

Introduction: Hearing Fantasy

Among the earliest fantastic tales published by French authors were those of Théophile Gautier and Jules Janin, whose work set the stage for an explosion of *contes fantastiques* through the 1830s and 1840s. Gautier's "La Cafetière" (1831) tells a brief but alluring story revolving around Théodore, an art student who, as the tale begins, departs Paris for a vacation at an old house in Normandy. The trip involves a full day of travel and when Théodore arrives with his friends, he is tired and retires to his room. It is a cavernous space that, oddly, already seems to be occupied – combs, boxes, and discarded dresses lay all about. Uneasy, he tries to sleep, but as the room darkens, strange shapes begin to dance on the walls, figures from the innumerable portraits and murals on the wall, which appear as flickering, distorted silhouettes. This unsettling visual show is accompanied by an increasingly acute experience of hearing: Théodore describes the persistently sighing wind and ticking clock, whose effects usher in a series of hallucinatory events. As the clock strikes eleven, its lingering resonance brings the room to life. The candles light themselves, a coffeepot hops down from the mantle and settles itself on the embers of the fire, armchairs walk about on their ornamental feet, and characters from the paintings step out into the realm of the real. All listen intently. Finally, the clock sounds the stroke of midnight and an unknown voice declares, "The hour is here, let us dance!" And now a more powerful magic takes hold. An orchestra woven into the great tapestry on the wall stirs into being, calling all to participate in a whirling entertainment whose speed and intensity hint at violence:

The horn player and the musicians [of the tapestry] who until then had given no sign of life bowed their heads in acknowledgement. The conductor raised his baton and the musicians struck up a lively dance tune. First, the company danced the minuet. But the rapid notes of the score played by the musicians did not match the stately movement of the dancers. After a while, each pair of dancers began to spin round and round like a top. The women's silk dresses made a curious noise as they whirled, like a flight of pigeons or a beating of wings. Puffed up from beneath by the draught, they looked like bells ringing. The musicians' bows attacked the strings so vigorously that they struck electric sparks from them, the fingers of the flautists moved up and down like quicksilver, the huntsmen's cheeks swelled out like

balloons and the resulting deluge of notes was so rapid and tumultuous that even the demons of hell could not have kept up the pace for more than a few seconds.¹

Music animates the inanimate and even, as the story unfolds, brings a dead girl back to life, allowing her to participate in the action. But as the orchestra fades and the light of dawn glimmers, the magic ends. Théodore loses consciousness and, when he wakes in the morning, finds himself dressed in peculiar clothes, bewildered, and unable to explain the events of the night previous.

Jules Janin's first *conte fantastique*, "Kreyssler," published the following year (1832), contains many of the same tropes. Here again, fantastic magic is ushered in on a wave of sound – another fanciful orchestra, this one made up of clinking glasses and booming kegs of beer described at the outset of the tale by the fictional musician Johannes Kreyssler (Kreisler):

I was still at the tavern the *Grand-Frédéric*; indeed, I had passed the entire night there. Oh what a night! A brilliant concert in the midst of a thick cloud of smoke! Pitchers knocking against pitchers, glasses clinking together, beer foaming and rising to the rim. Like a rustic flageolet married to a bagpipe, the cork pops to more clearly mark the beat; the barrel serves as bass drum in the corner of the orchestra. Well played, musicians! Bravo, music! We have executed a whole drinkers' symphony, allegro, in all keys and every meter. My goodness! When the sparkle of a robust wine glimmers at the brim of my glass, I feel like I am witnessing a magic spectacle.²

Intoxicated by wine and by the sound of his imagined orchestra, Janin's Kreyssler (like Théodore before him) begins to see dancing shadows on the wall of the tavern, grotesquely shifting as if with a life of their own. He enters a space akin to Shakespeare's "Midsummer Night's Dream" in which fairies, ghosts, and even the Princess Helen seem to appear. As light breaks, he wanders the streets surrounding the tavern carrying on an (imagined?) conversation with the princess. Finally, she disappears into her palace – or perhaps, Kreyssler muses, she ascends into the heavens. He continues on his walk, only to find himself back at his favorite watering hole the following evening, asking "Did I dream all of that?"

These tales, hallucinatory, sonorous, ontologically unstable, were written in the wake of E. T. A. Hoffmann's introduction to France in the late 1820s (in many cases, as both Gautier's and Janin's protagonists indicate, as a direct response to the German author's work).³ They mark the beginning

¹ Gautier, "La Cafetière," 8. ² Janin, "Kreyssler," 33.

³ Théodore is a reference to Ernest *Theodore* Amadeus Hoffmann. The point is made by Whyte, who also draws attention to the continuities between Gautier's animating coffeepot and Hoffmann's magical pot in *Der goldene Topf*; see his "Théophile Gautier, poète-courtisan." Janin's Kreyssler points (obviously) toward Hoffmann's musical alter ego, Johannes Kreisler.

3 *Introduction: Hearing Fantasy*

of a new culture of literary fantasy stretching through Balzac, Baudelaire, and Nerval to Maupassant and de l'Isle Adam. The *contes fantastiques* of these authors were much read – serialized in major journals, reissued in collections, lauded by some, denounced by others, emerging from (and perpetuating) a deep fascination with fantastic worlds. Common to the delineation of many of these is a species of multisensory description in which narrative, musical, and visual elements are woven together. Their synesthetic quality has attracted while also confounding critics, placing fantasy just outside the grasp of conventional analytical methodology and therefore legibility. Its disciplinary slippages make stories like Nodier's and Gautier's (and behind these, Hoffmann's) difficult to master; though cast in narrative form, they often seem to emerge from and be sustained by sound, which itself perpetuates otherworldly modes of seeing and knowing.

Studies of fantasy have only slowly begun to approach the kind of interdisciplinarity the mode itself seems to require. They originated in the domain of literary criticism, which has long emphasized the importance of the fantastic, situating it as central to mid-nineteenth-century novelistic and poetic production and, in a broader sense, to the articulation of French romanticism. Texts documenting the arrival and impact of E. T. A. Hoffmann (whose tales were translated under the rubric *contes fantastiques*) are numerous, as are accounts of France's response. Between Pierre Georges Castex's seminal *Le Conte fantastique en France de Nodier à Maupassant* (1951) to the wide-ranging overviews and anthologies of recent decades, including Neil Cornwell's *The Literary Fantastic from Gothic to Postmodernism* (1990) and David Sandner's *Fantastic Literature: A Critical Reader* (2004), dozens of books on fantasy have appeared, many detailing from various angles the ways in which the mode reshaped conceptions of supernaturalism (and therefore also naturalism), blurring entrenched boundaries between real and unreal, waking and dreaming, marvelous and mimetic. Structuralist accounts of fantasy (famously, that of Tzvetan Todorov) abound, as do poststructuralist, psychoanalytic, thematic, and postmodern readings, which demonstrate how the genre plumbed new psychological depths, played with archetypal images, undid existing narrative conventions, and confounded language itself.⁴ Work emanating from the literary community has been extended and enriched by visual historians including Marina Warner, Barbara Stafford, Wolfgang Kayser, and Roger Schlobin, who have linked the rise of fantasy with the wave of modern

⁴ Todorov, *The Fantastic*. Many later studies expand, modulate, or refute Todorov. For a range of methodological approaches, see as starting points: Jackson, *Fantasy*; Olsen, *Ellipse of Uncertainty*; Armitt, *Theorising the Fantastic*; Leonard, ed., *Into Darkness Peering*; Andrès, *La Fantaisie dans la littérature français du XIXe siècle*.

4 *Introduction: Hearing Fantasy*

bogeymen – newly “real” and “human” monsters – pictured by romantic engravers and painters from Francisco Goya to Eugène Delacroix, Gustave Doré, and Odilon Redon. And moving further afield, cultural historians have theorized the fantastic in conceptual terms, as a liminal social space generated by revolutionary notions of state and self.⁵

The result is an increasingly rich and multifaceted understanding of fantasy, including the ways in which it operated as a textual, visual, and psychological impulse. What remains persistently underdeveloped is a sense of its aural dimensions. Music, as seems so often the case, is the final hurdle, the most difficult medium to capture and theorize. But in the case of fantasy it is – quite obviously – crucial. Hoffmann’s tales and, as I have highlighted, those of his French champions, are woven through with sonorous description and evocation, their narratives of enchantment often propelled by acts of listening. In both Gautier and Janin, the *conte fantastique* is inextricable from the *orchestre fantastique* – from a newly debauched, magical, and intoxicating domain of instrumental sound. One thinks right away of Berlioz’s *Symphonie fantastique*, which premiered just before the publication of the first fantastic tales and was clearly entwined with them. Musical fantasy, in a strict sense, preceded French literary fantasy. So why has so little been written about it?

One explanation lies in the widely held sense of Berlioz’s symphony as a singular work, a lone exemplar of the musical fantastic in an era dominated by the *conte fantastique*, a “transient, marvelous exception,” as Wagner put it.⁶ But the idea is misleading. As literary fantasy proliferated so too did *fantastique* musical production, the two inextricably conjoined. Berlioz’s symphony, with its famously literary program, was followed quickly by two other Fantastic Symphonies (also attached to otherworldly narratives), both of which premiered by 1835.⁷ And around the same time, a corpus of other compositions bearing the rubric began to appear: sonatas, concerti, character pieces, and dramatic works, some by known composers (Liszt, Schumann, Moscheles), others by more obscure figures (Antonio Bazzini, Adolphe Blanc, Adolfo Fumagalli, Benjamin Godard). The term

⁵ Warner, *Fantastic Metamorphoses*; idem, *No Go the Bogeyman*; Stafford, *Body Criticism*; idem, *Devices of Wonder*; Schlobin, *The Aesthetics of Fantasy Literature and Art*; Kayser, *The Grotesque in Art and Literature*; Siebers, *The Romantic Fantastic*; Monleón, *A Specter Is Haunting Europe*. An ever-widening sense of fantasy’s interdisciplinary appeal is evidenced by the yearly proceedings of the International Conference on the Fantastic in the Arts.

⁶ *Dresdener Abendzeitung* (5 May 1841).

⁷ One of these (now lost) was composed by Berlioz’s compatriot, violinist François-Laurent-Hébert Turbry. The other was the work of a young Belgian composer, Etienne-Joseph Soubre, who began his *Sinfonie fantastique* in 1833 while a student at the *Conservatoire royale de Liège* and premiered it in 1835, only months before Turbry’s. Soubre’s work, which is clearly a response to Berlioz’s, survives. For detail, see my edition of his *Sinfonie fantastique à grand orchestre*.

5 *Introduction: Hearing Fantasy*

fantastique was applied to operas by Weber and Gounod, to a collection of mid-century ballets, and to several of Berlioz's later otherworldly evocations, including *Harold en Italie*, *La Damnation de Faust*, the *Messe des morts*, and parts of *Roméo et Juliette*. It was as meaningful in the musical sphere as in the literary and visual worlds, though neither the corpus of *fantastique* works nor the term itself has received sustained musicological attention.⁸

It is this lacuna that the present book aims to fill. It is concerned with the ways in which music interfaced with literary and visual fantasy and, more pointedly, with fantasy's emergence as a compositional category. What did the term mean in a musical context? What do the pieces to which it was attached have in common? How are they related to the procedures of pictorial and poetic fantasy? To shifting notions of supernatural representation? To theories of instrumental, especially orchestral, sound? Asking these questions goes some way toward resolving fantasy's elusiveness. As we shall see, many literary accounts of the mode begin and end with claims around its indefinability – the impossibility of saying what it is or how it means. Here, I have no pat definition to offer nor do I hope to simplify or contain fantasy, but I do suggest that its opacity arises in part from a neglect of its sounding dimensions, which were crucial from the outset. The fantastic is accessible only via multipronged inquiry, residing, as I argue in the pages to follow, in an interstitial space between reading, hearing, seeing, and sensing.

My musical point of departure is the same as that suggested by Gautier's and Janin's "orchestral" tales and by French music critics: the work of Hector Berlioz, who was bound up from the 1830s onward with fantastic rhetoric, positioned as the promulgator of a newly literary, Hoffmannesque, and more broadly "German" musical mode. This strand of the composer's reception has not gone entirely unnoted; indeed, the sense of a connection between the *Symphonie fantastique* and the wider discourses and aesthetics of fantasy stretches back to Christian Berger's *Phantastik als Konstruktion* (1983) and carries through later work by Wolfgang Dömling, Laura Cosso, Andrea Hübener, and Marianna Ritchey.⁹ These authors argue, among other things, for a link between Berlioz's rhetorical and formal strategies and those of contemporary *contes fantastiques*, mapping literary theory onto musical practice. They also draw attention to Berlioz's programmatic

⁸ There are several interesting and recent exceptions, especially in scholarship on staged music. These include Meglin's series of three articles under the umbrella title "Behind the Veil of Translucence"; also, Lacombe and Picard, *Opéra fantastique*.

⁹ Berger, *Phantastik als Konstruktion*; Dömling, *Hector Berlioz*; Cosso, *Strategie del fantastico*; Hübener, *Kreisler in Frankreich*; Ritchey, "Echoes of the Guillotine." See also my own dissertation, "Berlioz, Hoffmann, and the *Genre fantastique* in French Romanticism," and that of Ritchey, "Echoes of the Guillotine."

6 *Introduction: Hearing Fantasy*

borrowings – the overlaps between his otherworldly imagery and that of Hoffmann, Gautier, and Charles Nodier. These ideas are important and play a role in the chapters to follow, although I also complicate, extend, and in some ways reorient them. The musical fantastic was not, I suggest, simply responding to literary or visual impulses but was, from the beginning, intertwined with them. Authors of fantastic tales also reviewed fantastic musical works; composers of *musique fantastique* themselves published *contes fantastiques*. Fantasies seen, read, and heard were always already inextricably linked. More importantly, the shift produced by fantastic aesthetics extended well beyond Berlioz's symphony and Berlioz himself, transforming notions of otherworldly sound on a broad scale.

I am especially interested in Hoffmann's role in establishing a framework – literary, visual, and especially musical – for French fantasy. Both he and his alter ego, Kreisler, had a wide and deep impact (as Janin's tale indicates and Hübener's study confirms), importing a new kind of artistic consciousness as well as what French critics understood as a “modern” conception of the fantastic. The term, as both Hoffmann and his Parisian champions applied it, was not synonymous with “fantasy” in a loose sense. It did not refer, in other words, to imaginative worlds at large, but to a new form of rational enchantment first introduced in the literature and aesthetic theory of the late eighteenth century.¹⁰ At its heart was a breakdown of entrenched barriers between reason and imagination, reality and the unreal. Modern fantasy emerged on one hand from idealist philosophy, which posited a new relationship between nature and the supernatural, and on the other from political upheaval – the forces of both revolution and imperialism – which collapsed entrenched social and intellectual boundaries, forcefully enjambling reason with the irrational. In tandem, these impulses disrupted the old domain of the marvelous (what the French regarded as a native magical tradition, a theatrical mode associated with make-believe, illusion, and mythology), replacing it with a new species of “real” supernaturalism (*le surnaturel vrai*). No longer divorced from reason, magic became newly entwined with it; indeed, romantic science itself midwived the birth of fantasy, bridging the divide

¹⁰ An important distinction, since the term is sometimes applied to a much broader swath of literary material; see, for instance, James and Mendlesohn, *The Cambridge Companion to Fantasy Literature*, which clubs together tales of make-believe from the Renaissance to the present day. *Fantastique* as I invoke it here should also be separated from the “fantasy” (*phantasie, fantaisie*) as a musical form. Though certain connections between the mode and the form obtain, French lexicons do not make them synonymous. *Fantastic* as applied to Berlioz's work was connected to a new kind of orchestral sound and a novel approach to magical representation rather than to the improvisatory procedures associated with the *stylus phantasticus*.

between otherworldly belief and modern skepticism. Novel microscopic and telescopic inventions rendered invisible worlds visible, new geographical exploration made imaginary worlds actual, emerging theories of matter and mind penetrated beyond the surfaces of things to reveal hidden, distant, and ideal spaces. In musical as in literary and visual arenas, modern technologies (philosophical, physical, compositional) reinvented magic. They reinvested sound with an old incantatory influence and the musician himself with occult power.

Understanding how this power was regained means examining shifting boundaries among musical, theological, and empirical discourses, placing *fantastique* soundscapes against broader histories of supernaturalism. This is, in part, the project of Chapter 1, which begins with French Hoffmann reception – with the wave of reviews, commentaries, and analyses sparked by the arrival of the German author’s *Fantasiestücke* in the late 1820s. As we shall see, critics were much exercised by the intertwining of science and folklore in these stories, which seemed at once alluring and disruptive, introducing new modes of reading and listening (the two sometimes blurred). They separated Hoffmann’s fantastic mode not just from the French “marvelous” tradition, but from English Gothic aesthetics, and the “ancient” magic of Renaissance mythology, introducing a set of distinctions that would later be taken up by a host of twentieth-century critics. Here, I devote some time to fleshing these out, surveying a body of writing on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century musico-magical ontologies by (among others) Claude Palisca, Gary Tomlinson, and Penelope Gouk, and a corpus of work on eighteenth-century marvels initiated by Marian Hannah Winter and extended, most recently, by David J. Buch.¹¹ Together the work of these scholars sketches out a shift from an enchanted to a disenchanted reality, from a world animated by sonorous magic to one in which music was relegated to the merely aesthetic. Buch’s study takes us up to the 1790s, to the period André Grétry termed the “third age of the marvelous.” What followed, as French critics suggested, and as I argue here, was the *next* moment of musico-magical negotiation: the birth of modern fantasy, which reinvested sound with some of its lost Neoplatonic power and therefore magic with “real” efficacy. It was this shift that Parisian readers sensed in Hoffmann’s tales, which destabilized their own magical tradition, introducing a new narrative wavering that was also an enchanted (metaphysical,

¹¹ This is not the place to give a full account of the literature on music and magic, although a rich selection of writing on the topic will be represented in the chapters to follow. The works I mention here are well-known points of departure: Palisca, *Humanism in Italian Renaissance Musical Thought*; Tomlinson, *Music in Renaissance Magic*; Winter, *The Theatre of Marvels*; Buch, *Magic Flutes and Enchanted Forests*.

socially radical) form of listening. From the outset, they situated the fantastic as both a fictional and musical category, identifying Hoffmann as the primary exponent of the former and Berlioz of the latter. The *Symphonie fantastique*, according to many, was the flagship work of a burgeoning école fantastique, a piece ushering in a new kind of sounding supernaturalism and a modern model for the inspired musician.

Close readings of Berlioz's first symphony and its sequel *Le Retour à la vie* form the subjects of the following two chapters, which examine the ways in which these works rendered Berlioz a musical Hoffmann, translating into practice what the German *conteur* had only imagined in fiction and, in so doing, providing a template for the French "school" of fantastic composition. Berlioz's original title for the first symphony was *Épisode de la vie d'un artiste: Symphonie fantastique en cinq parties*, but very quickly, he shortened this to *Symphonie fantastique* and later, in the letters, referred simply to the *Fantastique*. His rhetorical telescoping is interesting, inviting us to consider how the term sums up the work. How fantastic was the Fantastic Symphony? How was it shaped by the twin philosophical and political impulses associated with the *surnaturel vrai*? Part of listeners' struggle to place and read the work, in Berlioz's time as well as now, I suggest, emerges from a difficulty theorizing fantasy itself, understanding its central ontological and disciplinary hesitations and the fractured persona of the Hoffmannesque artist himself.

This persona (and, in a larger sense, the nature of fantastic selfhood) is the subject of Chapter 2, which looks at Berlioz's first symphony as an autobiographical work, exploring its adoption/adaptation of the alienated, mad, and obsessive identity celebrated in Hoffmann's fiction. Accessing fantasy's "hesitating" domains is possible, in the German author's tales, only via spiritual suffering, a form of self-estrangement wrapped up with the German condition *Sehnsucht*, which he attaches to his own musical alter ego, Kreisler, and to a host of other "artistic" protagonists. In the program of the *Fantastique*, Berlioz diagnoses himself with a similar form of longing, although now his ailment is not just philosophical, but medical. Idealist yearning is conflated in his program with a form of unhealthy fixation: the famous *idée fixe*. Here, I examine the relationship between these pathologies, the ways in which metaphysical, psychiatric, and nervous discourses converged to produce the figure of the modern fantasist, allowing him to occupy while also escaping his own materiality – to exist as a doubled self. In pursuing this line of inquiry, I gesture toward a familiar psychoanalytic approach to the fantastic (the array of Freudian, Jungian, and Lacanian readings of the mode) while also departing from it.¹² I am less concerned

¹² For an overview of such approaches, see Butler, "Psychoanalysis."

with twentieth-century psychoanalytic thought than with the psychiatric theory of Berlioz's and Hoffmann's own moment – in concepts eventually taken up and expanded by Freud and his generation. The birth of modern “mental science,” I argue, produced a new kind of creative (literary, musical, visual) fantasy and, along with it, a form of unstable autobiography suspending artists between reality and fiction, madness and transcendental perception.

Chapter 3 moves from the *Fantastique* to its little-known sequel, from a consideration of Berlioz's fantastic self to an interrogation of his fantastic soundworld. In *Le Retour à la vie*, the composer reveals himself not just as a Kreislerian sufferer, but a Hoffmannesque listener – one whose access to the ideal was rooted, seemingly paradoxically, in acute perception of the real. The work was, as Berlioz put it, an extended contemplation of “his art” and the *monde fantastique* from which it sprang, an explanation of the symphony and its central theme. In it he located the *idée fixe* not just as a dream melody, but also as a natural sound drawn from the sighs of the breeze, the songs of birds, and the noises of water and earth. The intertwining of imaginary and actual worlds at the heart of the *Fantastique* is reflected in *Le Retour* by a parallel musical blurring: a collapse of supernatural into actual sound. This was not simply a form of “imitation” or orchestral materialism (a common complaint in the work's reception), but, as Berlioz argued, a new kind of vitalist “expression.” He, like Hoffmann, associated the fantastic soundworld with a sonorous enchantment that worked on and through the body, transmitting the divine energy of the natural world and in so doing an intimation of the metaphysical beyond. As we shall see, the idea was difficult for mainstream critics to grasp and explain; instead, it was explored through a series of *contes fantastiques* published by Berlioz's proponents through the middle 1830s, which positioned the composer's orchestra as an instrument of transformation and magico-nervous revelation.

If fantasy disrupted representational and epistemological binaries (distinctions between expressive and imitative, aesthetic and scientific), it also played with stylistic and formal ones. In the *Fantastique*, *Le Retour*, and a host of Berlioz's surrounding works, critics complained not just of orchestral noise, but of structural disorder: faulty harmonies, tortured rhythms, and syntactical illegibility. Fantastic music emerged, they claimed, both from imported philosophical impulses and, equally clearly, from revolutionary linguistic innovations – the lexical “reforms” of Louis-Sébastien Mercier, Charles Nodier, and Victor Hugo. Chapter 4 teases out these ideas, connecting the “natural” sound embraced by Berlioz and his proponents to romantic theories of “natural” language and, behind them, the

“natural” rights of man. New phraseology and syntax, as we shall see, were central to both the ontological uncertainty and political volatility of modern fantasy. In Hugo’s much-read Preface to the drama *Cromwell*, neology itself – the invention of new words and sounds – undid the artificial reality of the old marvelous world, replacing it with an aesthetics of all-embracing grotesquerie. High and low, poetry and prosody, ugly and beautiful, material and ethereal intermingled in his literary imaginary, its poetics indebted to aesthetic and political ideologies of organicism. It was this syntax that Berlioz associated with his own work and that of the *fantastique* pieces he admired, including Weber’s *Der Freischütz* and *Oberon*. For him, as for his critics, the imaginative grammar of these pieces was also a radical semiotics – onomatopoeic, cabbalistic, electric – poised to materialize new creative and social spaces.

The final chapters of this book move outward, concerned with the ways in which *fantastique* selves and soundworlds proliferated through the middle decades of the century. Berlioz remains, however, a center of gravity, largely because he was perceived as the chief representative – in many accounts, the pioneer – of the fantastic style. But he was not its only adherent, nor was the idiom itself monolithic. Berlioz himself acknowledged at least two subtypes central to his own work and that of his contemporaries: the *fantastique terrible* and the *fantastique gracieux* (an echo of Nodier’s 1830 distinction between “religious” and “poetic” fantasy). Both invoked, in quite different ways, the rational and more pointedly real and scientific otherworldliness associated with the modern fantastic. They emancipated fiends, elves, sprites, and other imaginary creatures from the confines of the marvelous, allowing them to creep back into the realm of materiality, to hover between reason and unreason in spaces of ontological hesitation generated (as in the *Symphonie fantastique*) by structural and orchestrational innovation.

The dark or “terrible” fantastic is the focus of Chapter 5, which examines novel kinds of infernal sound in the work of Berlioz and his contemporaries, tracing a move away from the mythological terrains associated with eighteenth-century underworlds toward the semi-real and terrestrial landscapes of romantic hells. Like God himself, demons were naturalized, rendered proximate by fantastic evocation, although the “real” with which they were associated was not the divinely saturated nature theorized by romantic idealism, but an artificial terrain constructed by imperialism – what we might understand, drawing on H. L. Malchow, Patrick Brantlinger, and others as a kind of Gothic naturalism. The new infernal power of these creatures was generated and revealed via science, especially the burgeoning disciplines of anthropology, geography, and comparative philology. In making this argument I return again to the intersections between fantasy