "The Philosophy of Composition" as in part satire, even a satirical reading establishes a binary between two extremes of framing authorial positions. At one end of the spectrum sits a writer defined by her craft, planning each word for its ideal effect upon the reader. At the other end sits the romantic writer, so affected and driven to such a state of inspiration, that the text becomes a medium of the authorial body's affect.[29] The resulting unified text testifies to the author's posture toward the text. Genevieve Amaral reads "The Philosophy of Composition" as offering a view that "it is the writer and the reader who consciously and rationally construct the unified effect of an artwork. Nothing must be left to chance; there is never any loss of subjective control on the part of the reader and writer" (230).

Poe's literary theory often gets characterized through his writings about his own work in "The Poetic Principle" (1850) and "The Philosophy of Composition" (1846). Poe

---

[28] While O'Brien never explicitly responds to Poe's criticism, the serious questions which now complicate the simplified theories of Poe's emphasis on unity did not predominate until much later. In discussing this "particular tradition," then I do not want to make Poe a simplified foil to O'Brien and dismiss more recent criticism that reads his literary criticism in complex and fascinating ways. Rather, I want to emphasize what seems to be O'Brien's response to Poe and the idea of unity.

[29] Here, we recognize certain stereotypes of Wordsworth or Whitman, which in turn were authorial postures acted out by the authors.

defines plot as: "*that from which no component atom can be removed, and in which none of the component atoms can be displaced without ruin to the whole*" (56 emphasis in original). That unity does not come accidentally, but through the authorial direction toward the denouement and "commencing with the consideration of an *effect*" (60).[30] Poe intertwines the unified body of the text with the intended effect, focusing on the textual body's role in affecting the reader. He describes the body of the text as preconceived as well as of a particular duration—not too short and not too long—so that its qualities (tone, rhythm, lexical choice) have specific correlated effects. These effects upon the readerly body are not just emotional but physical, as Poe points out that a poem can speed up a pulse or concentrate attention.[31] This theory of reading betrays a confidence in the bodies of readers, that their embodiment constitutes a relationship with the authorial and textual bodies.

Scott Peeples argues that the metaphors of construction in "The Fall of the House of Usher" parallel those of authorship. For him, the physical House of Usher parallels not only Roderick's embodiment of the familial role, as the story points out, but with the story's symbolic network.[32] In "The Fall of the House of Usher," the constructed things,

---

[30] Many critics have pointed out that Poe wrote "The Philosophy of Composition" partially as satire. The degree to which Poe describes his writing and hyperbolizes his craft, however, is unclear. The important detail for this article is that Poe's theory of unity *was* taken seriously by more than a few critics, particularly the New Critics. And if we take unity of the text to be paramount, we cannot go about dividing the text by Poe's intention. Poe provides a theoretical approach, even if (and especially since) he purposefully counteracts that theory.

[31] I use the term "readerly" to emphasize not just a type of audience, but to emphasize what I will discuss more later: that this is also a posture taken by a body toward a text. This is not really what Barthes (4-5) describes when he calls a text "readerly" or "writerly," since he is referring to a particular attitude or tendency of the textual body. However, what Barthes describes here are certain poses and postures involved in the act of criticism. In this case, I am describing the readerly as an attitude and posture of the reader toward the text.

[32] Similar arguments, linking the story's structure to the house can be found in Dennis Pahl's 1989 *Architects of the Abyss: The Indeterminate Fictions of Poe, Hawthorne, and Melville* and Ib Johansen's 1989 "The Madness of the Text: Deconstruction of Narrative Logic in 'Usher,' 'Berenice,' and 'Doctor Tarr and Professor Fether.'"

the unified bodies of stone or text, physically affect the narrator and the reader in turn. The narrator says, “With the first glimpse of the building, a sense of insufferable gloom pervaded my spirit” (365). Poe the story-builder, becomes Poe the house-builder, and simultaneously these roles create the horror effect. Later, as the narrator reads the Romance poem, “Mad Trist” of Sir Launcelot Canning, sounds from the poem come alive and echo throughout the house. The link between story and house means that the two collapse together, but for Peeples this serves to re-emphasize authorial control. He points out that “Mad Trist” forces the reader to recognize that “this is only a story.” The self-consciously parodic nature of the “Mad Trist” is an example of Poe “hiding his ‘signature’ in plain sight” (Peeples 186). Poe uses texts within texts to draw the reader’s attention toward the construction of the story, to the “wheels and pinions” of its making (Poe 61). This, Poe believes, will draw the reader into recognizing the story’s physical effects.

Poe’s writing, forged in the aftermath of the Panic of 1837, responds to paper anxiety with more paper. It isn’t that Poe naively believes that the relationship between authorial and readerly bodies guarantees meaning. However, he views the generative immateriality of paper-as-imagination as linking the real bodies of the author and reader. Thus, Kevin McLaughlin argues that a story such as “The Gold Bug” is a story not so much about the nature of money, but about the relationships of those who exchange paper. Poe explores paper anxieties and economic terror through the imaginative experience of terror. That is, the immateriality of a text creates an imaginative space for the readers to re-encounter the terrors of the economic world. Such a theory requires a

certainty of the reality of a reader's body, something which O'Brien will throw into doubt.

O'Brien's Panic

When Fitz-James O'Brien is remembered, if at all, he is often just an afterthought of other nineteenth-century horror writers. Even O'Brien's biographer, Francis Wolle, faults his subject for crudely imitating Poe and not living up to the standard: "O'Brien is a follower and imitator of Poe, and in no way his rival" (45).[33] O'Brien's veneration for Poe is evident in his writing and we see it when he praises his idol: "The subtle analysis and morbid intensity of Poe define his creations as sharply as if each were a living human face of wrath" (160). Dismissing O'Brien's literary debt as imitation, though, misses the way in which his writing offers a critique of Poe's critical theory and an alternative response to economic panic. Like Poe, O'Brien's literary work emerges in the wake of an economic revulsion, the Panic of 1857.

Contemporary accounts of the Panic of 1857 attributed its causes to the immateriality, not of money, but of fear. Like the Panic of 1837, the 1857 crisis resulted from the uncertainty of investments in westward expansion. While more recent studies of the 1857 crisis locate the problem in declining Western land prices and stress on securities brokers, contemporary accounts were much more ambiguous. [34] Charles Calomiris and Larry Schweikart (807) quote B. Douglass & Co. attributing the revulsion

---

[33] At other points, Wolle accuses O'Brien of plagiarism and shows the over-familiarity he had with Poe's work.
[34] For more on the Panic of 1857, see Calomiris and Schweikart's "The Panic of 1857: Origins, Transmission, and Containment." See also Calomiris and Gorton's, "The Origins of Banking Panics: Models, Facts, and Bank Regulation."

to "terror inspired by a trifling cause or misapprehension of danger." This, Calomiris and Schweikart point out, is part of a larger feeling that "the crisis was an unnecessary product of mismanagement or fear."

The primary difference between the Panics of 1837 and 1857 is the increased separation from the material causes such as public lands and specie. While westward expansion played a role in 1857, the crisis was tied more to the spectral nature of stock, bond, and securities markets. Market speculation had failed to keep up with the realities of expansion and so East Coast securities suddenly found themselves stressed. Calomiris and Schweikart argue that one of the causes of the panic was also the negation of the Missouri Compromise in the Supreme Court's ruling in "Dred Scott v Sandford" which caused political upheaval and affected expansion markets. One of the seeds of the Panic of 1857, then, was the spectralization of black bodies. The Supreme Court had thus rendered the encounter with the black slave an encounter with an invisible body, a thing with no signifier.

The twin panics of 1837 and 1857 set the stage for Poe and O'Brien by creating environments of anxiety over the increasing spectrality of the American economy. David Anthony argues that the period between these two panics produces a "debtor masculinity… [which] embodied anxieties over an economy based increasingly on immaterial foundation of credit, speculation, and paper money" (720). Likewise, David Zimmerman notes the inherently spectral nature of the American economy, which he argues became increasingly so in nineteenth-century America. He remarks that the Adam Smith's "invisible hand"—signs and instruments of an agency lurking beneath or beside consciousness"—resembles the weird automatism of the séance or the ghost. He writes,

"The autonomy of these hands eerily demonstrated that the hegemony of consciousness was tenuous… that there was a mechanism churning just below consciousness that might sometime be given over to its own uncanny automatism" (62).

If the panics of 1837 and 1857 produce the eerie revulsion of Poe and O'Brien, the writers' responses differ in their responses. The metafictional question "what was it?" posed in both "The Fall of the House of Usher" and "What Was It?" brings the nature of terror to their forefronts. But the mechanisms of that terror—the internal gears and wires of the text—reveal alternative threads that imagine the bodies of authors, texts, and readers quite differently. Poe's answer to his own question foregrounds the author's unrelenting control over the text and a particular attention to the reason of the reader. O'Brien, on the other hand, presents terror the encounter with the spectral nature of these bodies in relationship.

Poe's theory maintains that the body of text is a unified thing and this notion of the text ties its effects to the intent of the author. How and if the reader becomes terrified is a function of her posture toward the text and response to it. When Poe writes that the form of the text—its length and rhythm—affects the body of the reader and causes her pulse to rise, he imagines independent, unified bodies coming into contact: a shaped body of text, a reader putting her own body in juxtaposition with that text. However, O'Brien betrays a pervasive suspicion of the materiality of all bodies that begins with the spectral nature of the invisible thing.

A Ponderable Body

In “What Was It?” Escott promises that one can actually *know* a thing, a promise upon which he fails to deliver. This failure will also signal the replacement of the epistemological question with the ontological as with the shift from optic to the ontic body. Escott tells his friend Dr. Hammond: “If you don’t believe me convince yourself. Feel it—touch it” (90). The invisible body will vouch for its own existence. In addition, where Escott fails to imagine the “King of Terrors,” the invisible body seemingly answers Dr. Hammond’s question. In the narrative moment of truth, the moment when Escott reveals to the reader the invisible body, he desperately tries to make his case to two audiences: his fellow lodgers (diegetic) and the story’s audience (what I am calling “readerly”). He begs the incredulous diegetic audience to touch the invisible body. He tells them, “I can give you self-evident proof that here is a solid, ponderable body which, nevertheless, you can not see” (91). But the lodgers stay at the edges of the room and in the doorway; they refuse the self-evident proof. They witness the effects of the thing, watching the impression upon the sheets and pillow and hearing the bed creak. Regardless, the body remains removed from them.

While the diegetic audience refuses the sensuous access to the invisible thing, it remains inherently inaccessible for the narrative’s readers. As Escott beckons fruitlessly to the lodgers, the same efforts fail with the narrative audience. Efforts to verify its existence echo back to the story’s beginning when Escott offers “some facts” which will prove the story’s truth (83). What facts are these? The readerly audience cannot touch the body, nor verify its self-evident proof, nor witness its effects upon the bed sheets. Instead, we can only witness the effects of its effects all registered in Escott’s narrative: Dr. Hammond’s shriek as he touches it, the “low, universal cry” of the lodgers, and

Escott's own amazement (91). If Escott's purpose in telling this story is to narrate "some facts that passed under my observation" what has he actually told his readers (83)? In the end, Escott's story still asks, "What was it?" The terrifying body evades not only his imagination, but his narrative abilities as well. "What Was It?," then, is a story about narrative failure, since the narrative's stated purpose is to present the objective fact of the invisible body. Escott promises his readers facts, with the body itself being the central evidence of his case. Yet, this body remains inaccessible to the reader beyond his descriptions.

Reading O'Brien as a response to Poe frames this failure in the light of mastery and control over a body. Notice the position of Escott's body as he pleads with his audiences to know the invisible body: he stands over it. He invites his diegetic audience to run their hands over it. His emphasis upon ontic knowledge of a thing resonates with Poe's builder-author: leaned over the creation and shaping its body. This tactile interaction forms the thing, designates it, and takes mastery over it. But it also resembles the spectator's approach toward the object in that he must measure the invisible body according to his own. His hands run along the invisible body, juxtaposing his own body as a primary object by which the invisible body can be considered. This underscores his inability to represent the body, he must instead invite the others to sensuously engage with it, to posture their own bodies toward it, to know it.

To bridge the gap between the invisible body and his audiences, Escott makes several attempts at presenting it to them. He offers the extrinsic proofs of the body, first through running his hands over the body, then making the plaster mold. These external proofs will stand in for the unseeable body, vouching for its existence. But this is also a

method of reading the body for the reader and defining what it is and what it means. Despite recognizing that the invisible body cannot be known except for by touching, Escott still attempts to narrate the body. He tries to give the body a prosthetic replacement which can be comprehended and grasped as a body of text.[35] Narrating the body and making a plaster of Paris mold of it, in effect do the same thing: attempt to make the audiences see what cannot be seen. They create negative space by which the body can be grasped in part. The narrative does this by allowing the audiences to see its effects. We read about the impression upon the bed sheets and can recognize the presence of the body where it ends and the bed sheets begin. For Escott, the readerly audience cannot touch the body, we can only witness the response of one who does touch the body and this response is the only thing which can be presented to the reader.

Escott seems unaware that his narration must inevitably fail for his readerly audience; we cannot elide the difference between representation and presence. The reader then, knows what Escott cannot—that his effort to narrate the body and give it presence to the reader must fail. Paul de Man describes the gap between what the reader can see in the text that the writer cannot as "blindness." In his reading of the critical texts of Lukacs, Poulet, and Blanchot, he describes the "constitutive discrepancy… between the blindness of the statement and the insight of the meaning" of that statement" (110). Since O'Brien employs Escott as a narrator who attempts to provide insight into what the story means, the narrator dramatizes this blindness. What this blindness does for the reader is draw attention to the separation between Escott's body and her own. Escott, the narrator and

[35] Escott uses what Paul de Man (124) would describe as an eighteenth-century aesthetic theory of mimesis. De Man describes such a theory as, "The possibility of making the invisible visible, of giving presence to what can only be imagined, is repeatedly stated as the main function of art."

writer, stands over the invisible body, defining it. But the reader's removal from the scene, her own position outside the text and inability to see what Escott sees ironically reverses the blindness. The reader sees insight into the moment precisely because of her "privileged position of being able to observe the blindness as phenomenon" (de Man 106).

Escott behaves as if abstraction can be made concrete and his narration could stand in for the invisible body. It is the illusion of capitalism and the process of reification, behaving as if he can render material what has already been rendered immaterial. More importantly, though, the relationship between the diegetic and readerly audiences only further separates the two. The diegetic audience refuses knowledge of the body—no one wants to be confronted with the realities of capitalism. The readerly audience, on the other hand, presumably wants to know the thing. But behaving as if the reader can have any knowledge of the invisible thing only reminds the reader that she herself is an abstraction in the text. We are not present in the text or in the room; Escott's engagement makes the reader a ghost, seeing, haunting, but unseen. The reader is an invisible body faced with another invisible body.

Fitz-James O'Brien employs a narrator who is frustrated in his ability to make his readers understand so he can pose Dr. Hammond's question of terror. The narrative answers Hammond's question with a body beyond the limits of his imagination and narration. But Escott begins with a hesitant faith in his powers of representation. He writes, "I have, I trust, the literary courage to face unbelief" (83). As Paul de Man points out, the mimetic desire for the sign to re-present is "the undoing of a desire that it reduces to absurdity by its very existence: there never would be a need for imitation if the

presence had not been *a priori* pre-emptied" (126). Accordingly, he adds, "The sign is devoid of substance, not because it has to be a transparent indicator that should not mask a plenitude of meaning, but because the meaning itself is empty" (127). O'Brien's own answer to Dr. Hammond's question emerges not from the limitations of his narrator's imagination, but from the inevitable undoing of the narrator's language. What is the most terrifying thing? A presence unrepresentable and devoid of meaning. Escott, the unwitting narrator, forces the reader into an encounter with that presence unrepresentable. Invisible bodies meet one another and the reader's terror is recognizing her own spectrality.

"What Was It?" affects the reader through its disunity, rather than its unity. However, that O'Brien achieves that disunity through the intricate, relational web of bodies in and around the text. As Escott lies in his bed ("still as a corpse"), he says "A Something dropped" (88). But moments later, when he has turned on his lamp, he exclaims: "I absolutely beheld nothing!" (89). There is a striking juxtaposition of the body's something-ness and its nothing-ness. Each word of Escott's "absolutely beheld nothing" contradicts the other. How can one behold, grasp, and take hold of nothing? How can one absolutely behold? How can there be nothing absolutely? If Escott's words contradict themselves it is because of their relationality. To behold marks the posture of one body toward another and an attempt to contain it. Absolutely gives this action a magnitude, in this case an impossible magnitude, but the nothingness marks an absence which negates both words.

Both Escott's body and mind respond to what he sees and does not see. He says, "I can not even attempt to give any definitions of my sensations" and later adds,

"Imagination in vain tries to compass the awful paradox" (89). Not only can Escott not fully comprehend (grasp) the body's magnitude, but he cannot even fully grasp his own feelings in response to the body. "My body acted from instinct," he writes as he describes the surprise of the body falling from the ceiling, "before my brain had time to realize the terrors of my position" (88). Escott's body grapples with the body before his mind can attempt to know it. Accordingly, reckoning with the invisible body becomes a point of contact where Escott must measure his body against that of the invisible body to understand their differences. He compares the two bodies, remarking that the invisible body is "apparently fleshly, as my own; and yet" (89). Same, but with a difference: Escott compares the features of the bodies. However, it is the "awful paradox," which really blocks the comparison, this is the terrifying moment. How can he conceive of a something/nothing? He must do so in comparison with his own body, a "something." This gesture is reflexive though. That is, Escott's something-body cannot measure itself next to the something/nothing, invisible body, except to see itself in that body. The nothingness turns back upon Escott. His body is the first to register it, revealing the gaps and nothingness in his own self. Escott's terror comes from the mutuality of something and nothing as from his own body and the invisible body. It is only his reason which cannot grasp what his body can.

The Famished Body

Another event from O'Brien's past permeates the text by way of the invisible body. Less than a decade previous to the story's publication, O'Brien left Ireland in the midst of the Irish Famine. In the 21 years before O'Brien emigrated from Ireland, he

grew up in modest wealth amidst the absolute destitution of Famine Ireland. His social standing buffered him from directly feeling the Famine's worst effects and further separated him from his fellow Irish. Reading "What Was It?" in the light of the Irish catastrophe provides an alternative context for the story's events. Paralleling the bodily encounter with the invisible thing as with an Irish famished body takes on a racialized context, rendering the text's horror as a recognition of one's self as other within a colonial and capitalist system.

During O'Brien's time in Ireland, he lived in two of the areas most affected by the Irish Famine of 1845-52.[36] Until he was twelve, O'Brien lived south of Skibbereen, spending time between Loch Hyne and Baltimore House. After his father's death, his mother remarried and moved the family to Castleconnell, to the East of Limerick. In Castelconnell, O'Brien would have been exposed to the effects of the Irish Famine, since County Limerick was the second most devastated county in Ireland (Kinealy 363). Indeed, he begins writing poetry dealing directly with the Famine and sending it to be published in the weekly Dublin paper, *The Nation*. In "Oh! Give a Desert Life to Me," a young O'Brien dreams of moving to America to escape England's tyranny and Ireland, where "We weep o'er our degraded land." In "The Famine," O'Brien writes "Like a wolf in search of prey,/ Comes the Famine on his way—" and then imagines the victims, "As the ravens, hunger hoarse,/ Troop around the lifeless corse/ Of a fever-stricken horse."[37] In a much later short story, "The Bohemian," O'Brien will make a passing mention of a Central American famine as his narrator describes his own avarice: "Like those poor

---

[36] Fitz-James O'Brien was born between April and December 31, 1828 and sailed to America at the end of 1851. See Wolle for more biographical detail.

[37] O'Brien published "The Famine," as he did a number of other early poems, under the pseudonym of Heremon.

wretches so lately starving on the Darien Isthmus, who used to beguile their hunger with imaginary banquets, I consoled my pangs of present poverty with visions of boundless treasure" (56). While these are a few mentions of famines, much of O'Brien's work dealt with social inequities of his time.[38]

The invisible thing drops into "What Was It?" not only from the ceiling, but seemingly from the Irish Famine as well. Escott describes it as naked, with bony hands circling around his throat, but he seems most concerned with its mouth. After Escott grasps the thing and squeezes it, the thing begins to bite him with "sharp teeth" (88). From its appearance to its death, the thing is hungry, helpless, and destitute (as indicated by its nakedness). The particularly beastly and ravenous nature of the invisible body resembles contemporaneous language often used when talking about the Famine. In an anonymously published poem from the time, "Thanatos," the Irish Famine victim is depicted as inhuman, possessed, and ravenous:

> A mother's heart was marble-clad, her eye was fierce and wild—
> A hungry Demon lurked therein, while gazing on her child.
> The mother-love was warm and true; the Want was long withstood—
> Strength failed at last; she gorged the flesh—the offspring of her blood.
> (qtd in Morash 114)

The mother's rapaciousness metamorphoses her into a monster, figuratively and bodily; her eye becomes "wild" and she cannibalizes her child. In this and other depictions of Irish Famine victims we see a parallel in the hungry, invisible body of "What Was It?" Escott struggles with the thing he calls "ghoulish" as he contemplates what should be

---

[38] One such poem, "The Spectral Shirt," tells the story of a mother dying in a sweatshop, while sewing a shirt and the shirt coming back to haunt her boss, the Shirt Fiend (Wolle 36-7).

done with the invisible body tied to his bed. "Who would undertake the execution of this horrible semblance of a human being?" he asks. Instead, he tries in vain to feed the thing as he recognizes the signs of its starvation, writing, "Horrible as the creature was, it was pitiful to think of the pangs it was suffering" (93).

O'Brien's invisible monster seems to be molded from what Christopher Morash calls "an identifiable discursive formation" that emerges from Ireland during and after the Irish Famine. Morash's *Writing the Irish Famine* describes the ways in which images of victims as walking skeletons and ghouls appear in the repeated images of "the breathing skeleton," "stalking skeletons," "gaunt spectres" (5). The conventions of writing about the Famine allow us to recognize "a document whose 'social energies' are generated by 'memories' of the Famine" (6). Those memories, inflected by Irish folklore transform the victims into inhuman beings: rapacious and bestial. These images often come from British perceptions of the Irish, already shaped by the British stereotypes of Ireland as "wild, fertile, dotted with remnants of a mysterious past and an ancient race of noble savages" (Lengel 19). From this same "culturally specific semiotic web" of which Morash writes, we can recognize O'Brien's invisible body as another hungry victim of the Famine (Morash 6). Escott relates its beastliness to consumption, characterizing the "physiognomy of what I should have fancied a ghoul to be" according to its capability of eating a human.

Morash attributes the prevalence of supernatural motifs in contemporary descriptions of the Irish Famine to the conflict between nineteenth century narratives of progress and the threat which Ireland posed to those narratives. These narratives, heavily influenced by Thomas Malthus's writings, describe human civilization as progressing

toward perfection, morally, technologically, and culturally. "By mid-century," Morash observes, "progress was sacred." In England, one could see physical markers of progress—railroads, steam engines, modernized agriculture and present these in a progressive, historical narrative. However, as Morash writes, Ireland's close presence, occupying "the same temporal space of 'twenty-four hours'" threatened to pull apart this narrative (16). Ireland lacked these monuments of modernization and thus challenged the English narrative of progress. As a result, Ireland became characterized by its untimeliness and its outmoded culture. If England stood for modernization, then Ireland represented barbarianism and savagery. Edward Lengel recounts the instances where the Irish were described through racial difference to express the cultural divide, quoting the *Times* saying, "Ireland has a people whose character bears a stronger affinity to that of the Bengalese or the Cingalese than of any Teutonic family, or even their kindred Celt" (110). More Malthusian Britons came to view Irish graves as necessary for the emergence of modernity in Ireland. Stuart McLean notes that Edmund Spenser "depicted the native Irish as a race of bloodthirsty and scantily clad savages, by turns indolent and violent, the stark antithesis of English civility" (40).

Beyond just the discursive formation of both the ravenous bodies in O'Brien's text and the Famine, Stuart McLean's figure of what he calls the "famished body" offers us a way to recognize the pivotal role of the embodiment of temporality and the abject in the invisible body of "What Was It?"[39] McLean warns against the habit of reading the conflict between modern England and prehistoric Ireland solely in terms of "disenchantment… a polarity between, on the one hand, 'the age of steam,' and, on the

---

[39] Here, of course, we touch only briefly upon Julia Kristeva's concept of the "abject," which she defines as "the jettisoned object, is radically excluded and draws me toward the place where meaning collapses" (2).

other, an ‘old world’ of small-scale, tradition-bound local communities” (3). This creates a binary: one on side, the moderns rely upon secularism, science, and progress; on the other side, the savages cling to spirituality and backwards-thinking. McLean opposes this binary by suggesting that “The figure of disenchantment provides a suggestive starting point… as it holds together the secular and the supernatural in a relation of contrast and opposition that is also, necessarily, one of interdependence” (5). McLean finds the bodies of the Irish Famine victims to be the locus of multiple interdependent binaries. Citing Derrida’s *Specters of Marx*, he asks, “Doesn’t spectrality, affirming as it does the simultaneous absence and presence of the dead, impel us, rather, to question the assembled binarisms on which the authority and self-identity of the present are founded?” (112). What McLean calls the “famished body” is the reactionary designation by the outsider, an embodiment of the visitor to Ireland’s attempts to stabilize an identity marked by modernity, progress, and capitalism.

Visitors to Ireland characterized Famine victims by their deathliness: “Visiting Skibbereen on December 15, 1846, the Cork magistrate, Nicholas Cummins, found himself surrounded by some two hundred ‘phantoms,’ famished people clamoring for assistance, whose ‘demoniac yells’ reverberated in his ears and whose appearance was that of ‘frightful specters’” (McLean 115). Here, it isn’t just that the victims behave in ghoulish manners (as the demonic woman of “Thanatos”), but that their bodies signify an irruption of spectrality, of death irrupting into the living. If these bodies draw the binaries of death and life together, they also reveal the mutuality of other binaries of British and Irish interrelations. McLean writes, “The spectacle of Irish destitution both grounds and menaces the contrapuntal fashioning of an emergent British modernity” (69). The figure

of what McLean terms “the famished body” both challenges the British sense of having progressed, being modern, as well as constituting the position of modernity to the savage, Irish foil.

“The famished body,” however, indicates not pastliness to the British observer, but untimeliness. McLean offers Charles Gavan Duffy’s description of his travels through Ireland as an example of this:

> The famine and the landlords have actually created a new race in Ireland. I have seen on the streets of Galway crowds of creatures more debased that the yahoos of Swift—creatures having only a distant and hideous resemblance to human beings. Grey-haired old men, whose idiot faces had hardened into a settled leer of mendicancy, simeous and semi-human; and women filthier and more frightful than harpies… *shrieking* for their prey, like monstrous and unclean animals (92).

In Duffy’s passage he traces the temporality of the famished body’s monstrosity not to an ancient, less progressed time, but to the sudden achronistic emergence of beastliness.[40] As McLean points out, “Their condition is not one of liminality construed in relation to a fixed and stable center, but of an alterity that appears to have infiltrated and hollowed out the very ground of the social.” The nucleus of the British self, the modernity by which the Briton identifies him or herself, loses its centrality in the self-constituting relation to temporal alterity. It is inassimilable and the resulting famished body “decisively rupture[s] the continuum of historical understanding, precipitating an abyssal collapse of

[40] The word, “achronism,” indicates this concept of untimeliness, defined as “The state of timelessness; deficiency of time.” The more common anachronism would refer to the out of order quality of an event or thing, that something from the past has suddenly intruded upon the present. I will discuss this concept of achronism in later chapter, but for now I want to draw attention specifically to the ways in which the famished body and the invisible body irrupt into the present from a time which does not seem to exist to the self observing them.

meaning in which are implicated both the canons of academic and statist historiography and the reciprocal alignment of subjectivity and world" (93).

Escott characterizes the invisible body through its untimeliness, exclaiming "such a thing has never occurred since the birth of the world" (91). While the body frightens Escott because of its ghoulishness, he emphasizes its enigmatic nature through its achronism. At no point in the past, he says, has such a thing ever existed. Dr. Hammond attempts to account for it scientifically: "We do not see the air and yet we feel it." Escott counters by saying "*This* thing has a heart that palpitates. A Will that moves it. Lungs that play and inspire and respire" (91). The invisible body functions similarly to the famished body, rupturing historical and scientific understanding. However, McLean's figure is the non-Irish response to the Famine victim's body. O'Brien inserts the invisible body into his text, fashioning from his past the answer to the question: "What do you consider to be the greatest element of Terror?" As I have pointed out, it seems to emerge from an existing discursive field, a way of treating the bodies of Famine victims. But O'Brien places this body in the text, it falls upon Escott, and then the narrator must figure out what to do with this being.

Dr. Hammond's emphasis upon accounting ("[the body is] not unaccountable," he says) reflects the attempts to reckon with the body within an economic and quantitative system. Previously, we noted the protagonists' efforts to "read" the body and these parallel their attempts to "account" for it, that is, to offer a presentation of transactions that will justify a thing. Later, Escott asks, "What was to be done with our enigma?" questioning the use-value of the body. Then, he characterizes their interaction in economic terms as a "transaction" (93). As with reading the body, accounting for it fails.

Accounting for them would ensure their objective and constrained qualities. As such, they would re-stabilize the relationship between a modern self and a thing from the past. O'Brien's invisible body refuses accounting and accordingly refuses stabilization. Its enigmatic nature exceeds the constraints of the story's diegesis so that even the title fails to account for it as indicated in its question.

Mediated Touch

Few of O'Brien's other works display any sense of stark imagery or deep involvement with the disaster that caused the death of between half a million and one and a half million Irish men and women.[41] O'Brien's poetry tends to use Famine imagery to serve the purposes of his poetry rather than the other way around. O'Brien's elevated social status kept him somewhat insulated from the realities of the Famine. His onetime friend and later rival, William North, describes O'Brien as "intensely aristocratic in his feelings. Like all Irishmen, he came of a great but impoverished family, was heir to an estate of unascertained rental… and would rather have been damned eternally than admitted that he had had a drop of plebeian blood in his veins" (Wolle 68). Moreover, O'Brien gives his authorial Doppelgänger the distinctly non-Irish surname of Escott. This narrator is an American, even if not born and bred, and he feels part of the New York metropolis. Escott's Anglo-Saxon surname and metropolitan identity seemingly buffer O'Brien, the actual author, from the experience of meeting the invisible body.

O'Brien connects the textual body to that of the invisible thing by turning from the optic and to the ontic. This happens within the specifically economic anxieties

[41] Many histories of the Irish Famine have been written, but I have found Kinealy and Ó'Gráda to be particularly helpful.

brought about through the enigmatic nature of Robert Schuyler's presence and absence in the text. O'Brien imagines a constellation of bodies—his own, Schuyler's (and Escott's), and that of the invisible thing. This arrangement of bodies reveals the particular ontological anxieties of the text as well as those of economic revulsion.

Beginning in February, 1853, Schuyler exceeded his company's charter to issue three million shares when he issued an additional 19,000 shares at $100 per share.[42] His fraud came to light soon after and in newspaper accounts we see the same descriptions of his "dying broken-hearted in exile" that appear in "What Was It?" (Adams). In the aftermath of Schuyler's stock fraud, the stock prices of railroad stock fell and a great shock was sent through the rest of the American economy.[43] Rumors followed Schuyler's widow when she moved to Saratoga, NY. She built a large mansion with a stone building built 100 feet from it, supposedly connected by an underground tunnel. One rumor said that "Robert Schuyler is there, yet-alive, and that when anybody comes into the house, Mr. Schuyler runs under ground, to the chapel, and gets into his coffin there, 'dead,' to which his ghostly appearance, when living would add an air of probability" ("From Saratoga—Curious Story Afloat").

The curious story of Schuyler's fraud and its aftermath reveals a fascination with his body, now seemingly invisible. Rumors surround his disappearance and supposed reappearance. The warrant for his arrest describes him as "very affable in manners and polite; long arms and long fingers and looks rather skeleton" ("Flight of Schuyler to Europe"). The public seems desperate to see the body of the man responsible for the

[42] Robert Shaw provides the only historical overview of Schuyler's fraud.

[43] The *New Haven Journal* called the case "the great clog" put on stocks. *The Raleigh Register* adds notes that it will "bring ruin to many families, widows, and orphans." In addition, the railroad's treasurer committed suicide with strychnine (*The Daily Cleveland Herald*).

revulsion. But the fraud itself is a result of a system that creates invisible bodies. Schuyler had been charged with the issuing of stocks—abstract, textual bodies of capital rendered text on certificates. And the public clamors for Schuyler's body, a body that can be held accountable, as opposed to capitalism's spectral machinery. Much like the diegetic audience of "What Was It?", the newspaper men and readers refuse to be confronted with the illusory nature of capital.

What Schuyler's stock fraud and the Panics of 1837 and 1857 have in common is not just their immaterial causes, but the way they reveal the position of debtors within a capitalism. If we remember, the capitalist's ravenous devouring of labor produces the "zombie-like-alter ego." Thus, the economic anxieties of nineteenth-century America (though certainly not contained to this period or place) spilled beyond fears that the house of cards would collapse. Gavin Jones reads Poe's "The Fall of the House of Usher" as exceeding those fears, writing that to stop with this simple analogy is to miss the vertiginous "feeling of perspective itself" (5). Both Poe and O'Brien concern themselves with the perspective of the individual's perspective within society. What O'Brien dramatizes in "What Was It?" is the encounter with one's own economic double, the horrifying revelation of one's self rendered invisible and monstrous.

O'Brien curiously refers to Schuyler in his regular column in *Putnam's Monthly Magazine* as "that unhappy director of the New Haven Railroad" who fled to Europe (128). What is odd about O'Brien's reference is not just that he pities the man, but that he thinks Schuyler to be the haunted man. He describes him as, "the dishonest man must be pitied rather than persecuted." O'Brien imagines Schuyler, alone in Europe, but unable to escape his past. He writes, "His door never opens to a visitor without causing him a throb

of terror, lest it may be some avenging creditor on his track." His imaginary Schuyler reads every passenger list, waiting for someone to come for him; this Schuyler becomes fearful of the townspeople because they have detected that something about him is not quite right. "If a step sounds behind him," he notes, "you notice a sudden contraction of the body, as if shrinking from some invisible touch."

The dangerous potentiality of bodies haunts O'Brien's imagined Schuyler. He looks for them on boats, stepping on his heels, and reaching out to touch him. This column precedes the publication of "What Was It?" by some five years. In the earlier piece, though, the invisible body touches Schuyler rather than being touched. Schuyler, in his exile to Europe, is no longer the avaricious capitalist. Instead, he fears his debtors coming for him. O'Brien figures the monstrous and phantasmal body of capital as returning first upon the capitalist. He pities Schuyler perhaps because he, too, fears the dreaded touch of debts.[44] Given O'Brien's elevated social status as a youth and his popularity in New York City social circles, it seems natural that he might see a bit of himself in someone like Robert Schuyler.

O'Brien's encounters with the invisible body occur through the mediators of Escott and Schuyler. These bodies shrink from the invisible body that comes for each of them. The invisible touch reshapes how O'Brien perceives Schuyler—it becomes the point of contact that reveals their relationship and seemingly dissolves the boundaries of class. Here are two men, separated by a gulf of wealth, yet one can see their similar positions in a debt-driven capitalist society. Emphasizing this touch as drawing together

---

[44] Wolle's biography of O'Brien tells various stories about O'Brien going into debt and then spending the money extravagantly. In one story, he asks his editors at Harper's for an advance and, when refused, scrawled on a placard: "ONE OF HARPER'S AUTHORS/ I AM STARVING" (55). He paraded around the streets until he was handed five dollars in a compromise.

O'Brien and Schuyler focusses upon the similarity between the two. There is mutuality via pity between the two that does not terrify, but in fact mollifies the terror of the invisible touch. For both O'Brien and the imagined Schuyler, the invisible touch reaffirms one's position within contemporary capitalist progression as opposed to the backwards savagery of a place like Famine Ireland. O'Brien imagines that touch through Schuyler as he does when he writes his story through Escott's voice. It is these fictional characters who end up being touched by the body and by using the mediated bodies of Escott and Schuyler, the only effect of the touch upon O'Brien is the shared feeling between the author and his two fictional creations. In effect, O'Brien uses his narrative to establish the space of a shared capitalist now in the manner similar to the British who characterized the Irish as barbarous so as to stabilize the difference between untimeliness and modern synchronicity.

Directing our attention to the feeling of homogeneity draws us away from the force of the body's enigma. However, "What Was It?" tells the story of a destabilizing, decentering, and terrifying touch with an invisible body. As much as Escott attempts to dehumanize the body as inhuman, he cannot avoid its uncanny similarity to his own. McLean argues that the famished body's power comes through its grotesque materiality:

> The body of the famine victim is able to mobilize contradictory impulses of horror and fascination, as an other who threatens to invade and take possession of the observer's self, in part by virtue of its ineffaceable physicality…. Famine bodies evince a materiality at once grossly substantial and elusively phantasmal, evoking a materialism that, far from offering a refuge of certitude, threatens instead to dissolve the familiar boundaries between self and world (122).

Escott's attempts to read and account for the invisible thing signal his desires to shift attention from the body of the thing to mediated signifiers such as the plaster mold of the body. These efforts also attempt to reverse the shift the reader away from the ontic to optic to further the distance between bodies. Escott imagines that space between his body and that of the invisible thing collapsing and being forced to deal with the ontic presence.[45]

As with all of his attempts to mediate the shock of touching the invisible thing, O'Brien and his narrator must remain with the story of an unaccountable thing. The invisible body is not just the debts, which haunt the imaginary Robert Schuyler; it is a body that forces Escott, O'Brien, and the reader to recognize themselves in it. The boundaries, as McLean writes, between the self and world as well as the modern now and achronistic alterity collapse in the touch between the invisible body and the observer at the point of mediation. O'Brien—who eschews his Irishness and in particular separates himself from the "wretches" of the Irish Famine—must grapple with the terrifying similarity between his self and the famished body. O'Brien, as with Schuyler and the British who characterize the Irish as savage, cannot escape the collapsing space of capitalism, where despite his best efforts he is no different than the Famine victims.

The Panics of 1837 and 1857 revolved around questions of materiality and immateriality: immaterial speculations over material public lands, paper versus hard money, and the spectrality of American Indians and blacks. In 1857, many of the contemporary responses to the revulsion pointed not to this immateriality, but the

---

[45] In the longer form of this article, I explore O'Brien's invisible body in relationship to the Irish Famine of his past. The Invisible body, I argue emerges from the discourse of famine imagery and shows the primal and temporally anachronistic nature of the "famished bodies" of Famine victims and O'Brien's invisible thing.

public's panic in the face of immateriality. Ann Fabian quotes Henry Ward Beecher's response to the Panic of 1857: "'the whole continent is unstrung by nothing but fear,' and that what 'the country wants now is *manliness*'" (131). The manly body indicates a response to immateriality through material embodiment. In her summary of the two Panics, Fabian observes the moralized responses as people tried to find a reason for the economic revulsions. Some of these responses, she argues, point to the immaterial and thus ungodly nature of economics: "Behind the 'utterly fictitious' prices of manic euphoria stood the 'reality' of gold and silver, but even metallic value was mere fiction to the mind of God" (134). Like Poe, O'Brien embraces paper as the means of terror in his writing. Where Poe emphasizes the material reality of those involved in the exchange of paper texts, O'Brien calls the materiality of those bodies into question.

O'Brien's text poses two questions: "What do you consider to be the greatest element of Terror?" and "What was it?" The body of the invisible thing offers an answer of sorts, but only through its ontic presence. The final segment of the story deals with the almost comically mundane (in comparison to the terror of the body's appearance) question of: what does one do with the body of an invisible monster? It refuses to eat and it cannot speak. The final enigma of the story, then, is not the protagonists' inability to discover what the thing is. Rather, it is being faced with the domesticated helplessness shared between themselves and the thing. They bury the monster unceremoniously as Escott describes, "It was a strange funeral, the dropping of that viewless corpse into the damp hole" (93). Terror, in O'Brien's story, comes to its end so quietly and eerily, with none of the violence and teeth-gnashing of the story's middle portion. It is to suggest the most terrifying thing, the anxiety of post-Panic revulsions is the recognition of one's own

helplessness, one's invisible and monstrous self being buried in a damp hole. The paper textuality of "What Was It?"' is the encounter with the invisible body that forces the self-recognition of one's own spectrality. If the Panic of 1857 was caused by a "mismanagement or fear," then O'Brien suggests that capitalism itself is a quixotic attempt to manage terror, to maintain the illusion of the reality and materiality of bodies.

Chapter Three

"Up-To-Date With a Vengeance": *Dracula* and Prosthetic Bodies of Text

I. A Textual Body

Early in Bram Stoker's *Dracula* one of the novel's protagonists, Jonathan Harker, makes it clear that this is not a story of humans versus a monster; it is a battle of temporalities. Harker sits at the oak desk in a dusty room in Dracula's castle and writes:

> Here I am, sitting at a little oak table where in old times possibly some fair lady sat to pen, with much thought and many blushes, her ill-spelt love-letter, and writing in my diary in shorthand all that has happened since I closed it last. It is nineteenth century up-to-date with a vengeance. And yet, unless my senses deceive me, the old centuries had, and have, powers of their own which mere 'modernity' cannot kill. (40-1)

Harker has recently discovered that he is captive in Dracula's Transylvanian castle. Dracula leaves the castle and, in his absence, Harker explores the places forbidden to him. Previously, the Englishman has described himself as feeling like "a rat" and "a baby" in his frantic helplessness (31). However, in this scene he feels a particular kinship with some fair maiden of a past era. Harker's sympathy or kinship, though, registers as an anxiety over the proximity of the feelings that accompany the anachronistic invasion of his thoughts. He opposes what he views as his and his diary's modernity to the pastness of the lady. This reveals an anxiety over anachronistic feeling that poses a threat to modernity.

Critics of *Dracula* have always obsessed over the body of the vampire. Most often this obsession has been sexual in nature.[46] Friedrich Kittler laments the pervasive and "endless talk of sex and crime in the novel. Whether vampires are more likely to be anally or orally sadistic, whether Stoker's wife was frigid, and whether or not his morals are Victorian—this and nothing else concerns interpreters" (157). It should surprise no one that critics dwell upon *Dracula*'s sexuality since the novel effuses with intensely sexual imagery. Not all *Dracula* criticism, however, has focused on its sexual imagery. For example, David Seed's 1985 "The Narrative Method of *Dracula*" directed critics to examine its mode of textual production. And Friedrich Kittler's attention to the technological production of the novel in his 1982 "*Dracula*'s Legacy" led to greater attention over the last few decades to the novel's deep involvement with media.

However, for all the attention paid to the bodily anxieties of sexuality, gender, and otherness in *Dracula,* there has remarkably never been a study of Stoker's novel which significantly emphasized its treatment of temporality. In the aforementioned writing scene, writing becomes a mediation of time, a weapon against anachronism, while at the same time revealing the vulnerability of modern temporality. Harker imagines that modernity might try (but fail) to kill off the past. *Dracula* has been at times labeled gothic, Victorian, or modernist, but for most its periodization is liminal and hybridized. Jennifer Wicke argues this liminality is an encounter of temporality where "a modernist writing begins" (492). That is, the novel itself is a negotiation of temporality, a bloody exchange between the anachronistic and the synchronic. However, critical discussions of

[46] These studies of sexuality in the novel have often dealt with the conflict between horror and sexual perversion, such as the now canonical studies of Christopher Craft, Phyllis Roth, and Christopher Bentley. In addition, the novel's sexuality has been discussed in terms of late Victorian and *Fin de Siècle* social norms, such as the work of Kathleen Spencer.

the novel's temporality is mostly limited to its external qualities—its periodization rather than its internal concepts of time. *Dracula* criticism continually refers to the anxiety in the text and I argue that these anxieties are figured temporally and that anxiety and temporality inform one another.[47] *Dracula* is a novel which turns its anxieties into externalized phenomena of time, while simultaneously being a novel about anxieties over the nature of temporal phenomena. The novel reflects modernism's engagement and rejection of the past only to show the ways in which this rejection draws attention to the persistence of anachronism in modernism. By treating *Dracula*'s unexcavated engagements with time, we can also understand the larger modernist struggle against the atavistic literary tradition of the Victorians. In the novel, bodies of texts become the contested externalizations of anachronism.

Here I Am

Let us return to Harker, sitting at the dusty oak desk and writing in his diary. His entry opens with the phrase—*Here I am*—in which Harker emphasizes his presentness. He writes in the moment. Or, as another famous letter-writer once described it, he writes "to the moment." For a modern narrator, Harker certainly reminds us of those archetypal epistolary narrators of Samuel Richardson. Pamela and Clarissa, too, were imprisoned. They, too, had their letters read. They, too, used their narration as a means of maintaining

---

[47] The term most critics use in regards to this novel is "anxiety" rather than fear, horror, or any other term. One does not typically think of a blood-sucking monster as causing anxiety. Anxiety seems more suited to social situations, to being ill-at-ease in an environment. Nicholas Daly coined the phrase "anxiety theory," in his *Modernism, Romance, and the Fin de Siècle*, to describe the embodiment of threats to social order in a particular character. Joan Copjec discusses anxiety in *Dracula* at length and her concept is relevant here because it demonstrates the novel's fear as primarily temporal: "anxiety signals a lack of lack, a failure of the symbolic reality wherein all alienable objects, objects which can be given or taken away, lost and refound, are constituted and circulate" (26).

their sanity as well as reasserting some sort of agency over their captors.[48] *Here I am*—the gesture of asserting one's presentness—the temporal quality of bodily presence—is always empty. After he has written it, the moment has passed him by. But the text on the page orthographically stands in for him, creating a prosthetic double on the page. His double now asserts presence for him and returns his language. *Here I am* is not just a momentary register of a feeling or thought, but a continued assertion. His text persistently asserts itself, reassuring Harker that the text is still there, but also that he continues through that text. Harker looks down at what he has just written and the double speaks back like a figure in a mirror. From this point, the orthographic double becomes a weapon to fight the vampire. Dracula has no image in a mirror and casts no shadow. He has no textual double, yet.

Where in old times possibly some fair lady sat—possibly, he says. Harker has already expressed his increasing fears for his life and the feeling of being trapped. That he sits at a desk for a moment and imagines the possibility of a lady seems extraordinary. She is fair, he thinks, picturing her beauty.[49] *With much thought and many blushes*—the details of her beauty and modest blushes seems a luxury at odds with his fears. This lady certainly doesn't resemble his fiancée, Mina, who we witness later writing letters in her journalistic shorthand. Mina is a modern woman, one who writes with precision and clarity, not with blushes. *Her ill-spelt love-letter*—ill-spelt? This strikes me not only as

---

[48] Alison Case in her reading of Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa* notes that the epistolary narrator is unaware of their role as "plotter" (in both sense of the words), since "the ordering principle of the story as narrative must be presumed to lie elsewhere than with the consciousness through whom we perceive the story. The question the reader is faced with is not just 'what is the telos of this plot,' but 'whose plot is this?'" (23). Harker, too, controls only what he can assert through his journal, which will eventually gain power through Mina's editorial control of it. This is one among many examples where *Dracula* reverses its gender roles through its textuality.

[49] Peter Garrett, in *Gothic Reflections*, argues that this is the beginning of Harker's feminization by aligning himself with her, a feminization which has been observed by others such as Christopher Craft (125).

bizarre, but as oddly detailed. This, too, feels like a direct contrast to Mina, who we cannot imagine frantically sending a sloppy letter. Mina's letter to Lucy in Chapter IX stands in stark contrast to this imaginary lady. In this letter, Mina recounts her hurried journey to Budapest with an even tone. Though she is traveling to see her hospitalized fiancé, there is nothing about her letter that suggests being "ill-spelt" or written "with blushes." Instead, she recounts the moment afterwards in a far less effusively "feminine" tone: "I could only tell him that I was the happiest woman in all the wide world, and that I had nothing to give him except myself, my life, and my trust, and that with these when my love and duty for all the days of my life" (100-1).

Rather than resembling Mina, Harker's imaginary woman carries more likeness to the other woman of the text, Mina's friend, and the woman who many of the other protagonists court, Lucy Westenra. Twelve days after Harker writes *Here I am*, Lucy writes to Mina: "Here am I, who shall be twenty in September, and yet I never had a proposal till today, not a real proposal, and today I have had three. Just fancy! THREE proposals in one day! Isn't it awful! I feel sorry, really and truly sorry, for two of the poor fellows" (57). She begins with an assertion of presence almost identical to Harker's. However, Lucy fixes herself further in a particular present as a woman of a particular age who has just transitioned from single to engaged. In addition, those proposals triangulate her presence, fixing it in society (particularly between the very different suitors of the Lord, the scientist, and the Texas). Lucy also writes the way Harker imagines his fair lady to write; the language is effusive and excited, dotted with exclamation marks. She, too, notes that her tears have been falling upon the pages of her letter: "Oh, Mina dear, I can't help crying; and you must excuse this letter being all blotted" (58). If the woman Harker

imagines in this scene is Lucy is it because of a specific desire for Lucy, or a woman from the past who resembles Lucy, or that Lucy embodies certain archetypal characteristics of that woman?[50] What leads him to these thoughts? Do they reveal secrets desires? Are these even Harker's desires? The appearance of the three vampires moments later might lead us to believe that he is being hypnotized or that these images are invading his mind.[51]

Harker's train of thought begins with the emphasis of presentness, but immediately he gets pulled into anachronism. If we erase the mentions of the lady, his sentence reads: "Here I am, sitting at a little oak table… and writing in my diary in shorthand all that has happened since I closed it last." Harker conflates time and space in this sentence in the doubling of his presentness: *here*—space—*I am*—time. Doing so, he asserts his presence (spatial) and presentness (temporal). But the lady cleaves the presence/present as she does his sentence. He imagines that she, too, sat here, writing. And in his imagination she, too, was an "I am" here. In the dusty space of the abandoned castle room, anachronism persists, invading Harker's thoughts as it bifurcates his presentness. Moments later, he will think about the power of "modernity," a power undermined in these sentences. Harker's assertion of presentness can last no longer than nine words before anachronism interrupts.

It is nineteenth century up-to-date with a vengeance. What does Harker mean by this? The "it" here refers to the diary, written in short-hand. Harker believes the mode of textual production (shorthand) asserts its own presentness. It is a modern writing-form, a

---

[50] Regardless of how we answer this question, the similarity brings us back to the connection between this imaginary woman and the archetypes of Pamela and Clarissa.
[51] Later, we will discuss the telepathic connection Dracula maintains with Mina, but this is another possible example of one's mind being overtaken by the thoughts of another.

textual mode unavailable to the imaginary lady. The shorthand symbols mark a presence/presentness that his body cannot. The comment makes the orthographic and prosthetic body created by the diary primarily a temporal body, a body up-to-date *with a vengeance*. The hyperbolic addition of vengeance indicates that its temporality is in opposition to something else; the now does battle with the not-now. It also presupposes its own reactionary nature, that the first blow has been struck by anachronism. *And yet*: a hitch—this battle is not so simple. *Unless my senses deceive me*: Harker has not just imagined the lady. His senses, not his brain or reason, interrupt his thoughts. Which senses he does not say, but the anachronism of the lady is something he feels.

The old centuries had, and have: anachronism persists. Something about the lady's body or Harker's body forces Harker to acknowledge that those old centuries continue to the moment he writes. They cannot be cordoned off into the category of not-now-ness. *Powers of their own.* This phrase clarifies his previous comment about the diary being *up-to-date with a vengeance*. By being up-to-date, the diary apparently has powers much like the apparitional body of the lady. The diary does battle with powers of the old centuries embodied in the lady. *Which mere 'modernity' cannot kill*. Harker interchanges his phrases of presentness: "nineteenth century," "up-to-date," and "modernity." These not only coexist with and do battle with, but now they are meant to kill the persistent anachronistic body. The powers Harker fears belong to the forlorn lady who invades his thoughts. Despite her seemingly harmlessness, he fears the powers of anachronism. Why? What does he fear so much that he wants his modernity to kill her? Or is this even his desire? Does modernity require itself to be figured in opposition to the anachronistic woman?

Anachronistic Bodies

Any assertion of *Dracula*'s modernity or status as a modernist text must deal with the purported untimely figure at the center of the novel—the aristocratic, ancient vampire who lives in a dilapidated castle. Dracula describes himself not so much through anachronism as much as atavism. He boasts, "In our veins flows the blood of many brave races who fought as the lion fights, for lordship" (33). He continues by listing the heroic deeds of his ancestors and connects himself to these triumphs as present through the shared bloodline, saying "This was Dracula indeed!" Dracula conceives of his embodiment through the circulation and abundance of blood. He laments "Blood is too precious a thing in these days of dishonourable peace; and the glories of the great races are as a tale that is told" (35). That is, Dracula's sense of the past fabulates his blood by presenting it as a text through his the blood-atavism remains present.

Harker (and later his fellow protagonists) reads and narrates Dracula's body and blood differently. To him, Dracula is anachronism. Dracula surrounds himself in antiques and "worn and frayed and moth-eaten" rooms, which are filled with out of date newspapers (25). After Dracula finishes telling the "story of his race," Harker makes a memorandum to himself: "this diary seems horribly like the beginning of the 'Arabian Nights,' for everything has to break off at cock-crow—or like the ghost of Hamlet's father" (33, 35).[52] In this second association, Harker invokes what could be considered *the* literary figure of anachronism. Jacques Derrida famously used the ghost of Hamlet's

---

[52] Harker's slip between *Arabian Nights* and *Hamlet* also indicates the way in which Dracula's anachronism is embedded within his oriental otherness. For more on this postcolonial Dracula, see Stephen Arata's "The Occidental Tourist: 'Dracula' and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization."

father as a key figure for understanding Hauntology. Specifically, the ghost represents the puncturing of the present through the sudden appearance of anachronism.[53] Derrida calls it, “the disjointure in the very presence of the present… non-contemporaneity of present time within itself” (*Specters* 29). Harker invokes such an anachronism to think of Dracula, an aristocrat who lives in a setting of other anachronisms: superstitions, peasants, and castles.

The conflict here is over how Dracula and Harker imagine embodied temporality. Dracula presents himself as the continued circulation of a living text. For him, blood and time are inclusive and in flux as he emphasizes the continued presence of his ancestors: “in our veins flows the blood of many brave races” (33). That inclusivity incorporates the bodies of others into his body, conceiving of time through the internalization of the external. Harker on the other hand defines Dracula through the embodied otherness of temporality. When he describes the old, decayed surroundings of the vampire for example, he says, “I saw something like them in Hampton Court, but…” (25). In the out-of-date magazines and newspapers as well, Harker displays an understanding of time as bifurcated by pastness and the past’s opposition to presentness. Both assert their own concepts of synchrony, but while Dracula uses his to create a shared sense of temporality, Harker must think of his synchrony through opposition to pastness.

Harker’s conception of time finds its apotheosis in the scene where he imagines the fair woman from long ago. He refers to writing in his diary as “up-to-date with a vengeance,” indicating that this particular mediality of his thoughts represents a specific temporality of now-ness. The “powers of their own” which Harker ascribes to the past are

---

[53] Interestingly enough, the period of hauntology, what Martin Jay referred to as “The Uncanny Nineties,” largely ignored *Dracula*’s central anachronism.

those which push him into familiarity with imaginary women. The women and the past represent feelings, passions, and will begin a simplified binary that will carry out through the rest of the novel; to be up-to-date means rationality and to be anachronistic means effusive passion. Harker's experiences attack his rational mind as he says, "Let me be calm for out of that way lies madness indeed." He goes on to add, "I turn to my diary for repose. The habit of entering accurately must help sooth me" (41). This scene sets the stage for the rest of the novel's conflict, where media become the mode of negotiation and attack between the binary of synchrony and anachrony.

Body of Evidence

Since David Seed's 1985 study of *Dracula*'s narrative method, Stoker's critics have become increasingly drawn to the novel's technological assemblage of the narrative. Seed was the first to comprehensively examine *Dracula*'s usage of a fragmented and collated narrative in contrast to its more famous antecedent, Wilkie Collins's *The Woman in White*. Collins's novel announces its own editorial production:

> The plan he has adopted for presenting the story to others, in the most truthful and most vivid manner, requires that it should be told, at each successive stage in the march of events, by the persons who were directly concerned in those events at the time of their occurrence. (128)

Stoker mimics this in the preface of *Dracula*:

> How these papers have been placed in sequence will be made manifest in the reading of them. All needless matters have been eliminated, so that a history almost at variance with the possibilities of later-day belief may stand forth as

> simple fact. There is throughout no statement of past things wherein memory may err, for all the records chosen are exactly contemporary, given from the standpoints and within the range of knowledge of those who made them. (5)

Collins's novel created a model for the manipulation of the narrative assemblage as a mode of the textual performance of the novel's central mystery. The two texts intertwine the narrative forms with their truthfulness, but as Seed notes, in *Dracula* the pattern of events emerges throughout the story rather than at the end of the novel. Seed writes that "Dracula narrates its own textual assembly" as its protagonists self-consciously draw attention to the narrative qua narrative as well as its various technical modes (73). However, *Dracula*'s technical production has always been part of the discussion surrounding it even if, as Seed observes, the novel's teeming sexuality has been the dominant focus.

Orson Welles, in his 1938 radio production of *Dracula*, foregrounds the narrative's pastiche as central to the story's meaning and effect.[54] In this version, Arthur Seward addresses the audience directly: "I have here certain documents, telegrams, clippings from the press of the day, memoranda, and letters from various hands. All needless matters have been eliminated, so the history almost at variance with the possibilities of contemporary belief may stand forth as simple fact."[55] Welles derives this radio preface from the novel's, but draws attention to the particular materiality of the texts from which he reads. For each version, the narrative mode is factual testimony that simultaneously steps into human perspective ("given from the standpoints and within the

---

[54] Welles's version is interesting because his adaptation for the radio drama is a further translation of the vampire into a new medium.

[55] Welles combines the roles of Jonathan Seward and Arthur Holmwood into Arthur Seward.

range of knowledge of those who made them"), while removing their human flaws. Memory, the preface tells us, can err, but this narrative will not because of its contemporaneity. *Dracula* opens by associating the assemblage of facts which are always true (timeless) but they are also distinctly within time, a persistent now-ness.

The novel's textual assembly consists of a body of texts, which continually emphasize their own temporality. The protagonists repeatedly temporalize their narrations, saying things such as "And so now, up to this very hour," "so here I am," or "She is calling to me" (208, 195, 285). Such comments elide the space between action and record so as to make the human narrators part of the transcription network. Bypassing the characters' memories objectifies those memories, so that while these are "standpoints," the perspectives are merely modes of transcribing the facts. They are depersonalized positions from which a reader may view the action. The reader also refers two both the diegetic readers in the text—who are the protagonists reading the texts—as well the reader of *Dracula*, the novel. The resulting body of texts becomes, as Mina explains, "the sum of our knowledge" (196). Mina produces copies of this body for all the others to read.[56]

The factual status of the body of texts referred to in the preface signals to the reader that *Dracula* is about bodies of evidence. Those bodies not only index phenomena, but present a paradigm that contradicts "later-day belief." Lucy Westenra's body is such a body for the protagonists. After Harker's narrative breaks off in Transylvania, the novel shifts to Lucy in Whitby, England. Lucy corresponds with Mina Murray (who will

---

[56] We have evidence that all the protagonists read the text except for Lord Godalming and Quincy Morris. Godalming, in fact, responds oddly to the text by turning it over in his hands, remarking upon its heft, then saying "I don't quite see the drift of it" (203). This is odd since he has not attempted to read it in the first place. This leads to a question: is Godalming illiterate?

become Mina Harker) about the trio of lovers who propose to her in one day and who will become part of the novel's group of protagonists: Dr. Jonathan Seward, the American Quincey Morris, and Arthur Holmwood (later Lord Godalming). Seward summons his mentor Professor Van Helsing as they puzzle over their inability to read the symptoms Lucy's body exhibits. Lucy's eventual death surprises everyone, except Van Helsing who can properly interpret the signs of the vampire.

Van Helsing, however, refuses to explain her death because he anticipates their disbelief. In an argument between mentor and mentee, Seward begs Van Helsing, "Tell me!... I have no data on which to found a conjecture" (170). Van Helsing responds by chastising him about the limits of "our science," saying, "There are always mysteries in life" (171).[57] Seward acknowledges the limits of his knowledge and so asks for a thesis, without which he says "I am going in my mind from point to point as a mad man" (172). Van Helsing explains that it is the body itself, not the preconceptions of a hypothesis, which Seward must approach.

The conflict between disbelief and belief repeats itself in a less scientific manner with Lord Godalming, who doubts Van Helsing when he hears that he must mutilate the body of his dead fiancée. Van Helsing can only point to Lucy's body as index of the vampiric phenomenon: "All I ask you now is that you come with me, that you look and listen" (184). Once Godalming sees Lucy's body he becomes convinced. Seward writes, "We all looked on in horrified amazement as we saw, when he stood back, the woman, with a corporeal body as read at the moment as our own" (189). That Lucy's body is real comes as no surprise, but Seward's comment here connects the corporeal presence of

[57] Later, I will discuss the role of psychical phenomena in this novel, but this is one of the few moments when phenomena such as astral bodies or telepathy are openly discussed.

Lucy's body to the reality of the vampiric phenomenon as described by Van Helsing. Lucy's is a textual body in which can be read vampirism, a body which Seward tells us has been authored by Dracula (193). In creating new bodies of the vampiric text, Dracula creates his own transcription network to rival that of the protagonists.

Throughout *Dracula* texts supplant the bodies of characters as "bodies of evidence," which do not refer back to the originals, but replace them. Dracula forces Harker to send letters back to England falsely reporting his journey home. He writes, "Last night one of my post-dated letters went to post, the first of that fatal series which is to blot out the very traces of my existence from the earth" (49). These letters attest to the movements of his false body, a double created by their falsity. He worries here that the false double will erase his own body and he will be forgotten in Transylvania. Previous to this, Dracula has dressed as Harker and walked into the village to give the false impression that Harker had posted the letters. He laments: "This, then, is his new scheme of evil: that he will allow others to see me, as they think, so that he may both leave evidence that I have been seen in the towns or villages posting my own letters, and that any wickedness which he may do shall by the local people be attributed to me" (47). Both Dracula and the letters are imposters, but the false attribution of Harker's body posting the letters gives authority to the equally false letters.

Textual bodies act as body doubles, sometimes more authoritative than human bodies. As the protagonists become a cohesive unit, they circulate texts to become acquainted with one another. Seward presents Mina with his phonographic cylinders so she "will know [him] better" (196). This portion of his audio diary carries no relevance to Lucy's death, but he presents them as a window to his true self. Likewise, after Van

Helsing reads through Mina Harker's initial compilation of letters and diary, he sarcastically says, "I have read your diary that you have so goodly written to me…. I, who have read your so sweet letter to poor Lucy… not know you!" (165). Later, Van Helsing tells Harker that he knows the man "from the knowing of others; but I have seen your true self since last night" (169). In this last example, Van Helsing knows another person not only from understanding his relationship to other bodies, but has seen something more "true" in Harker from reading the textual bodies about him. These texts represent something more authoritative through their factual contemporaneity.

Dracula sets these texts in opposition to the bodily senses. Harker, who has already experienced a shock in Transylvania tells Van Helsing that "I did not know what to trust, even the evidence of my own senses" (168). Early in his adventure in the castle, Harker suffers a crisis of belief through his experiences. Harker opens his diary entry for May 12th with: "Let me begin with facts—bare, meager facts, verified by books and figures, and of which there can be no doubt" (35).[58] He contrasts these facts (unadorned with excess language) with the untrustworthiness of his own sensorial experience: "I must not confuse them with experiences which will have to rest on my own observation or memory of them" (35-6). Here, he appeals to a de-personalized and external way of approaching Dracula and the castle. However, nothing which follows can be verified by any other source. He presents no books and no figures that could possibly serve as verification. Instead, Harker appeals to the external source of his own text as the

[58] Though the novel refers to these entries as from "Jonathan Harker's journal," Harker never refers to it as such. He refers to it as a diary, while Mina later calls it his journal, exhibiting the editorial control she has over the text. While diary did not some of the more personal and emotive connotations of contemporary English, in the late nineteenth century it still indicated a more personal perspective than the more business-oriented journal.

empirical and de-personalized perspective. If all he had to present was his own bodily experiences, he would be untrustworthy, but it is as if the doubled perspective of the textual body (in the form of the diary) can testify as a second witness. In claiming to begin with "facts," then, he misleads himself (or pretends) that his text is in fact an unadorned self-evident thing.

The Non-Human Modern

In his 1991 *We Have Never Been Modern*, Bruno Latour traces a particular concept of modernity to a seventeenth-century argument over the status of evidence in politics and science. Latour conceives of modernity through an opposition between nature and society. It is specifically the epistemological basis of authority that can help us understand temporal bodies in *Dracula*. Modernity is built, Latour says, upon three paradoxes: that nature surpasses human construction, but can be replicated and constructed in the laboratory; that society is a construction, but remains outside human control; and that the two—nature and society—do not intermingle. The first two paradoxes create hybridity, but the third "renders of the work of mediation that assembles hybrids invisible, unthinkable, unrepresentable" (34).

The first paradox of nature relies upon a particularly modern shift in attitudes toward the concept of evidence. Latour quotes Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer's observations that 17th century penal law and biblical exegesis depended upon "the multiplication of witnesses [to allow] 'a concurrence of such probabilities" of moral certainty" (22). Physicist Robert Boyle translates this usage of evidence to the contemporary research laboratory, relying upon the authority of "scholars, monks, jurist

and scribes" (23).[59] Again quoting Shapin and Schaffer, Latour notes Boyle's new category of evidence which relies upon non-human authority:

> The pressure of the water in our recited experiment [on the diver's bell] having manifest effects upon inanimate bodies, which are not capable of prepossessions, or giving us partial informations, will have much more weight with unprejudiced persons, than the suspicious, and sometimes disagreeing accounts of ignorant divers, whom prejudicate opinions may much sway, and whose very sensations, as those of other vulgar men… they may easily give occasion to mistakes. (23).

Latour argues that modernity substitutes the non-human bodies that populate the laboratory for the premodern authority of human experts. These new bodies have no prepossessed ideas, do not suffer from incomplete knowledge, and most importantly do not possess the sensations of "vulgar men."

Boyle's scientist takes a modern posture toward the non-human objects which testify to the truth of nature in the laboratory. Latour writes, "In themselves, facts are mute; natural forces are brute mechanisms. Yet the scientists declare that they themselves are not speaking; rather the facts speak for themselves." The diver's bell of Boyle's description, then, takes the witness stand. It makes the case for the prosecution by pointing to itself. Latour continues: "Little groups of gentlemen take testimony from natural forces, and they testify to each other that they are not betraying but translating the silent behavior of objects" (29). There is an ironic swap of agency in this interchange. The scientist, who speaks, hypothesizes, interprets, and asserts, is mute; the equipment speaks. It points to itself as self-evident. The effect of the experiment registers upon the

---

[59] Boyle footnote reading Sarah Rivett.

body of the equipment and the equipment then points to that effect as material evidence of the phenomena being studied.

Latour's reading of modernity does not consist of periodicity or the cordoning off of particular historical moments.[60] Instead, Latour provides a model of modernity as a process of externalizing phenomena as a method of control that successive generations will employ. Those particular moderns of the Transatlantic *Fin de Siècle* master this process. We observe the modern method of exteriorization in Boyle's "inert bodies, incapable of will and bias but capable of showing, signing, writing, and scribbling on laboratory instruments before trustworthy witnesses" (23). Boyle's modern laboratory consists of orthographic witnesses. Phenomena write upon those instruments—signing, writing, scribbling—for the scientific witness to merely report. The modern process exists in the empirical reaction to these inert bodies, making the scientist and modern a passive respondent to the truth of physical and universal laws. Laboratory equipment becomes inert *bodies* which in turn become quasi-mystics, the reveal the truth of the word through the inscriptions upon their medial bodies.

In Latour's reading, modernity emerges, however, not through the shift from scripture and classical texts to scientific bodies, but through the exegetical network of the laboratory. Latour asks the question: "If science is based not on ideas but on a practice… if it takes place within the private space of the experimental community, then how does it reach 'everywhere'?" (24). The answer is in the extension of the proliferation of the practice of the modern laboratory. Modernity spreads through the multiplication of a homogenized laboratory, through the mass production of the inert bodies which register

[60] In addition, Latour's modernity predates the historical moment of modernism by centuries.

phenomena. As the diver's bell, the microscope, the thermometer become standardized so does the exegetical process of interpreting their signs, writings, and scribbles.

Inert Bodies

As with Latour's modernity, *Dracula*'s protagonists assert their power in the novel through inert bodies, specifically textual bodies. They attribute the power of the cohesive textual body, which makes up the novel to the arrangement of parts. Van Helsing remarks that one of the protagonists' greatest weapons is their "power in combination" (210). This combination provides the narrative with its promise of depersonalized testimony. Returning to the Preface, we remember the assurance that "There is throughout no statement of past things wherein memory may err, for all the records chosen are… given from the standpoints… of those who made them." *Dracula* replaces its human protagonists with the non-human and inert bodies of their texts.

The non-human witnesses of the text are themselves products of modernity. Jennifer Wicke describes the spread of the elements of the "modern office" throughout *Dracula* in the language of the text. Shorthand, she argues is "the modern, or mass cultural, cryptogram," a modern consumptive process that flows through the reader (471). It also add to the constitution of a modern workplace environment which surrounds the protagonists. Wicke calls this environment, "the rationalization (in Weber's sense) of the procedures of bureaucracy and business, the feminization of the clerical work force, the standardization of mass business writing" (471). Wicke specifically focuses upon shorthand as designating modernity through textuality, but *Dracula* is composed by various textual bodies: newspaper clippings, a travel diary (with memoranda for future

use), a diary written in shorthand, a scientific case log recorded on a phonograph which is then transcribed, letters between friends, forged letters, business letters, misspelled and dirty letters, a ship's log, a medical report, manifold (like carbon paper), telegrams, and memoranda.

The variety of textual sources speaks to the mundane transmission of information. For example, Harker uses a "dirty scrap of paper… written with a carpenter's pencil in a sprawling hand," to find the man who helped Dracula move his boxes (230). This dirty scrap of paper, it seems, is of little consequence to the narrative. However, it is part of the bureaucratic paper trail that leads the protagonists (and the readers) to Dracula.[61] Kittler remarks that the means of *Dracula*'s textual production is "the written account of our bureaucratization" (164). The details by which they track down the vampire synchronize the characters by utilizing the ordinary fragments which make up modern life. These fragments are also part of the replication of the modern office space. Like Boyle's laboratory, *Dracula*'s office is a network which processes information through non-human bodies. The shift from laboratory to office also signals the change of modernity. Whereas the modernity Latour describes at first emerges from ontological questions of nature in the laboratory, a turn to the modernity of the office marks the shift to the banal, inert bodies of capitalism.

The modern office of *Dracula* consists of the arrangement of parts, including the protagonists themselves. When the protagonists sit down to decide upon a plan of attack, they assemble in the form of a late nineteenth-century "board of committee" (208). The

---

[61] This paper trail resembles our own contemporary anxieties over internet footprints by which corporations and governments track our movements and know about us. But as we will see later, *Dracula* differs in that the protagonists eventually create a new body for Dracula.

board meeting is complete with Mina acting as a secretary, the members voting, and a taking of inventory. Van Helsing summarizes the protagonists' assets: "the power of combination… resources of science; we are free to act and think; and the hours of day and night are ours equally. In fact, so far as our powers extend, they are unfettered, and we are free to use them. We have self-devotion in a cause, and an end to achieve which is not a selfish one." The protagonists constellate themselves as part of the "much data" Van Helsing believes will eventually lead to their victory" (213). It is only through sharing information about Dracula that they can eventually conquer him.

The modern process of the office directs away from the texts' relationships to humans. The carpenter's pencil and sprawling hand only enter the text through Harker's remarks and being misled by its misspellings. At other times, the primary texts carry other traces of the human bodies as in the case of the phonograph. When Mina listens to Seward's phonograph diary, she says, "It told me, in its very tones, the anguish of your heart. It was like a soul crying out to almighty God" (197). Mina transfers the agency of the report away from Seward, whose voice and anguish she has listened to, and onto the "hollow cylinders of metal covered with dark wax" (196). The phonograph is the laboratory equipment of the modern workplace. Edison boasted, "It will retain a perfect mechanical memory of many things which we may forget, even though we have said them" ("Perfected Phonograph" 649-50). His description closely resembles Boyle's description of the laboratory's inanimate bodies "which are not capable of prepossessions, or giving us partial information, will have much more weight with unprejudiced persons."[62]

---

[62] This also reminds us that there is an additional step to the response to the anachronistic. First, the modern externalizes the phenomenon through the shift to the conditions of the modern laboratory. Then, Edison

The protagonists replace themselves with the prosthetic bodies of the texts they create. These new inert bodies stand in for their own feeling, flawed bodies. When Mina listens to Seward's audio diary, she describes its transmission of feelings. The phonograph is a prosthetic that feels, unlike the various bodies of text in *Dracula* which seem to buffer the reader from feelings. It carries the "very tones" of Seward's body, putting Mina in contact with them as if they had just come from Seward's own mouth. She writes that she has heard his heart beating through those tones, collapsing the space between Seward's autonomic functions, his emotions, his voice, and finally his words. All of these congeal into the singular audio recording of the phonograph. Mina also describes the phonograph's inherent truthfulness. Edison once speculated that "It would be even worth while to compel witnesses in court to speak directly into the phonograph, in order to thus obtain an unimpeachable record of their testimony" ("Phonograph and its Future" 533 *sic*). And while the phonograph does act as another inert body of evidence, Mina describes its truthfulness in relationship to Seward himself. She calls the instrument "cruelly true" not because of the content of the testimony, but for the degree to which it is an exact copy of the original. The phonograph carries the "very tones" of Seward's original body. Mina's surprise, then, registers the inert body's ability to so perfectly stand in for the living human body.

When Kittler reads *Dracula*, he observes the ways in which text-become-technological works to kill the vampire. He writes, "the hand-written diary, as soon as it is hooked up to phonographs and type writers, autopsies and newspaper reports, will kill the Lord of the East and the Night, leaving him only the miserable immortality granted

---

offers the paradigmatic example of the laboratory's subsequent shift to the externalization of the self through alienation.

the hero of a novel" (148). In this scene, modern technology translates modern technology. Even so, Kittler writes that to translate in the novel is to "replace the Id with an Ego, to replace violence with technology" (149). Kittler emphasizes the text's technology for its timelessness. He writes, "Only machines are capable of storing the real of and beyond all speech" (168). *Dracula* is the record of phenomena, the storage of all existing data on the vampire, and Kittler sees the failure of speech to account for him.

Kittler's notion of storage resembles Bernard Stiegler's account of the orthographic exteriorization of memory. Stiegler's concept of *epiphylogenesis* provides a model for understanding this process of production. As Stiegler argues, human evolution occured through an orthographic and tertiary mode of memory. The development of writing began this process because it "liberates a new possibility of access to the past, configures properly historical temporality" (12). The human can no longer think without written language. This and other forms of exteriorizing human temporality are technics, which "thinks *before* us, being always already there before us, insofar as there is a being before us; the *what* precedes the premature *who*, has always already pre-ceded it" (32). One cannot read *Dracula* except through its "mass of type-writing" and its technological means of production.

The specific modernity of *Dracula* and the Transatlantic *Fin de Siècle* consists of the externalization of temporal phenomena. Mina bases her collation of the texts on the chronology ("dates are everything") so as to create a "whole connected narrative" (198-9). She continually edits the text, keeping it up to date and then circulating the new texts. In effect, the new texts serve to synchronize the protagonists. The close relationship between the text and temporality means that to be up-to-date literally means to be

informed, so that knowledge is synchronic. *Dracula*'s network synchronizes the protagonists through the temporality of the inert textual bodies. These bodies can be characterized by their own technological modernity. Like *Dracula's* original critics who noted the "up-to-date-ness of the book," critics such as Wicke conflate the usage of technology *in* the text with the novel's status as the "first great *modern* novel in British literature" ("Recent Novels" 151; Wicke 467). Wicke's designation is as deceptively simple as the word itself. The word "modern" can refer to contemporaneity a segment of time that is spatially designated as in (or adjacent to) *now-ness*. Of course, Wicke later refers to *Dracula* as coming "at a crux that marks the modernist divide for both theory and literature" (468). *Dracula*'s modernity, then, refers also to a particular brand of modernity—literary and culture modernity. This literary and cultural modernism has been widely debated in the century following, but it is generally a stratum of cultural time designated by what Wyndham Lewis calls "the Reality of the Present" (11).

Wicke's modernity skips a groove as she reads *Dracula*. Reading *Dracula* next to its criticism reinforces the protagonists own efforts to externalize temporality in the text. The novel—like Wicke's modern office—becomes populated by temporal signifiers designating people, places, and objects as either belonging to modernity or being anachronistic intrusions into that modernity. When Wicke discusses the "modern office," modernity connotes a physical space composed by its temporality. A modern office is comprised of "the procedures of bureaucracy and business, the feminization of the clerical work force, the standardization of mass business writing" particular to end of the nineteenth-century Britain (471). These externalized signs designate the space's temporality. Similarly, Friedrich Kittler writes that Mina Harker uses "the technology of

democracy" which provides her with "the weapons of a new age" (154). Mina, too, becomes a symbol for modernity in her role as a "New Woman."[63] But even this embodiment of modernity often comes from external sources, such as her usage of technology and her profession.

Many critics have observed that the technological nature of the texts' production serves as a weapon to fight Dracula.[64] If texts such as the dirty scrap of paper represent the bureaucratic ordinary of the late nineteenth century, other fragments reveal their technological contemporaneity. Contemporary reviewers often noted the novel's technical mode of storytelling, such as the review in *The Pall Mall Gazette*: "Mr. Bram Stoker lays the main scenes of his tale in England and London, right up to date, with the type-writer, the phonograph, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the Zoo, and all the latest improvements complete. That is the way to make a horror convincing" ("For Midnight Reading"). Wicke observes that despite the novel's Gothic and anachronistic drapery, its "Nineteenth-century diaristic and epistolary effusion is invaded by cutting edge technology, in a transformation of the generic materials of the text into a motley fusion of speech and writing, recording and transcribing, image and typography" (470). Synchronization between the protagonists, then, occurs by the filtration of their experiences through technologically modern equipment.

Harker originally set the stage for synchrony becoming the weapon of choice against Dracula through his initial binary of anachrony equating to passion and primitive,

---

[63] Various critics such as Carol A. Senf have argued that Mina, in fact, is not a New Woman, but even Senf notes that she is a "modern woman" ("*Dracula*: Stoker's Response" 45).

[64] Christine Ferguson, for example, argues that the technological mix of non-standard English causes Dracula's downfall. Carol Senf (*Science and Social Science*), Kittler, and Wicke additionally argue that *Dracula*'s textual technicity leads to the defeat of vampirism.

base feelings versus the rationality of the modern. When Van Helsing assembles his board meeting, he lays out the assets of the modern protagonists against those of the anachronistic vampire. In contrast to the "resources of science," knowledge of Dracula exists in "traditions and superstitions" (210). Dracula's ability to reason pales in comparison to the protagonists, as Van Helsing repeatedly refers to his "child-brain" and contrasts it to the man-brains of the protagonists (279). Van Helsing even refers to Mina's intelligence by saying, "She has man's brain—a brain that a man should have were he much gifted" (207). The protagonists' downplaying of Dracula's intelligence seems at odds with vampire's ability to learn languages and his own voracious intellectual appetite.

The protagonists need to assert a different conception of intelligence and rationality, because they view textuality differently. Dracula views their opposition not as between the embodied passions versus rationality, because he puts the conflict in terms of competing intellects. Mocking Mina as he attacks her, he says, "You would play your brains against mine…. Whilst they played wits against me… I was countermining them" (252). However, the difference between the two sides is that the protagonists externalize temporality while Dracula embodies it. Early in the novel, as Dracula conflates his atavistic blood with presence and textuality, he does so with a particular intimacy. Dracula has spent years reading about England and planning his invasion through books. "Through them," he says, "I have come to know your great England; and to know her is to love her" (26). Only moments before Dracula tells Harker that as a city man, Harker cannot understand what it is like to be a hunter, but describes it by saying Harker "cannot

enter into the feelings of the hunter" (24). While knowledge creates intimacy between Dracula and England, he bemoans the limitation of textual mediation.

Dracula's conception of embodiment combines ontology and epistemology so that to know a thing is to join with it. When he thinks about what it means to know England, then, Dracula says, "I long to go through the crowded streets of your mighty London… to share its life, its change, its death, and all that makes it what it is" (26). The emphasis here is upon Dracula's previous conflation of circulation, vitality, and time. In another scene, Harker walks in to find Dracula laying upon a sofa, reading the English Bradshaw's Guide, a timetable of the English railways system. To know England, then, is to comingle with its circulatory vitality. That vitality is also particularly temporalized in the continued reiteration of the circulation of blood and texts. This is precisely what the protagonists fear most, the intimate comingling of temporality and embodiment. Dracula wants to overcome the mediation of textuality when he says, "Alas! As yet I only know your tongue through books" (26). The protagonists, on the other hand, continually believe that they will go mad without texts. Moreover, the protagonists counter Dracula through the externalization of temporality. They create a prosthetic double, which feels and comingles with nothing.

The proof of the textual substitution is in the seeming contradiction between the novel's ending and its preface. In the *Note* at the end of the novel, Harker observes that the text is almost completely composed of copied material. "Nothing but a mass of type-writing," he observes, "except the later notebooks" (326). The lack of authenticity makes their content less believable, he thinks. However, Van Helsing contradicts him, "We want no proofs; we ask none to believe us!" (327). This appears to contradict the novel's

preface which asserts the verity of the novel according to its composition: "All needless matters have been eliminated, so that a history almost at variance with the possibilities of later-day belief may stand forth as simple fact" (5). Does the preface ask for the belief which Van Helsing eschews? No, since this would require a testing a hypothesis, which Van Helsing previously warned Seward against. Rather, the body of the text, like Lucy Westenra's body, stands as the body of evidence of its own phenomenon. The vampiric threat of anachronism and base, primitive desire has been externalized and textualized; it is tamed and rationalized.

II. A Phenomenal Body

The modern laboratory puts human and non-human bodies in a network of causal relationships. For example, in the laboratory, the phenomenon being studied causes an effect upon an instrument, which then measures the phenomenon for the scientist who reads her instruments. The setting of the laboratory and the causal chain of events, create the repeatability that is the basis of empirical science. It also externalizes the phenomenon and extricates the scientific reader from the interpretive process. The reader herself can be swapped out for any other human body, which can read the instruments. The interpretive force of the laboratory comes from the setting and the causality in the relationship between bodies. By understanding the conflict between psychical research and the orthodoxy of *Fin de Siècle* empirical science, we can understand that this too is a battle staged over temporality, specifically the temporality of causality.

Psychical research, as it emerged at the end of the nineteenth century, responded to problems created by the modern laboratory even while it tried to work within the same

restraints.[65] Psychical phenomena such as telepathy, clairvoyance, or communication with the dead are inherently non-materialist as Edward Gurney expresses in his *Phantasms of the Living*: "The psychical element in man, I repeat, must henceforth almost inevitably be conceived as having relations which cannot be expressed in terms of matter" (1).[66] The modern laboratory cannot conceive of human and non-human interactions except through materiality. And yet, as Gurney and other psychical researchers bemoaned, there is a host of human experiences which seem to phenomenally escape physical experience.

The key difference between psychical research and the religion or superstition which psychical researchers wanted desperately to differentiate themselves from, depended upon mimicking the repeatability of the modern laboratory. To do this, the psychical researcher had to refigure the laboratory. Gurney writes, "Questions of mood, of goodwill, of familiarity, may hold the same place in psychical investigation as questions of temperature in a physical laboratory; and till this is fully realised, it will not be easy to multiply testimony to the extent that we should desire" (30). The compromise revolves around the tricky status of "materiality." While a theory of communicating with the dead may not be material in its dealing with substance, it is never the less of import to the material (physical) interaction of bodies, both human and non-human. Materiality, in the word's earliest instances forms a category opposed to the spiritual. What Gurney presents as important and yet disregarded by what he calls "the new orthodoxy of materialistic science," are concepts that deal with real, physical bodies such as mood or

---

[65] I am pretty sure now that this chapter will now come after a chapter on Henri Bergson, FWH Myers, and the rise of Psychical Research, so I am unsure how much I will need to give context here.

[66] *Phantasms of the Living* is one of the most comprehensive early studies of psychical phenomena and deals most with the phenomenon of telepathy.

familiarity (liv).[67] Gurney neither opposes his work to materialism ("Our prevalent temper is not so much *materialistic* as *agnostic*"), nor does he base it upon materialism (lvi). Rather, he follows the lead of Wilhelm Lundt, whom he quotes as saying, "It is not the psychical life…which is a product of the physical organisation; rather it is the physical organism which, in all those purposive adjustments which distinguish it from inorganic compounds, is itself a psychical creation." All that is material, then, derives itself from a "residue" of the psychical realm (xli).

The psychical research laboratory bases itself upon repeatability, but implicates the human body in its interpretive process in a way that the scientific laboratory doesn't. Gurney points out that the modern scientist uses the data of experiments to predict or prophesize future results, "The expert gets his cosmic prophecies accepted by pointing to the perpetual fulfilment of his minor predictions in the laboratory" (3). Psychical research, on the other hand, cannot predict its phenomena. Instead, it can only study probability. Gurney points out, "the first question for science is not whether the phenomena can be produced to order, but whether in a sufficient number of series the proportion of success to failure is markedly above the probable result of chance" (31). The example often cited (and parodied) is the experiment of Extrasensory Perception (ESP) in which the subject tries to guess the suit of a card being held up by the scientist. One cannot predict whether the subject of the experiment will exhibit ESP in a particular instance, which would set up a causal relationship (i.e. scientist hypothesizes the subject will exhibit ESP behavior under particular conditions). Instead, the emphasis upon

[67] Indeed, we can start to see the ways in which psychical research paved the way for the expansion of science into psychiatry in Sigmund Freud's thoughts on telepathy. Or, we can see the germs of Silvan Tomkins's affect theory as well.

probabilities sets up acausal relationships between the scientist, subject, and nonhuman objects (e.g. cards). The phenomenon will simply manifest itself in the subject's body at random.

Synchronicity

Half a century after the birth of psychical research, Carl Jung would treat the temporality of its research more explicitly with the development of his concept of "synchronicity."[68] He describes the concept as "a modern differentiation of the obsolete concept of correspondence, sympathy, and harmony" (*On Synchronicity* 995). The phenomenon to which the concepts of correspondence, sympathy, harmony, and finally Jung's synchronicity respond remains constant, specifically the interaction between human and nonhuman bodies in time. While Jung's concept is anachronistic to Stoker's novel, it responds to the particularly phenomenal experience of temporality which *Dracula* describes. The phenomenon Jung describes is more accurately a range of phenomenal experiences with temporality. Most importantly, Jung responds to phenomena of not only the human's psychic state, but its direct correlation to external bodies by thinking through the problem temporally.

Jung's synchronicity counters the predominance of causal relationships in modern science by conceiving of human/non-human interactions in acausal relationships. He describes the accumulation of data that contradict a strictly causal universe, writing, "When coincidences pile up in this way one cannot help being impressed by them—for

---

[68] The term "Synchronicity" is in and of itself an anachronism to *Dracula*, having not been coined until 1930 by Jung. He uses the term in his "Richard Wilhelm: In Memoriam," but it doesn't appear in print until 1952's *On Synchronicity*.

the greater the number of terms in such a series, or the more unusual its character, the more improbable it becomes" (*On Synchronicity* 971). Jung writes elsewhere that his concept replaces the previous concepts of correspondence, sympathy, and harmony, which are so caught up in *feeling* between bodies as thought supernaturally. Synchronicity replaces those concepts because Jung bases it in the empirical evidence of phenomena. Jung's replacement, however, continues to the basis for a phenomenal experience of temporality upon "impressions" and feelings. This is important, because Jung places the psychical experience of phenomena in such a physical context of the body. Not only does the body of the human who experiences these phenomena matter, but by emphasizing the centrality of impressions.

In a later letter, Jung describes phenomena in terms of the interaction between human and non-human bodies. He writes, "How does it come that even inanimate objects are capable of behaving as if they were acquainted with my thoughts" (*Jung on Synchronicity and the Paranormal* 35)? For Jung, synchronicity denotes the temporal contact between the psyche and the external world.[69] Temporality, whether causal or acausal, consists of the impressions made from the interaction between human and non-human bodies. As an example, he describes the correspondence between a patient who describes her dream of a scarab beetle and the sudden appearance of a beetle as she describes her dream. Here, the human and non-human appear synchronized in the coincidence. But Jung does not dismiss it as a coincidence: "Synchronicity designates the parallelism of time and meaning between psychic and psychophysical events, which

---

[69] In "The Psychological Foundations of Belief in Spirits," Jung describes the human psyche as "not an indivisible unity, but a more or less divided totality." He argues that these "psychic fragments" remain wholly distinct from the ego (81).

scientific knowledge so far has been unable to reduce to a common principle. The term explains nothing, it simply formulates the occurrence of meaningful coincidences which, in themselves, are chance happenings, but are so improbable that we must assume them to be based on some kind of principle, or on some property of the empirical world" (*On Synchronicity* 995). Synchronicity, then, implicates human and non-human bodies alike in a collective experience of time as simultaneous. However, Jung further indicates that non-human bodies behave "as if they were acquainted with [his] thoughts." That is, events occur out of the collective behavior of humans and non-humans alike.

Telepathy

When Sir Oliver Lodge first demonstrated wireless telegraphy in 1894, he introduced the concept of "syntony," or sympathetic resonance. By attuning two antennae, Lodge proved that messages could clearly transmit through the ether. During the previous decade of research, Lodge had developed syntony to attempt another sort of communication: telepathy. Like wireless telegraphy, Lodge describes telepathy as "a sympathetic connection" except with minds instead of antennae ("Thought Transference" 56). A central paradox of the late nineteenth century's scientific and technological boom is that it not only coincided with psychical research into unexplained phenomena, but that at times there was no separation between the two. Of the various tele-phenomena studied in *Fin-de-Siècle* physics, telepathy appeared as plausible to some researchers as the telephone, electrical induction, and wireless telegraphy.

Contemporary observers hailed the telegraph's ability to draw together disparate segments of the world, calling it the "annihilation of time and space" ("Syrian Route"

513).[70] Telegraphy allowed for not just communication over vast distances, but as it developed it catalyzed the standardization of time in the decades after the 1847 introduction of Greenwich Mean Time. However, it was the later unmooring from land and cable with wireless telegraphy that seemingly removed the *Fin-de-siècle* imagination's constraints by entering the ether. One observer envisioned the wireless telegraph as the introduction into a new age of human history: "Archaeologists speak to us of a stone age, a bronze age and an iron age in the history of the world; but the Twentieth Century will surely claim the title to be called the Ether Age" (Fleming 640). Telepathy, too, promised to draw the world closer by bringing human minds into direct communication with one another. Wireless telegraphy and telepathy offered the promise of a growing synchronization, of being "in sync" with Western modernity.

The spread of scientific language and procedure lay at the center of Western modernity's growing synchronization. J.T. Merz associates the proliferation of modernity with scientific language at the beginning of his four volume *A History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century*:

> In the course of our century, Science at least (*sic*) has become international: isolated and secluded centres of thought have become more and more rare. National peculiarities still exist, but are mainly to be sought in those remoter and more hidden recesses of thought…. and so far as the greater volume of ideas is concerned, we can now speak of European thought. (19-20)

---

[70] This phrase was repeated frequently in reference to early usage of telegraphy. This particular source explicitly thinks about the annihilation of time and space of the British Empire, which we will see more of later.

The development of tele-technologies and tele-cultures marked the slow spread of global modernity, synchronizing cultures along the way. The paradox of the *fin de siècle* is that the discursive scientific language Merz describes also produced fields of research that appeared to many as out-of-sync with modern thinking—talking to ghosts, communication through thought, and extra-sensory perception.

While critics have paid attention to the novel's use of the telegraph, they have largely ignored its telepathy.[71] I argue that *Dracula* serves as an analog for the late twentieth-century spread of modernity in that we cannot understand its tele-culture of technology without understanding its tele-culture of psychical phenomena. In the novel, temporality constitutes the central point of conflict between these two tele-cultures. *Dracula* enacts the spread of global modernity, synchronizing the West, and in reading it, we must turn our attention to its exclusions and the ways in which people and feelings are deemed *out of sync*. The novel follows a pattern of modernity by turning away from human witnesses and toward the unfeeling bodies of modern technology. The conflict between protagonists and Dracula can thus be characterized as being between the inert bodies of modernity and the feeling, primal bodies of vampirism.

Fin de Siècle psychical research witnessed a shift from nineteenth century spiritualism's desire to communicate with the dead to a focus on the living.[72] The first proceedings of the *Society for Psychical Research* introduces the concepts of telæsthesia

---

[71] A recent exception to the critical oversight of telepathy in the novel would be Antonio Sanna's 2103 "The Postmodern Evolution of Telepathy from *Dracula* to the *Twilight Saga*." In this article, Sanna portrays telepathy as a potential source of threat to the individual by Victorian society. This article differs by looking at the scientific and technological inquiries of telepathy that were driven more by questions of space and time than by what Sanna sees as the interest in affectionate connections by the members of the Society for Psychical Research.

[72] John Gray's *The Immortalization Commission: Science and the Strange Quest to Cheat Death* details the formative role that communication with the dead had on the formation of psychical research societies, which also continued even as other phenomena were explored.

and telepathy "to cover all cases of impression received at a distance without the normal operation of the recognized sense organs" (147).[73] These concepts emerged as modern iterations of the more general "thought-reading." They were distinctly separate from other Society for Psychical Research (SPR) inquiries into communication with the afterlife.

Early SPR investigations often involved testing mediums through an uncomfortable proximity to their bodies. Pamela Thurschwell describes the unpleasant situation of the SPR (often men) physically restraining a medium (often women) to minimize any trickery. She quotes William James's relief at moving away from these sorts of investigations: "It is pleasant to turn from phenomena of the dark-sitting and rat-hole type (with their tragi-comic suggestion that the whole order of nature might possibly be overturned in one's own head, by the way in which one imagined oneself, on a certain occasion, to be holding a tricky peasant woman's feet)" (31-2). The sexually charged encounters between investigators and mediums made for a poor research laboratory. James's comments also underscore the squeamish nature of the SPR researchers when dealing with bodies. Every aspect of the medium's body became the anxious site of investigation.[74] The medium's ear might be connected to five yards of thread, her body frisked, and as in one case, "she would be weighed and measured, internally examined,

[73] This has been attributed to F.W.H Myers, but the "Report of the Literary Committee" is co-signed by W.F. Barrett, C.C. Massey, Rev. W. Stainton Moses, Frank Podmore, Edmund Gurney, and Myers. Chapter one of this dissertation will investigate the history of the SPR in more detail.

[74] Once again, Samuel Richardson's novels seem to reassert themselves in the echoes of this conversation. In *Pamela*, Richardson worried that if his character/narrator were too controlling of the narrative, she would be seen as a scheming "plotter." Mr. B worries about this too and there is a famous scene where Pamela asserts her own body as a trustworthy replacement for the body of text she carries in her bosom. In the case of the medium, though, even the body turns into a source of trickery.

her temperature would be taken, her excreta checked and her perspiration examined for changes in chemical composition" (qtd in Thurschwell 158).[75]

A shift toward telepathy meant directing the scientific posture away from the groping hands on women's bodies and toward the safer bodies of the psychical laboratory. The SPR researchers certainly didn't use "laboratories" very often, but they moved their research out of the darkened séance parlors and into the light. *Phantasms of the Living* describes the new scene of investigating thought-transference, where an "agent" attempts to project his thoughts onto the percipient: "the percipient is not consciously or voluntarily a party to the experiment; as in spontaneous telepathy, his mind has not been in any way adjusted to the result; he finds himself affected in a certain manner, he knows not by what means" (86). Notice the gender switch—the medium of this investigation, the percipient, is now a "he." In addition, not only are the investigators no longer rigorously testing the medium's body, but the medium should not even know that he is being tested. The pivot from communication with the dead to communication with the living (gestured in the title *Phantasms of the Living*) indicates an emphasis upon the physicality of living bodies (as opposed to ethereal bodies) as well as a safe way to distance oneself from phenomena.

Tele-Culture

Dracula's protagonists fight the vampiric threat with technology, but Dracula employs telepathy as a counter tele-culture. Mina Harker and Dracula become

---

[75] Janet Oppenheim's *The Other World* provides numerous examples of the researchers' focus upon the female medium's body. In one case, a young woman named Mary Showers is exposed at a séance and the Oppenheim notes that "the best that her admirers could do for her reputation was to claim that, in a state of 'somnambulism,' she was not responsible for her actions" (20)

telepathically linked in an intensely sexual scene when Dracula forces Mina to drink his blood. He then boasts that she will, "be later on my companion and my helper…. When my brain says 'Come!' to you, you shall cross land or sea to do my bidding" (252). Dracula's use of telepathy as a weapon at first indicates a directionality and control of one body by another. However, as the link develops, the two bodies become more mutually conjoined. Telepathy creates an alternative network of sharing and synchronization to the telegraphic network.

When thought-transference emerged as a serious subject for the Society of Psychical Research (SPR) inquiry in the 1880s, researchers used the words "telepathy" and "telaesthesia" interchangeably. Both words indicate feeling—not just thinking—at a distance.[76] Scientists such as Sir Oliver Lodge sought to examine just how this distance is bridged.[77] Lodge, in his "An Account of Some Experiments in Thought-Transference," equates the phenomenon to electrical phenomena. Just as the copper wire conducts and does not contain the energy of an electrical current, he says, so too does the human mind conduct and not contain consciousness. He writes, "That the brain is the organ of consciousness is patent, but that consciousness is located in the brain is what no psychologist ought to assert" (129). Telepathy and telegraphy emerge from the same principles for Lodge: if consciousness, like electricity, exists in the ether and is only focalized by a brain, then thoughts and feelings are also not contained in the human mind, just as a telegraphic message is not contained by an antenna. Lodge's concept of syntony

---

[76] The Society for Psychical Research introduced these concepts "to cover all cases of impression received at a distance without the normal operation of the recognized sense organs" ("Report of the Literary Committee" 147). Roger Luckhurst's *The Invention of Telepathy* provides the best background of how telepathy emerged out of various discursive frameworks.

[77] More on Lodge's experiments can be found in Courtenay Grean Raia's "From ether theory to ether theology: Oliver Lodge and the physics of immortality."

saw the human mind and antennae as analogous. He argued that two human minds might resonate as radio antennae, and share a sympathetic resonance that would allow for a clear message to be received.

Sympathy and syntony in Lodge's hypotheses conjoin temporality and feeling. Telegraphy, which would increasingly synchronize vast distances of Western modernity's spaces, accomplished this through the sympathetic resonance of antennae. Roger Luckhurst notes that colonialists trumpeted the power of the telegraph to synchronize the British Empire. Often they associated this synchronization with feelings such as William Stead's assertion that the ubiquity of telegrams would allow them to keep "340 millions of human beings within the Empire… in touch and in sympathy" (Luckhurst 140-1).[78] A wireless telegraph system allowed for the centralized incorporation and regulation of the British Empire's bodies. Accordingly, when contemporary observers referred to sympathetic feelings, the feelings belonged to the Empire and not to the bodies. Individual feelings threaten the empire's stability because of the linkage between feeling and time—to assert one's own feelings over the Empire's would make one *out of sync* with Western modernity.

Telepathy offers a slightly different sympathetic resonance to wireless telegraphy's by focusing on human feeling shared between two bodies. The shared feelings originate in one of these bodies and are simultaneously experienced by the other. The SPR's *First Proceedings* describes an example of telepathy in a woman named Mrs. Gates who has a "singular sympathy existing between herself and her children, and manifesting itself by marked disquiet at moments when they are in danger or pain,

---

[78] It is worth noting that Stead, like Lodge, bridged the gap between the SPR and technological advance as he published a psychical journal called *Borderland*.

although she may have no means of knowing it" ("Report of the Literary Committee" 133). The SPR's publications contain many of these sorts of "presentiments of danger at a distance" that almost always include the feelings being verified by a letter telling of a danger (or death) experienced at a certain time. In these examples, the message multiplies into telepathic and epistolary (or at times telegraphic) form, but it is the telepathic message that has occurred at the same time, synchronizing the bodies (the body in danger and the body experiencing feelings or witnessing images of danger) temporally through shared feelings.

If the studies of telegraphy and telepathy share an origin story and the two work through similar means, their stark opposition in *fin de siècle* culture is telling. The rise of the SPR caused a great degree of consternation amongst the transatlantic scientific communities. Sir Oliver Lodge's reputation took a great hit as he veered further toward psychical research and orthodox members of the British Association for the Advancement of Science questioned their fellow members who had followed Lodge's lead. These objectors took issue with psychical research methods that were not reproducible. One debater lauded another psychical researcher, William Crookes, for his research on radiometry, noting specifically why it differed from Crookes's psychical research: "Why do we accept [Crookes's assertions]? Because these can be reproduced at any time, and by any person" (qtd in Noakes 4). A telegram differed from a telepathic message because the former could be reproduced by anyone.

Telepathy, in its psychoanalytic context, was a conflict of temporality. As Mikkel Borch-Jacobsen observes, Freud's concept of *Massenpsychologie* contrasts to other psychologists such as Gustave Le Bon. While Le Bon's and Freud's theories of the

unconscious overlapped in many ways, Le Bon centered his theory upon its inherent social nature. Borch-Jacobsen writes, "For Le Bon, the 'racial [hereditary] soul' already marks a first degree of crowd *organization*. It may well be older, more archaic, than the individual subjects it melds into a whole, but it is still a 'soul'—that is, a *subjectivity* (emphasis original 138). The sociability of the unconscious, Le Bon figures as ancient and carried out through bloodlines. On the other hand, "The Freudian unconscious characterizes desires, representations, fantasies of an essentially monadic subject" (139-40). Le Bon, with his emphasis on the anachronistic, therefore embraces a mode of thinking the unconscious through the interrelation between individual subjects. Borch-Jacobson characterizes Le Bon's concept of the unconscious as "indissolubly nonsubjectal and 'social,' to the extent that he never designates anything but immediate communication with others... prior to any consciousness of self, and thus also prior to any consciousness of others. Taken to the extreme, it is thought transmission, telepathy" (140). The conflict between Le Bon and Freud indicates the pairing of temporalities with the relative porousness of the self.

Anachronism certainly plays a key role in Freud's theories. In *The Wolf Man's Magic Word*, for example, Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok give us the key figure of the crypt of trauma lodged in the unconscious, what Derrida referred to as an "'artificial' unconscious lodged like a prothesis (*sic*), a graft in the heart of an organ, within the *divided self*' (*Fors* xiii). The story of the Wolf Man (Sergei Pankejeff) illustrates not only anachronism persistence, but also the internalization of another by the unconscious. But Freud maintains a distinction between the self and other. Where Le Bon can imagine a

Massenpsychologie that dissolves the boundaries of the self, Freud maintains those boundaries.

Though Freud never delivered his two speeches on telepathy, Derrida argues that the concept remained at the center of Freud's most basic beliefs. It is, Derrida writes, "Difficult to imagine a theory of what they still call the unconscious without a theory of telepathy. They can be neither confused nor dissociated" ("Telepathy" 14). Freud had a fraught relationship with the occult, of which telepathy seemed to him the safest concept. For psychoanalysis, telepathy was a wonderfully alluring concept. Pamela Thurschwell describes Sandor Ferenczi, a mentee of Freud's who went on to pursue telepathy and the occult with a great fervor, as embodying

> the ways in which psychoanalysis cannot leave the occult behind, and the ways in which the desire for the "physical equivalent of the psychical act"--a turn -of-the-century scientific, cultural and literary longing for explanations for transmission--becomes the disavowed but necessary building block for the new psychoanalytic economies of the mind, and for new ways of imagining intimate connections to others. (119)

Freud believed psychoanalysis to be creating an external and physical analog to the internal and psychical states. But telepathy, though it seemed so central and connected to his theories, always remained the "foreign body" of psychoanalysis ("Dreams and Occultism" 56). Freud feared that a public embrace of telepathy would lead to occultism and that would destroy psychoanalysis altogether. In the now well-documented conflict between Freud and Jung over the latter's research, Jung recalled,

> I can still recall vividly how Freud said to me, "My dear Jung, promise me never to abandon the sexual theory…. You see, we must make a dogma of it, an unshakeable bulwark." He said that to me with great emotion… In some astonishment I asked him, "A bulwark--against what?" To which he replied, "Against the black tide of mud" --and here he hesitated for a moment, then added—'of occultism." (Kerr 317)

Against the black tide of mud—what a fascinating expression. Is Jung's "black tide" a primeval muck, come from the past to swallow up civilization? Thurschwell observes that "Thought-transference must be kept to the outside of psychoanalysis in order for psychoanalysis to establish the boundaries of its discipline…. Psychoanalysis requires a (at least somewhat) stable subject which telepathy's horizon of shared thought problematizes" (131). Once again, we see the body desperately seeking to maintain control over itself and its boundaries. Psychoanalysis, as we have seen in modernism and *Dracula*, must externalize the phenomena it fears so deeply so as to render it inert and safe.

Freud and Derrida fall into the same trap as *Dracula*'s protagonists, turning to contemporary tele-technologies to represent and externalize the phenomenon of telepathy. Freud likens the SPR's research into telepathy as the psychical counterpart to wireless telegraphy" (36). Derrida, too, sees telepathy through the larger context of tele-culture, expanding from the *Fin de Siècle* invention of of telegraphy and telephones to satellites. "This goes for any tele-system," he says in "Telepathy" (16). Nicholas Royle summarizes the relationship between telepathy and technology:

> "Telepathy" is historically linked to numerous other tele-phenomena: it is part of the establishment of tele-culture in general. I tis necessarily related to other nineteenth-century forms of communication from a distance through new and often invisible channels, including the railway, telegraphy, photography, the telephone and gramophone.... the question "Do you believe in telepathy?" need not be regarded as categorically or essentially distinguishable from questions such as, "Do you believe in the telephone?" ("Telepathy and Literature" 5).

Telepathy, then, seemingly emerges from the same roots of new *Fin de Siècle* technologies of communication as yet another wireless bridging of distance. Thurschwell adds that,

> "The ways in which new technologies of communication are severing the wire of visible, materialized transmission in the last decades of the nineteenth century help create a new metaphorics for imagining intimate relations with others… For psychical researchers… telepathy both promised and threatened that the mind was not necessarily a sealed and protected space" (36).

All of these comments—from Freud, Derrida, Royle, and Thurschwell—ignore the fact that while telepathy may create a new metaphorics or reimagine communication in a revolutionary way much like these technologies, it is materially different.

In looking at the ways these writers theorize telepathy, we can recognize the same repeated impulse of externalizing phenomena. Telepathy is distinctly unlike the telephone because the telephone requires a network of external bodies. Two phones, satellites, and towers: all the externalized media carry the message, translating, retranslating, and eventually vibrate through the bones of the human ear (that is, when we're dealing with

those who can hear). Telepathy, on the other hand, relies upon human bodies as the primary media of communication. Externalizing telepathy as one of many tele-systems ignores its phenomenal nature and elides the real danger to the concept of the boundaries of the human self. A telephone reasserts those boundaries—my voice vibrates into a microphone and a process begins which will reproduce a version of that voice for another body.

As we have seen with *Dracula* as well, there is a great difference between these media and their temporality. Telepathy is often described for its atavism as when Freud called it "the original, archaic method of communication" ("Dreams and Occultism" 55). However, telepathy also took on the anachronism of futuristic utopia as when physicist and psychical research, William Barrett, imagines a time when it could break down class barriers in his book *On the Threshold of the Unseen*. If the rich would have to share in the pain of the poor and the poor would be able to enjoy the pleasure of luxury, "the brotherhood of the race would not be a pious aspiration" (294). Unlike the telephone or satellites, telepathy never indicated the participation in a particular now. The technological shrinking of space and time that followed the railroad, telegrams, and telephones excluded telepathy as an anachronistic tele-system.

III A Telepathic Body

Let us return to the scene, early in the novel when Jonathan Harker thinks of "some fair lady" as he writes. I previously described the way in which he violently opposes his own "modernity" to the powers of "the old centuries." In this scene, though, we can also recognize Gurney's "familiarity" and Jung's synchronicity (which he says

replaces "correspondence, sympathy, and harmony"). To continue where this scene leaves off, Harker puts down his diary and decides that rather than return the prison of his own room he would, "sleep here, where of old ladies had sat and sung and lived sweet lives whilst their gentle breasts were sad for their menfolk away in the midst of remorseless wars" (41).

The scene where Harker imagines the imaginary woman as he writes does not indicate a particular causality. The appearance and reappearance of these imaginary women are non-sequiturs to his current state of panic. The imagined women emote over the absence of their men even as Harker celebrates the absence of Dracula from the castle, giving no impression that one thought lead to another. Rather, as Jung observed the room seems to be acquainted with his thoughts. Or more aptly, Harker seems to be acquainted with the room's thoughts.[79] There is a familiarity between the scene and character, one that implicates them in each other simultaneously. Harker, we might say, is in sync with the room. And key to this synchronicity is that Harker has put down his diary. Orthographic recording of externalized world shifts to a situation where Harker is simply a body amongst other bodies. Those other bodies are the anachronistic women who remain a part of their room. In addition, synchronicity here occurs telepathically—Harker, the women, and the room share feeling and thought.

Harker's shared feelings with the vampiresses anticipates the far more prominent example of telepathy in *Dracula*, when Mina and Dracula become telepathically linked. In an intensely sexual scene, Dracula has forced Mina to drink his blood. He then boasts that she will, "be later on my companion and my helper…. When my brain says 'Come!'

[79] To further populate this text with bodies, Jung's suggestion here makes us think about the way in which the room itself acts as another body amongst bodies, not just a space in which bodies exist.

to you, you shall cross land or sea to do my bidding" (252). Mina recognizes her cognitive link with Dracula and asks Van Helsing to hypnotize her. The hypnotism captures her in an altered state: "Mina opened her eyes; but she did not seem the same woman" (271). Van Helsing treats her as if she has physically moved, asking "Where are you?" Mina's describes her surroundings through bodily senses not her own, hearing the waves outside, the sound of men stomping their boots, and the movement of a chain. These aural experiences all register passively in hypnotized Mina, who acts as a medium. Harker notes that Mina's manner of speaking under hypnosis used "the same tone [as] when reading her shorthand notes." Her role as psychical medium here collapses within her previous roles as bureaucratic medium. But Harker describes this process as interpretive: "The answer came dreamily, but with intention; it were as though she were interpreting something" (272). How, though, does the psychical medium participate in the interpretive process?

At its center, telepathy conflates all bodies as bodies of texts. It is a concept that simultaneously reinforces the boundaries of a body that might feel or think while effacing the boundaries between those bodies. The novel's employment of telepathy is no coincidence, since it mimics the function of the narrative's linkage of the various protagonists. Royle associates telepathy with the emergence of the concept of another *Fin de Siècle* development, narrative "point of view." And to think about the telepathy in a text, he says,

> We move from a restrictive and no doubt restricting notion of telepathy as something that presupposes the identity and unity of a subject (he or she who receives or transmits a telepathic communication) to a writing of distant minds,

> apprehensions of feeling and suffering in and of the distance, phantom communications, unconscious, absent or ghostly emotions, without any return to stabilized identities. (“The ‘Telepathy Effect’” 105)

Telepathy of bodies, Royle tells us, ties those bodies up so inextricably that they read one another; they think one another. Royle argues in *Telepathy and Literature* that there is “an essential relation between ‘telepathy’ and ‘the novel’” (89). He asks, what is the omniscient narrator if not telepathic?

Stoker associates psychology and telepathy in Lucy’s innocuous observation about Seward, who she says, “has a curious habit of looking one straight in the face, as if trying to read one’s thoughts” (57). At another point, Mina describes looking into Jonathan’s eyes and says, “there was no need for speaking between us” (210). Van Helsing places thought-reading amongst other inexplicable, yet real phenomena such as astral bodies and ghostly apparitions. As Carol Senf notes, “Dracula is thus especially interesting because it emphasizes the conflict between people who believe that the world is systematic and subject to both reason and human control and individuals whose very existence embodies mystery and the total lack of human control over a powerful and overwhelming universe” (“Stoker’s Response” 19). But as we’ve seen in the earlier discussion of the paired anxieties over temporality and embodiment, the conflict between protagonists and Dracula is not merely one of atavistic supernatural versus the modern rational. Rather, it is a human fear over the latent feelings inherent in bodies, their dangerous desires, and, to appropriate Freud, “the black tide of mud.” This leads to the assemblage of *Dracula* as a prosthetic body for the vampire, a body which can be known, grasped, and conquered.

Mina’s telepathic communication with Dracula positions her as yet another body of text leading to Dracula. But as a text, she presents us with an odd critical encounter. Harker previously noted that she does not merely provide the information for the protagonists to read. Rather, she speaks in a trance, “as though she were interpreting something” and then likens it to her transcription into shorthand. Mina’s role as medium does not metamorphose her into a telephonic switchboard, connecting the protagonists to the messages coming from Dracula. She is a feeling and thinking body of text. The process of feeling and thinking, though, are hard to define. Does she enter into Dracula’s body? Does she register his sensations from a distance like a telegram? Mina’s position between the bodies of the protagonists and Dracula draws all the bodies into a multi-directional interrelationship. Though we never see Dracula’s perspective, the nature of the telepathic link means that he enters into Mina’s body as it is hypnotized amongst the protagonists. None of the bodies involved passively read another. The telepathic link constitutes the network of meaning; just being draws the characters into one another’s feelings and thoughts.

Mina’s active role as medium also complicates the linking of modernization and the movement away from the dangerous bodies of [women] mediums. William James felt so uncomfortable interrogating (touching, feeling, frisking) the body of the medium and yet the protagonists directly engage with Mina as a feeling and interpreting body. The use of hypnosis and rendering Mina passive, however, suggests a guarded engagement with her—is she being made into a laboratory instrument? But her brief tenure as a textual body also demonstrates that if a text/body registers phenomena, it is a shared prosthetic

body. The readers and authors of the text are drawn into that body in a mutual engagement.

While studies of media in *Dracula* emphasize the technological nature of the novel's narrative, telepathy draws our attention to the other media in the novel. The prosthetic bodies through which the protagonists attempt to conquer Dracula force the protagonists into dialectic. Where these bodies of texts would externalize temporal phenomena and buffer them from sensations, they instead implicate all the bodies involved. The characters themselves constitute the telepathic network of bodies which create the meaning within the novel. Is there any difference between Mina telepathically reading Dracula's feelings and thoughts and feeling Seward's heartbeat when she listens to his voice on the phonograph? But the prosthetic body of text the protagonists make for Dracula is meant to master and destroy him by making him knowable. As Derrida points out, "Telepathy must not be of the family of 'knowledge' or 'non-knowledge' but of another type" ("Telepathy" 22). What is the third way? How do we categorize epistemology outside of knowing? Perhaps this is the real monster of *Dracula*: in the protagonists' desperate efforts to stabilize their categories of the modern rational versus the anachronistic embodied, a hybrid monster appears, the textual body which escapes these categories.[80]

The Modern Telepathic

---

[80] Nicholas Royle's book Telepathy and Literature gestures toward a third way by suggesting George Eliot's *Daniel Deronda* is a "hypnopoetics, a foresight-sympathy-saga-machine of a passionate vision of possibilities" (109). Royle's way of theorizing literature has been highly valuable to my research. However, I would suggest a different sort of engagement here that will stretch beyond this particular chapter. I want to take adjust each element of his formulation of hypnopoetics—beyond forsight to all anachronism; beyond sympathy to embodiment; beyond saga to text; and taking the mechanization out completely for the textual body.

Derrida argues that modern rationality like psychoanalysis must reject telepathy as a foreign body. Though he locates telepathy as so central to the ideas of psychoanalysis, he notes the silence of Freud on the issue in failing to give the speeches on telepathy. Freud was dissuaded from addressing the issue directly late in his life. The modern movement of psychoanalysis, they feared, would be sunk by the "archaic method of communication between individuals" ("Dreams and Occultism" 55). Derrida describes the telephonic notion of telepathy as a great switchboard of Platonism. That central operator maintains transference and meaning. Telepathy is a "foreign body" to modernism, because it means that the body emerges as a centralized point of communication. One cannot simply transfer from body to body with an external conversion rate.

The protagonists in *Dracula* do not just discover a blood-sucking monster that comes to them from Transylvania. Monsters can be out-fought, their weaknesses understood, and they can be vanquished. What comes to England from the mountains of Transylvania is the recognition of the persistence of anachronism in the present moment, the atavism of blood, and the inextricability of textual bodies. This latent potentiality of human and non-human bodies drives the novel's anxiety. And in the protagonists' use of prosthetic bodies of text to fight Dracula, they only reaffirm their own participation with the network of anachronistic meaning-making.

In this way, *Dracula* lives up to Jennifer Wicke's designation as the beginning of modernist writing. Modernism's obsessive preoccupation with atavistic literary heritage comes to life in the novel. By participating in modernism's attempts to externalize anachronism through the technophilic and bureaucratic media, the protagonists implicate

modernist anxieties in their fight. But the body of *Dracula*, the prosthetic textual "mass of type-writing," lives on. Blood and body are text and text is blood and body.

Chapter Four

Feeling Out of Time: Bergson, Proust, and *An Adventure*

> A modernist work of art is by definition "incomprehensible"; it functions as a shock, as the irruption of a trauma which undermines the complacency of our daily routine and resists being integrated into the symbolic universe of the prevailing ideology; thereupon, after this first encounter, interpretation enters the stage and enables us to integrate this shock—it informs us, say, that this trauma registers and points towards the shocking depravity of our very 'normal' everyday lives.
>
> - Slavoj Žižek

Modernist literature has come to be read through its interruptions. In chapter one, we saw how modernists cast themselves as breaking from history by characterizing themselves as separate from the past. But as Žižek writes above, modernist aesthetics also jarred readers into a wildly altered experience of the present. The novels of Virginia Woolf, James Joyce, and Marcel Proust shock their readers through their uncanny renderings of reality, particularly by turning to the arbitrary and constitutive nature of language in designating that reality. The radicalization of language as complicating and at times sparring with reality can be seen most clearly in the modernist obsession with temporality. Ronald Schleifer writes, "Many thinkers associated with twentieth-century Modernism… came to see that time is not an object, something that can be described, reported and referred to in a constative utterance. They also came to see that it is not something that can simply be presented and performed. Rather, time, they discovered, must be figured and, more precisely, articulated by something other than itself" (69-70).

Chapters one and three focused on the critical blind eye that has been turned to modernism's phantasms of the living. In these chapters, I argued that too much has been made of modernism's obsession with the past and not enough has been made of the ways

in which modernist texts deal with synchronicity and the present. In this final chapter, I want to turn back to modernism's engagement with the past, particularly through memory. I previously noted Jean-Michel Rabaté's claim: "If indeed the main thrust of high modernism… has been to link the wish to 'make it new' with an awareness of the primitive nature of ritual, then their modernity can no more escape the return of the repressed than preempt its unforeseeable effects" (3-4). The past, as many critics have observed, continues to creep into modernist aesthetics despite (or, perhaps as a result of) the efforts of modernists to make a clean break from the past. A break creates new edges, though, sharp and able to pierce the modernists' precarious present. In this chapter I argue that modernism also reimagines the past as inextricably tied up with the present, jutting into consciousness.

Once again, though, the overlooked relationship between the Society for Psychical Research (SPR) and modernist literature complicates our understanding of modernism's engagement with temporality. In this chapter, I examine the story of Charlotte Anne Moberly and Eleanor Jourdain's book, *An Adventure,* which tells their story of having traveled through time by entering the memory of Marie Antoinette. Their remarkable text provides a unique triangulation of the canonical modernists Henri Bergson and Marcel Proust. *An Adventure*'s release in 1911 coincided with the explosion of Henri Bergson's popularity across Europe and the Modernist Transatlantic (discussed at length in chapter one) and preceded Proust's *Swann's Way* by two years. Bergson's rise in the Anglophonic world, Proust's novels of time and memory, and the publication (as well as salacious public appetite for) of *An Adventure* are hardly coincidental.

An Adventure emerged from the larger growth of psychical research throughout the *Fin de Siècle* and Bergson was close to psychical research throughout his career. Bergson even makes marginal notes about Moberly and Jourdain in a book on ghosts he read in the 1920s. The final point on this triangle is Marcel Proust's *Remembrance of Things Past*, published in 1913. I read Bergson, Proust, Moberly, and Jourdain through the discursive context of *Fin-de-Siècle* theories of temporality. These writers conceive of bodies—human and textual—as permeable not only to temporality but to affect. By reading Bergson and Proust through *An Adventure*, I argue for a *Fin-de-Siècle* theory of reading, one in which textual bodies offer a nexus of engagement for the affective polytemporality of authorial and readerly bodies.

I. An Adventure

As she wandered the parks of Petit Trianon in 1901, Eleanor Jourdain felt an "eerie feeling… [which] culminated in a definite impression of something uncanny and fear-inspiring" (18). She and her companion Charlotte Anne Moberly had traveled from to Paris to Marie Antoinette's private park as a way to get to know one another. What they experienced, their feelings, and the people they witnessed went on to inspire intrigue, fascination, and skepticism in audiences around the world. For the next ten years they researched their experiences and published their findings in a book entitled, *An Adventure*. In this book, they claim to have traveled through time to Versailles as it was in the eighteenth century. More specifically, they believed that they had arrived in the 18th century by walking into the memory of Marie Antoinette.

Their bizarre shared experience at Versailles led them to believe that they had "inadvertently entered within an act of the Queen's [Marie Antoinette's] memory when alive" (23). The exact claim was that, as they walked through the parks at Versailles, they stepped into the space as it existed in 1789, the way Marie Antoinette remembered it while she was imprisoned during the revolution (in 1792). They traveled not just through time, but into someone else's memory of a place. Over the next ten years, the two wrote separate accounts of their experience at Petit Trianon and researched various explanations for their eerie feelings, which they perceived to be supernatural. The resulting pseudonymously published account, *An Adventure*, sparked the fascination of the public and dismissive reactions from psychical researchers.[81] Like most stories of unexplained phenomena, *An Adventure* tells us less about the nature of the phenomenon and more about the ways in which humans make sense of the world phenomenologically through narrative.

The Moberly-Jourdain Incident (as it was called) illustrates what psychical researchers came to call "retrocognition." There have been other published accounts of retrocognition that bear many similarities to Moberly and Jourdain's experiences, but the quality and detail of Moberly and Jourdain's narrative is unparalleled.[82] Charlotte Anne Moberly and Eleanor Jourdain were both academics. Moberly was the daughter of George Moberly, himself an academic and minister, and Charlotte became the first female don at Oxford as the principal of St. Hugh's College. Jourdain, 17 years

---

[81] *An Adventure* was originally published under the pseudonyms Elizabeth Morison and Frances Lamont. It wasn't until after they both died that their names were publicly known.

[82] Andrew MacKenzie's 1997 *Adventures in Time* is the most comprehensive discussion of retrocognition. In the SPR's archives at Cambridge University there is an Andrew MacKenzie collection that constitutes the best collection of research into retrocognition. But Moberly and Jourdain's story is still the most detailed and researched example of the phenomenon.

Moberly's junior, was to begin working with Moberly at Oxford later in 1901. Years later, she would replace Moberly as the principal of St. Hugh's. Neither of the women knew one another and since the two were to be working together, Jourdain thought that they could be better acquainted if Moberly joined her in Paris. The trip worked, but not in the way it was intended. Their shared experiences at Versailles and the controversy to follow the book's publication drew the two women very close for the rest of their lives. At the time of the trip, neither of the women was particularly young and therefore impressionable (Moberly turned 55 in 1901 and Jourdain was 38 at the time). Their age, experience, and professional achievements, however, did not protect them from accusations of being impressionable and naive.

The day of their trip to Versailles began pleasantly enough. Moberly notes that they took a rest in the Salle de Glaces. She writes, "A very sweet wind was blowing in at the open windows over the flower beds below" (2). She suggests that they walk to the gardens of Petit Trianon. As a child, she had read about Marie Antoinette's hamlets in a magazine and she carried that curiosity with her. They used a map—Baedeker's—but describe their journey as ambling and aimless. When they came upon a point where the road diverged into three paths, they met two men dressed with tri-corner hats who give them directions. But from this point, when Moberly notes they left the lane, she describes an extraordinary depression steadily deepening. Moberly says this is the first time she felt "as if something were wrong" (17). When she spoke to the two men, asking for directions, they seemed to answer her mechanically. She remembers repeating the questions and they answered in the exact same way. After following their directions, Jourdain's account describes similar feelings to Moberly. "There was a depression and

loneliness about the place," she writes, "I began to feel as if I were walking in my sleep; the heavy dreaminess was oppressive" (18).

Afterward, they came upon a man who brought these eerie feelings to a head, "culminating," as Jourdain says, "in a definite impression of something uncanny and fear-inspiring" (18). Moberly also describes it as a culmination of her "peculiar sensations" (194). He sat next to what they called a kiosk. It was a building that no longer stood in 1901, but which they believed to have been standing in the 18th century, having been used as a music pavilion. The man had a dark and rough complexion, marked by smallpox. Both Moberly and Jourdain describe him as ugly. Moberly says his face is "repulsive—his expression odious" (194). Jourdain says his face carries a "very evil and yet unseeing" expression (202). When she passed him by she says she "felt a repugnance" (202).

As they discuss which way to go, Moberly thought to herself she could not be convinced to go left and Jourdain chose to go right (revealing both to be driven by an unconscious compulsion in a certain direction). Suddenly, a man ran up to them from behind and accosted them. "Mesdames, Mesdames," he said, "Il ne faut pas passer par là." He prevented them from going left and pointed to the right (yet another force driving them in a direction), saying "par ici… cherchez la maison" (202-3). [83] Both women took note of his pronunciation. "Il ne fout" he said, pronouncing "faut" oddly to their ears. They would later associate this with a messenger of Marie Antoinette referred to in books as "Breton," which they suggest might explain his peculiar accent. After they turned, he disappeared suddenly from behind them. They only heard the sound of running. It was just one of the many occasions where the bodies of those the women encountered seemed

[83] "Ladies! Ladies! You cannot go that way… this way to the house."

to defy physical laws. On another part of their walk, Jourdain remembers automatically drawing her skirt in to herself as if to make room for someone and being unable to account for her movement. Later, she recounts a general impression over the day that there were a number of people who she could not see. Moberly describes one encounter, which curiously escaped Jourdain's attention. Outside the main house of Petit Trianon, she saw a woman sitting on a camp stool, appearing to be sketching the trees. After seeing a portrait of the Queen that closely resembled the woman at a later time, she came to believe this woman to be Marie Antoinette. When Moberly mentioned the woman to Jourdain sometime after, she was very surprised to learn that Jourdain had not seen the woman who had sat not far from them.

Moberly and Jourdain's experiences in 1901 would eventually lead to a decade-long obsession, but did not immediately cause them to feel alarm. Moberly recounts the days after their adventure:

> For several days we never mentioned these things, nor did I think of them until I was writing home a descriptive letter of all our expeditions, amongst others that to the Petit Trianon. As the scenes came back one by one, the same extraordinary sensation of being closed in and of deathly stillness came back so strongly that I stopped writing and said to Miss [Jourdain]: "Do you think the Petit Trianon is haunted?" Her answer was prompt: "Yes, I do." I begged her to say how and where, and on hearing almost an exact replica of my experience we discussed it together, and then I realised for the first time the theatrical appearance of the man who came behind us—the inappropriateness of the wrapped cloak on a hot August

> afternoon, the unaccountableness of his coming and going, and the excited running. (187-8)

The two women tried to account for their experiences according to methods of psychical research: they wrote down their experiences separately and then sought evidence to account for what they witnessed. The Moberly and Jourdain archives at Oxford University testify to the lengths the women went to attach out-of-place accents, clothing, and buildings to a scheme that might make sense. They spent a great deal of time researching and corresponding with experts about the buildings like the kiosk that they saw on their walk, but which no longer stood in 1901.

The facts around *An Adventure* are bizarre, to be sure. In the fifty years following the publication of *An Adventure*, Charlotte Anne Moberly and Eleanor Jourdain were attacked by psychologists and anyone who wanted to pull at the threads of their narrative. SPR president, Eleanor Sidgewick, published an anonymous review in *The Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research* in which she ridiculed the women as having completely confused their surroundings through "tricks of memory" (354).

Moberly and Jourdain had originally submitted their research to the SPR, which conducted its own evaluation of the evidence. The investigation was organized by the SPR secretary, Alice Johnson (she was also the primary mode of communication between the SPR and the two women), who Moberly and Jourdain eventually came to resent for her treatment of them. Johnson (and the SPR investigators she represented) took issue with the fact that Moberly and Jourdain relied upon their second accounts of their experiences, accounts that were written in November. In Johnson's memoranda, she also criticizes the discrepancies in the geography as described: whether a bridge was on the

right or left or whether a feature was described by one woman and not the other.[84] As Johnson saw it, there were too many discrepancies between the stories of Moberly and Jourdain and their experiences lacked a trustworthy urtext, an immediate account of the events, untainted by emotion or memory tricks.

Objective Bodies

The public interrogation of *An Adventure* revolved around the nature of the narrative as evidence. Of its 205 pages, Moberly and Jourdain use only 25 to tell the actual story (Moberly's is 14 pages and Jourdain's is 11).[85] The rest of the book details the women's subsequent ten years of research on Petit Trianon, offering proofs that what they saw could have only existed in the late 18th century. Their narratives invoke little of the sympathetic sensation of haunting for the reader, putting off any narrative suspense by always immediately explaining confusion in the narrative. The women step away from their story so that "others may be able to judge it fairly" and emphasizing that "it is not our business to explain or to understand" (vi, v). Instead, they ask that it be treated as testimony to be interrogated by the jury of its readers. *An Adventure* attempts to satisfy empirical conditions by displacing Moberly and Jourdain's feelings from their bodies onto an objective textual body.

Despite their attempts to make their narrative objective evidence, many in the psychical research community rejected them and their story. Four decades later, W.H.

---

[84] Alice Johnson's memoranda and thoughts on the case are recorded in SPR.MS 61/1/21 in the archives at Oxford University.

[85] *An Adventure* originally contained a section entitled "A Rêverie," which was a creative imagining of Marie Antoinette remembering Petit Trianon. Later editions of the book removed this chapter and the appendix.

Salter returned to the issue and, though he was sympathetic to the women, he lamented that they were not fastidious enough in their collection of evidence. Many of his complaints come from a suspicion of descriptive language since more adjectives and colorful descriptions appear in later versions of the story. He concludes,

> But the authors recorded, investigated, and published their experience in such a way as to leave the whole affair in an impenetrable fog of uncertainty. All this would have been avoided if they had added to their many virtues some knowledge of the standards of evidence and the recognized procedure for conforming to them, that the peculiar subject-matter of psychical research makes necessary. (186)

Salter's criticism somewhat ameliorates the original acerbic response from Eleanor Sidgwick that dismissed Moberly and Jourdain as untrustworthy. Sidgewick's review claims that, "The foundations on which the supernormal claims of the 'Adventure' are built are too slight, and too little allowance is made for the weaknesses of human memory both in adding to and subtracting from facts" (360).

When the leadership of the SPR rejected Moberly and Jourdain's *An Adventure*, they did so because the evidence itself could not be trusted. The only evidence provided was the testimony of the two women, testimony which Eleanor Sidgwick complains had been written three months later "and it is unusual to be able to rely on one's memory for the details of things seen after even a much shorter interval of time" (354). However, Moberly and Jourdain went to great lengths to make their testimonies objective.[86] And

[86] In "Demeure," Jacques Derrida discusses the precariousness of testimony, writing, "In order to remain testimony, it must therefore allow itself to be haunted. It must allow itself to be parasitized by precisely what it excludes from its inner depths, the *possibility*, at least, of [being] literature" (30). Psychical research, by its nature, adds an additional element to the threat against the testimony: the threat of one's

the ways in which they distance the text from the eerie feelings of their experiences highlights the fundamental problem of objectivity faced by psychical researchers.

Moberly and Jourdain spend most of their book on the research rather than their narrative accounts.[87] But even in their stories, the women distance themselves from their experiences, externalizing the narrative as objective. The preface presents the book as a collection of evidence. "It is not our business to explain or to understand," they write, adding "But, in order that others may be able to judge fairly of all the circumstances, we have tried to record exactly what happened as simply and fully as possible" (v-vi"). Claiming that it isn't their "business to explain" the events in the stories is disingenuous since they quite obviously offer explanations. But Moberly and Jourdain attempt to redirect suspicion by bifurcating themselves. They offer up the textual body of *An Adventure* as a collection of objective testimonies. It is this body of text, they suggest, that should be interrogated, thus directing the critical gaze away from themselves. Narratively buffering oneself from the manipulation and meaning-making in the text was certainly quite common for women writers during the 18th century. Alison Case's *Plotting Women* argues that women writers distanced themselves using narrative elements like introductions so as to avoid suspicion for preaching or "plotting." Case

---

own experiences being tainted by hallucination. In chapter one, we observed the paradox inherent in the SPR's terminology of a "veridical hallucination," or a truthful hallucination. That paradox here returns to complicate the truthfulness of Moberly and Jourdain's testimonies. The women's testimonies may be false because they have perjured themselves and lie, or the testimonies may be false because of—as Eleanor Sidgwick puts it—the women fall prey to "tricks of memory" (354).

[87] Here, I use narrative to refer to what narrative theory calls the *fabula*. Narrative theory has generally defined *sjuzhet* and *fabula* as: the event and the story or plot that renders the event into a narrative. Thus the "narratives" of Moberly and Jourdain are explicitly literary renderings of their experiences; the women recount their feelings in "plotted" narrative form. And these narratives are separated by tone and genre from the rest of the text, which is a presentation of research that will vouch for the verity of the narratives.

writes “Feminine narration… is characterized by the restriction of the female narrator to the role of narrative witness” (4).

By separating themselves from the narrative, Moberly and Jourdain alienate themselves from their own sensations. Describing a pathway overhung with trees, Moberly says, “This gave the whole place a sombre look suggestive of dampness” (7). Here, her sensation of disturbing depression spreads from the shadowed image of the pathway to a qualified feeling (“sombre”) and then to a sense as if upon the skin (“dampness”). This reverses what we would recognize as the regular flow of feeling that begins with sensation and then becomes qualified as a feeling and narrative of what that feeling means. In *An Adventure,* the sensations of “sombre” and “dampness” occur not upon the skin of the narrator; Moberly does not feel dampness upon her skin. Instead, the sensations are treated as textual elements providing further proofs.

The bodies that feel in *An Adventure* do not belong to Moberly or Jourdain. Rather, the sensations belong to the objects of inquiry. In the quote above, the trees themselves suggest dampness and the disembodied narrator tells us nothing of how the skin of Ms. Moberly felt. An Adventure relies on feelings (“of depression and anxiety”) and yet, as evidence, it cannot be the account of two women’s feelings. Rather, the body of the text stands in for the bodies of the women. In this case, Moberly and Jourdain have replaced their bodies of sensations with the textual body of evidence to be examined by the readers. With the intensity of the body displaced to a disembodied body of evidence, the resonance becomes prosthetic. As in the case of the “dampness,” it is not a sensation upon the skin that becomes qualified and amplified (e.g. “the air was damp from the trees that hemmed in above and this made me feel sombre”). Rather, dampness expresses the

quality of the trees as "sombre," or as objects already taken up by the interpretive act of narrating the evidence.

Bodies Contagious

The Moberly-Jourdain incident only appears in English literary criticism once, in Terry Castle's 1991 "Contagious Folly: 'An Adventure' and Its Skeptics."[88] Examining the accusations against Moberly and Jourdain's sexuality, Castle shows the skeptical responses to Moberly and Jourdain to be as suspect as *An Adventure*. The case of the Moberly-Jourdain Incident sparked "Adventure-*mania*" in not only the two women who spent a decade researching their experiences, but also in its critics: "If Moberly and Jourdain, rummaging through archives, had fallen victims to a kind of hermeneutic folie—a befuddling obsession with proving themselves right at any cost—it was precisely this obsession which, like an infection, they succeeded in transmitting to their critics" (760). The obsessive drive for factual and counterfactual responses to the phenomena of Trianon spreads between critics and believers alike.

The Moberly-Jourdain Incident presented what some saw as a *folie à deux*. Castle explains: "Clinicians in the early part of the century had been much puzzled by something they usually referred to, for want of a better term, as 'infectious insanity' or 'insanity by contagion': the apparent transmission of delusional ideas between two persons" (762).[89] She then notes the slippage between accusations of a *folie à deux* and

---

[88] Castle discusses the Moberly-Jourdain Incident in articles in *Representations*, *Critical Inquiry*, and her book, *The Female Thermometer: Eighteenth-Century Culture and the Invention of the Uncanny*. These are the only times Moberly and Jourdain enter contemporary criticism, but *An Adventure* drew widespread commentary from the likes of Bergson and W.B. Yeats, among others.

[89] Castle's emphasis upon the critical language as diagnosing the women is important to note. Later, I will discuss the language of contagion that Bergson employs as well. That we see contagion repeatedly employed in and around psychical research shows the way in which psychical research presents the concept

those critics who alluded to a potential homosexual relationship between Moberly and Jourdain. Both accusations rely upon imagining the self as susceptible to the contagion of another. She writes: “Later clinicians associated *folie à deux* not only with women and homosexuals—always the primary target groups—but also with other ‘dangerous’ minorities, including the laboring poor, immigrants, and blacks” (770). Accusations of contagious insanity were inherently troubled by two factors: *folie à deux* could describe normal behavior between two people and the insanity ascribed was almost always a way of demarcating between the culturally normal and the fringe.

On the surface it would seem that two people experienced very similar phenomena would lend credence to their claims. However, it had the opposite effect for the book. In 1957 Lucille Iremonger wrote a particularly savage attack on the two women attributing the experiences to the connection between Moberly and Jourdain. She writes, “The clumsy Miss Moberly fell for the airs and graces of ‘French’ Miss Jourdain” (qtd in Castle 758). And Terry Castle adds, “Given such pathological goings-on, Iremonger insinuated, it was not hard to see the Trianon ghost story as symptomatic-of the ‘unhealthy’ emotional tie that existed between its perpetrators” (759). According to Iremonger, the Moberly-Jourdain Incident was a question of influence: one of the women (Iremonger oscillates between which one) held a sort of psychical and—more importantly—emotional sway over the other woman. Whereas the collection of individual testimonies would normally add to one another when collecting evidence, in this case, the testimonies are suspect because they are contaminated specimens.

---

of bodies as permeable and not self-contained. This concept gets both stigmatized and discredited by the language of “contagion” by figuring that permeability as both the evidence of a disease and the concept of bodily permeability as a product of disease.

Perhaps it is coincidence that Henri Bergson targets modern science's fear of contagion in his speech before the SPR (discussed at length in chapter one) only two years after *An Adventure* was published. In the next section, I will discuss Bergson's familiarity with the text. However, even without a direct connection between the two, it is clear that the empirical obsession with contagion and the drive to separate objects from subjects permeated every aspect of psychical research. Moberly and Jourdain sought to inoculate themselves from criticism by constructing their book and yet it was the fundamental nature of the experiences—eerie feelings—that made them targets of suspicion.

An Adventure presented psychical research with a fundamental problem of the need to reconcile empiricism's emphasis upon objective, individual bodies of evidence with psychical phenomena's conceptions of subjective, feeling, and interrelated bodies. Theories of retrocognition, telepathy, and many other psychical phenomena take as their premise the idea that a human self is not isolated. Rather, retrocognition theorizes the human self as susceptible to being overtaken by another's feelings; one's emotions do not emerge solely from one's own body and mind. And yet, the SPR, in interrogating psychical phenomena with the rigor of orthodox science, must rely upon the opposite premise. SPR's empiricism forced them to reject Moberly and Jourdain because the testimony they provided was not pure enough.

II. Bergson's Aesthetics

While *An Adventure* was wildly popular in England, it is unclear the level of fame it achieved in France (not being translated until decades later). Henri Bergson appears to

have been familiar with the story at least by the 1920s. Among the books in his archives at the Bibliothèque Littéraire Jacques Doucet is Ernest Bozzano's *Les Phénomènes de Hantise*, a book translated from Italian into French in 1920. Bergson made quite a few marginal comments, but in one case he writes "An Adventure" next to a discussion of hauntings taking the form of cinematic spectacle ("la forme de spectacle cinématographique d'événements") (16). Later, Bozzano characterizes an "elective" haunting, where the percipient experiences reality such as a door being closed according to an external subjective reality (e.g. the door is suddenly open because the ghost experiences it as open). In the marginalia, Bergson writes "C'est toujours 'An Adventure,' le fantôme apportant avec lui toutes les circonstances et l'entourage, qui se substituent au reel. Ex: la porte qui s'ouvre quoique restant fermée."[90] Bergson connects Bozzano's text and *An Adventure* as presenting the idea of one's experience of reality (interaction with objects and sensations) as being overtaken by another (ghostly) body.[91] Bergson, then, is not only clearly aware of the Moberly-Jourdain Incident, but he engages it in a way that demonstrates that he is drawn to the story's theoretical engagements with

---

[90] "It's still 'An Adventure,' the ghost bringing along with it the circumstances and the environment, which replace the real. e.g., the door that opens though it remains closed."

[91] The portion of text being annotated reads: "Il est donc permis de croire que le seul phénomène physique accusé, celui de la porte ouverte par le spectre, se réduit à une visualization subjective. De plus, pour le considerer comme objectif, il faudrait que la percipiente eût retrouvé la porte ouverte; ou, elle oublie de nous renseigner à ce propos. [Au] contre, il suffit de consulter les nombreuses relations citant des episodes semblables, pour apprendre que généralement les percipients s'étonnent de retrouver fermées les portes qui'ils avaient vu ouvrir par les spectres." Translated: "One can therefore assume that the only physical phenomenon that was acknowledged, that of the door opened by the ghost, is reducible to a subjective visualization. Moreover, in order to view the phenomenon as objective, the percipient would have had to find the door open; or she forgets to let us know about it. On the other hand, one only needs to read up on the numerous reports citing similar episodes to see that percipients are generally surprised to find that the doors they had seen ghosts open were closed." This is interesting since I argue that one of the shared concerns of Bergson, Moberly, and Jourdain is the status of bodies, objects, and evidence.

the human self's experience of reality and temporality.[92] Bergson's engagement with psychical research shows us the ways in which his philosophy relies upon the sort of affective contagion revealed in *An Adventure*. More specifically though, Bergson deals with psychical research in a way that creates what we can understand as an aesthetics of these psychical phenomena. Bergson's aesthetic philosophy has been neglected for his theories of time and self, but the relationship between his aesthetics and his writings on psychical research have been particularly under-studied. But if Bergson's philosophy was as influential to modernist literature as discussed in chapter one, then there is an unexplored thread of how the aesthetic philosophy that proliferates from Bergson's work has been informed by the concepts of psychical research.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, hypnosis became a ubiquitous tool of the burgeoning fields of psychology and psychical research. Hypnotic suggestion offered its practitioners access to the veiled unconscious. It also seemed to provide a new perspective on the neurological workings of the brain. In the *First Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, the committee for studying hypnotic phenomena latches on to contemporary hypnotic research that emphasizes the heterogeneous biology of the brain. Citing Professor Rudolf Heidenhain's research, the committee writes,

> in the hypnotic condition, stimulation by word or gesture of the lower sensory centres in the "subject's" brain, instead of passing on in the usual way to the higher portion of that organ and there giving rise to consciousness and volition, passes by a direct path to the immediate centres of motion, and there gives rise to

[92] It is also perhaps worth noting in the light of my Introduction's discussion of William and Elizabeth Denton's *The Soul of Things* that Bozzano discusses the book and in a light blue pencil, Bergson underlines the title of the book.

> automatic responses, which may take the form of mimicry or of unconscious carrying out of simple orders. (219)

Hypnosis offered a map for understanding the interweaving pathways of brain-function and separated autonomic functions, reflexes, and the higher brain functions of conscious thought. By the late nineteenth century, scientists understood hypnosis to work by bypassing conscious thought through the passive, lower brain functions. For Bergson, though, hypnosis offered a way to theorize the permeability of human consciousness.

As with the rest of psychical research, hypnosis oscillated between the fringe and center of "legitimate" scientific pursuit. Beginning with Franz Mesmer at the end of the eighteenth century, hypnosis (or mesmerism) became a contentious debate for scientific academies.[93] Freud famously turned away from hypnosis so as to more clearly articulate psychoanalysis at the end of the nineteenth century.[94] Leading into the *Fin de Siècle*, it is Jean-Martin Charcot who brought hypnosis to the forefront of legitimate neurological study.[95] Bergson's contact with hypnosis came in the 1880s when he was at the beginning of his career in Clermont-Ferrand.[96] Bergson writes about his first encounter with hypnosis in the first article of his career, "De La Simulation Inconscient dans L'État

---

[93] For a more comprehensive history of hypnosis, see Henri Ellenberger's *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*.

[94] Freud's rejection of hypnosis is similar to his treatment of telepathy and psychical research more broadly (as I discuss in chapter three). For more on Freud and hypnosis, see Mikkel Borch-Jacobsen's "Hypnosis in Psychoanalysis."

[95] In 1893, the British Medical Journal remarked upon Charcot helping to transition hypnosis into legitimacy, writing: No man was more opposed to quackery, and to him is due the credit of helping to rescue artificial somnambulism from the illegitimate embrace of the charlatan. Fifteen years ago only a strong man could have given the demonstrations which he gave without endangering his professional status, and a few shallow visitors carped even at him; but he passed through the ordeal with impunity, and rendered it easy for others to prosecute the same studies" (2).

[96] R. C. Grogin writes that "From 1883 until the appearance of *Time and Free Will*, Bergson is known to have participated in many hypnotic sessions" (22).

D'Hypnotisme," which appeared in an 1886 issue of *Revue Philosophique de la France Et de l'Etranger*.[97]

Bergson's first writing on hypnosis in "De La Simulation" takes a case of purported thought-reading as researched by a local doctor in Clermont, M.V. Todd Cronan summarizes:

> M. V.'s experiments involved standing before a group of boys, his back to the window, with an open book before him raised to eye level. From the boys' perspective, they could see only the cover of the book and the partially exposed face of the hypnotist. According to M. V.'s report, while the boys were in a hypnotic trance they could read the number as well as the words and lines on the open page before him, although the text was unobservable from their point of view. For M. V., this was a clear case of thought reading, and he assumed that the boys saw the words pass through his mind while he was reading and simply read the words along with him. (81)

When Bergson and André Robinet conducted their own experiments, they came up with an alternative conclusion. Bergson notes the ease with which he induced an hypnotic state in the boys: "Il nous suffit de poser brusquement une main sur leur tête et d'attirer ainsi leur regard sur le nôtre pour les plonger instantanément dans cet état de stupeur qui caractérise l'hypnotisme" (333).[98] Bergson and Robinet replicated M.V.'s experiment: Robinet would stand in front of a window, facing the boys, and holding a book 10 centimeters from his face. He then asked the boy to read the text. The boys were able to

[97] "De La Simulation Inconscient dans L'État D'Hypnotisme" has not been translated into English. Any quotes from the text are my translation.
[98] "We need only suddenly place a hand on their heads and attract their gaze and on ours to plunge them instantly into the stupor characteristic of hypnotism."

read from the text without looking at it. When Bergson inquired how they could accomplish such a feat, the boys replied: "'Je le vois.' 'Où le voyez-vous?' 'Là.' Et, passant un doigt sous le livre, de manière à pouvoir toucher la page que je regarde, il le pose avec une étonnante précision sur le numéro ou le titre qu'il s'agissait de deviner."[99]

Bergson eventually concludes that rather than the boys seeing the pages from Robinet's eyes (through thought-transference), it was a case of hyperesthesia related to the hypnotism. The boys—particularly the most adept boy, "L…e"—were more receptive to sensory information in their hypnotic state and therefore they could read the text off the reflection in Robinet's eyes. Cronan explains: "Hypnotic suggestion, by decisively relaxing the body, induced a profound change in the shape of the subject's cornea (what Bergson described as a "ciliary spasm") that made the eye for a brief period of time hyperacute, as though it were a microscope" (83). Bergson's first public discussion of hypnosis categorizes not as thought-reading, but as opening the human self to more sensory phenomena than would be available to the consciousness. In his first book, *Time and Free Will*, Bergson returns to hypnosis as a way to understand aesthetics.[100]

Graceful Bodies

In *Time and Free Will* Bergson counters a mechanistic universe by arguing that free will exists when the human can escape the rhythm of habit that exists in the external

[99] "'I see it.' 'Where?' 'There.' And passing his finger under the book, in such a way that he could touch the page I am looking at, he places it with surprising precision on the number or title that he was required to reveal."

[100] *Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience* was Bergson's doctoral thesis, published in 1889 and later translated into English in 1911.

world. *Time and Free Will* begins with dance as a way to understand the relationship between free will and *durée*. He discusses the aesthetic feeling of grace, what he calls the "simplest" aesthetic feeling (TFW 11). The dancer draws the spectator in through the flowing rhythm of movements that forecast future movements. "If curves are more graceful than broken lines," he writes, "the reason is that, while a curved line changes its direction at every moment, every new direction is indicated in the preceding one. Thus the perception of ease in motion passes over into the pleasure of mastering the flow of time and holding the future in the present." In his explanation, Bergson frequently shifts between emphasizing the agency of the performer and the spectator.[101] Here, the dancer's mastery of the flow of time creates a graceful feeling, but he follows this with an external control over these movements by the accompanying music. "For the rhythm and measure," he writes, "by allowing us to foresee to a still greater extent the movements of the dancer, makes us believe that we now control them" (TFW 12). That is, music offers the spectator the pretense of mastery and knowledge of the dancer's movements. He continues:

> As we guess almost the exact attitude which the dancer is going to take, he seems to obey us when he really takes it: the regularity of the rhythm establishes a kind of communication between him and us, and the periodic returns of the measure are like so many invisible threads by means of which we set in motion this imaginary puppet. Indeed, if it stops for an instant, our hand in its impatience cannot refrain from making a movement, as though to push it, as though to replace it in the midst of this movement, the rhythm of which has taken complete

[101] Todd Cronan offers a rare reading of hypnosis as it relates to Bergson's aesthetics, arguing for an emphasis upon the agency of the artist.

> possession of our thought and will. Thus a kind of physical sympathy enters into the feeling of grace. (TFW 12-3)

Dancing thus demonstrates the precariousness of the human's free will; the spectator is offered the illusion of control only to be physically overcome by the body of another. Grace is a byproduct of having one's body overtaken by a physical sympathy. This brings Bergson to his point:

> we shall perceive that the object of art is to put to sleep the active or rather resistant powers of our personality, and thus to bring us into a state of perfect responsiveness, in which we realize the idea that is suggested to us and sympathize with the feeling that is expressed. In the processes of art we shall find, in a weakened form, a refined and in some measure spiritualized version of the processes commonly used to induce the state of hypnosis. (TFW 14)

Bergson's art-as-hypnosis thesis makes explicit Bergson's larger desire to examine the human self's encounter with external objects as both aesthetic (crafted by human) and natural. Art offers us a chance to witness the self as being "lulled into self-forgetfulness" (15) but aesthetic feelings only serve to exemplify all human feelings through their basis in quality and not quantity. As he explains, "The merit of a work of art is not measured so much by the power with which the suggested feeling takes hold of us as by the richness of this feeling itself: in other words, besides degrees of intensity we instinctively distinguish degrees of depth or elevation" (17).

When Todd Cronan examines how hypnosis shapes Bergson's aesthetics, he wants to argue for an aesthetics of intentionality. By reading Bergson's aesthetics through hypnosis, Cronan asks from where the feelings of grace and beauty spring: are they like

hypnotic suggestions, subconsciously inspired by the hypnotist (or artist)? Or, are they feelings deeply embedded within the self, triggered during a state of intense relaxation? While Neo-Bergsonists, particularly in the vein of Deleuze, would argue for the latter, Cronan attempts to recover the former to settle for a medium between the two. That is, Cronan argues:

> It is this sense of the latency of emotions within the beholder, as well as the artist's intention to evoke those effects, that is refused or neglected by Bergson commentators and entirely absent in the Bergson-inspired interpretations of Matisse. The sense that a work of art can hypnotically "cause our attention to swing to and fro" is affirmed by the Bergsonian interpreters, but that idea is stripped of its intentionalist setting, which requires both the artist's and the beholder's agency. (93-4)

My intention is not to reconcile the arguments of Cronan and the Neo-Bergsonists. In the context of this chapter, it matters very little from where aesthetic emotions originate. Rather, what matters here is the fact of Bergson's aesthetics heavy reliance upon the inextricable relationship between the bodies involved in aesthetic exchange. The conflict between Cronan and the Neo-Bergsonists perfectly demonstrates the non-directional, acausal, and polytemporaneous exchange of aesthetic encounters.

Cronan's quarrel with the Neo-Bergsonists is that they have ignored the causality and intention hidden in Bergson's aesthetics. Cronan's Bergson believes that aesthetic feelings lie dormant in human's unconscious, but that it is the artist's intent to draw out those feelings that sparks the aesthetic encounter. Citing Bergson, Cronan writes: "The great artist is someone who can help us 'experience what he cannot make us understand.'

And what the artist helps us to experience is the depth of ourselves" (95). This argument traces a line of causality, beginning with the intentional act of an artist, to the artistic encounter (and the percipient's role in that encounter), and the unlocking of aesthetic feeling in the percipient.

The causality of this argument and the sequential temporality it implies seem to ignore Bergson's other attempts to extricate feelings from a strict, causal temporality. Bergson, for example, does not want to suggest that the latent feelings of the percipient are sequestered memories that one recalls as a result of the aesthetic experience. This would be a more Freudian concept of aesthetics and temporality. Instead, there is a more anachronistic encounter in Bergsonian aesthetics. Though Bergson begins his aesthetic discussion in *Time and Free Will* with the relationship between dance and grace, he argues it is the more immobile arts of architecture and sculpture that inspire the greatest aesthetic feelings. And they inspire these feelings through the anachronistic engagement with the art. Bergson writes:

> While the works of ancient sculpture express faint emotions which play upon them like a passing breath, the pale immobility of the stone causes the feeling expressed or the movement just begun to appear as if they were fixed forever, absorbing our thought and our will in their own eternity. We find in architecture, in the very midst of this startling immobility, certain effects analogous to those of rhythm. The symmetry of form, the indefinite repetition of the same architectural motive, causes our faculty of perception to oscillate between the same and the same again, and gets rid of those customary incessant changes which in ordinary life bring us back without ceasing to the consciousness of our personality even the

> faint suggestion of an idea will then be enough to make the idea fill the whole of our mind. (TFW 15-6)

The aesthetic experience of architecture relies upon an oscillation between *same* and *same again*. This contrasts to the human self's regular experiences of "ordinary life": in sequence and through causality. It is not causal to say that one is shocked into aesthetic feeling by experiencing architecture. Rather, the experience is a recognition, the jolting simultaneity of sameness between the self and aesthetic object. The "self-forgetfulness" of aesthetics that reminds Bergson of hypnosis is really a removal of barriers between the self and object, it is an encounter with the permeability of the self.

This is a good point to remember that Bergsonian temporality is predicated on "the continuous progress of the past which gnaws into the future and which swells as it advances" (CE 4). To say one's feelings are latent is not to say that they are static memories that have been locked away. Rather, the past is continually pushing forward to the present. Thus, the experience of same and same again is the experience of the self as *in flux* in a way that resembles fixity. It seems counter-intuitive to describe sculpture or architecture—arts that seem to fix materiality in time—as *in flux*. However, the fixity of these arts draw the percipient's attention away from sequential states and toward the continuity of past into the present. Thus, Bergson's aesthetics seem less interested in the causality of intention or anti-intention, but rather they are concerned with the stage of aesthetic experience between the self and object.

Physical Contagion

Bergson characterizes the aesthetic experience as contagion. He writes, “The plastic arts obtain an effect of the same kind by the fixity which they suddenly impose upon life, and which a physical contagion carries over to the attention of the spectator” (TFW 15). In chapter one, I discussed Bergson’s admonition to scientists afraid of contagion of emotions and phenomena. Though, he does not want to jettison science for art, Bergson clearly wants to use aesthetic experience as a way to inform the human self’s encounter with the world. Time, rather than experienced in discreet units, is something experienced contagiously. The aesthetic experience proves a model for the myriad of phenomenal encounters that compose the human self’s engagement with the world.

These phenomenal encounters with the world are continuous and Bergson describes them through intensity. He writes, “Sometimes the feeling which is suggested scarcely makes a break in the compact texture of psychic phenomena of which our history consists; sometimes it draws our attention from them, but not so that they become lost to sight; sometimes, finally, it puts itself in their place, engrosses us and completely monopolizes our soul” (TFW 17). His model of contagious feelings runs along a spectrum from a slight feeling inspired to the complete loss of self to the feeling of the object. Bergson imagines aesthetic experience as being able to completely overtake the self with the feelings of another.

Bergson’s concern for contagion is not, as we see in Castle’s reading of *An Adventure,* focused on emotional contagion. Terry Castle’s “Contagious Folly” does not read *An Adventure* as an aesthetic object as much as an historical one. By focusing on critics’ obsessions with the *folie à deux*, she notes their fear of emotional contagion. Above, we discussed how critics sought to interrogate and discredit Moberly and

Jourdain's claim of walking into another's memory. This historical or scientific interrogation approaches *An Adventure* with the questions: did it happen? And then, how can we explain what happened? Bergson employs the language of contagion to highlight orthodox's scientific concerns over the slippage between subject and object, a slippage that Bergson believes inherent to the human self.

In chapter one, I argued that the same discursive context that gave rise to psychical research produced Bergson's concept of temporality. Bergson did not approach psychical research for its examinations of phenomena.[102] Rather, he saw it as a venture, parallel to his own, into the human self's engagement with that phenomena. In this light, Moberly and Jourdain can be engaged not just historically and scientifically, but aesthetically. *An Adventure* remains vastly understudied as having any bearing on the philosophical, aesthetic, and literary movements of the period. However, Moberly and Jourdain's book offers up a theory of temporality and affect that is remarkably radical: time, memory, and the human self are so permeable that the three might become so intermingled as to be unvariegated entirely. And yet, this theory feels quite at home with the statements of Bergson: "For our bodies, with which and through which we perceive, are different from other images, in that we are aware of them not only through perception, but also through affections" (qtd in Moore 33). Additionally, Bergson's close friend, Charles Richet writes: "As one has said for a long time, no fact disappears from memory: everything is fixed in it. Everything acts on us and leaves an indelible trace. Our

[102] It should be noted that in "De La Simulation Inconscient dans L'État D'Hypnotisme" Bergson is making a scientific inquiry to prove or disprove a hypothesis. He moves quickly away from this sort of engagement with the processes of psychical research in the rest of his writings. This, then, further accounts for his efforts to distance himself from doing actual psychical research that we discuss in chapter one.

intellectual existence at a moment is the result of all the impressions received in our past existence. How few, in this immense number, are perceived by consciousness" (248).

Falling into the trap of probing *An Adventure*'s verity turns us sharply away from understanding the actual implications of Moberly and Jourdain's experiences. This is, of course, the recurring conflict for marginalized bodies and voices: that the dominant societal difference between hegemonic and heterodox bodies short-circuits efforts to feel empathy and sameness. This is why the orthodox scientific community's efforts to redirect attention onto the objective body simultaneously causes the marginalization of certain kinds of bodies (in these chapters we cover queer, racialized, and female bodies) and is a result of the marginalization; one cannot empathize or understand the experiences of a body whose otherness marks it as untrustworthy. I want to reimagine *An Adventure* in a similar manner. The question of the book's veracity is a cause and result of Moberly and Jourdain's marginalized positions and lack of authority.

By offering a theory of temporality and affect that radically imagines human selves as permeable, they subvert the orthodox scientific interrogations such as W.H. Salter's quoted above: "All this would have been avoided if they had added to their many virtues some knowledge of the standards of evidence and the recognized procedure for conforming to them, that the peculiar subject-matter of psychical research makes necessary" (186). The actual theory of *An Adventure* reveals the farcical paradox at the heart of Salter's well-meaning complaint. *An Adventure* is completely inextricable from Moberly and Jourdain's bodily experiences. And yet, Salter seems to think that if only the experiences could be extricated from those bodies, it would be remarkable.

And this is where Bergson, Moberly and Jourdain collide: all three write of feelings that might completely overtake the percipient. For Bergson, they are aesthetic feelings of beauty or grace, but they are the feelings inherent to an external object; they are the affects of a thing acting upon a human self. For Moberly and Jourdain there is no mediating object. If we consider Marie Antoinette the artist, she needs no canvas or carved stone to affect the percipient (though Moberly does see Marie Antoinette drawing). The important common denominator, though, is the susceptibility of the human self to the power of the external affects. To understand these ideas as aesthetic theories of temporality in the *Fin de Siècle*, it is important to make one final detour. Discussing Bergon, Moberly, Jourdain, and aesthetics of temporality in the *Fin de Siècle*, the elephant in the room is that giant of modernist memory, Marcel Proust.

III. Narrative

Marcel Proust enters this chapter by the felicity of circumstance. While the relationship between Bergson and Proust has been discussed heavily in critical circles, there is no evidence to trace Proust to Moberly or Jourdain.[103] However, in reading *Du Côté de chez Swann*, a moment just at the end struck me. The novel finishes with the narrator walking through the Bois de Boulogne toward "Trianon." The distance between the Bois and Trianon at Versailles is quite large (eight miles) and so it is unclear as to whether Proust's narrator is referring to Marie Antoinette's Trianon.[104] The rumination on memory and

[103] Professor Luc Fraisse drew my attention to Pierre-Yves Leprince's 2014 novel *Les Enquêtes de Monsieur Proust*, which imagines Proust's interaction with Moberly and Jourdain's book. In the novel, Leprince's Proust dismisses Moberly and Jourdain's book as merely a ghost story. The Proust in Leprince's novel, it seems, is a skeptic.

[104] I have consulted several French scholars about a possible Trianon that I might not know of, but no one seems to be able to place the reference. It is, of course, possible that Trianon is being used directionally and

time here would stand out to few readers as particularly different from the rest of Proust's novels that are entirely composed of competing conceptions of temporality. On my reading, however, the forcefulness of the involuntary memory Proust describes and the appearance of Trianon brought Moberly and Jourdain to mind.

In the closing breaths of *Du Côte de Chez Swann*, we witness the opposition of two senses of memory play out against one another. The first is the narrator's nostalgia, which he describes by saying, "Les éléments de ce désir devenu lui-même inaccessible comme le plaisir qu'il avait jadis vainement poursuivi."[105] On the other hand, what drew the narrator to the woods in the first place is the thought of fall, the sensations of witnessing the autumn leaves falling in the breeze. He describes these memories, saying, "Dans ma chamber fermée, [les feuilles mortes] s'interposaient depuis un mois, évoquées par mon désir de les voir, entre ma pensée et n'importe quel objet auqel je m'appliquais, et tourbillonnaient comme ces taches jaunes qui parfois, quoi que nous regardions, dansent devant nos yeux."[106] Both Montcrief and Lydia Davis' translations in the footnote below skate over Proust's language of the leaves interposing themselves, Montcrief settling instead for the more poetic "had been drifting" while Davis simply translates it "had been coming." But the dead leaves "s'interposaient"; they force

---

not as the actual destination. In this case it is perhaps even more interesting that Proust chooses Marie Antoinette's Trianon and not her husband's (and the state's) Versailles.

[105] Montcrief's translation: "The elements of that memory which I felt to belong to a distant era, to a date in time towards which it was forbidden me to ascend again the fatal slope, the elements of that longing which had become, itself, as inaccessible as the pleasure that it had once vainly pursued."

[106] Montcrief: "Into my closed room [autumn leaves] had been drifting already for a month, summoned there by my desire to see them, slipping between my thoughts and the object, whatever it might be, upon which I was trying to concentrate them, whirling in front of me like those brown spots that sometimes, whatever we may be looking at, will seem to be dancing or swimming before our eyes." Lydia Davis' translation: "In my closed room, they had been coming for a month now."

themselves upon him. These are the sorts of memories that contain reality and take form. Proust himself coined the term *la mémoire involuntaire* for these sorts of memories.[107]

Proust's *la mémoire involuntaire* is perhaps one of the most discussed concepts in modernist literature.[108] Elizabeth Jackson neatly lists off its constituent parts: "Its involuntary character, its structural function, its intricate mechanism including unusual impetus-sensations, original and beautiful content, striking subsidiary effects" (586). Jackson also notes that the involuntary memory of *La Recherche* is itself a collection of mnemonic-sense interactions that develops throughout Proust's works. *La mémoire involuntaire* became central to narratological readings of temporality, but more recently it has been explored for how it characterizes temporality and aesthetics through affect.

Analepsis

Since Gerard Genette's 1972 *Narrative Discourse*, Proust's *la mémoire involuntaire* has been often thought of as analeptic. That is, the situational anachrony that occurs throughout the text can be best understood through the whole of the narrative's temporality. Paul Ricoeur describes this Genettian understanding of Proustian memory:

> Whether it is a question of completing the narration of an event by bringing it into the light of a preceding event, of filling in an earlier lacuna, or provoking involuntary memory by repeated recalling of similar events, or of correcting an

---

[107] It has been repeatedly noted that the concept predates Proust. See Justin O'Brien's, "La Memoire involontaire avant Proust"; Edward Bizub's *Proust Among the Psychologists Proust et le moi divisé: La Recherche, creuset de la psychologie expérimentale (1874-1914)*; and Elizabeth Jackson's "The Genesis of the Involuntary Memory in Proust's Early Works."

[108] I will not attempt a summary here. However, we can note particular threads of interpretation and understanding of involuntary memory. We will discuss Genette's narratological reading of the concept as an aesthetic structuring of text. Cognitive researchers such as Emily Troscianko see Proust as rendering a reality of memory that corresponds to more recent neural and cognitive research. Patience Moll reads involuntary memory as profoundly ethical in nature, bridging the gap between self an other.

> earlier interpretation by means of a series of reinterpretations—Proustian analepsis is not a gratuitous game. It is governed by the meaning of the work as a whole. (83)

This thread of reading memory narratologically directs the reader's attention to the central force of the narrator and the reader's encounter with time as rearranged, coded, and structured.

Genette's concept of the fictive temporality of the text disembodies time. He writes:

> As the distinction between subjective and objective anachronies is not a matter of temporality but arises from other categories that we will come to in the chapter on mood, we will neutralize it for the moment. Moreover, to avoid the psychological connotations of such terms as "anticipation" or "retrospection," which automatically evoke subjective phenomena, we will eliminate these terms most of the time in favor of two others that are more neutral, designating as *prolepsis* any narrative maneuver that consists of narrating or evoking in advance an event that will take place later, designating as *analepsis* any evocation after the fact of an event that took place earlier than the point in the story. (39-40)

By this time we should recognize the almost automatic laboratory gesture of shifting attention from subjective to an objective body. Genette sees the subjective phenomena in the text as troublesome and "neutralizes" them. For Genette, both the narrator's and text's bodies are unfeeling, but controlling forces that act upon the reader. As he observes, "[the narrator's] recollections control the whole of the narrative" (45). And though this control

waxes and wanes, the dynamic of the reader's experience rigidly moves from writer to text to reader.

Paul Ricoeur's reading of *À La Recherche* softens this strictly cognitive stance on encountering Proustian temporality. Instead of the narrator's control, Ricoeur proposes a "fictive experience of time" in reading the novels. He describes it as "the temporal aspect of this virtual experience of being-in-the-world proposed by the text…. Short of the reception of the text by the reader and the intersection between this fictive experience and the reader's actual experience, the world of the work constitutes what I shall term a transcendence immanent in the text" (100-1). This is not a shift to the reader's purely subjective experience, but rather, he calls it "a projection of the work" (101). Ricoeur's use of virtuality does not carry the Bergsonian connotation of potential form. Rather, he wants to imagine the textual body as a neutral position that the reader can step into, an out-of-body experience of sorts. This neutral space is not quite the sanitary, objective body of Genette's narratology, but it certainly turns the discussion of the text into a more universal discussion of observing how the body of the text (in this case a very stable, uncontested body) acts upon the body of a reader (imagined to be all bodies).

Ricoeur justifies this reading by noting the extra-temporality or universality that he sees the novels eventually moving toward. He writes, "The time [the novel] brings to light is not, at first, time regained in the sense of time lost that is found again, but the very suspension of time, *eternity*, or to speak as the narrator does, 'extra-temporal' being" (144). *La Recherche* moves the reader toward reconciling two temporalities: that which can be "lost" and that which exists outside of time. The text of *La Recherche* is also simultaneously the text of the unnamed narrator (as the novels depict the journey toward

his ability to create art) and that of Marcel Proust. Ricoeur argues that the text as artistic creation "*narrates the transition from one meaning of time regained to the other*" (145). Proust's novels, then, graft the extra-temporality of time and artistic vision onto the ephemeral temporality of time lost.

Ricoeur's concept of temporality does not coincide with that of Bergson's philosophy, but it does offer a variant of sorts to Bergsonian "virtuality." The "virtual experience" of Ricoeur's reader imagines a neutral space between authorial, textual, and readerly bodies. For Ricoeur, reading provides an out-of-body experience that is both affectively neutral and temporally universal. In chapter one, we discussed Bergsonian temporality more in-depth, but for him, virtuality means potential form that is tied to distinct and not universal temporality. For Bergson, narration presents a point of contact between those bodies that is inherently affective and polytemporaneous. The question is just what sort of narrative encounter occurs in the Proustian text?

Deleuze, of course, believes Proust to have a very different concept of time from Bergson. He writes, "Proust does not in the least conceive change as in Bergsonian duration, but as a defection, a race to the grave" (18). Deleuze defines *la mémoire involuntaire* as "an old sensation [that] tries to superimpose itself, to unite with the present sensation" (20). However, I want to argue that Proustian narration, though it may not be concerned with Bergsonian duration, is certainly caught up in the same discourse of polytemporaneity and the permeability of the self that we have seen in the previous chapters. My goal here is not to show how Proust reads Bergson's philosophy, but to show the remarkable uncanniness between the bodily encounters in Proust, Bergson, Moberly, and Jourdain.

The Poet-Scientist

In Nicola Luckhurst's *Science and Structure in Proust's À la recherche du temps perdu*, she describes Proust's approach to language as phenomena-first. Proust earned a reputation as a "poet scientist" because, she argues, he developed intuitive models of phenomena and then sought scientific models by which to understand those phenomena:

> Proust's letters tend to detail a phenomenon, often an aspect of human (and particularly social) behavior; he then pares down the description until he captures its essential characteristics and/or dynamic, at which point he asks his correspondent whether anything similar occurs in their field—botany, say, or geometry. (134)

For Proust, writing renders the textual body as a proxy for a human's body; it seeks to figure the textual body as feeling the way a human body might. In examining Proustian affect, we can see the ways in which Proust does not behave like a scientist. The phenomena rendered in his texts are more than just described or detailed. He does not, then, as Luckhurst suggests, act as a scientist by isolating the phenomena. Though Proust looked to science to validate his observations, his approach is to then transfer those phenomena to a textual mode. This phenomena-first approach is important because it resembles the thread of Bergsonian aesthetics that emerges from psychical research.

Proustian narration has served as a central mode of modeling the critical discussions of affect in literature. Additionally, there is a particular strain of this criticism that reads Proust for the way in which affect creates a point of exchange for text and

reader. Inge Wimmers borrows from Ricoeur to argue that the motivated reader participates in the affect of Proust’s text:

> As we make our way through *À la recherche*, our attention becomes focused on emotions, since they are of central interest to the hero-narrator who dwells on them in examining his own life and who, moreover, closely analyses his own response to works of fiction, thus inscribing in the very novel we are reading a theory of affective response where characters are the focal point in the hero's own motivated reading of fiction. (8)

This point of contact draws the reader into the text, to “live *through* it” (22). It is this specific mode of affective interrelations that stands out. Wimmers takes the neutral body of text that Ricoeur proposes and saturates it with the overwhelming hues of Proust’s emotions. Through that affectively charged text, she writes, “readers are initiated instead into a mode of being—a foreboding of how it feels—whose full implications will become obvious only in a retrospective reading when analogies can be drawn between the same and similar” (23-4).

For Wimmers and others, the exchange is not only affective, but Proust’s “mode of being” is itself a temporally folded and retrospective being-in-the-world. Throughout *La Recherche*, the narrator’s memories shift and take on new connotations. The reader, too, experiences the text and its memories through the folds of time and memory. As Malcolm Bowie describes it, “Present reading time is haunted by reading times past” (52). That is, the narrator’s memory snowballs and morphs its shape by taking on new affective meanings, but this process happens for the reader as well. As memories repeat throughout *La Recherche*, the reader’s experiences of those stories grows and evolves.

Bowie also argues that this experience of time is not simply past-oriented, but enfolded with future temporality as well. "Within the paragraphs," he writes, "the propulsive energy of the writing, the living sense of futurity that drives the narration on, comes from an astonishing power of recapitulation… The way forward into a clear new future always involves revisiting the past" (52).

Critics such as Leo Bersani would thoroughly disagree with a reading of Proust and phenomena. In *The Culture of Redemption* Bersani writes, "In what mode do phenomena persist in the record of their essence? In a sense, [*À*] *La Recherche* moves toward a relatively simple answer to that question: in the later volumes, the phenomenal is more and more absorbed in the universally valid formula, the general law" (11). Bersani and many other critics, including Deleuze, read Proust as converting the materiality of affect and experience into immaterial text. In "Sleeping with Proust," John Lurz argues that, in making such arguments, critics follow "a desire to reconstruct experience in an ideal realm" (133). And in doing so, he says, critics ignore the materiality of the text itself.

Lurz turns toward the end of *La Recherche* to witness the affect inherent in the materiality of text. In this pivotal scene, Proust plucks a volume of George Sand from the shelf of the library. Proust writes:

> So all the time I had been following my line of thought, I had been taking down the precious volumes at random until, absent-mindedly opening one of them, *François le Champi* by George Sand, I felt unpleasantly struck by some impression which seemed to have too little in common with my current thoughts,

> until I realized a moment later, with an emotion which brought tears to my eyes, how much in accord with them this impression actually was. (*Finding* 191)

As Lurz reads it, “This passage thus indicates that, far from being purely mental, reading is actually a radically sensory experience, and, accordingly, the description of being ‘struck’ by an ‘impression’ takes on an insistently physical connotation” (135). The materiality of the bodies of text and Proust’s character indicates the ways in which affect and reading far-exceed a notion of reading as a mental process.

This specific thread of Proustian criticism weaves together a multiplicity of ideas and as such, we should spell them out clearly. Proust’s texts rely on an overwhelming collision of competing temporalities. Those temporalities are rendered explicitly through affect-as-phenomena. The texts that contain these temporalities and affects are themselves material bodies. Finally, the texts offer a point of contact between the authorial, textual, and readerly bodies where the reader can be overwhelmed and affectively overtaken.

Inattentive Bodies

Proust published the first volume of *À la recherche du temps perdu* in 1913, two years after Moberly and Jourdain published *An Adventure*. It is almost certainly a coincidence that at the end of *Swann’s Way*, his narrator walks through the Bois de Boulogne in the direction of Trianon and that during this walk, his memories seem to overtake him in a way that resembles the Moberly-Jourdain Incident. There is another coincidence connecting Proust to Moberly and Jourdain, though. In 1965, the theory emerged that what Moberly and Jourdain experienced was a costume party. This idea had

been mooted much earlier as well, but the theory reemerged in a book by Philippe Jullian on the Count Robert de Montesquiou. The Count has been frequently cited as the inspiration for Proust's ostentatious character Baron de Charlus. Jullian described the Count's elaborate costume parties held at Versailles. One of the articles connecting these new claims to *An Adventure* described the Count's lifestyle: "That the count lived in Versailles at the appropriate period [around 1901, when Moberly and Jourdain experienced their retrocognition], that he and his friends, wearing eighteenth-century costume, used to meet for poetry reading at the Trianons, and that he and his Argentine secretary often wore long green travelling cloaks" (Holroyd).

Coincidences though they may be, I argue that what is not coincidental is the thread of theories of temporality that runs through the works of Proust, Bergson, and Moberly and Jourdain. All of these writers imagine a human self that can be overtaken by the affect of another. Bergson relies upon hypnosis to get to this point, but he does so by emphasizing the percipient's oscillation between attention and inattention. The dancer, we will remember, lulls the audience member into the false sense of control. "Thus the perception of ease in motion passes over into the pleasure of mastering the flow of time and holding the future in the present," he writes. He concludes: "The rhythm… has taken complete possession of our thought and will. Thus a kind of physical sympathy enters into the feeling of grace" (TFW 12-3).

Compare this shift from attention to inattention, from possession to being possessed, to Wimmers' reading of Proust. Wimmers writes: "As we make our way through *À la recherche*, our attention becomes focused on emotions… thus inscribing in the very novel we are reading a theory of affective response where characters are the

focal point in the hero's own motivated reading of fiction" (8). Wimmers argues that the motivated reader's attentive posture toward the text allows for them to step into the body of the text and experience its emotions. But look at the body of Proust's narrator when he takes Sand's novel in his hand: "I felt myself unpleasantly struck by an impression which seemed at first to be utterly out of harmony with the thoughts that were passing through my mind." This is not a motivated reader, but a man who merely touched a thing and, by a sort of magic spark, he is "struck by an impression." As the narrator continues, the jarring effect of this impression occurs for a multitude of reasons: his own memories of the book, his attitude at the time, and the just touching the book forced these to collide in a moment.

Proust's text proves capable of the same sort of jolting impressions upon its readers and I would argue this is because of inattention rather than attention. *À la recherche* is a sprawling, often tedious text, because of its repetition. Throughout its volumes, memories repeat each time imbued heavily with the narrator's emotions. The memories (the madeleine, Combray, his grandmother) return so regularly that they could be likened to Bergson's dancer. They repeat their gestures so that a reader might be drawn into the illusion of control that these feelings are her own. And the density of the text also exhausts the reader at times with thick description and often the narrator's overwrought (and one might say melodramatic) reader's emotions. Proust intentionally fatigues his reader, pushing and pulling her between attention and inattention, precisely so as to affect her and overtake her with affect.

Retrocognitive Reading

Moberly and Jourdain's *An Adventure* is a catalog of sudden and striking impressions. It begins with the incongruity between Moberly and Jourdain's own feelings and the gloominess that seems to overtake them from nowhere. "Everything suddenly looked unnatural, therefore unpleasant," Moberly writes, "even the trees behind the building seemed to have become flat and lifeless, like wood worked in tapestry." But the feelings Moberly and Jourdain describe as belonging to objects are not only observations of things looking unpleasant, the feelings become internalized by the women. Moberly recalls that "from the moment we left the lane an extraordinary depression had come over me, which, in spite of every effort to shake off, steadily deepened." Every encounter along the path brings with it an incongruous feeling that begins as external, but overtakes the women.

Both Moberly and Jourdain describe meeting a dark complexioned man as the culmination of their eerie feelings. The women describe him as being repulsive, with Jourdain noting "I felt a repugnance going past him." Later, their research revealed to them that this man must have been the Comte de Vaudreuil. They say that he was a creole man who was marked by smallpox. He had been an intimate of the Queen and used her to gain permission from the King to allow for a performance of the politically scandalous *Le Mariage de Figaro*. Moberly and Jourdain argue that their revulsion toward the Comte was not due to his unattractive looks, but rather that he appeared so hideous because of Marie Antoinette's memory. As she looked back from prison, she felt his betrayal and the Comte who manifests himself in her memory is a revolting man. Just how the women express their disgust in the Comte is important. Jourdain "felt a repugnance" and Moberly writes that seeing him "was the culmination of my peculiar sensations." They

describe these feelings in a way that alienates them from their own bodies, because they argue that these are Marie Antoinette's own feelings toward the Comte overtaking them.

The pivotal moment of *An Adventure*'s retrocognitive experience is one that only Moberly witnessed. Charlotte Anne Moberly's describes coming upon Marie Antoinette sitting on a camp-stool, drawing. Later, when Moberly recounted this story to her brother, he suggested that perhaps they saw the Queen as she imagined herself rather than as herself. In this theory, the clothing which Moberly describes in such detail would not have been what Marie Antoinette wore on that day, but her clothing as she imagined herself wearing. What's really curious though is the feeling Moberly describes as she sees the Queen. Elsewhere, Moberly and Jourdain explain that the emotions of Marie Antoinette's memory have overtaken their own feelings. They felt impelled to walk a certain direction because the Queen wanted to and they felt disgust toward the Comte de Vaudreuil because Marie Antoinette despised him. However, in this moment, Moberly writes, "I looked straight at her; but some indescribable feeling made me turn away annoyed at her being there." There is a circularity revealed at this moment that suggests some sort of self-awareness. Marie Antoinette perhaps relives her memories through the bodies of Moberly and Jourdain and seeing herself shatters the illusion. It is also curious that Jourdain is completely outside of this pivotal moment. Their experiences are shared, in some ways, but they are not identical. Let us shift back to Proust's narrator with George Sand's text in hand, which I quote at length:

> At a dinner-party, where thought always remains close to the surface of things, I would probably have been able to talk about *François le Champi* and the Guermantes without either of them meaning what they had meant in Combray.

But when I was alone, as at this moment, I was plunged down to a much greater depth. In those moments, the idea that some woman I had met in society was a cousin of Mme de Guermantes, that is, the cousin of a magic-lantern character, seemed incomprehensible, and it seemed equally incomprehensible that the finest books that I had read might be—I do not say better than, which of course they were—but even equal to the extraordinary *François le Champi*. This was an impression from long ago, in which my memories of childhood and family were affectionately mingled and which I had not immediately recognized. For a moment I had angrily wondered who the stranger was who had just upset me. But the stranger was myself, it was the child I was then, whom the book had just brought back to life within me because, knowing nothing of me except this child, it was this child that the book had immediately summoned, wanting to be looked at only by his eyes, loved only by his heart, and wanting to speak only to him. So this book which my mother had read aloud to me in Combray until it was almost morning had retained for me all the wonder of that night. It is true that the 'pen' of George Sand… did not at all seem to me, as it had seemed so long ago to my mother before she slowly began to model her literary tastes on mine, a magical pen. But it was a pen which, without meaning to, I had charged with electricity, as schoolboys often do for fun, and now a thousand insignificant details from Combray, unglimpsed for a very long time, came tumbling helter-skelter of their own accord to hang from the magnetized nib in an endless, flickering line of memories. (*Finding* 192-3)

The impression that strikes the narrator is an uncanny encounter with the self, a self that is simultaneously temporally distant in the past and yet so immediately present. “I had angrily wondered who the stranger was who had just upset me. But the stranger was myself,” he writes. The book summons his own ghost. Yet, it is not just the uncanniness of encountering himself as different, but the shocking feeling of being overtaken by those anachronistic feelings.

The question persists upon reading and rereading Moberly’s encounter with Marie Antoinette: whose feelings are these? “I looked straight at her; but some indescribable feeling made me turn away annoyed at her being there,” she writes. Moberly says she is annoyed at the presence of the Queen. Does this feeling belong to Marie Antoinette? Does Moberly experience the Queen seeing herself and feel an annoyance? If so, this scene greatly resembles Proust’s narrator as he angrily asks about the stranger that is himself. This scene will also recall us to the experience Freud describes in a footnote of *The Uncanny*:

> I was sitting alone in my *wagon-lit* compartment when a more than usually violent jerk of the train swung back the door of the adjoining washing-cabinet, and an elderly gentleman in a dressing-gown and a traveling cap came in. I assumed that he had been about to leave the washing-cabinet which divides the two compartments, and had taken the wrong direction and come into my compartment by mistake. Jumping up with the intention of putting him right, I at once realized to my dismay that the intruder was nothing but my own reflection in the looking-glass of the open door. I can still recollect that I thoroughly disliked his appearance. (17)

Here, the feeling of uncanniness is experience of alienation from one's self. And in Proust's case, the reader becomes further entwined with the affective polytemporality of the text. Not only does the reader witness the shifting and accumulating emotions of memories repeated. But the reader also experiences the uncanniness of their own entrance into the text, Proust's own uncomfortable annoyance at seeing himself through another body.

The theory of retrocognition imagines time and space in such a way as to say that affect and memories can be unmoored from both. One can step into a time and space and be completely overtaken by the affect contained within. Wimmers refers to a "mode of being"; Ricoeur talks about "L'experience fictive du temps." What is retrocognition if not a theory of reading, an aesthetic theory correlated to Proust's and Bergson's? In this moment from *Le Temps Retrouvé*, *François le Champi* conjures the narrator's earlier self and all its emotions. In *An Adventure*, Moberly and Jourdain encounter the conjuration of Marie Antoinette and all her affective memories. Moberly and Jourdain do not quite experience Versailles as Proust experiences Combray in this moment. Rather, they experience it as a reader experiences Proust experiencing Combray. This is the sudden and jarring experience of the self and other presented in Proust, Bergson, and Moberly and Jourdain's writings. The textual body becomes a nexus of competing temporalities and emotions.

If modernist literature can be read for its interruptions, it can and should also be read for its elisions. Modernist literature does not simply try to mark a break from the past, it also erases the distance between past and present. The question I ask in juxtaposing Proust, Bergson, and Moberly and Jourdain is not one of influence or cause

and effect. Rather, it is a question of coincidence and simultaneity. In and around the same few years, radical ideas of the self begin to develop: that a self is so permeable to time and affect it can be overtaken completely. Bergson's theory of temporality says that a multitude of temporalities pushes toward the present to be actualized in a body. But that body is not only our own, Moberly and Jourdain seem to say.

It is also no coincidence that this theory of reading I have described can be witnessed in a text like *An Adventure* that, as we have noted, also exemplifies the conflict between the masculine authority of *Fin-de-Siècle* scientific practice and psychical research. The fear of contagion is a reflection of the desire to assert the solidity of the self. And those marginalized bodies—Jewish, queer, and female, in examples in this chapter—represent a threat to that independent self. To admit to a permeability of the self would be to recognize the emotion, memories, and trauma of the marginalized. As such, this theory of reading is a profoundly ethical one. Encounters with bodies of texts are encounters with the other that invite or force us to recognize the marginalized bodies. And in such an encounter, we see the marginalized seeing themselves; they are annoyed at being there.

Conclusion

A Meeting in Paris

On or about April 6, 1922, human character changed. Contrary to Virginia Woolf's famous claim, this date refers not to an art exhibit, the death of a monarch, nor poetry of the time, though it would also have a great effect upon literary modernism. On this date, Henri Bergson—the foremost modern philosopher of time—and Albert Einstein—the newly emerged chief physicist of time—met in Paris. Rather than marking the emergence of modernism, this meeting signaled the beginning of the end of the phenomenal *Fin de Siècle*.

When Bergson met Einstein, he was at the height of his powers, a five-time nominee for the Nobel Prize in literature (he would go on to win in 1927) and world-renowned. Albert Einstein was no minnow, having himself won the Nobel Prize in physics the year before. But even this achievement by Einstein was overshadowed by Bergson's overwhelming presence. In December of 1922, Svante Arrhenius delivered a speech awarding Einstein with his Nobel Prize. "There is probably no physicist living today whose name has become so widely known as that of Albert Einstein," he began. This speech, however, was not to reward Einstein for his theory of general relativity from 1915. Rather, the prize committee gave Einstein the award for his much less ground-breaking "work on specific heat and the photoelectric effect" (Arrhenius). Arrhenius specifically cited Bergson for ignoring Einstein's theory of general relativity. As Jimena Canales explains: "The reasons [for the snub] were surely varied and complex, but the culprit mentioned that evening was clear: 'It will be no secret that the famous philosopher Bergson in Paris has challenged this theory.' Bergson had shown that relativity 'pertains

to epistemology' rather than to physics—and so it 'has therefore been the subject of lively debate in philosophical circles.'" ("This Philosopher"). Bergson's questions about Einstein's theory were enough to sew doubt and so the committee demurred, choosing a less-controversial theory to reward.

Bergson and Einstein's meeting at the *Société française de philosophie* was intended to bridge the gap between the two prominent thinkers to help them understand one another. It failed to do so and became a pivotal moment that began the waning of Bergson's influence for the wax of Einstein's. The chief disagreement between the two was disciplinary boundaries. As Canales summarizes:

> All that Bergson wanted to say was that "all did not end" with relativity. He was clear: "All that I want to establish is simply this: once we admit the Theory of Relativity as a physical theory, all is not finished." Philosophy, he modestly argued, still had a place. Einstein disagreed. He fought against giving philosophy (and by inference Bergson) any role in matters of time. ("Einstein, Bergson" 1170)

For Einstein, time could not be measured or understood outside of physical phenomena. Bergson, as we have seen throughout the preceding chapters, believed that the physical world was only a portion of the world. Canales continues: "Einstein claimed that no overlap existed between psychological conceptions and physical conceptions of time. He, therefore, did not see a role for philosophy in matters of time" (Einstein, Bergson" 1176). Eventually, Einstein's arguments won the day. Bergson was largely viewed as not understanding Einstein's theories and his theories looked like they belonged to a bygone era. While Bergson continued to be relevant and influential after this period, Einstein's

success in this debate meant that the philosophies of time that were the hallmarks of the *Fin de Siècle* were cordoned off to literature and the arts. Psychical research, too, saw itself decline around this period, increasingly viewed with suspicion and disdain.

In many ways, Einstein's success represented just one more step in the increasing drive toward objectivity that defined modernity. However, in the context of Bergson's role in bridging the gap between psychical research and literary modernism, the dramatic shift from Bergsonism to Einsteinian physics marks a significant ending point for the *Fin de Siècle*. Canales calls it the triumph rationality over intuition, but in the context of this discussion it is the end of *feeling out of time*, because feeling no longer mattered.

Feeling Out of Time

In this dissertation, I describe the *Fin de Siècle* as generally stretching between the 1860s and 1920s. Long before this period and well-after it, people have felt out of time. They have experienced the world phenomenally and they have felt out of sync with modernity. However, during these specific decades, the way these feelings manifested themselves was very particular in how it negotiated conflicts between believing in psychical phenomena and empirical, scientific approaches to the world.

In contrast to the "superstition" of the spiritualist movements of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth century, psychical research sought to study phenomena more objectively. The goal of psychical researchers was to legitimate phenomenal feelings by normalizing them and demonstrating the way these phenomenal feelings did not belong to just a single (and there by untrustworthy) body. The conflict between the subjective feelings of a human body and an objective reality played out

within the Society of Psychical Research even as the SPR fought this battle with the broader scientific community.

The result of these conflicts is the mistrust placed in the testimony of the individual. Any feeling that countered the accepted experience of normal bodies was deemed heterodox. The marginalization of these feelings and the bodies that feel them meant that psychical research offered a legitimizing avenue for the marginalized people. Though the SPR itself was very homogenous—composed heavily of upper class, English men and women—it continued to amplify heterogenous voices. Gurney's Hallucination Census, for example, drew from a wide swath of the population and similar efforts spread beyond England's borders.

The *Fin de Siècle* can be partly understood through the conflicts of homogenizing, objective forces of empire, race, sexuality and the mere existence (as well as feelings) of those who feel out of step with this homogenizing force. This is precisely the type of intersecting conflict that Raymond Williams describes in *Marxism and Literature*, the book in which he coined the phrase "structures of feeling":

> There is always other social being and consciousness which is neglected and excluded: alternative perceptions of others, in immediate relationships; new perceptions and practices of the material world. (126)

Williams describes the persistence of the heterodox in the face of hegemonic cultural forces, which Williams calls "dominant" culture. Conflicting with that dominant culture are "archaic," "residual," and "emergent" cultures. In the context of this dissertation, residual culture seems the most relevant. Williams writes:

> The residual, by definition, has been effectively formed in the past, but it is still active in the cultural process… as an effective element of the present. Thus certain experiences, meanings, and values which cannot be expressed or substantially verified in terms of the dominant culture, are nevertheless lives and practised on the basis of the residue—cultural as well as social—of some previous social and cultural institution or formation…. At certain points the dominant culture cannot allow too much residual experience and practice outside itself, at least without risk. It is in the incorporation of the actively residual—by reinterpretation, dilution, projection, discrimination and exclusion—that the work of the selective tradition is especially evident. (122-3)

Residual culture persists in the feelings that cannot be “expressed or substantially verified” by dominant culture because language and modes of expression are dictated by the shared language of dominant culture. Williams, then, make a temporal argument here about modes of expression in capitalism. To be marginalized by hegemony is to feel out of time with modernity. Moreover, the attempts to express these feelings are themselves anachronistic.

In the light of Williams’ work, psychical research can be understood through the negotiating structures of feeling in culture. The dominant cultural forces described in these chapters are those of empiricism and objectivity. Accordingly, the dominant culture is also a disembodied one, a culture of objects and instruments that measure and feel rather than human bodies. The research I have described—from Gurney or Moberly and Jourdain—incorporates many aspects of that dominant culture. Psychical researchers attempted to negotiate the heterodox feelings of individuals with the empirical processes

of objectivity. In chapter one, I describe Edmund Gurney's effort to offer up an alternative body of evidence to counter the dominant body of culture, the culture that said seeing the ghost of a dead relative immediately after their death would be impossible. Belief in ghosts and the spiritualism of the beginning half of the nineteenth century were archaic by the latter half of the century. But the reemergence of superstitious phenomena in the context of psychical research represents the return of an outmoded belief system as both counter-cultural—resisting the dominant laboratory objectification of reality—and cultural negotiation—adopting some of those objectification processes.

During the *Fin de Siècle*, psychical research offered a mode of feeling out of time that gained just enough cachet as to influence the literature of the period. Literary modernism's crisis of temporality is precisely a fight of residual and emergent cultural modes against the dominant culture. Psychical research did not cause this conflict, but it was one of many ways in which those living within the dominant culture began to express feeling out of step with that culture. Bergson's overwhelming influence over the period had no small effect on legitimizing this heterodox cultural expression.

Einstein's victory over Bergson represented the success of dominant culture over the residual. Einstein asserted that time had only physical characteristics and philosophy had nothing to tell us on the subject. It was simple, Einstein said, "Il n'y a donc pas un temps des philosophes": there is no more a time of the philosopher ("This Philosopher"). The objective won the day over the subjective. By contracting temporality to only the physical, Einstein foreclosed "feeling" time altogether. The exclusion of other modes of encountering temporality, though, is the exclusion of other modes of being, since as we

have seen temporality is inextricably tied up in conceptions of the human self. The human, Einstein implied, is a solely a physical being.

Beyond *le Fin*

Feeling out of time can in no way be contained to the temporal or geographic spaces traversed in this dissertation. Additionally, the perspective taken in these pages pertains particularly to an Anglophonic and Francophonic Transatlantic and particularly of white bodies. The Jewish, Irish, and Eastern European bodies discussed in this dissertation certainly offer us a way of understanding racialized bodies. However, there is a real question to be asked of how black bodies in the United States experienced the marginalization of feeling out of sync with the hegemonic white modernity. The works of Charles Chestnutt, Ralph Ellison, and Rudolph Fisher stand out as speaking directly to the sense of how African American bodies experience these questions of the human self and temporality differently. The branch of this research that pertains specifically to African-American expressions of feeling out of time would require its own book.

The concept of feeling out of time also feels particularly relevant to the climate in which this dissertation has been written. On November 8th, 2016, the United States elected a president who once asserted climate change to be a hoax perpetrated by the Chinese. He was elected in what has been described as a populist backlash against coastal elites. I can’t help but reflect on this as I bring years of research and writing to a close on the subject of “pseudo-scientific belief.” Bruno Latour ventured a similar reflection in his 2004 article “Why Has Critique Run out of Steam?”:

> I myself have spent some time in the past trying to show "'the lack of scientific certainty'" inherent in the construction of facts. I too made it a "'primary issue.'" But I did not exactly aim at fooling the public by obscuring the certainty of a closed argument—or did I? After all, I have been accused of just that sin. Still, I'd like to believe that, on the contrary, I intended to emancipate the public from prematurely naturalized objectified facts. Was I foolishly mistaken? Have things changed so fast? (227)

Should I bring myself to the end of this project and feel a similar sense of foolish shame? Whenever I have found myself at parties, explaining this work, I have faced the question: "but do you believe in it [ghosts, telepathy, etc…]?" If we take ghost stories seriously, must we take climate skepticism seriously? Must we take everything seriously? These are the wrong questions.

The skepticism that exists in conservativism finds its expression in the political channels in which capitalism has driven it. And liberalism is not exempt, as evidenced by the large pockets of bourgeois progressives who express skepticism in genetically-modified organisms or vaccines. All of these skepticisms have been directed toward or by industrial capitalism: big oil, big agriculture, or big pharma. Most recently, it is simply "Washington" and "Wall Street" that have been targets of suspicion. The skepticism exists; its targets are ancillary.

The suspicion and subsequent rage of Black Lives Matter and the rural, white working-class who enthusiastically embraced Donald Trump are not that different. Newspapers speak of people feeling "left behind" by society. Put in the parlance of this dissertation, they feel out of sync with modernity. For African-Americans, this can be a

feeling of dissonance as they witness the urban diversity utopias espoused by progressive Americans and the continual existential threat posed by the militarized police. For Muslims and other minorities, being "out of sync" is masked in language of assimilation, where failure to speak English or the wearing of a hijab marks one as anachronistic to modern American society. The bourgeois progressive spaces in American cities belie the cycles of poverty that persist in minority communities. And the isolated communities of white, rural America too look at the media's embrace of queer issues and people of colors and feel out of sync with what they witness on the television. These wildly different contexts and experiences find common cause only in their estrangement from dominant culture.

The study of psychical research's influence on literature during the *Fin de Siècle*, then, is a reminder of the ways in which marginalized bodies express their subjective feelings in the face of dominant culture. The question of *An Adventure*, for example, is not "did two women *really* travel through time by walking into the memory of Marie Antoinette?" just as the question of *A la recherche* is not "did this character *really* experience all the emotions and feelings of the past just by smelling a madeleine?" And so the question should not be "do Americans *really* believe that the Chinese fabricated a global conspiracy of scientists to suppress American manufacturing?" Instead, we should recognize the ways in which many Americans feel isolated and excluded by the phenomena of globalism because they have been alienated and excluded by American capitalism.

In his essay, Latour describes the confusing encounter with the conspiracy theories of a villager:

> What has become of critique when my neighbor in the little Bourbonnais village where I live looks down on me as someone hopelessly naïve because I believe that the United States had been attacked by terrorists? Remember the good old days when university professors could look down on unsophisticated folks because those hillbillies naïvely believed in church, motherhood, and apple pie? (228)

Latour's lesson is that relativism has removed the authoritative structure of education and intelligence. What Latour fails to recognize in this encounter is the way in which people—French, American, or Afghani—feel themselves subject to massive, military and political power structures. Of course, it matters whether or not the American government staged a terrorist attack, just as it matters whether or not climate change is real. But it also matters that war, treaties, and extra-judicial killings by drones occur and individuals are powerless to respond.

Psychical research was long-ago shunted away to the dustbins of antiquated science. Now, it inspires eye-rolls and laughter. But why is it that theories of ghosts, telepathy, and retrocognition abounded during a literary period chiefly understood through its crises of temporality? In this dissertation, I take those psychical theories seriously in a way that contemporary criticism resists doing (ghosts seem to be the exception, emerging as useful tools of theoretical thought over the last few decades). Heterodox, subjective feelings manifest themselves in a variety of ways and paying attention to their expressions is vital to recognizing the ways in which marginalized bodies understand themselves.

Bergson's decline in the broader cultural imagination is in part due to the success of Einsteinian physics. How often is he taught in modernist seminars? It is because it becomes increasingly difficult for contemporary culture to recognize the imagination of "spirit" without thinking of its kitsch expressions in new age philosophy or motivational speakers. The *Fin de Siècle* continues to encounter the anachronistic perspective of contemporary literature that simply cannot imagine time as anything but physical. The failure to reckon with something like the sincere belief that one can travel through time by walking into memories is a continued erasure of subjective feelings. Literary modernism (and more specifically Bergsonism) without psychical research is a body without spirit, a contracted encounter with the past. To see a ghost, then, is to see the marginalized bodies that haunt dominant culture, to feel out of time.

Bibliography

Adams, Charles F., Jr. "A Chapter of Erie." *The North American Review* 109:224 (1869): 86. *Making of America*. Web. 1 Jan. 2013.

Amaral, Genevieve. "Edgar Allan Poe's Fear of Texts: 'The Man of the Crowd' as Literary Monster." *The Comparatist* 35 (2011): 227-28. Print.

Anthony, David. "Banking on Emotion: Financial Panic and the Logic of Male Submission in the Jacksonian Gothic." *American Literature* 76.4 (2004): 719–47. Print.

Arata, Stephen D. "The Occidental Tourist: Dracula and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization." *Victorian Studies: A Journal of the Humanities, Arts and Sciences* 33.4 (1990): 621–45. Print.

Arhennius, Svante August. "Nobel Prize in Physics 1921 - Presentation Speech." *Nobelprize.org*. http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/physics/laureates/1921/press.html. Accessed 6 Nov. 2016

Barthes, Roland. *S/Z: An Essay*. Trans. Richard Miller. New York: Hill and Wang, 1975. Print.

Bentley, Christopher. "The Monster in the Bedroom: Sexual Symbolism in Bram Stoker's Dracula." *Psychology and Literature* 22 (1972): 27–34. Print.

Bergson, Henri. *Creative Evolution*. Trans. Arthur Mitchell. New York: Holt and Co., 1911. Print.

---. "De La Simulation Inconsciente Dans L'État D'hypnotisme." *Mélanges* 333–41. Print.

---. *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*. Mineola, N.Y: Dover Publications, 2001. Print.

---. *Matter and Memory*. Trans. Nancy Paul and W. Scott Palmer. New York: Macmillan, 1911. Print.

---. *Mélanges*. Ed. André Robinet. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1972. Print.

---. "Phantasms of the Living." *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research* 26 (1913): 462–79. Print.

Bersani, Leo. *The Culture of Redemption*. Harvard University Press, 1992. Print.

Biers, Katherine. *Virtual Modernism: Writing and Technology in the Progressive Era*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013. Print.

Borch-Jacobsen, Mikkel. "Hypnosis in Psychoanalysis." *Representations*, 27 (1989): 92–110. Print.

Bowie, Malcolm. *Proust Among the Stars*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000. Print.

Bown, Nicola, Carolyn Burdett, and Pamela Thurschwell, eds. *The Victorian Supernatural*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Print.

Brandon, Ruth. *Spiritualists: Passion for the Occult in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1984. Print.

Braude, Stephen E. "Peirce on the Paranormal." *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 34.1 (1998): 203–24. Print.

Brennan, Teresa. *The Transmission of Affect*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004. Print.

Brown, Bill. *A Sense of Things: The Object Matter of American Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004. Print.

Calomiris, Charles W., and Larry Schweikart. "The Panic of 1857: Origins, Transmission, and Containment." *The Journal of Economic History* 51.4 (1991): 807–34. Print.

Canales, Jimena. "Einstein, Bergson, and the Experiment That Failed: Intellectual Cooperation at the League of Nations." *MLN* 120.5 (2005): 1168–1191. Print.

---. "This Philosopher Helped Ensure There Was No Nobel for Relativity." *Nautilus*. 21 April 2016. http://nautil.us/issue/35/boundaries/this-philosopher-helped-ensure-there-was-no-nobel-for-relativity. Accessed 6 Nov. 2016.

Case, Alison A. *Plotting Women: Gender and Narration in the Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century British Novel*. University Press of Virginia, 1999. Print.

Castle, Terry. "Contagious Folly: 'An Adventure' and Its Skeptics. (Questions of Evidence)." *Critical Inquiry* 17.4 (1991): 741. Print.

"Charcot and Hypnotism." *The British Medical Journal* 2.1704 (1893): 479–80. *JSTOR*. Web. 2 July 2016.

Collins, Wilkie. *The Woman in White*. Ed. John Sutherland. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.

Copjec, Joan. "Vampires, Breast-Feeding, and Anxiety." *October* 58 (1991): 25–43. Web. 2 July 2016.

Craft, Christopher. "'Kiss Me with Those Red Lips': Gender and Inversion in Bram Stoker's Dracula." *Representations* 8 (1984): 107–33. *Primo*. Web. 2 July 2016.

Crary, Jonathan. *Suspensions of Perception: Attention, Spectacle, and Modern Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000. Print.

Cronan, Todd. *Against Affective Formalism: Matisse, Bergson, Modernism*. Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press, 2014. Print.

Daly, Nicholas. *Modernism, Romance and the Fin de Siècle: Popular Fiction and British Culture, 1880-1914*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Print.

de Man, Paul. *Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983. Print.

Delattre, Floris. “Floris Delattre, ‘Henri Bergson et l’Angleterre’ (Discussion).” *Études Bergsoniennes* 2 (1949): 199–208. Print.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Bergsonism*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. New York: Zone Books, 1990. Print.

---. *Proust and Signs*. Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press, 2004. Print.

Derrida, Jacques. “Demeure.” *The Instant of My Death / Demeure: Fiction and Testimony*. Trans. Elizabeth Rottenberg. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000: 13–103. Print. Print

---. *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, The Work of Mourning & the New International*. Trans. Peggy Kamuf. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.

---. “Telepathy.” Trans. Nicholas Royle. *Oxford Literary Review* 10 (1988): 3–41. Print.

Eagleton, Terry. *The Ideology of the Aesthetic*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1991. Print.

Edison, Thomas A. “The Perfected Phonograph.” *Nature* 39.996 (1888): 107–109. *Primo*. Web. 2 July 2016.

---. “The Phonograph and Its Future.” *The North American Review* 126.262 (1878): 527–536. Print.

Ellenberger, Henri F. *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books, 1981. Print.

Fabian, Ann. “Speculation on Distress: The Popular Discourse of the Panics of 1837 and 1857.” *Yale Journal of Criticism*. 3.1 (1989): 127-42. Print.

Ferguson, Christine. “Nonstandard Language and the Cultural Stakes of Stoker’s *Dracula*.” *ELH* 71.1 (Spring, 2004): 229-249. Print.

Fleming, J. A. “Scientific History and Future Uses of Wireless Telegraphy.” *The North American Review*. 168: 510 (1899): 630–40. Print.

“Flight of Schuyler to Europe.” *New York Daily Times*. 23 Sep. 1854: 1. *Proquest Historical Newspapers*. Web. 20 March 2013.

Freud, Sigmund. “Dreams and Occultism.” *New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*. London: Hogarth Press, 1974. 31-56. Print.

Freud, Sigmund. “The Uncanny.” *Sigmund Freud, Collected Papers, Vol. 4.* Trans. Alix Strachey. New York: Basic Books, 1959. Print.

“From Saratoga.—Curious Story Afloat.” *Daily Morning News*. 14 Aug. 1857. *Making of America*. Web. 15 March 2012.

Furniss, Tom. “A Romantic Geology: James Hutton’s 1788 ‘Theory of the Earth.’” *Romanticism* 16.3 (2010): 305–21. Web. 9 October 2016.

Garrett, Peter K. *Gothic Reflections: Narrative Force in Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003. Print.

Gauld, Alan. *Founders of Psychical Research*. London: Kegan Paul International, 1968. Print.

Genette, Gerard, and Jonathan Culler. *The Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1983. Print.

Gillies, Mary Ann. *Henri Bergson and British Modernism*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1996. Print.

Gray, John. *Immortalization Commission: Science and the Strange Quest to Cheat Death.* London: Faber and Faber, 2012. Print.

Grogin, Robert C. *The Bergsonian Controversy in France, 1900-1914*. University of Calgary Press, 1988. Print.

Gurney, Edmund, Frederick W. H. Myers, and Frank Podmore. *Phantasms of the Living*. London: Trubner and Co., 1886. Print.

Holroyd, James Edward. "Light on the Ghosts of Versailles." *Sunday Times* 7 Aug. 1965: n. pag. Print.

Iremonger, Lucille. *The Ghosts of Versailles: Miss Moberly and Miss Jourdain and Their Adventure*. Faber and Faber, 1957. Print.

Jackson, Elizabeth R. "The Genesis of the Involuntary Memory in Proust's Early Works." *PMLA* 76.5 (1961): 586-94. JSTOR. Web. 3 March 2016.

James, Henry. *The Turn of the Screw & In the Cage*. New York City: Modern Library, 2001. Print.

Johansen, Ib. "The Madness of the Text: Deconstruction of Narrative Logic in 'Usher,' 'Berenice,' and 'Doctor Tarr and Professor Fether.'" *Poe Studies* 22 (1989): 1-9. JSTOR. Web. 3 February 2014.

Jones, Gavin. "Poor Poe: On the Literature of Revulsion." *American Literary History* 23.1 (2011): 1–18. Print.

Jung, Carl. *Letters*. Ed. Gerhard Adler. Trans. Jeffrey Hulen. Vol. 2. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976. Print.

---. "The Psychological Foundations of Belief in Spirits." *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research* 79 (1921): 75–93. Print.

Kime, Wayne R., ed. *Fitz-James O'Brien: Selected Literary Journalism, 1852-1860.* Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2003. Print.

Kittler, Friedrich A. “Dracula’s Legacy.” *Literature, Media, Information Systems: Essays*. Ed. John Harvey Johnston. Amsterdam: GB Arts International, 1997. 143–73. Print.

Latour, Bruno. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Trans. Catherine Porter. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1993. Print.

---. “Why Has Critique Run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern.” *Critical Inquiry* 30.2 (2004): 225–48. Print.

Lepore, Jill. 2009. “The Humbug.” *The New Yorker*. 27 April 2009. Web. 2 July 2016.

Leprince, Pierre-Yves. *Les nouvelles enquêtes de Monsieur Proust*. Paris: Gallimard, 2015. Print.

Levine, Stuart and Susan F. Levine, eds. *Critical Theory: The Major Documents*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2009. Print.

Lewis, Wyndham. *Blast 1*. Berkeley, CA: Gingko Press, 2009. Print.

Lodge, Oliver. “An Account of Some Experiments in Thought-Transference.” *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, 2 (1884): 189–200. Print.

---. “Thought Transference.” *The Forum*. Forum Publishing Company, 1909. 56–62. Print.

Luciano, Dana. “Sacred Theories of Earth: Matters of Spirit in The Soul of Things.” *American Literature* 86.4 (2014): 713–36. Web 9 October 2016.

Luckhurst, Roger. *The Invention of Telepathy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. Print.

Luckhurst, Nicola. *Science and Structure in Proust’s “A La Recherche Du Temps Perdu.”* New York: Clarendon Press, 2000. Print.

Lurz, John. “Sleeping with Proust: Reading, Sensation, and the Books of the Recherche.” *New Literary History* 42.1 (2011): 129–146. Web. 2 July 2016.

MacKenzie, Andrew. *Adventures in Time: Encounters With the Past*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Athlone Press, 1997. Print.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: Volume 1: A Critique of Political Economy*. Trans. Ben Fowkes. New York: Penguin, 1992. Print.

McLaughlin, Kevin. "Just Fooling: Paper, Money, Poe." *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 11.1 (1999): 38–67. Print.

Mears, John W. "Ravaisson, Lachelier, and Fouillèe; Or, The Recent Spiritualist Philosophy of France." *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review* 3.12 (1874): 679–97. Print.

Merz, John Theodore. *A History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century.* Vol. 1. 4 vols. New York, Dover Pub, 1965. Print.

Milutis, Joe. *Ether: The Nothing That Connects Everything*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006. Print.

Moll, Patience. "Community, Communication and Multiplicity in Proust." *Philosophia* 36. 1 (2008): 55–65. *JSTOR*. Web. 2 July 2016.

Muir, Edwin. *We Moderns: Enigmas and Guesses*. London : G. Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1918. Print.

Mullarkey, John. *Bergson and Philosophy*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000. Print.

O'Brien, Fitz-James. "The Diamond Lens." Salmonson 20-40.

---. "The Editor at Large." Kime 126-38.

---. "Our Authors and Authorship. Melville and Curtis." Kime 156-72.

---. "The Pot of Tulips." Salmonson 41-55.

---. “What Was It?” *The Poems and Stories of Fitz-James O’Brien*. Ed. William Winter. Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1881. Print.

---. “What Was It?: A Mystery.” Salmonson 83-94.

O'Brien, Justin. “La Memoire Involontaire Avant Proust,” *Revue de littérature comparée*, (1939): 19-36. *JSTOR*. Web. 2 July 2016.

Oppenheim, Janet. *The Other World: Spiritualism and Psychical Research in England, 1850-1914*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988. Print.

Owen, Alex. *The Place of Enchantment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004. Print.

Pahl, Dennis. *Architects of the Abyss: The Indeterminate Fictions of Poe, Hawthorne, and Melville*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1989. Print.

---. “De-composing Poe’s ‘Philosophy.’” *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 38.1 (1996): 1–25. Print.

Pearson, Keith Ansell. “Introduction.” *Henri Bergson: Key Writings*. New York City: Continuum, 2002. 1-45. Print.

Peeples, Scott. “Poe’s ‘constructiveness’ and ‘The Fall of the House of Usher.’” *The Cambridge Companion to Edgar Allan Poe*. Ed. Kevin J. Hayes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 178–190. Print.

Peirce, Charles S. “Criticisms on ‘Phantasms of the Living.’” *Proceedings of the American Society For Psychical Research*. 1.1 (July 1885): 150-7. *Hathi Trust*. Web. 2 July 2016.

Pernot, C. “Spiritualisme et Spiritisme chez Bergson.” *Revue de L’Enseignement Philosophique* 3 (1964): 1-24. Print.

Poe, Edgar Allan. “The Fall of the House of Usher.” *The Complete Stories*. New York: Knopf, 1992. 365-82. Print.

---. “The Philosophy of Composition.” Levine and Levine 60-71.

---. “The Poetic Principle.” Levine and Levine 178-99

“Professor Bergson on the Soul.” *Mélanges* 955-959.

Proust, Marcel. *Finding Time Again*. Trans. Ian Patterson. New York: Penguin Books, 2002. Print.

---. *Swann’s Way*. Ed. Lydia Davis. New York, N.Y.: Penguin Classics, 2004. Print.

---. *Swann’s Way*. Trans. C. K. Scott-Moncrieff. London: Chatto & Windus, 1941. Print.

---. *Time Regained.* Trans. C. K. Scott-Moncrieff. London: Chatto & Windus, 1941. Print.

Quirk, Tom. *Bergson and American Culture*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2011. Print.

Rabaté, Jean-Michel. *The Ghosts of Modernity*. University Press of Florida, 1996. Print.

Raia, Courtenay Grean. “From Ether Theory to Ether Theology: Oliver Lodge and the Physics of Immortality.” *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 43.1 (December 1, 2007): 18–43. *JSTOR.* Web. 1 October 2015.

“Report on Spiritualism of the Committee of the London Dialectical Society, together with the Evidence, oral and written, and a Selection from the Correspondence.” *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. London: Longman and Co., 1871. Print.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Time and Narrative.* Trans. Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. Vol. 2. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 1990. Print.

Roth, Phyllis A. “Suddenly Sexual Women in Bram Stoker’s Dracula.” *Literature and Psychology* 27 (1977): 113–21. Print.

Rousseau, Peter L. “Jacksonian Monetary Policy, Specie Flows, and the Panic of 1837.” *The Journal of Economic History* 62.2 (2002): 457–88. Print.

Royle, Nicholas. “The ‘Telepathy Effect’: Notes Toward a Reconsideration of Narrative Fiction.” *Acts of Narrative*. Ed. Carol Jacobs and Henry Sussman. Stanford University Press, 2003. 94–109. Print.

Russell, Bertrand. “The Philosophy of Bergson.” *The Monist*. 22:3 (July 1912): 321-37. *JSTOR*.

Web. 1 October 2015.

Salmonson, Jessica Amanda, ed. *The Supernatural Tales of Fitz-James O’Brien: Volume One: Macabre Tales*. New York: Doubleday, 1988. Print.

Salter, W. H. “‘An Adventure’: A Note on the Evidence.” *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research* 35 (1950): 178–87. Print.

Schleifer, Ronald. *Modernism and Time: The Logic of Abundance in Literature, Science, and Culture, 1880-1930*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Print.

“The Schuyler Fraud Case.” *The New York Times*. 25 Jan. 1866. *Making of America*. Web. 15 March 2012.

Sidgwick, H., Johnson, A., Myers, F.W.H., Podmore, F., and Sidgwick, E.M. “Report on the Census of Hallucinations.” *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research* 10 (1894): 25-422. Print.

Seed, David. “The Narrative Method of Dracula.” *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 40.1 (1985): 61–75. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Sept. 2013.

Senf, Carol A. “*Dracula*: Stoker’s Response to the New Woman.” *Victorian Studies* 26.1 (1982): 33–49. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Sept. 2013.

---. *Science and Social Science in Bram Stoker’s Fiction*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002. Print.

Shaw, Robert. “The Great Schuyler Stock Fraud.” *Railroad History* 141 (1979): 5-18. Print.

Sidgewick, Eleanor. “Reviews: *An Adventure*.” *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research* 25 (1911): 353–60. Print.

Society for Psychical Research (Great Britain). “First Report of the Committee on Mesmerism.” *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research* 1 (1882): 217–29. *Hathi Trust*. Web. 16 Jan. 2014.

---. “Report of the Literary Committee.” *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research.* London: Trübner and Co., 1883. *Hathi Trust*. Web. 16 Jan. 2014.

“The Society For Psychical Research.” Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research 1 (1882): 3–12. *Hathi Trust*. Web. 16 Jan. 2014.

Smith, Andrew. *The Ghost Story 1840-1920: A Cultural History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010. Print.

Soulez, Philippe and Frédéric Worms. *Bergson*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2002. Print.

Specie Circular. 1836. *EBSCO MegaFILE*. Web. 20 July 2014.

Spencer, Kathleen L. “Purity and Danger: ‘Dracula,’ the Urban Gothic, and the Late Victorian Degeneracy Crisis.” *ELH* 59.1 (1992): 197-225. *JSTOR*. Web. 2 July 2016.

Stoker, Bram. *Dracula: Authoritative Text, Backgrounds, Reviews and Reactions, Dramatic and Film Variations, Criticism*. Ed. Nina Auerbach and David J Skal. New York: W.W. Norton, 1997. Print.

“The Syrian Route to the East.” *Blackwood’s Magazine*. W. Blackwood, 1857. 506-18.

Terdiman, Richard. *Present Past: Modernity and the Memory Crisis*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993. Print.

Troscianko, Emily T. “Cognitive Realism and Memory in Proust’s Madeleine Episode.” *Memory Studies* 6.4 (2013): 437–456. Web. 2 July 2016.

Watt, Adam. “Proust et Le Moi Divisé: ‘La Recherche’ Creuset de La Psychologie Expérimentale (1874–1914).” *French Studies* 61.4 (2007): 538–538. *JSTOR*. Web. 2 July 2016.

Welles, Orson. “Dracula.” *The Mercury Theatre on the Air*. CBS, 11 July 1938. Radio.

Wicke, Jennifer. “Vampiric Typewriting: ‘Dracula’ and Its Media.” *ELH* 59.2 (1992): 467-93. *JSTOR*. Web. 2 July 2016.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977. Print.

Wimmers, Inge Crossman. *Proust and Emotion: The Importance of Affect in “A La Recherche Du Temps Perdu.”* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003. Print.

Winter, Alison. *Mesmerized: Powers of Mind in Victorian Britain*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 2000. Print.

Wolfreys, Julian. *Victorian Hauntings: Spectrality, Gothic, the Uncanny and Literature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001. Print.

Wolle, Francis. *Fitz-James O’Brien: A Literary Bohemian of the Eighteen-Fifties*. Boulder, CO: The University of Colorado, 1944. Print.

Woolf, Virginia. *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown*. London: Hogarth Press, 1924. Print.

Zimmerman, David A. “Frank Norris, Market Panic, and the Mesmeric Sublime.” *American Literature* 75.1 (2003): 61–90. Print.

Žižek, Slavoj. “Alfred Hitchcock, Or, The Form and Its Historical Mediation.” *Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Lacan: (But Were Afraid to Ask Hitchcock)*. New York: Verso, 1992. Print.