

Readers, tourism and the making of Sherlock Holmes's England

Dave McLaughlin

Introduction

When thinking about places associated with the England of Sherlock Holmes, we might think of Undershaw, Arthur Conan Doyle's home in the Surrey countryside. We might, perhaps more naturally, think of 221B Baker Street in London, a place that readers and fans of the Sherlock Holmes stories have been visiting for more than a century (Reijnders 2013: 3). Yet, we should also think of Cairo, in Egypt, as an important site in the making of Sherlock Holmes's England. It was in Cairo, in the late 1970s, that self-professed devotee of Doyle's Sherlock Holmes stories (or 'Sherlockian') David Hammer had the idea for a Sherlock-themed tour of England. As he recalled in his memoirs, written at the dawn of the twenty-first century, his desire for a tour of Holmes's England came from a desire to know the places of this country – the places associated with Sherlock Holmes (Hammer 2001: 10). Further, Hammer noted that, since no such tour existed, it fell to him to create it. Therefore, between 1983 and 2001, he wrote a series of travel guides to England, as the Great Detective would have known it. There were four books in all: *The Game is Afoot* (1983); *For the Sake of the Game* (1986); *The Worth of the Game* (1993); and *A Deep Game* (2001).

Hammer's travel writing can be understood as one manifestation of a larger proliferation of Holmes-inspired literary tourism, which took off in the latter years of the twentieth century – laying the foundations of a reader-led industry of sorts which continues to this day (McLaughlin 2016, 2017; examples include Alexander 1984, 1999; Sundin 1985, and Christopher 2012). This explosion in Sherlockian literary tourism at the end of the last century was broadly characterised by readers who used their travels to and through places associated with the Sherlock Holmes stories in order to practice what I have termed expansionary literary geography – a species of encounter with fiction in which readers harness the creative agency of literature in order to consciously expand or add to the literary spaces of the text. As I explained in my doctoral thesis:

It is a deliberate endeavour to turn personal and embodied experiences of actual-world places into extensions of Holmes's fictional world - and to influence fellow Sherlockians' imaginative encounters with that world - that are the hallmarks of this practice. (McLaughlin 2017: 32).

The embodied practices of expansionary literary geography which characterise much Sherlockian literary tourism are based on a shared, ludic belief that Sherlock Holmes was a historical figure and not simply a fictional character. It was the strength of this professed belief among early Sherlockians that famously led G.K. Chesterton to exclaim that, if these readers continued like this, there would come a time when many people genuinely believed 'that Sherlock Holmes really existed and that Conan Doyle never existed' (in Saler 2012: 106).

Yet, if we look again at his memoirs and the ways in which Hammer talks about his own work, we can get a sense of a somewhat different purpose to Hammer's literary tourism. Writing about the genesis of his Sherlockian literary tourism, Hammer admitted that

I never really believed that Holmes had lived. I still don't, but I do believe that he was real; so real, in fact, that if he has not become a figure of history, he has of heritage, which surely constitutes a significant form of reality (Hammer 2001: 10).

It is the aim of this chapter to understand the impact of David Hammer's investment in Holmes as a figure of heritage, and to explore how that shaped the ways in which he, as a reader, created the sites of Holmes's England as a material manifestation of that heritage – and literally wrote the guidebooks that encouraged others to follow in his footsteps.

Literary tourism and heritage

Literary tourism has long been associated with what Robert Hewison has called the 'heritage industry' (in Harrison 2010: 16; see also Plate 2006; Hendrix 2008; Reijnders 2009, 2011, 2013; Westover 2012; James 2013; Van Es and Reijnders 2016). Tourism studies scholars Robinson and Anderson argue that literature possesses, 'some sort of public legacy expressed in emotional

as well as spatial terms’ (Robinson and Anderson 2002: 26). In this way, literary works can be seen as ‘cultural reference points that sit with conceptions of social and cultural identity, ideas and ideals of nationality and nationhood, and popular discourses of historical development’ (Robinson and Andersen 2002: 26). Harald Hendrix classifies writers’ houses as ‘destinations of literary pilgrimages *and other manifestations of heritage tourism*’ (Hendrix 2008: 1, emphasis added).

Further, scholars have suggested that there is at present a general ‘conflation of literary tourism with that of heritage tourism, conceiving of this practice to be the “corollary of the present-day obsession with heritage and cultural memory”’ (Van Es and Reijnders 2016: 5). The causes of this association between literary tourism and cultural heritage is not hard to discover. Nicola Watson argues that it was a short leap from literary tourism’s necessary act of ‘imaginative (re)possession and (re)discovery’ (Watson 2006: 4), to a place where the ‘emerging national literary canon [could be] seized upon in order to effect a sort of interiorised national mapping’, abetted by the fact that literary pilgrimages in Britain effectively ‘allowed travellers [from Britain and abroad] to make themselves imaginatively at home across the nation through the medium of literature’ (Watson 2006: 14).

The history of literary tourism and literary mapping has been associated with the nineteenth-century rise in geographical education, perhaps directed towards nationalistic ends. ‘Locating fictional spaces on a map’, Bulson notes, ‘allows readers to transform fiction into practical knowledge. That explains why educators, learning from tourists and the guidebook companies, latched on to literary maps early on to teach students about literature, geography, and history simultaneously’ (Bulson 2007: 4). Into the twenty-first century, literature and tourism remain associated with the idea of re-living an imagined or half-remembered, past. Thus, Robinson and Anderson write that, ‘nostalgia is important here and it seems like literary tourism increasingly plays to an audience that wishes to travel in time as well as space’.

If such practices suggest something artificial about the association between literary places and cultural identity, Zemuglys further reminds us that ‘heritage has been fundamentally understood as a possession, the “spoils” claimed by nations and ethnicities for both moral and immoral

ends', drawing on texts about literary heritage produced in its 'heyday' to argue that 'the placed literary past was regarded as a possession over which collectivities could be defined' (Zemuglyls 2008: 40). Thus the purpose of literary tourism, with its focus on places to be possessed as a means of defining one's social group is, in part, the creation of literary heritage. It is important, here, to remember David Lowenthal's comments that, first, 'the relics of time help us both to know the past and to bend it to our own uses' and, more forcefully, that heritage 'clarifies pasts so as to infuse them with present purposes' (Lowenthal 1998: xv); in other words, 'It is a past entirely fitted to the present' (Zemuglyls 2008: 1).

This recognition that literary heritage is a dynamic and imaginative act of possession and creation, combining places, literatures and present purposes, can help us to understand the role that Hammer's travel books play in making Holmes's England as a site for Sherlockian tourists to visit, explore and possess. Importantly, despite his claim that Sherlockians, 'are essentially time-travellers, committed to another time, and perhaps worse, to places where we never lived, and for some, have never seen' (Hammer 1997: 2), Hammer's travel books represent less a nostalgic attempt to capture an imagined or half-remembered past. Rather, as I will argue, Hammer used his travels and resulting guides in order to *create* a heritage for Sherlockians, as a particular sociocultural group. His literary tourism practices, through which, as I will demonstrate, he both creates and venerates literary heritage sites connected to Sherlock Holmes, work to justify the dynamic and creative tendency in Sherlockiana and to concretise these practices in the world.

Zemuglyls has written that literary heritage contains within it a tension, between the individuality of fictional encounters and the collective, controlling impulse of heritage (as a form of authorised and collective remembrance). She notes particularly how literary tourism, as an act of commemoration, involves not just a 'return to the original places of creation' but also 'how that return doubles as return to the *original scene of reading*' (Zemuglyls 2008: 45, emphasis added). As I have argued elsewhere, for Sherlockians this tension is further complicated by the explicit existence of a community of readers encountering these stories together (McLaughlin 2016: 147-148). Over the following pages I shall show how these elements of literary heritage – the places

of creation, the scenes of reading and the awareness of other readers – inform Hammer’s tourism, as a means of creating Sherlock Holmes’s England as a place of Sherlockian heritage.

The acid test: places of creation

The first element in the creation of England as a place of Sherlockian heritage is a focus on the places of literary creation. Hammer’s Sherlockian tourism began with a desire to know and to encounter the places of Holmes’s England. He said as much to the SAS tour agent with whom he first discussed the idea of a Holmes-inspired tour of England: ‘if I knew the sites, I wouldn’t need the tour’ (Hammer 2001: 9). As a self-described ‘site-maven’ (Hammer 1997: 3), he put this in rather colourful language in the preface to his first travel guide, *The Game is Afoot!* (1983). He explained that his aim was ‘to put the Canon to the acid test - to return to the original source’ (Hammer 1983: 7). He described his travels as ‘an attempt to locate and identify the geographical verities of the Canon’, necessary because ‘There are few residences located with any simple certainty (Hammer 1983: 8-9) in these stories.

Hammer’s original source was not any one text of the Sherlock Holmes stories; rather it was England itself. Hammer ‘was convinced from the number of sites near his Norwood home that Doyle had seen places on his constant walks and related his already developed story ideas to them. I believe also that the sites themselves sometimes created the stories, and certainly they always influenced them’ (Hammer 2001: 10). Later, in *The Worth of the Game*, he justified including Doyle’s childhood neighbourhood around Picardy Place in Edinburgh in his guide by reasoning that, ‘Whether one chooses to regard Dr. Doyle as the father of Mr. Holmes or his literary *accoucheur*, he was necessarily author or agent, and in either capacity his antecedents and environment are well worth the enquiry’ (Hammer 1993: 6).

On the surface, Hammer’s justifications for including Doyle’s homes and haunts in his work were aimed at his fellow Sherlockians who were more invested in the idea ‘that Sherlock Holmes really existed and that Conan Doyle never existed’ (Saler 2012: 106) – or at least that one did not need to recognise Doyle as his creator to write about Holmes as a living man. Yet, Hammer’s

insistence on including Doyle also suggests that he is practicing what Andrea Zemgulys has called ‘association’. As she explains it in relation nineteenth-century literary tourism:

factual and fictional worlds coincided loosely, through expansive speculation rather than precise labeling. Associations made almost any landscape relevant to the memory of a writer; they encompassed... sites just reminiscent of fictional settings, sites simply curious and interesting to those who wished to know more (Zemgulys 2008: 23).

Yet, it is important to note that although Hammer apparently began his quest with an image of places associated with Doyle – those country lanes along which the author would walk and think – his end point is rather different. In his published travel guide, Hammer uses association to gather together sites from Doyle’s life and from his stories under the heading of ‘the English haunts of *Mr. Holmes*’ (Hammer 1993: xi, emphasis added).

In doing so, Hammer blurs the line distinguishing places of authorial inspiration from places of narrative importance. In *A Deep Game*, his London-specific travel book, Hammer includes the former offices of *The Strand Magazine* among his list of Holmesian sites around Trafalgar Square. It was here, he tells his readers, ‘two neat holographic manuscripts... were submitted by an unknown writer, a Dr. A.C. Doyle of 2 Upper Wimpole Street’ (Hammer 2002: 15). The overlap between his discussions of Doyle’s writing career with his mapping of places central to *Holmes*’s life means that Hammer’s Holmesian and Doylean geographies are collected together. Yet, the folds in these geographies are not where one might expect them to be. The diegetic and extradiegetic cities are joined not by the nib of Doyle’s pen but by the tarmac of The Strand. That is to say: the places of Doyle’s life are as important a part of Holmes’s England as are the locations of the story.

Hammer’s travels are not only devoted to marking literary sites on a pre-existing map: his tourism is the agent by which Sherlock Holmes’s England is itself created. This act of creation depends on possession as well as discovery. For instance, In *The Worth of the Game* (1993) Hammer visits Doyle’s school at Stonyhurst. Hammer reserves perhaps his greatest excitement, and some of his most descriptive language, for this visit. He confesses that ‘I had long wished to

see Stonyhurst because so much of Doyle remained there' (Hammer 1993: 27). His visit to the place where 'the boy Doyle became the man Doyle' (25) brings out the Romantic in Hammer. 'We followed for a time the course of the River Ribble', he writes, 'on its eager way to the Irish Sea, and were intrigued by the road signs for the Trough of Bowland, just to the north. The area around Stonyhurst was summer-verdant in the river valley, with the forest foliage lush and luxuriant' (Hammer 1993: 28).

We can understand Hammer's visit to Stonyhurst as an act of possession in the name of creating literary heritage in two ways. First, following Lennard Davis, Hammer's Romantic descriptions of his journey to Stonyhurst can be understood as more than the result of artistic rapture. Davis argues that the representation of places through linguistic description has long been a tool for asserting possession of those places. In an artful piece of metaphor, he likens the role of linguistic description of represented spaces to Robinson Crusoe's practice of 'describing' his living space by drawing a line around it: by 'describing' his space, Crusoe claims it for his own. In much the same way, says Davis, 'the refashioning of the terrain through language and extended description is a development in political [or, in this case, sociocultural] control' (Davis 1987: 73).

Secondly, it reflects many literary tourists' curiously possessive attitude towards authors' homes and haunts, which scholars of literary tourism and literary heritage have identified. (Trubek (2010) calls it an 'irrational allure'.) Hammer's desire to see the place where 'the man Doyle' – the author of Hammer's beloved stories – was made is an act of what Zemuglys calls 'finding the person in the place' which, she argues, 'made creation legible and understandable, and made authority approachable and life-sized' (Zemuglys 2008: 47). It was, as Erin Hazard notes, in late nineteenth-century America, during the 'interim between the occupation of this first [American] generation of literary houses by their authors and their establishment as museums' that curious readers began to engage in 'surveying all their spaces and contents, and probing the details of the private lives once contained therein' (Hazard 2006: 27). Hammer's visit to Stonyhurst repeats these early acts of probing and surveying, transforming the school from a living educational establishment into an artefact of the past, a 'relic of time' (Lowenthal 1998: xv), ripe for being

bent to Hammer's purpose of creating Sherlock Holmes's England as a *Sherlockian* tourist destination.

At The Chequers: scenes of reading

The second element in Hammer's heterarchical collection of time-relics that contribute to his creation of Holmes's England is his own memories of what Zemgulys calls 'scene[s] of reading' (Zemgulys 2008: 45). In this section I will argue that these scenes of reading are important to Hammer's creation of England as a site of *Sherlockian* heritage because they locate the meanings of literary places in reader's acts of literary creation as much as in authors' lives. That is to say, these places belong in the England of Sherlock Holmes because they are a part of David Hammer's life as a Sherlockian reader.

The practice of locating literature in place, is 'the enactment of the return to the "original" scene not just of creation but of *reading*' (Zemgulys 2008: 19, emphasis in original). For Zemuglys, as for Watson before her (Watson 2006: 14, 23-55), this foundational act of literary heritage involves an attempt to gain a greater connection or sense of intimacy with the author (see also Wells 2012:?). She writes that

literary geography fantasizes a personal relation to the author by catering to a sense of readerly gratification, of knowing and closeness. It also fantasizes such a relation by creating a sense of readerly definition, by representing the reader as a self, as a person grounded in his or her own experiential past (Zemuglys 2008: 57).

If 'the visit to writer's places [was] a recollective act performed by the reader *of* the reading' (Zemuglys 2008: 57), then Hammer's inclusion of his visit to The Chequers in his description of Holmes's England can be understood as a means of recognising the role of Sherlockian readers encounters with fiction in the making of this literary heritage.

In *The Worth of the Game* (1993), for instance, Hammer sets out to locate the site of The Chequers pub, at which Holmes and Watson stayed in 'The Adventure of the Creeping Man'

(2009). His visit to the actual-world Chequers pub in Oxford owes as much to his own memories of drinking there as a student as it does to his reading of the Sherlock Holmes stories. He notes that this story was set in 'Camford', an amalgam of Cambridge and Oxford, and that the usual Sherlockian basis for deciding which town is really Camford 'falls along lines of loyalty – alumni loyalty' (Hammer 1993: 50). Thus, by drawing on his reading of 'The Adventure of the Creeping Man' and equally on his university experience, Hammer creates an association, of the kind Zemuglys discusses, between a place from his own life and Sherlock Holmes's England. With this association, hammer implies the equal importance of readers and authors as sources of this particular literary heritage.

Whereas Hammer's representation of The Chequers as a scene of reading arguably establishes a personal relation between himself and Holmes, it also represents an image of Hammer as a reader who is 'grounded in his or her experiential past' (Zemuglys 2008: 57). This is because his discussion of The Chequers is led not by the similarities between the textual description of the Camford pub and the establishment Hammer finds himself in (as he does elsewhere, see Hammer 1997: 11). Rather, it is led by his own recollections of the pub over time. So, he begins by admitting that 'when in Oxford in the late 1960s, I learned of The Chequers, erroneously believing that it was the Oxford inn where Shakespeare regularly stayed enroute (sic) to Stratford on Avon' (Hammer 1993: 50). Hammer devotes another page and a half to this story, telling of his enquiries with the local council and the pub's owner, and his eventual discovery that the pub was first recorded as such in 1681 – too late for Shakespeare to have drunk there. In the middle of this story about his personal connection to the pub over the years, Hammer inserts a fleeting reference to Sherlock Holmes – at the end of a sentence about the Shakespeare mystery. 'There the matter [of the Shakespeare connection] stood until 1979 when I made the connection with Sherlock Holmes' (Hammer 1993: 51).

Hammer's writing further presents himself grounded in his experience as an active participant in making, rather than simply recognising, Holmes's England. He devotes the majority of the chapter to his own visits to the pub, past and present; and, like his visit to Stonyhurst, Hammer's return visit to The Chequers is made in a spirit of possessing the space once occupied by, in this case, 'a figure of heritage' (Hammer 2001: 10). On page 52, Hammer lists five lines from 'The

Adventure of the Creeping Man’ which mention The Chequers; two of these refer to eating or drinking in the pub. It is no coincidence, then, that Hammer’s chief means of experiencing the pub is to eat and drink there. As he writes

Audrey and I dined well on pub-plus food, a bit above the ordinary pub fare, and we learned that the establishment no longer proffered rooms to travellers. May today’s travellers dare hope that the decision did not result from an earlier transient’s pock-marking a rented wall with a patriotic VR? No, strike that, it was 1903 so would have had to have been a patriotic ER (Hammer 1993: 56).

With these closing remarks – translating a Holmesian act from ‘The Adventure of the Musgrave Ritual’ (2009) into a setting from ‘The Adventure of the Creeping Man’ – Hammer affirms the central place of his own creative engagement with the Sherlock Holmes stories in the making of Holmes’s England.

By drawing this textual image of himself and his wife dining in The Chequers, Hammer seeks at once to gain a greater sense of intimacy with Sherlock Holmes and to put himself on an equal creative footing with Doyle. If, as Zemgulys argues, the inn, tavern or drinking house was a popular site of literary tourism and ripe for possession as literary heritage, because ‘it had been favoured by the (conversing, observing) writer and offered a glimpse of the working writer at rest’ (Zemgulys 2008: 21, see also Watson 2009), then in this scene there is a type of ghostly reflection at work. Hammer raises the spectre of Holmes ‘at rest’, firing bullets into the wall from his sofa, whilst depicting himself, as the author of this account of Holmes’s England, at rest in that quintessentially authorial haunt: the pub.

Their own special visions: other readers

The third and final part of this heterarchical collection of elements which inform Hammer’s literary tourism – and the part which best identifies Hammer’s project as the creation of literary *heritage* ripe for touristic exploration– is the presence of other readers in Hammer’s writings. In

his memoir, Hammer wrote that the decision to bring other Sherlockian readers along for the journey had been a deliberate one. He explained that his first publisher, Jack Tracy,

convinced me that the manuscript [of *The Game is Afoot!*] needed to show how the sites were located, adding personal details of the search to make it more interesting. What I had regarded as hubris he saw as engaging detail, making the reader a fellow passenger on the search (Hammer 2001: 13).

Later, in *The Worth of the Game* (1993) Hammer indicated that what had begun as an act to better engage his readers had come to define his approach to the making of Holmes's England as a place of Sherlockian heritage. 'Just as the poets their special visions possess', he wrote, 'so do we Sherlockians each hold in secret possession our own private view of the immediate world of the doctor and the detective' (Hammer 1993: xiii). Knowledge that each Sherlockian possesses their own idea of Sherlock Holmes's world precludes Hammer from offering his own travels as a definitive guide to the places therein. Instead, he wrote that: while Sherlockians 'each invoke our own visions, the little book which follows is intended to buttress your particular dream' (Hammer 1993: xiv).

The idea that Sherlock Holmes's England is made from the 'own particular dreams' of every American Sherlockian (or, rather, every reader of Hammer's books) might at first seem at odds with the idea of heritage as an authorised or controlling narrative of the past. After all, as Hammer's excursion to The Chequers suggests, many of these particular dreams of Holmes's England are plausibly based in readers' own recollections of reading – of their encounters with the Sherlock Holmes stories in particular places and times. And memory and heritage are arguably poles apart. 'Memory is defined by scholars', writes Zemgulys, 'as...pointedly distinct from representations of the past such as heritage' (Zemgulys 2008: 69). She goes on to define heritage as 'regulating, institutional, totalizing, closed' and memory as "'unruly", subjective, open and fragmentary', arguing that they 'would not seem to belong on the same page' (Zemgulys 2008: 69).

Yet, I would suggest that there are two ways to think about Hammer's inclusion of other readers as the key to understanding his creation of the England of Sherlock Holmes as a project to create a literary heritage. The first is to accept literary heritage as a form of 'collective memory'. Zemgulys again:

Literary heritage, with its memorials and museums, patently represents a project of memory: it constructs the past as accessible in the present, one moreover continuous and grounding. Its tourists, further, bring the past into active relation with the present... The celebration of national writers and transnational readers further allow us to understand literary heritage as a project of "collective memory" (Zemgulys 2008: 69).

Notwithstanding their attempts to immortalise a *fictional character*, Hammer's travel guides, with their emphasis on discovering the specific locations for events in Holmes's life (including the locations of his creation), arguably represent a form of memorialisation; moreover, one produced for a specific group of people: the Sherlockians who form Hammer's core audience. Furthermore, Hammer's responses to Holmes-associated locations such as The Chequers, imagining the spectral figure of Holmes performing well-known actions in some other room, reflect the thoughts of many literary tourists in the museum-homes of famous authors: it is the feeling that 'the writer might at any point re-enter' the room (Robinson and Andersen 2002: 19).

Hammer's promise that his travel guides are 'intended to *buttress* your particular dream' (Hammer 1993: xiv, emphasis added) indicates Hammer's awareness that collective memory needs a focal point around which to coalesce. Indeed, Zemgulys argues that 'Understanding literary heritage as collective memory explains how its appeal to private and individual recollection is both energizing and destabilizing of community' (Zemgulys 2008: 69). Hammer's travel guides can be seen as textual equivalent of a statue or a museum-house: a site which provides a starting point over which individuals can lay their own recollections. A place where memory becomes heritage through the power of community.

The second means of understanding the presence of other readers as a vital element in turning literary tourism into the creation of literary heritage becomes apparent with a reconsideration of

David Lowenthal's argument, which I quoted earlier: that heritage 'clarifies pasts so as to infuse them with present purposes' (Lowenthal 1998: xv). For David Hammer, as a Sherlockian, the present purpose with which the (imagined) past of Sherlock Holmes's England is infused is the expansionary literary geography – the practice of creatively expanding on the literary spaces of Holmes's world through adding their own stories and adventures – that characterises much of Sherlockiana. By making his readers 'fellow passengers' in his search for the locations of Sherlock Holmes's England, Hammer refrains from presenting each site as a given and, rather, focuses on the *process* of locating these Holmesian places. The following passage, relating to the quest for the eponymous Wisteria Lodge, is typical:

If Watson's description of the Esher-to-Wisteria Lodge walk that raw March evening is substantially accurate, the Lodge is not too far distant from the Heath Road. The villa has historically been placed in the region between Esher Common and Oxshott Heath... Despite a careful scrutiny and a retracing of the route more than once, we found no dwellings along the road which had either the antiquity or the style of the original Wisteria Lodge (Hammer 1983: 111).

By focusing on the process of finding the sites such as the Wisteria Lodge, Hammer creates a new image of a set of past events – the creation of the literary spaces of Holmes's world by Arthur Conan Doyle in his texts. This new image is permeated with a present purpose: to represent the literary spaces of Sherlock Holmes as ever under construction, always being shaped by the activities and imaginations of Sherlockian readers. Hammer's guides simulate his experience for readers and encourage others to do what he did: to use tourism as a means of creating and possessing the England of Sherlock Holmes as a heritage site and to regard that heritage site as an invitation to future tourism.

Conclusion

In *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History* (1998), David Lowenthal reminds us that

Fiction is thus not the opposite of fact but its complement, giving our lives a more lasting shape... That myths are batty and irrational does not spoil their worth. Camelot and the Grail lack historical credibility but convey psychological authority... these rooted mythologies lend cosmic meaning to our own lifetime quests (Lowenthal 1998: 146).

These words, and a recognition of the power of “true” lies’ (Lowenthal 1998: 146), can help us to make sense of the quotation from Hammer with which I began this chapter – his recognition that Sherlock Holmes is not so much a figure of history as one of heritage – ‘which surely constitutes a significant form of reality’ (Hammer 2001: 10). It would be easy to read this remark as the apologia of a Sherlockian, ‘committed to another time, and perhaps worse, to places where we never lived, and for some, have never seen’ (Hammer 1997: 2).

However, in this chapter I have read Hammer’s tourist guides, written in approach to the dawn of the twenty-first century, as seriously shaped by his belief that Sherlock Holmes has become a figure of heritage for Sherlockians. I have demonstrated how Hammer’s embodied travels help give these true lies about Holmes and Watson and their half-real lives a material place in the world. By following the practices of literary heritage creation, as identified by Zemgulys, his guides created Sherlock Holmes’s England as a place of Sherlockian literary heritage – they emphasise the creative agency of Arthur Conan Doyle, but also importantly of readers, in shaping the ‘true lie’ of an England of or belonging to Sherlock Holmes the fictional character.

Further, in their appeal to other readers’ special visions and private views of this place, they reveal the *purpose* of Hammer’s use of the relics of the past in this way. These travel guides indicate that the sociocultural purpose of this act of creating literary heritage. They are enticements to, and guides for, readers to do those practices which will put their own pasts and experiences on the same register as those of Doyle and of Holmes himself; to justify the Sherlockian group practices of expanding on Holmes’s world – of creating new stories and new places in which the Great Detective can live on forever.

By writing *tourist guides*, rather than a descriptive monograph or a series of articles, Hammer further emphasises the importance of Sherlockian tourists' visit to these sites of their literary heritage – as an act of commemoration but also, vitally, as an act of creation: one which will make anew Sherlock Holmes's England as a destination for literary tourists, for as long as there are tourists willing to make it so.

References

Alexander, A. (1984) *On the Scent: A Visitor's Guide to Sherlock Holmes's London*. Seal Beach, CA: The Bullpup Press.

Alexander, A. (1999) *Hot on the Scent: A Visitor's Guide to Sherlock Holmes's London*. Ashcroft, BC: Calabash Press.

Bulson, E. (2007) *Novels, Maps, Modernity: The Spatial Imagination, 1850-2000*. London: Routledge.

Christopher, J. (2012) *The London of Sherlock Holmes*. Stroud: Amberley Publishing.

Davis, L. (1987) *Resisting Novels: Ideology and Fiction*. London: Methuen.

Doyle, A.C. (2009) *The Penguin Complete Sherlock Holmes*. London: Penguin.

Hammer, D. (1983) *The Game is Afoot: A Travel Guide to the England of Sherlock Holmes*. Bloomington, IN: Gaslight Publications.

Hammer, D. (1986) *For the Sake of the Game: Being a Further Travel Guide to the England of Sherlock Holmes*. Indianapolis, IN.: Wessex Press.

Hammer, D. (1993) *The Worth of the Game: Being a Final Travel Guide to the England of Sherlock Holmes*. Bloomington, IN: Gaslight Publications.

Hammer, D. (1997) *A Dangerous Game: Being a Travel Guide to the Europe of Sherlock Holmes*. Dubuque, IN: Gasogene Press.

Hammer, D. (2001) *The Game is Underfoot!: The Memoir of a Sherlockian Publisher*. Shelbure, ON: The Battered Silicon Despatch Box.

Hammer, D. (2002) *A Deep Game: The Traveler's Companion to the London of Sherlock Holmes*. Indianapolis, IN: Gasogene Books.

Harrison, R. (2010) 'What is Heritage?' in Harrison, r. (ed.) *Understanding the Politics of Heritage*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Hazard, E. (2006) '"A Realized Day-Dream": Excursions to Nineteenth-Century Authors' Homes'. *Nineteenth Century Studies*, 20, pp.13-33.

Hendrix, H. (2008) *Writers' Houses and the Making of Memory*. London: Routledge.

James, K.J. (2013) 'Literary Tourism, the Trossachs and Walter Scott'. *Journal of Tourism History*, 5(1), pp.93-96.

Lowenthal, D. (1998) *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McLaughlin, D. (2016) 'The Game's Afoot: Walking as Practice in Sherlockian Literary Geographies'. *Literary Geographies* 2(2). pp. 144-163.

McLaughlin, D. (2017) 'Mobile Holmes: Sherlockiana, travel writing and the co-production of the Sherlock Holmes stories'. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Cambridge.

Plate, L. (2006) 'Walking in Virginia Woolf's Footsteps'. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9(1), pp.101-120

Reijnders, S. (2009). 'Watching the detectives. Inside the guilty landscapes of Inspector Morse, Baantjer and Wallander'. *European Journal of Communication*, 24(2), pp.165-181.

Reijnders, S. (2011) 'Stalking the Count. Dracula, Fandom & Tourism'. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(1), pp.231-248.

Reijnders, S. (2013) *Places of the Imagination: Media, Tourism, Culture*. London: Ashgate.

Robinson, M. and Andersen, H. (eds.) (2002) *Literature and Tourism: Reading and Writing Tourism Texts*. London: Continuum.

Saler, M. (2012) *As If: Modern Enchantment and the Literary Prehistory of Virtual Reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sudin, G. (1985) *Sherlock's London Today: A Walking Tour of the London of Sherlock Holmes*. Des Plaines, IL: Sherlock's Bookshop.

Trubek, A. (2010) 'The Irrational Allure of Writers' Houses'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Available at:

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/816274065/abstract/614B461B7D604B06PQ/1>

[Accessed August 2 2016]

Van Es, N. and Reijnders, S. (2016) 'Making Sense of Capital Crime Cities: Getting underneath the urban façade on crime-detective fiction tours'. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, pp.1-19.

Watson, N. (2006) *The Literary Tourist: Readers and Places in Romantic and Victorian Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Watson, N. (2009) *Literary Tourism and Nineteenth-Century Culture*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wells, J. (2012) *Everybody's Jane: Austen in the Popular Imagination*. London: A&C Black.

Westover, P. (2012) 'Inventing the London of Literary Tourists: Walking the Romantic city in Leigh Hunt's "Wishing-Cap" essays'. *European Romantic Review*, 23(1), pp.1-19.

Zemgulys, A. (2008) *Modernism and the Locations of Literary Heritage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.