

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/103083>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

From Villa Diodati to Villa Gabrielli: A Manuscript Appendix to *Fantasmagoriana*

Abstract: The role played by *Fantasmagoriana* in the genesis of *Frankenstein* and *The Vampyre* has largely prevented the full critical appreciation of this work in its original context of production, i.e. the French market of supernatural anthologies in the early nineteenth century, paving the way to the so-called *frénétique* vogue. By analysing a manuscript appendix to *Fantasmagoriana*, drafted between the mid-1820s and the mid-1830s and bound within a copy formerly belonging to the Roman family Gabrielli-Bonaparte, this article reinstates *Fantasmagoriana* within the environment of Napoleonic and post-Napoleonic culture and its renewed interest in the supernatural. Whereas English-speaking criticism has normally approached *Fantasmagoriana* through *Tales of the Dead*, i.e. Sarah Utterson's Gothicizing and partial translation of 1813, an analysis of *Fantasmagoriana* from the point of view of its original readership will enable us to rethink the specificities of the French Gothic beyond Anglo-centric perspectives.

Keywords: *Fantasmagoriana*, *littérature frénétique*, Collin de Plancy, phantasmagoria

Nowadays, the French-German anthology *Fantasmagoriana* owes its critical fame to its largely fortuitous presence at Villa Diodati in 1816, and to the role it was credited to play – it is irrelevant, here, whether groundedly or not – in the genesis of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) and John Polidori's *The Vampyre* (1819).¹ *Fantasmagoriana*, however, would deserve a certain degree of attention even if it had not crossed such powerful moment in literary history, and perhaps independently from it. This French collection of German supernatural stories was influenced by British models (principally those of Walpole, Radcliffe, and Lewis) and later enjoyed a relatively lively afterlife across Western Europe. *Fantasmagoriana* enables us to challenge 'the tyranny of Anglo-American narratives of the Gothic' and even to re-think pre-made perspectives, including the very definition of 'Gothic' as a polyvalent umbrella-term.²

In this article, I examine a specific copy of *Fantasmagoriana* once belonging to the Gabrielli-Bonaparte family in Rome, and currently held within the Rare Book Collection at the University of North Carolina. In 1815 prince Mario Gabrielli married Charlotte Bonaparte, Napoleon's niece, and their house at Janiculum quickly became a regular haunt for the French community in Rome. At some point between the late 1820s and the mid-1830s, a member of the family or one of their guests had the two original tomes of *Fantasmagoriana* bound into one. Moreover, a 130-page manuscript appendix of sixteen further stories was added, so that the work could be presented, in the new binding, as *Fantasmagoriana avec Appendix*. By so doing, this anonymous collector evidently

aimed to enrich the original work with material s/he felt to be homogeneous, in both cultural and narrative terms, with *Fantasmagoriana*. Reconstructing the sources of these stories – all excerpted, as we will see, from the second edition of Jacques Collin de Plancy's *Dictionnaire infernal* (1825-26) – will offer us, thus, invaluable insight into the genre in which such texts were categorized. At the same time, as a testimony of reading and writing practices related to the enjoyment of supernatural fiction, this copy will allow us to re-think Gothic-related imaginaries of reading from a European viewpoint.

The paucity of critical attention paid to *Fantasmagoriana* over the years is doubtlessly, albeit paradoxically, a result of its reiterated centrality, on the part of Byron's guests, while reconstructing the geneses of their masterpieces. The Shelleys' and Polidori's testimonies have monopolized (and often replaced) the study of *Fantasmagoriana per se*, and William Michael Rossetti's quick liquidation of it as 'a poor sort of book', when editing Polidori's *Diary*, did not encourage further research.³ Whereas *Fantasmagoriana* is cursorily mentioned when reconstructing the gestation of Shelley's and Polidori's works, dedicated contributions tend to focus uniquely on its role at Diodati, consequently marginalizing the actual book, its context of production, and its envisaged readership.⁴

Fantasmagoriana was published anonymously, in Paris, in 1812. It included ten tales, collected and translated by Jean-Baptiste Benoît Eyriès. Eyriès was a geographer, and *Fantasmagoriana* was a *divertissement* from his main activity: still, the book was a well-planned editorial operation, aimed at presenting a fashionable literary corpus to the French public of the Napoleonic age. Five tales out of ten had been published just one year before in the first two volumes of *Gespensterbuch*, an anthology edited by Johann August Apel and Friedrich August Schulze; one of them had been conceived as the sequel to a tale by Heinrich Clauren originally appearing in 1810 in the newspaper *Der Freimüthige* which was also included in *Fantasmagoriana*. Finally, the collection was complemented by one more tale by Apel, excerpted from the 1810 volume *Cicaden*, and by a long piece from Johann Karl August Musäus's fairy-tale anthology *Volksmärchen der Deutschen* (1782-86). A varied, albeit geographically consistent corpus (all authors came from Saxony-Thuringia) thus crossed the Rhine, as well as, almost immediately afterwards, the Channel: the Diodati company would read the French text, but as early as 1813 Sarah Elizabeth Utterson translated a large part of Eyriès's anthology into English under the title *Tales of the Dead*.⁵

Fantasmagoriana belongs, thus, to a fluid and relatively neglected zone of literary history, namely the wide world of 'fiction writing, reading, and publishing during the late 1700s and early 1800s [...] that still', Julia Douthwaite claims, 'proves challenging to research'.⁶ Tended between the eighteenth century and the Romantic age, the literary market of Napoleonic Europe and its trans-national exchanges are still underdeveloped fields, especially from the viewpoint of Gothic

literary history and the unavoidably Anglo-centric bias underlying such notion. As a consequence, it is no surprise that *Fantasmagoriana* has been overall ignored by Gothic studies, notwithstanding some notable exceptions.⁷ No fully reliable edition exists in English: Terry Hale's edition of 1992 reproduces *Tales of the Dead*, and A. J. Day's complete edition of 2005, while including the tales eliminated by Utterson, inexplicably omits Eyriès's French preface, moreover leaving the remaining tales in the partial translation of 1813.⁸ In scholarly terms, it is generally absent from chronologies,⁹ and only marginally or not referenced at all, even in works aimed at reassessing the Gothic from European or global perspectives.¹⁰

In translating part of *Fantasmagoriana* for the British public – 'the amusement of an idle hour'¹¹ – Sarah Utterson did something more than rendering a French-German text into English. *Tales of the Dead* is a powerful operation in cultural appropriation, domesticizing *Fantasmagoriana* into the boundaries of the British Gothic tradition. Among the ten stories of the French anthology, Utterson omitted those in which supernatural events are explained by rational means and/or in humorous tones, considering them not 'equally interesting' to the others; she shortened Musäus's *L'Amour muet/Stumme Liebe* (literally, 'silent love') and re-titled it *The Spectre-Barber*, forcibly stressing the supernatural element in the tale and arguing that all matter extraneous to it might 'appea[r] rather misplaced' in a collection 'of this kind'.¹² She added a tale of her own, as well as epigraphs from British authors (graveyard poets and Shakespeare) in the tradition of Radcliffe and Lewis; and gave the entire book a Gothicizing title, thereby eliding all reference to phantasmagoria shows and to their playful oscillation between illusion and disenchantment.¹³ Telling, in this respect, is the epigraph: whereas *Fantasmagoriana* opened with a quotation from Ovid, speaking of the poet's power to fill the heart with deceitful terrors ('*falsis terroribus implet*'), Utterson chose instead Prospero's far more literal magic from *The Tempest*, and the 'potent art' that makes graves 'wak[e] their sleepers'.

Approaching *Fantasmagoriana* through *Tales of the Dead* may risk reading the text through Utterson's Gothicizing lenses, thereby missing the specificities of the French text – the most important of which is its title, which was in many ways an experimental one. Eyriès joined the neologism *fantasmagorie*¹⁴ – denoting a kind of show performed in Paris at least since the early 1790s¹⁵ – with the suffix *-ana*, which had characterized a vast corpus of books appearing since the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The so-called '-ana books' were either collections of unpublished writings from some recently dead author (as was the case with *Lutherana*, published in 1571) or miscellanies of texts of various kinds and provenances, gathered under a common label. Such collections were quite common in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century France, as testified

by an erudite notice on the subject published by bibliographer Gabriel Peignot in 1810 and by an erudite booklet of 1821, by bibliophile Gabriel Hécart.¹⁶

Peignot proposed two meanings for the suffix, which could either be a Latin neuter plural (as was the case with *Miscellanea Naudeana*, ‘miscellany of Naudé’) or an abbreviation of *anecdota*, a term derived, in turn, from the Greek (privative α + ἐκδοτος, ‘given out’) and meaning ‘unpublished’.¹⁷ In both cases, ‘-ana’ titles emphasized the collective and plural nature of books they referred to, stressing their composite and hybrid structure, and presenting their editors as the mere assemblers of pre-existing and otherwise unavailable materials, now offered to the taste of unpretentious readers. Peignot’s notice testifies well to the bad reputation ‘-ana books’ had acquired for scholars: generally characterized by a certain poorness in terms of editorial care and philological rigour, Peignot acknowledged, they still appealed to many people, because of the variety (*variété*) of sources they offered to the readers’ curiosity and of the relatively unknown anecdotes (*anecdotes peu connues*) they included.¹⁸ Such is also the case with *Fantasmagoriana*, the first ‘-ana book’ explicitly related to supernatural matters, which generated at least three imitations in the following ten years, trying to capitalize on its popularity: J. P. R. Cuisin’s *Spectriana*, published in 1817¹⁹; Gabrielle de Paban’s *Démoniana*, of 1820²⁰; and Charles Nodier’s *Infernalina*, appearing in 1822.²¹

Two external sources allow us to make preliminary observations on the way *Fantasmagoriana* was received in the French literary environment, as well as to speculate on its envisaged readership. The first one is Cuisin’s preface to *Spectriana*, in which the editor is cautious in differentiating his work from the

foule de rapsodies connues sous le nom de *manuel des sorciers*, *fantasmagoriana*, etc., qui ne méritent pas plus de créance que d’estime. On nous pardonnera sans doute d’avoir pris un titre aussi futile que celui de *spectriana*; c’est un tribut que nous avons payé à la manie de l’époque où nous vivions.²²

[crowd of rhapsodies known under the names of *Manuel des sorciers*, *Fantasmagoriana*, etc., which do not deserve more credit than they deserve appreciation. It shall doubtlessly be pardoned to us if we have chosen such a frivolous title as *Spectriana*: it is the tribute we paid to the mania of the age we are living in]

This consideration is telling, in that the ‘mania’ of the age Cuisin is referring to is not exactly the one we might expect. Indeed, Cuisin is not complaining about the flood of Gothic and supernatural

fiction, but rather about the vogue of scientific entertainment that had been proliferating in revolutionary France, and which had resulted in the massive publication of amateur works aimed at disseminating scientific and pseudoscientific knowledge to the broader public. Most of these works discussed issues that were very popular at the time – including electricity, ventriloquism, automata, animal magnetism/mesmerism, and occultism – and proposed entertaining ways to make experiments with science, without establishing a dividing line between science and the marvellous.²³ Such is the case of the *Manuel des sorciers* Cuisin mentions, which is in fact a compilation of mathematical and arithmetic curiosities, enriched with a great number of magic tricks and parlour games involving numbers; in the subtitle, the anonymous author specifies how the book belongs to the genre inaugurated by Henri Decremps's claimed *La Magie blanche dévoilée* (1783 and 1784), namely one of the most famous eighteenth-century handbooks of illusionism.²⁴

The second one is a book published in 1820, Gabrielle de Paban's *Histoire des vampires et des spectres malfaisants*, including a bibliographical appendix on recent publications dealing with supernatural matters and including *Fantasmagoriana*.²⁵ The book meant to capitalize on the recent success of *The Vampyre* (which Paban thought to be Byron's work), and it is therefore not surprising that, alongside Polidori's novella and Ann Radcliffe's novels – popular in France since 1797²⁶ – five entries out of twenty-eight concerned works of fiction inspired by British sources. Equally present are explicitly non-fiction books, comprising histories of magic or exoteric-apocalyptic treatises devoted to the 'occult' connections between Enlightenment philosophers, the Revolution, and Satanism. The most interesting group, however, is the last and most conspicuous one: ten books of the list – about 34 per cent of the total; one of them is *Fantasmagoriana* – present definitely homogeneous traits, the most prominent of which is their ambiguity regarding their fictional nature.²⁷

In examining this sub-genre, four elements need to be stressed. First, these books generally present themselves as collections (*recueil, choix, galerie*) and/or as encyclopaedic compilations (*dictionnaire*), displaying forms of authorship that are deliberately weak: editors are often anonymous, and their operation is normally defined by terms relating to the semantic spheres of research, selection, assemblage, and translation (*recueillir, publier, trouver, puiser, extraire, traduire*). Second, they stress the variety of forms they aim to include, covering all kinds of short-story narratives: *histoires, aventures, faits, évènements, nouvelles, contes, anecdotes, recherches, petits romans*, terms that are often coupled with colourful adjectives (*merveilleux, remarquable, bizarre, prodigieux, surprenant, extraordinaire*) and/or validated through different strategies of authentication (*rapportés par des personnes dignes de foi, extrait et traduit ... des diverses chroniques du sombre empire, puisés dans des sources réelles*). Third, they openly overemphasize

their supernatural content, indulging in long enumerations of supernatural figures (*spectres, revenans, esprits, fantômes, apparitions, diables, demons, loups-garoux, vampires*) and phenomena (*visions, songes, prodiges, magie*), as well as of uncustomary and/or murderous events (*gens crus morts et rappelés à la vie et sortis de leur tombeaux, événemens merveilleux, délits mystérieux, vengeances atroces, combinaisons du crime*). Fourth, and finally, paratexts more or less explicitly stress these books' entertaining or even educational nature: the epigraph of *Fantasmagoriana* speaks, as we have seen, of 'deceitful terrors'; *Dictionnaire infernal* is opened by an engraving representing an allegory of superstition and by a quotation from Plutarch condemning superstitious terrors; a poetic quatrain in the frontispiece of *Histoire des fantômes* hopes for readers to 'have fun' and 'open their eyes' (*Que le lecteur s'amuse, et qu'il ouvre les yeux*); and *Démoniana* declares itself as a 'work fit to reassure the fearful imagination against superstitious terrors' (*ouvrage propre à rassurer les imaginations timorées, contre les frayeurs superstitieuses*). Products, in Hale's terms, of the 'intellectual chaos' following the Revolution, these works were 'hastily assembled compendiums drawing on sources as diverse as the French fairy tale, German romantic poetry, the Gothic novel, and folklore', in which 'one might find, thrown together [...], a collection of short anecdotes concerning imps, demons, gremlins, alchemists and vampires. [...] such compendiums proliferated ... and were still thriving as late as 1820'.²⁸

On the one hand, *Fantasmagoriana* could therefore be approached to books – such as *Le Manuel des sorciers* – dedicated to conjuring and illusionism, as well as to mixing popularised science with entertainment. On the other, it could be assimilated to the sub-genre of collections of 'contes horrifians', a marginal market that would nonetheless prove itself to be crucial in the development of the French Gothic, in bridging the *roman noir* of the eighteenth century, the *littérature frénétique* of the 1820s and 1830s, and the later, more refined French 'fantastic' influenced by E. T. A. Hoffmann.²⁹ Although doubtlessly inspired by the popularity of Radcliffe and Lewis after 1797 (*Le Livre des prodiges*, the first example of this genre, appears not incidentally in 1802, explicitly inserting itself in the wave of the 'new English novels'),³⁰ these collections emerged from the intersection of several strains of traditions that were well settled in French-speaking culture: the taste for gore of popular press (the so-called *canard*);³¹ the theatre of excess displayed by Old Regime collections of 'tragic stories' (such as Rosset's *Histoires mémorables et tragiques de notre temps*, of 1614);³² the many anthologies of anecdotes of various kinds – entertaining, bizarre, erotic, spicy – published throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and the treatises on supernatural matters of the eighteenth century, such as those of Augustin Calmet and Nicolas Lenglet Du Fresnoy, which these books predate.³³

Published immediately before the peak of 1817-20, *Fantasmagoriana* was not only part of this sub-market, but actually gave a substantial input to its development. Eyriès omitted all authors' names and gave no indication about the original publication of tales; his preface focused on the problem of the existence of ghosts, making no reference to British novels and rather addressing the reader to Calmet and Lenglet Du Fresnoy.³⁴ As a consequence – with the exception of Ovid's knowing epigraph, however accessible only to those who could read Latin – the literary nature of the book remained undeclared, with the result of presenting *Fantasmagoriana* as an ambiguous textual object: a hybrid of fiction and 'real supernatural', of folklore and anecdote, but by no means a 'literary' book as Radcliffe's novels or the supposedly-Byron's *The Vampyre*. Whereas *Gespenserbuch* had already been marketed by Apel and Schulze as a repertoire of popular traditions,³⁵ *Fantasmagoriana* could be and was actually read as a repertoire of folktales and anecdotes, enriched and subtly Gothicized by their 'German' birthmark: and, as such, some of its stories would reappear in the second and vaster edition of Plancy's *Dictionnaire infernal* (1825-26).³⁶

At some point, which we can approximately date between 1826 and the mid-1830s – when the vogue of *frénétique* undergoes deep changes, particularly in the sphere of short fiction³⁷ – someone drafted a fair copy of sixteen stories, binding them as the appendix to a copy of *Fantasmagoriana*. These stories – as much as those of *Fantasmagoriana* – had arguably been retold in salons and private parties; attaching them to the book corresponds, therefore, to the desire of gathering a repertoire of supernatural *fait divers*, plausibly for the entertainment of the lively salon held by Charlotte Bonaparte in Villa Gabrielli al Gianicolo.

The first terminus is certain, as the appendix bound in the Gabrielli copy reverses the relationship of dependence between *Dictionnaire infernal* and *Fantasmagoriana*: all sixteen stories actually appear in the four volumes of which the *Dictionnaire* of 1825-26 is composed, and which can be considered, therefore, as the appendix's main source. Although it is true that Plancy had, in turn, copied the majority of his stories from other collections – so that they could theoretically be available elsewhere³⁸ – the *Dictionnaire* is the only repertoire in which they are all present, moreover in the same order (table 1). The compiler, at all evidence, selected stories by perusing the *Dictionnaire* from cover to cover and by focusing on such entries as 'Apparitions' and 'Diable'.

Stories are mostly copied verbatim, with very minor interventions on the part of the transcriber. Two exceptions, in this respect, are noteworthy. First, the copier gives stories a title when one is not present in Plancy (as is the case with 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, and 16); story 3 is a case in itself, as it was titled *Les diables ramoneurs* in Plancy's source, but bore no title in *Dictionnaire infernal*. Second, the transcriber takes a large degree of freedom with story 12, devising an entirely new

preamble and changing the name of the heroine from Philinnion to Phylis. Both cases seem to confirm a short circuit between oral transmission and printed sources: probably, the compiler wished to transcribe stories s/he had already heard in oral form, but used the titles and names by which they were known in society (hence, for example, the confusion between *Les diables ramoneurs* and *Le Diable ramoneur*, which are homophonous in French, or the preference for a more memorable name as ‘Phylis’).

Criteria of selection and excerption are particularly telling. Notwithstanding the perception we nowadays have of *Fantasmagoriana* – which is mostly rooted in the Shelleys’ accounts of Diodati and their speaking of ‘ghost stories’ –, when it came to producing the appendix, the compiler of the Gabrielli copy selected tales of various kinds, of which ghost stories are only a small part (10, 11, 13, and 16). Half of the selection, instead, concerns devils and demons in different forms (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9). This choice bears particular significance in a context, such as the French one, in which Satan-related themes had played a central role, from the eighteenth century onwards, for allegorizing unruliness and insubordination, epitomizing freethinking, voicing forbidden desires, and exploring the hidden corners of human nature.³⁹ The title *Fantasmagoriana*, after all, was not – despite what Polidori could think, when misspelling the title as ‘phantasmagoriana’ – a reference to ghosts (*fantôme*), but rather to the visual creations of imagination (*fantasme*). At the same time, of course, it was an allusion to Robertson’s phantasmagoria shows, in which ghosts were only part of a broader sequence of images: the programme of a typical phantasmagoria show, as transcribed in Robertson’s memoirs, includes well-known ghost stories and anecdotes related to ghosts – such as the tale of the ‘Bleeding Nun’ from Lewis’s *The Monk*, or the infamous story of Lord Lyttelton’s death – but also episodes from Classical mythology, literary history, or the Bible, scenes taken from Dante’s *Inferno* or from Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*, as well as images of witchcraft (including a dance of witches).⁴⁰

The association between *Fantasmagoriana* and Robertson’s illusions is not only, thus, a way to exploit thematically ‘the dominant medium of visual entertainment’ at the time.⁴¹ ‘Lanternicity’, I believe, fully underlies the book both as a modality of visualization – by which supernatural scenes can be interpreted by making reference to the visual codes of magic lantern shows – and as a structural element, endowing the anthology with the variety that characterized Robertson’s phantasmagorias. Not incidentally, Eyriès mixed fully Gothic stories with sentimental and humorous tones, all elements tellingly silenced by Utterson. *Fantasmagoriana* terminates with a funny twist of plot, by which an ‘authenticated’ apparition reveals itself to be a complete fabrication. Robertson played the same game on stage: all the public had seen, he told the audience in the closure, was only the product of highly refined technology and of the self-deceptive powers

of imagination.⁴² And so does the appendix, whose last story, bearing the revealing title of *Les revenants*, couples two anecdotes occurred in an Italian hotel on the way to Rome: a spectre whose icy touch was probably an impression created by ‘the good Italian wine’ (*le bon vin d’Italie*) and a monkey mistaken for the ghost of its deceased owner, whose gestural habits the animal had learned to imitate. On such trifles, the appendix concludes, most ghost stories are grounded: a way of closing the book in a light tone, moreover by evoking a setting – an Italian hotel in the Roman countryside – with which *Grand Tour* travellers, and particularly the guests of Villa Gabrielli, were definitely familiar.

From this viewpoint, the Gabrielli-Bonaparte copy of *Fantasmagoriana* invites us to rethink the consumption of Gothic and supernatural fiction beyond the spheres of silent reading and writing. If, according to Emma Clery, users of Gothic texts perceive themselves as caught in a cyclic process, in which ‘voracious consumption breeds further production’ and ‘readers become writers in turn’,⁴³ hybrid textual objects as the Gabrielli copy invite us to reflect on the role played by orality, storytelling, and social rituals in the circulation and re-elaboration of supernatural-related narratives.

¹ *Fantasmagoriana, ou Recueil d’histoires d’apparitions de spectres, revenans, fantômes, etc.*, 2 vols. (Paris, Schoell, 1812). In the 1818 preface to *Frankenstein*, Percy Bysshe Shelley speaks of ‘some German stories of ghosts, which happened to fall into our hands’ and which ‘excited in us a playful desire of imitation’ (in M. Wollstonecraft Shelley, *Frankenstein. The 1818 version*, ed. D. L. Macdonald and K. Scherf (Peterborough, Broadview Press, 1999), p. 48); one year later, Polidori relates of the company ‘having perused a German work, which was entitled Phantasmagoriana [sic]’ ([J. Polidori], ‘Extract of a Letter from Geneva, with Anecdotes of Lord Byron, & C.’, *New Monthly Magazine*, 11: 63 (1 April 1819), 195); in her introduction to the *Frankenstein* of 1831, Mary Shelley mentions ‘Some volumes of ghost stories, translated from the German into French’ (in Shelley, *Frankenstein. The 1818 version*, p. 354). Whereas the role of *Fantasmagoriana* is generally accepted by scholars (see for example J. Clubbe, ‘The Tempest-toss’d Summer of 1816: Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*’, *The Byron Journal*, 19 (1991), 26-40), some, such as J. Rieger, argue that the anecdote may largely be a fabrication: ‘Dr. Polidori and the Genesis of *Frankenstein*’, *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 3 (Winter 1963), 461-72. A series of blog posts by M. van Woudenberg has recently re-imposed the question to the attention of scholarship: ‘*Frankenstein* and *Fantasmagoriana*: An Introductory Blog’, *Romantic Textualities. Literature and Print Culture, 1780-1840*, 20 December 2013, <http://www.romtext.org.uk/frankenstein-and-fantasmagoriana-an-introductory-blog/> [last accessed 26 November 2017]. See also F. Camilletti, ‘Storie di fantasmi, tradotte dal tedesco’, in J. A. Apel *et al.*, *Fantasmagoriana*, ed. F. Camilletti (Rome: Nova Delphi, 2015), pp. 7-98 and ‘Beyond the Uncanny: Fantasmagoriana, Intertextuality, and the Pleasure Principle’, *Compar(a)ison*, 1-2 (2015), 61-81.

² Avril Horner, introduction to *European Gothic. A Spirited Exchange 1760-1960* (Manchester and New York, Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 1-16, p. 1.

³ John Polidori, *The Diary 1816 Relating to Byron, Shelley, etc.*, ed. W. M. Rossetti (London, Elkin Mathews, 1911), p. 126.

⁴ See for example S. E. Lewis, ‘*Congeries of Pleasing Horrors*’: ‘*Fantasmagoriana*’ and the Writings of the Diodati Group, MA dissertation, Department of English, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1995. Concurrently with the Diodati bicentenary, *Fantasmagoriana* has, however, been re-edited in French (La Fresnaie-Fayel, Otrante, 2015), Italian (*Fantasmagoriana*, ed. F. Camilletti), and German (*Fantasmagoriana. Geisterbarbiere, Totenbräute und mordende Porträts*, ed. M. Bernauer (Berlin, Ripperger & Kremers, 2017)), hopefully paving the way to new research on the subject.

⁵ *Tales of the Dead* (London, White, Cochrane, and Co., 1813).

⁶ J. V. Douthwaite, *The Frankenstein of 1790 and Other Lost Chapters from Revolutionary France* (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 2012), p. 2.

⁷ See for example Terry Castle, ‘Phantasmagoria: Spectral Technology and the Metaphorics of Modern Reverie’, *Critical Inquiry*, 15:1 (Autumn 1988), 26-61, later included in *The Female Thermometer: Eighteenth-century Culture and the Invention of the Uncanny* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 140-67.

⁸ T. Hale (ed.), *Tales of the Dead: Ghost Stories of the Villa Diodati* (Chislehurst, The Gargoyle's Head Press, 1992); A. J. Day (ed.), *Fantasmagoriana. Tales of the Dead* (St Ives, Fantasmagoriana Press, 2005).

⁹ Jerrold E. Hogle (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. xvii-xxv.

¹⁰ E.g. A. Horner (ed.), *European Gothic. A Spirited Exchange 1760-1960* (Manchester and New York, Manchester University Press, 2002); A. Horner and S. Zlosnik (eds.), *Le Gothic. Influences and Appropriations in Europe and America* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008); M. Elbert and B. M. Marshall (eds.), *Transnational Gothic. Literary and Social Exchanges in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Farnham, Ashgate, 2013); A. Cusack and B. Murnane (eds.), *Popular Revenants. The German Gothic and Its International Reception, 1800-2000* (Rochester, N, Camden House, 2012).

¹¹ As per the advertisement to *Tales of the Dead*, p. ii.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ On this aspect see D. J. Jones's *Gothic Machine: Textualities, Pre-Cinematic Media and Film in Popular Visual Culture, 1670-1910* (Cardiff, University of Wales Press, 2011) and *Sexuality and the Gothic Magic Lantern. Desire, Eroticism and Literary Visibilities from Byron to Bram Stoker* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), in particular pp. 32-70.

¹⁴ See G. Gougenheim, 'L'Inventeur du mot *fantasmagorie*', *Vie et langage*, 49 (April 1956), 160-62.

¹⁵ See L. Mannoni, *The Great Art of Light and Shadow: Archaeology of the Cinema*, ed. and transl. R. Crangle (Exeter, University of Exeter Press, 2000), pp. 126-75.

¹⁶ See G. Peignot, 'Notice bibliographique des ouvrages publiés sous le nom d'ana', in *Répertoire de bibliographies spéciales, curieuses et instructives* (Paris, Renouard/Allais, 1810), pp. 211-68 and J. G. Phitakaer [G. Hécart], *Anagrapheana, sive Bibliographiæ peculiaris librorum ana dictorum, iis que affinium prodromus* (Valenciennes, H.-J. Prignet, 1821).

¹⁷ Peignot, 'Notice', pp. 217-8.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

¹⁹ [J. P. R. Cuisin], *Spectriana, ou recueil D'Histoires et Aventures surprenantes, Merveilleuses et Remarquables de Spectres, Revenans, Esprits, Fantômes, Gnomes, Diabes, et Démons, etc.* (Paris, L'Écrivain, 1817).

²⁰ G. de P[aban], *Démoniana ou nouveau choix D'anecdotes surprenantes, de Nouvelles prodigieuses, d'Aventures bizarres, sur les Revenans, les Spectres, les Fantômes, les Démons, les Loups-Garous, les Visions, etc., etc.* (Paris, Locard et Davi, 1820).

²¹ Ch. N[odier], *Infernaliana* (Paris, Sanson, 1822).

²² Cuisin, *Spectriana*, p. x. Translations, here and henceforth, are mine.

²³ See Douthwaite, *The Frankenstein of 1790*, p. 71.

²⁴ [Anon.], *Le Manuel des sorciers, ou l'arithmétique amusante. Ouvrage dans le genre de la 'Magie blanche dévoilée'* (Paris: Louis, 1801); M. [H.] Decremps, *La Magie blanche dévoilée ou explication des Tours surprenants, qui font depuis peu l'admiration de la Capitale et de la Province, avec des reflexions sur la Baguette divinatoire, les Automates joueurs d'Échecs, etc. etc.* (Paris, Langlois, 1784). On Decremps's book and the author's commitment at debunking popular magic see R. Darnton, *Mesmerism and the End of the Enlightenment in France* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 29 n. 15.

²⁵ [G. de Paban], 'De quelques nouveautés sur les vampires, les spectres, les loups-garoux, etc., etc.', in *Histoire des vampires et des spectres malfaisans avec un examen du vampirisme* (Paris, Masson, 1820), pp. 260-78.

²⁶ A. M. Killen, *Le Roman terrifiant ou roman noir de Walpole à Anne Radcliffe et son influence sur la littérature française jusqu'en 1840* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1967), p. 81.

²⁷ These books are (in chronological order): *Le Livre des prodiges* (Paris, Pillot, 1802); *Histoire des Revenans, ou prétendus tels*, 2 vols. (Paris, Goulet, 1810); *Fantasmagoriana; Spectriana*; J. S. C. de Saint-Albin [Collin de Plancy], *Les Contes noirs, ou les frayeurs populaires* (Paris, Mongie, 1818); J. A. S. Collin de Plancy's *Dictionnaire infernal*, 2 vols. (Paris, Mongie, 1818); J.-A.-S. Collin de Plancy, *Le Diable peint par lui-même* (Paris, Mongie, 1819); G. de P[aban], *Histoire des fantomes et des demons qui se sont montrés parmi les hommes* (Paris, Locard et Davi, 1819); *Démoniana*; [J. R. P. Cuisin], *Les Ombres sanglantes*, 2 vols. (Paris, Lepetit, 1820).

²⁸ T. Hale, 'Translation in Distress: Cultural Misappropriation and the Construction of the Gothic', in Horner, *European Gothic*, pp. 17-38, p. 27.

²⁹ See A. Glinoe, *La Littérature frénétique* (Paris, PUF, 2009), pp. 69-74, who focuses in particular on the works by Cuisin, Plancy, and Nodier.

³⁰ 'L'accueil favorable que le Public a fait depuis plusieurs années aux nouveaux romans anglais, dont la majeure partie offre des scènes de spectres, revenans, fantômes, etc., donne lieu de croire qu'il recevra avec la même indulgence l'ouvrage que l'on publie aujourd'hui sous le titre de *Livre des Prodiges*' [the favourable reception audiences give since several years to the new English novels, the largest part of which offers scenes of spectres, revenants, and ghosts, makes it plausible that they will receive with equal indulgence the work hereby published under the title *The Book of Wonders*] (*Le Livre des prodiges*, 4th ed. (Paris, Au Dépôt general de Nouveautés, 1808), p. 3).

³¹ See M. Lever, *Canards sanglants. Naissance du fait divers* (Paris, Fayard, 1993).

³² See C. Biet (ed.), *Théâtre de la cruauté et récits sanglants en France (XVIe-XVIIe siècle)* (Paris, Laffont, 2006).

³³ A. Calmet, *Dissertation sur les apparitions des anges, des démons et des esprits, et sur les revenants et vampires de Hongrie, de Bohême, de Moravie et de Silésie* (Paris, De Bure l'Aîné, 1746) and N. Lenglet-Dufresnoy, *Recueil de Dissertations sur les Apparitions, les Visions et les Songes*, 2 vols. (Avignon, Leloup, 1751).

³⁴ On Eyriès's preface see Camilletti, 'Beyond the Uncanny'.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 73-4.

³⁶ Collin de Plancy, *Dictionnaire infernal, ou Bibliothèque universelle*, 2nd ed., 4 vols. (Paris, Mongie, 1825-26). The story of the 'Spectre Barber', from in Musäus *L'Amour muet*, is retold in the entry 'Barbier' (vol. I, pp. 320-2); *La Chambre grise* and *La Chambre noire* are defined as 'German anecdotes of the nineteenth century' (*anecdotes allemandes du dix-neuvième siècle*), and form the backbone of the entry 'Chambres infestées' (vol. II, pp. 105-10); *L'Heure fatale* is presented as a 'folktale' (*conte populaire*) in the entry 'Heure' (vol. III, pp. 242-6).

³⁷ Glinoer, *La littérature frénétique*, pp. 131 and 135-41 for the metamorphoses undergone by the short-story genre after the import of Hoffmann's tales.

³⁸ Stories 1-5 also appear in an appendix of 'Notes et anecdotes' included in M. de Boissy [É. Guénard], *Libussa, Reine de Bohême* [sic], 3 vols. (Paris, Courval et al., 1825), vol. III, pp. 72-231. Guénard's source was also Plancy.

³⁹ See M. Milner's still valid overview, *Le Diable dans la littérature française de Cazotte à Baudelaire, 1722-1861*, 2 vols. (Paris, José Corti, 1960), in particular pp. 252-5. See also M. Biard, *La Révolution hantée* (Paris, Vendémiaire, 2017) for an exploration of the iconography of hell during the French Revolution.

⁴⁰ É. G. Robertson, *Mémoires récréatifs, scientifiques et anecdotiques*, 2 vols. (Paris, Chez l'Auteur, 1831), vol. I, pp. 294-304.

⁴¹ Jones, *Sexuality and the Gothic Magic Lantern*, p. 9.

⁴² Robertson, *Mémoires*, vol. I, p. 284.

⁴³ E. J. Clery, *The Rise of Supernatural Fiction, 1762-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 97.