7. FEBRUAR 2020

THE IMMORTAL SHERLOCK HOLMES

FROM RELIC TO A MODERNISED RETELLING

NADIA EMILIE VON RUMMELL NIELSEN
AALBORG UNIVERSITY

Abstract

The following paper originates on a general interest in the famous fictional detective Sherlock Holmes and how he continues to stay relevant in the present-day. The purpose of this paper is to examine how the BBC adaptation *Sherlock*, more specific the episode "The Reichenbach Fall", portrays Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's short story "The Final Problem" in present-day. The primary analytic model used, is structuralistic, which means that this paper is not an 'in-depth' examination of a specific theme. Instead, it is a more general examination of *how* BBC's *Sherlock* functions. More specifically, this paper seeks to identify the strategy used by Steven Moffat and Mark Gatiss to create their adaptation. In order to identify the strategy, this paper use *Novel to Film* (2004) by Brian McFarlane and Linda Hutcheon's *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006) in combination with the structuralistic approach. By the use of cardinal functions and character functions, this paper's results show that it is possible to make Sherlock Holmes relevant in the 21st century and a present-day figure, without compromising the fidelity towards the original short story. Besides the results of the cardinal functions and character functions, fan-created paratexts support this finding, as fans continue to vividly debate, speculate, analyse and share their theories.

Preface

This dissertation is a revised version of the thesis, which I submitted for assessment in the summer of 2019. The theories used in the first thesis was found to be too ‘text-heavy’, with the result of difficulties in understanding them and thus use them in practice. Having come to the realisation, I changed course and ultimately discarded all the theories in favour of the theories by Brian McFarlane and Linda Hutcheon, which focus on adaptation instead of ‘secrets’. The realisation was a result of feedback and criticism received for the first submission. Though abandoning the original idea and theories, Sherlock Holmes remains the focal point of this thesis. More so, the material used in the first submission, the short story and adaptation, likewise remains the same. Furthermore, a change regarding the approach was naturally made, as this thesis changed course.

Tabel of Content

1. Introduction

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle have written no less than four novels and 56 short stories about his famous detective Sherlock Holmes and his companion Dr John Watson. *A Study in Scarlet* (1887) was the first detective story to feature the duo. In Leslie S. Klinger's new annotated version of Conan Doyle's stories about Sherlock is a quote from John le Carré's introduction. In his introduction, he manages to capture what Conan Doyle masters when writing and at the same time why Conan Doyle's work is so popular:

> Peek up Conan Doyle's literary sleeve and you will at first be disappointed; no fine tunes of phrase, no clever adjectives that leap off the page, no arresting psychological insight. Instead, what you are looking at is a kind of narrative perfection: a perfect interplay between dialogue and description, perfect characterisation and perfect timing. No wonder that, unlike other great story-tellers of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Conan Doyle translates without loss into practically any language (Doyle & Klinger 2005:xiii).

John le Carré's quote points out that Conan Doyle's work translates without loss into any language. Looking at the adaptation *Sherlock*'s IMDb-page with a score of 9.1/10, it appears that this adaptation work without loss as well. *Sherlock* will be the adaptation used in this thesis. Shifting from le Carré, which mainly focuses on Conan Doyle's writing skills, Alan Barnes suggests what it is that makes Sherlock so recognisable:

> It could easily be argued that Sherlock Holmes was the first pop icon of the modern age. Instantly identifiable by his silhouette alone, even the slightest of visual prompts lead to the Great Detective: deerstalker, Meerschaum pipe, violin, hansom cab, Watson, housekeeper, Hound (Barnes 2011:8).

The quote is from *Sherlock Holmes on Screen* (2011), which deals with every adaptation made on the screen up until 2011. Despite being one of the latest editions, several adaptations have seen the light of day since. Included in Barnes' book is this thesis' chosen adaptation the TV-series *Sherlock* (2010-); however, it is only the first season.

1.1 Film and TV-series adaptations

The first film adaptation of Sherlock Holmes was the American production from 1900 named *Sherlock Holmes Baffled*. It was a black and white production lasting approximately 35 seconds and was silent (Barnes 2011:216). Since then, there has been several representations and adaptations of Sherlock Holmes. Actors such as Viggo Larsen, Clive Brook, Basil Rathbone, Christopher Lee, Jeremy Brett, Robert Downey Jr., Benedict Cumberbatch and Jonny Lee Miller have all played Conan Doyle's famous detective (Barnes 2011:316-20).

The recent adaptations depict Sherlock in different ways, and at different times, Robert Downey Jr.'s representation of him is somewhat an action hero in Victorian London. In contrast, Benedict Cumberbatch's Sherlock lacks social skills, is set in the 21st century London and the story in each episode is almost identical to Conan Doyle's stories - yet updated. Jonny Lee Miller's version is a recovering drug addict, also set in the 21st century, but in New York and with a female Watson. This thesis will, however, only concern one of the adaptations, namely *Sherlock*.

It is clear that with the more recent adaptations, a newfound love for Sherlock and Watson has occurred. The recent adaptations are not just for newer fans, but likewise appeal to the already existing fanbase. Sherlock emerged based on a conversation between Steven Moffat and Mark Gatiss during their train ride to and from the Doctor Who Cardiff base. To Gatiss, Sherlock had "become so much about trappings - the hansom cabs, the fog, Jack the Ripper will creep in" (Barnes 2011:168). Moffat, on the other hand, reckoned that a modernised retelling would allow the viewer "to see the original stories the way the original reader would have read them - as exciting, cutting edge, contemporary stories, as opposed to these relics they've become" (Barnes 2011:168). With Moffat and Gatiss' notion of Sherlock Holmes in mind, it is time to present the research topic.

1.2 Research Topic

Moffat and Gatiss' adaptation, *Sherlock* (2010-), and their reinterpretation of Conan Doyle's short stories form the basis of this thesis. Their adaptation relies on staying true to the original stories with a plot that matches the 21st century. More so, Moffat and Gatiss' Sherlock introduces not only a reinterpretation of some characters but new characters as well. Besides, the reinterpretation of both plot and characters and introducing new characters, Moffat and Gatiss include fan theories in

one of their episodes. Including fan theories from both the short story and the adaptation, serves to highlight how Sherlock Holmes is still a relevant figure and not just a relic. Therefore, this thesis is examining the following:

- The reinterpretation and recreation of the plot to identify the strategy/strategies used
- The characters functions and how they are updated/reinterpret
- The role of fan theories and how they continue to be a part of experiencing Sherlock Holmes

This thesis will research and identify how Moffat and Gatiss have reinterpreted Conan Doyle's, Sherlock Holmes. Moreover, it will deal with the known characters and the new addition of characters and more specifically, the function and reinterpretation of the different characters in the adaptation. As there is a shift in medium, the analysis will also examine cinematic effects. Finally, this thesis will include fan theories from both the short story and the adaptation. Due to the different endings, the fan theories emerged at different times on different bases. However, they have been included to show how Sherlock is still relevant as fans continue to speculate, analyse and take part in solving cases.

1.3 Structure

The methodology chapter will account for the theories, the short story and its counterpart in the adaptation. Moreover, it will contain a minor section on the difficulties which can occur when analysing two different mediums. Finally, there will be a short presentation of the selected material.

The methodology chapter is followed by the theory section. This section clarifies the theories by Brian McFarlane and Linda Hutcheon. McFarlane's theory presents the 'cardinal functions' concept, why staying faithful to the source material is essential. Moreover, McFarlane introduces Vladimir Propp's notion of character functions. Both McFarlane and Hutcheon elaborate on three strategies, which are crucial to identify what kind of adaptation *Sherlock* is. There will be a chapter on the approach used in this thesis, which will clarify the decision to use that approach rather than another. Before the analysis, there will be a short chapter about forensic fandom and its importance to this thesis.

The analysis will present the cardinal functions in both "The Final Problem" and "The Reichenbach Fall" to highlight the most critical parts in each and to show how one event must occur

for the next to happen. Moreover, included is a close examination of the reinterpretation and recreation made in the adaptation compared to the original. The intention is to show how Moffat and Gatiss update the original story to the 21st century. Afterwards, the character functions will be elaborated and eventually point out what reinterpretation of some characters and the addition of new characters can add to the plot. Lastly, the analysis will cover the fan theories and when and why they occur and likewise establish their purpose.

Finally, the conclusion will determine the findings in the analysis. It will also provide an outcome of whether or not Moffat and Gatiss have succeeded in updating the original, identify the strategy used and eventually conclude why - if so - it is a success.

2. Methodology

The methodology chapter will account for the theories, short story and adaptation. Moreover, difficulties in comparing two different media are explained, including the limitations on screen as well as in literature. Finally, it will discuss the selected short story and its adaptation counterpart.

2.1 Comparing two different media

As this thesis works with two different types of media, i.e. literature and a TV-series, it is natural to look at any obstacles which might occur when working with two media. In writing, characterisation is by telling, as there is no visual aspect. The resolution to this lack is by describing appearance and/or behaviour. The thoughts and state of mind of a character can likewise be included when characterising. However, on-screen characterisation is more straightforward, as not only body language and facial expressions are available, but also actions and the narrative.

2.1.1 Limitations on screen and in literature

The main limitation on screen is the time frame, which must be kept. Each episode of *Sherlock* is approximately 90 minutes long, and each season only contains three episodes. Another important point regarding this thesis' comparison of "The Final Problem" and "The Reichenbach Fall" and staying faithful, is the viewers' vision of the characters, as an actor is representing the character. When adapting stories, there is often an alteration of narrative, as directors subsequently choose a different method to tell the same story. With Moffat and Gatiss' version, the narration by Watson

has disappeared - though he still blogs about their adventures. However, Moffat and Gatiss deal with this by actions or through the point of view of different characters.

Literature lacks the visual aspect, as opposed to film and TV-series. This 'problem' can, to some extent, be solved by illustrations. Sidney Paget is the man behind different types of illustrations of Sherlock Holmes in *The Strand Magazine*. Paget created some of Sherlock's trademarks, despite Conan Doyle never including them in his stories. The famous deerstalker is the work of Paget. Conan Doyle, however, wrote that Sherlock wears a "close-fitting cloth cap" (Conan Doyle & Klinger 2005:).

2.2 Selected theory

The two theories included is by Brian McFarlane's, *Novel to Film* (2004) and Linda Hutcheon's *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006). Both deal with adaptation, but where McFarlane primarily deals with literature to film and provides five different case-studies in which he applies his theory, Hutcheon deals with a wide range of adaptations and not just that from literature to film. In this thesis, I have chosen to combine the two theories, as they complement each other. I will be using cardinal functions and character functions, something only McFarlane deals with. Besides these two functions, McFarlane and Hutcheon will, in combination, outline three different strategies to follow when creating an adaptation. This section will also enlighten the emphasis of staying faithful to the source material. The addition of Hutcheon's theory was due to it supporting various of McFarlane's claims, which only further stresses that McFarlane's theory is still reliable.

2.3 Selected short story and adaptation

As already stated, this thesis will focus on Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's short story "The Final Problem" and the episode "The Reichenbach Fall" from BBC's series *Sherlock* (2010-) as the episode is based on the short story and thus makes it ideal for comparative analysis. The finally elected material was not the first choice, the short story "A Scandal in Bohemia" and its adaptation "A Scandal in Belgravia" was also considered for the analysis, and at one point all four works were considered for making a comparison. However, due to the extensive work with the material needed and given the amount of time provided to complete the thesis, narrowing down the content was found to be more appropriate to create a more focused thesis.

The motive for choosing one over the other came down to the thesis' first scope, where the main focus was supposed to be secrets and so what better secret to deal with than the death of Sherlock Holmes? Since the radical change of scope, it is worth establishing why one was chosen rather than the other. Though this thesis' primary focus is no longer secrets, it was still interesting to examine and compare how the adaptation dealt with Sherlock's death and eventual resurrection, especially when fans of Sherlock Holmes in advance knew Sherlock did not die.

2.4 Appendix

The appendix will contain the full transcription of some of the more extended conversation used in the thesis.

3. Theory

3.1 The Theory of Adaptation

In the following, Brian McFarlane's theory *Novel to Film* (2004) and Linda Hutcheon's theory *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006) will, in interaction, clarify what adaptation is. The two theories will present a brief introduction to adaptation, say a little about the importance of staying faithful towards the source material before outlining three strategies on how to produce different adaptations. Moreover, there will be a paragraph elaborating on the story/plot distinction. Finally, this chapter will explain cardinal functions and character functions and why they are vital in order to identify the strategy used for *Sherlock* and the episode "The Reichenbach Fall".

A Brief Introduction to Adaptation

Adaptation is everywhere today, as Hutcheon states in *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006): "Adaptations are everywhere today: on the television and movie screen, on the musical and dramatic stage, on the Internet, in novels and comic books, in your nearest theme park and video arcade" (Hutcheon 2006:2). Similarly, in *Novel to Film* (2004) McFarlane states that adaptation has been used for the past ninety years (McFarlane 2004:7). Moreover, Hutcheon mentions Shakespeare, who transferred stories from page to stage, thus introducing them to a whole new audience. Hutcheon further mentions Aeschylus, Racine, Goethe and da Ponte, all of whom retold familiar stories in new forms (Hutcheon 2006:2).

However, there are two sides to adaptation. According to McFarlane, there is one side with producers who see it as a lucrative "property". One of them is Frederic Raphael, who has scathingly claimed that "like known quantities… they would sooner buy the rights of an expensive book than develop an original subject" (as quoted in McFarlane 2004:7). On the other side, McFarlane enhances that most producers profess a loftier attitude, one of them is DeWitt Bodeen. According to Bodeen, the task of adaptation is a creative undertaking, which requires a selective interpretation. Furthermore, it requires the ability to recreate and sustain an established mood (McFarlane 2004:7).

In Hutcheon's theory, words like "secondary", "derivative", "belated", "middlebrow", or "culturally inferior" (as quoted in Hutcheon 2006:2) describe popular contemporary adaptations in both academic criticism and journalistic reviewing. "Betrayal," "deformation," "perversion," "infidelity," and "desecration" are just some of the other words used when attacking film adaptations of literature (Hutcheon 2006:2). Moreover, if we concentrate on "infidelity", it revolves around the audience - who will complain about one or another violation of the original. McFarlane states that though the audience might complain, they must endure the desire of wanting to see what the books "look like". However, their images of the story will not match the images on the screen (McFarlane 2004:7). This is something Hutcheon supports: "a negative view of adaptation might simply be the product of thwarted expectations on the part of a fan desiring fidelity to a beloved adapted text…" (Hutcheon 2006:4). The infidelity discussion leads to the next section, concerning the importance of fidelity to the original work.

Staying faithful

McFarlane discusses how being faithful to the source material is a significant criterion for a film to succeed. He talks about staying true to or catching the spirit of the author of the novel and that fidelity towards the original is a significant criterion when it comes to evaluating the adaptation. More so, the producer can either respect the fidelity criterion or violate or tamper with this notion. Despite being faithful, some critics will always find the adaptation insufficient, which leaves no guarantee for the adaptation to be a success (McFarlane 2004:8-9). However, fidelity is not the only issue which should be taken into account. It is worth involving the viewers' pleasure, as that is as much a criterion when measuring the success of an adaptation.

In correlation with this, Hutcheon claims that a part of the viewers' pleasure "simply comes from repetition with variation, from the comfort of ritual combined with the piquancy of surprise" (Hutcheon 2006:4). As opposed to McFarlane's statement, Hutcheon suggests that recognition and

remembrance are part of the pleasure - and risk - of experiencing an adaptation; the same goes for change (Hutcheon 2006:4). Hutcheon disagrees with McFarlane and does not think that fidelity to the original text should be the criterion of judgment or focus of analysis. She further points out that when a film becomes a financial or critical success, the question of its faithfulness to the original appears to be of minor importance (Hutcheon 2006:6-7).

There are different levels of staying faithful to the original text, those levels depend on what kind of strategy the adaptation uses. The following paragraph clarifies those different strategies.

Different strategies

Both McFarlane and Hutcheon list three strategies, *transposition*, *commentary*, and *analogy*, to categorise adaptations. *Transposition*, *commentary*, and *analogy* is the terminology used by McFarlane and the preferred one in this thesis. Hutcheon refers to the strategies as *a formal entity or product, a process of creation* and *the process of reception,* respectively. Hutcheon reverts to the dictionary meaning of "to adapt", meaning "to adjust", "to alter", or "to make suitable", which can be done in several ways (Hutcheon 2006:7). However, although they use different terminology to describe the three strategies, they cover the same definition.

The first strategy is *transposition*, which remarks the adaptation as "an announced and extensive transposition of a particular work or works" (Hutcheon 2006:7). This strategy can involve a shift of medium or genre, or a change of frame and therefore context; for instance, by telling the same story but from a different point of view, which can create a different interpretation. It can also mean a shift in ontology from the real to the fictional, such as a historical account to a fictionalised narrative or drama (Hutcheon 2006:7-8). An example of *transposition* is the TV-series *Sherlock Holmes* (1984) starring Jeremy Brett as Sherlock. The series transferred the short stories to the screen and appeared almost identical.

Commentary is the second strategy. This strategy describes how an adaptation follows the original work, but with purposely altered elements from the novel (McFarlane 2004:11). Hutcheon states that the adaptation always involves both "(re-)interpretation and then (re-)creation" (Hutcheon 2006:8). An example of this strategy is the adaptation of Jussi Adler Olsen's *Kvinden i Buret* (2007). Though the film closely follows the novel, it still contains some altered elements - such as excluding characters. An example of this is the protagonist's lodger.

Finally, the third strategy, *analogy*, covers adaptation as a form of intertextuality, where the producer departs from the original to create another work of art (McFarlane 2004:11). Moreover,

Hutcheon points out that with this strategy, the viewer experience adaptations through the memory of other works that resonate through repetition with variation (Hutcheon 2006:8). An example of this could be *Resident Evil* (2002), the film adaptation of the videogame of the same name. Those who have played, the videogame will experience it differently, than by those who have not played the videogame (Hutcheon 2006:8).

Having established the three strategies, the following paragraph will proceed to cover the distinction between story and plot.

The story/plot distinction

To distinguish between story and plot, McFarlane draws on Terence Hawkes (who draws on Viktor Shklovsky's work on narrative). Hawkes distinguishes between story and plot by stating that the story is the basic order of events. In contrast, the plot represents the distinctive way in which the story is made unfamiliar. This means that the novel and the adaptation can share the same story but differentiate in plot strategies - strategies which subsequently alter sequence, thus enhancing different emphases and making the story unfamiliar (McFarlane 2004:23).

Furthermore, Hutcheon points out that most theories of adaptation assume that the common denominator is the story, the core of what is transposed across different media and genres (Hutcheon 2006:10). More so, with adaptation, the equivalences are sought in different sign systems for the various elements of the story: themes, events, world, characters, motivation, point of view, consequences, context, symbols, imagery (Hutcheon 2006:10). The story, or common denominator, leads to the next paragraph, which will clarify the importance of cardinal functions as well as character functions.

Cardinal functions and character functions

According to McFarlane cardinal functions are narrative actions which open up alternatives with direct consequences for the subsequent development of the story, which is supported by elements characterised by a different order of functionality (McFarlane 2004:24). It is a way of considering how closely the producers have sought to reproduce the original in film terms, how they have chosen to transfer narrative functions not dependent on language (McFarlane 2004:47). Identifying the cardinal functions in the short story and the adaptation serves the purpose of spotting the differences the producers have made. Differences can be the order of the appearance of the cardinal functions or it can be additions with a view to promoting a given situation (McFarlane 2004:49).

Cardinal functions have to do with the narrative structure of the text, change the cardinal functions in the plot and you change the story - and something pivotal in the story cannot change.

In continuation hereof comes character functions. McFarlane refers to Vladimir Propp's notion: "that the all-important and unifying element is found… in the characters' functions, the part they play in the plot" (as quoted in McFarlane 2004:24). Propp classifies his character functions into seven 'spheres of actions' and states: "Function is understood as an act of character, defined from the point of view of its significance to the course of the action" (as quoted in McFarlane 2004:24). Based on Propp's notions, McFarlane suggests that one might isolate the chief character functions of the source material to observe how and if the adaptation retains them. Propp's seven 'spheres of action' derives from thirty-one functions, however, it seems more reasonable to see them as *roles* rather than *characters*, as this reflects the subordination of character to action (Barry 2009:221). The seven 'spheres of action' are 1. the villain, 2. the donor (provider), 3. the helper, 4. the princess (a sought-for-person) and her father, 5. the dispatcher, 6. the hero (seeker or victim) and 7. the false hero (Barry 2009:221).

Propp's character functions, or 'spheres of action', are not only applicable to Russian folk tales but are useable when working with this thesis source material as well. Folk tales are relatively simple, but the versatility of Propp's notion is much increased, as Robert Scholes remarks, a character may take on more than one role in any given tale - meaning that the villain may also be the false hero, the donor may also be the dispatcher and so forth. More so, a role may employ several characters, such as multiple villains (Barry 2009:221-22). The following section will explain the approach used throughout the analysis.

3.2 Approach

With the theories established, this chapter will provide a clarification of the approach used in this thesis. It will do so by presenting examples of ways others have gone when examining Sherlock Holmes. The examples will then lead to the explanation of the decision to use this approach rather than others.

3.2.1 Different Approaches

This thesis could have gone in any direction, and it even started in an entirely different place. However, there are several different approaches to be found, common to all is that they interpret on Sherlock Holmes, the content of the text or both. Four dissertations have been selected to show some of the different focus points.

The first is Sarah Robinson's thesis, which, much like this one, focuses on Conan Doyle's original works and adaptation. Robinson chooses to work with both *Sherlock* (2010) and *Elementary* (2012). Her focus lies on a postcolonial perspective, arguing that Sherlock's identity relies on the existence of the 'other' and the mystery he or she creates. In general, Robinson focuses on the adaptations *Sherlock* and *Elementary*, and how they still carry evidence of an imperial mindset, despite more than 40 years of post-colonial theory (Robinson 2018:ii).

A second approach is Arundhati Ghosh's PhD. in which he focuses on detective fiction through the prism of confession. More so, he deals with not only Sherlock Holmes but also Hercule Poirot and Philip Marlowe. Ghosh argues that a certain kind of secular confession remains and that Sherlock and Poirot are the embodiments of secular pastor figures - they command and extract confessions from clients and criminals alike (Ghosh 2013:iii-iv). Again, a dissertation very far from what this thesis is examining.

The third example is Paige Bigelow's thesis, in which she presents a study in love through the medium of BBC's Sherlock Holmes and Dr Watson in *Sherlock*. In short, Bigelow interprets the relationship between Sherlock and Dr Watson as it develops in the narrative (Bigelow 2014:iv). Fourth and finally, Melissa Caro Lancho likewise analyses BBC's *Sherlock*. Lancho's point of view is Gender Studies, more precisely within the theories of Queer Studies. In short, Lancho is doing a homoerotic reading of *Sherlock* and the short stories, and why it works better with the adaptation than the short stories (Lancho 2013:1-2).

All four works interpret on Sherlock Holmes, whether it is Conan Doyle's work, the adaptations or both. They all deal with exciting topics and themes. During a quick search on Sherlock Holmes, it is clear that others have done dissertations similar to those presented above or gone in a completely different way as well. However, interpretation of such themes is not the motivating force of this thesis. The purpose of this thesis is to examine *why* and *how* Conan Doyle's classic stories about his detective continue to work well, primarily with the focus on the adaptation *Sherlock*.

3.2.2 Final Decision

As mentioned before, this thesis could have gone in any direction before settling on one. The first approach took its stand on a more comparative analysis, intending to identify the secrets in "The Final Problem" and its adaptation "The Reichenbach Fall" and consequently, to examine how the adaptation modernised the secrets from the short story, how they were recreated and reinterpreted. Like so many others, this thesis too changed course a couple of times before settling on its final approach.

The final approach settled on being a more structuralistic reading of "The Final Problem" and "The Reichenbach Fall". Rather than trying to interpret the chosen material and focus on specific angles, its primary goal is to understand *how* and *why* Conan Doyle's detective Sherlock Holmes continues to work in the 21st century. This thesis has no interest in interpreting the series. Instead, it wishes to deal with the narrative techniques used, which makes this series capable of deceiving the viewer. Moreover, based on a narratology analysis, the cardinal functions identified will show why one given event must take place before the next can occur. Besides, Sherlock Holmes must be, in the structuralistic sense, recognised by his function or role: as the hero, just as Dr Watson must as the helper - the same goes for the rest of the characters studied in this thesis.

This thesis is not the first, nor will it be the last, to make use of a more structuralistic approach. Erlend Lavik's article "Narrative Structure in *The Sixth Sense*: A New Twist in "Twist Movies"?" likewise used a more structuralistic approach. Much like Lavik's article, this thesis might not appear to be a 'real' analysis to some, as it does not investigate a specific theme or topic, such as the previously mentioned dissertations. As with Lavik's *The Sixth Sense* article, this too will not function as a steppingstone to a discussion tying the series into some theme or subtext. Had this thesis continued to focus on secrets, it might have revealed something on modern culture - or even started a debate. Eventually, something else rose to attention: adaptations, narrative structure, cardinal functions, character functions and forensic fandom.

The Russian formalist Vladimir Propp defined the character functions. Though Propp worked with Russian folk tales and identified recurring structure and situations in those (Barry 2009:218), his notion of character functions is still applicable to other tales or stories. Propp seeks to outline how there are some structures in texts are constructed in a certain way. This thesis shares Propp's notion to some extent. As with Propp, the idea is not to interpret and think: "what does this and this mean?". Instead, this thesis' aim is to examine *how* and *why* something works, in this case,

Sherlock as a series, and more specifically, with the focus on one episode and the selected characters from that episode.

Besides Propp, this thesis leans on Brian McFarlane and Linda Hutcheon's understanding of how adaptations work, more so, how to create an excellent adaptation. To create a good adaptation, McFarlane and Hutcheon presents three strategies, which each covers a different way to approach the adaptation. Each strategy relies on the expression the producer(s) wishes to create - whether it being *transposition*, *commentary* or *analogy*. Introduced in McFarlane's theory is the notion of the cardinal functions mentioned earlier, which follows Propp's notion of events happening in a specific order before the next can take place.

This thesis got McFarlane, Hutcheon and Propp, all working with the narrative structure to some extent. Choosing to follow their lead, it is indisputably an unusual choice. Nonetheless, it is the motivating force of this thesis and what is interesting to me. This being said, agreeing on criteria of what is interesting is difficult. Lavik makes a good point when he states that there is no need to make a final hermeneutic or diagnostic step, at least in his perspective (Lavik 2007:10). Lavik is not alone with this perception. He mentions David Bordwell, who, on several occasions, points out that in other fields, it is perfectly acceptable to focus on structure, technique and composition as an end in itself (Lavik 2007:10). There is no illegitimate action in dealing with a narrative structure in this way, despite it being the more unusual choice, and thus this thesis will do just that.

Before starting the analysis, a clarification of why this thesis includes fan theories will take place.

3.3 Forensic Fandom

Included in the analysis is a large amount of different fan theories; this section seeks to establish their inclusion. In order to understand fan theories, it is necessary to turn to Jason Mittell and his *Complex TV* (2015), in which he describes the term forensic fandom. Forensic fandom covers television encouraging viewers to research more on what they see on the show. In the digital age, it has become much easier to participate in forensic fandom and share theories as well as debate the show and create paratexts.

Mittell states that viewers watch complex programs to see "how will they do it?" (Mittell 2015:43). He further states that "Much of complex television fosters a mode of forensic fandom in which viewers are encouraged to solve such high-concept puzzles, to ask "why?" and presume that

there is an answer to be found by drilling down and analysing" (Mittell 2015:65). The questions "how will they do it" and "why" are precisely why this thesis includes fan theories, more so, the purpose is to show how fans still engage in the Sherlockian universe.

Moreover, Mittell clarifies that complex television has different narrative techniques and that they vary by show. He states that there is a balance between episodic and serial form of narratives. The episodic show does not tie viewers down and follow a 'stand-alone' format. In contrast, the serialised shows, if executed correctly, will leave the viewer wanting more until the next episode airs. As a result, some turn to the internet in hopes of finding something, which could point to what is going to happen next, or if they missed something.

When producers allude to mysteries and suggest a revelation, they frame expectations and inspire forensic fandom to analyse both the text as well as the paratext for clues to reveal the events in advance (Mittell 2015:112). When Moffat and Gatiss revealed Sherlock to be alive after his supposed suicide, they inspired forensic fandom to analyse for clues and participate in the mystery. Furthermore, when Moffat went out and claimed that viewers missed a vital clue in the "The Reichenbach Fall", he coyly, but instantly, encouraged viewers to keep playing along with the series - as they had already discussed how Sherlock faked his suicide.

The fan theories included, serve the purpose of showing how Sherlock continues to be relevant as fans are still encouraged to research, question and play along despite their knowledge of the original stories. With the theories, the approach and the reason for including fan theories established and clarified, the analysis of this thesis can begin.

4. Analysis

In order to uncover the strategies used in the adaptation, the main focus of the analysis is the cardinal functions. The analysis will open by clarifying the structure of both source materials, then move on to outline the cardinal functions and concurrently why they are cardinal functions. Afterwards, a closer examination of the adaptations cardinal functions and how they work will follow. In continuation hereof, a discussion of the adaptations character functions will follow, to further establish how the short story has been updated and clarify the changes in character functions between the original story and the adaptation. Finally, the analysis will contain a paragraph revolving around fan theories to both the short story and the adaptation, which serve the purpose of showing how and why Sherlock Holmes is still relevant today.

4.1 The Frame Tale

Each episode in *Sherlock* is almost identical to Conan Doyle's stories and Moffat and Gatiss' episode "The Reichenbach Fall" is no exception. The episode takes its point of departure from Conan Doyle's "The Final Problem" in which Sherlock dies. Although the story is the same, there is a change in the plot. Comparing this to the three strategies of adaptation presented by McFarlane and Hutcheon, it is tempting to claim that the adaptation is the right mix of all three strategies, but that is a simple choice. However, without any further examination of the adaptation, let us say that it is the right mix of all three strategies. It is a *transposition*, in the sense that Moffat and Gatiss wish to stay as close to the original short story as possible, which they have, as they tell the same story. However, it is *commentary* as well, as Moffat and Gatiss have purposely altered the original in some respect, but without violating the original story. Finally, *Sherlock* also represents *analogy*, as the series represents another work of art by bringing Sherlock Holmes forward to the 21st century, by allowing other points of view via actions and different characters.

The most distinctive similarity between the original and the adaptation is that both follow the frame-tale structure. "The Final Problem" is a classic example of a frame-tale. It begins with Watson narrating in the present time, introducing the readers to what the story will revolve around. He then proceeds to tell the main story. When finally returning to the present time, Watson provides the reader with the conclusion to the story. Though claiming this to be the most distinctive similarity, the adaptation works around the frame-tale structure in slightly different ways as Watson's narration has been rejected and replaced with more than one point of view. Instead, the episode opens with a heavy-hearted Watson, in present time, visiting his therapist, who forces him to say out loud why he is there: the death of Sherlock Holmes. After the opening credits, the audience learns that what follows took place three months before Watson's therapy session. The main story can now begin, in which the circumstances leading to Sherlock's death take place. After Sherlock's death scene, the audience is brought back to present time where Mrs Hudson and Watson attend Sherlock's funeral and visit his graveside. However, quite contrary to the original, the adaptation does not offer the same conclusiveness.

The above was only a brief outline of how each story deals with the frame-tale; it is not a final examination. It will not alone clarify what kind of strategy Moffat and Gatiss have used in order to update Conan Doyle's classic to the 21st century. In order to provide a more conclusive

outcome, to clarify what kind of strategy (or strategies) Moffat and Gatiss use, the next paragraph will specify the cardinal functions. Simultaneously it will state why they are pivotal, before moving on to a closer examination of those cardinal functions.

4.1.1 Cardinal Functions

The purpose of this paragraph is to outline why those specific cardinal functions are of importance. Cardinal functions are irreplaceable, they cannot change, and if a cardinal function is changed the story change as well, indicating that something crucial in the story can never change. The short story has undergone several readings and the adaptation reviews as well, to identify the cardinal functions of the story.

The cardinal functions in both the short story and the adaptation lead to the death of Sherlock. However, the adaptation has altered the order in which they appear. It should be clear that the definitive identified cardinal functions are so because if one of them were to change or be left out, it would no longer be the same story. The change in the order of appearance does not change the story; it only changes the plot. The following paragraph will present the cardinal functions to both the original and the adaptation. Furthermore, an elaboration will clarify why they are cardinal functions.

"The Final Problem"

The 1. cardinal function identified from the short story is *the letters from Colonel James Moriarty*. At first, those letters appear to be a minor plot event. However, those letters are the reason why Dr Watson eventually end up writing "The Final Problem", implying that without those letters, there would be no story. Those letters set the story of as Dr Watson feels forced to defend Sherlock's reputation and name, which leads to the next cardinal function revolving the person Colonel James Moriarty defends in his letters, namely his brother Professor Moriarty.

Introducing Professor Moriarty is the 2. cardinal function, which opposite the first cannot appear as a minor plot event, as this is the first the readers hear of him. Due to this fact, his presentation takes up quite some space in the short story. It is Sherlock who introduces Professor Moriarty to Dr Watson in the present time, which then leads to the 3. cardinal function where *Professor Moriarty visits Sherlock*. A visit which takes place before Sherlock visits Dr Watson and introduce him to Professor Moriarty. Sherlock's recollection of Professor Moriarty visiting him is

likewise essential to the story, as it portrays the relationship between the two of them. The visit further portrays how they taunt each other but also show Professor Moriarty's intellectual.

Dr Watson recalls how he and Sherlock flee London, an event that could appear to be of minor importance. However, its importance is not to be mistaken. *Fleeing London* is a part of Sherlock's plan, though being scared, he plans to outnumber Professor Moriarty making this cardinal function number 4. In continuation hereof, *Professor Moriarty escaping the police* is the 5. cardinal function. Professor Moriarty has been in pursuit of Sherlock since he and Dr Watson left London and had the police managed to capture him when Sherlock planned so the story would have ended then and there. Both Sherlock and Professor Moriarty would still be alive, indicating that neither Colonel James Moriarty or Dr Watson would have written anything - no letters and no story.

The next cardinal function, number 6, emerges when Sherlock and Watson reach their destination in Switzerland. As they approach the Reichenbach Falls, *a Swiss boy comes running with a letter for Dr Watson*. A letter claiming that an English lady is ill and wishes to see an English doctor before she dies. This cardinal function is crucial to the story, as it puts Dr Watson in quite the dilemma - does he leave Sherlock alone, knowing that Professor Moriarty is still at large, or does he ignore the request from the English lady? In connection with this, the 7. cardinal function occurs, as *Dr Watson persuaded by Sherlock return to the hotel, leaving Sherlock alone.* Leaving Sherlock alone is yet another significant plot event, despite agreeing with Dr Watson to wait for him and eventually meet with him at their final destination. It is unknown where Professor Moriarty is and if he has reached Switzerland as well - the outcome is unclear.

Cardinal function number 8 covers *Dr Watson realising the English lady, was a hoax*. The cardinal function cement that the following two cardinal functions are indeed crucial to the plot. The hoax serves the purpose of luring Dr Watson away, and as the hotel manager describes the man, who might have sent the letter Dr Watson realises that Professor Moriarty has reached Switzerland and most likely is facing Sherlock alone. Cardinal function 6., 7. and 8. work as a trinity and combined they make each other essential to the plot. The hoax is necessary due to the outcome of the following events.

The final three cardinal functions cover number 9 where *Dr Watson finally after two hours return to the Reichenbach Falls*, only to discover that there is no sign of neither Sherlock nor Professor Moriarty. It is a crucial plot point as the outcome of their encounter is unknown. In cardinal function number 10, *Dr Watson discovers the letter from Sherlock* in which he explains how he knew the letter was a hoax to lure Dr Watson away and finally what took place between

after he left. The explanation is needed and can never be left out, Dr Watson has built his entire story on revealing how Sherlock died and finally he provides the redemption. The 11. cardinal function reveals that there was *no recovery of Sherlock and Moriarty's bodies*. However, though it appears to be a conclusive ending, it opens a window, not only to fans but also for Conan Doyle to resurrect Sherlock. The 11. cardinal function is only a cardinal function because of the resurrection; otherwise, it would have been the conclusive ending Conan Doyle intended it to be.

"The Reichenbach Fall"

The adaptation features 11 cardinal functions like the short story, which is not a requirement but a coincidence in this case. The adaptation's cardinal functions and thus, the events they cover do not follow the same timeframe as those in the short story. The 1. cardinal function identified are *the three prominent cases* Sherlock solves in the opening scene. They do not match any of the cardinal functions from the short story. However, it does refer to an event from the short story, where Sherlock was working on three different cases in France. As stated, Sherlock solves these three cases in the opening scene and much like the letters from Colonel James Moriarty, these cases set of the story. This cardinal function does not appear to of significant importance, but as the show continues, it will be clear why Sherlock's massive exposure in the press due to those three cases is crucial.

From the first cardinal function and to the second is a gap, as several events occur — however, the 2. cardinal function covers *the arrest of Moriarty, his trial and him walking free*. The event is a direct reference, yet reinterpreted, to Moriarty escaping the police in the original story. Furthermore, it covers the introducing of Moriarty, which is very similar to the one Sherlock gives in the short story (calling him a spider in the centre of his web). As proclaimed, cardinal functions cannot change, and thus the introduction of Moriarty must be included in the adaptation as well. On a passing remark, the adaptation introduces Moriarty earlier in the series, but this is the first proper introduction of him and his 'business'.

As *Moriarty is now walking free, he visits Sherlock* - again a direct transfer of a cardinal function from the short story - making this the 3. cardinal function in the adaptation. The similarities continue, as Moriarty threatens Sherlock in both versions. In the adaptation he promises him a fall. The 4. cardinal function is a reinterpretation of Colonel James Moriarty's letters. In the adaptation, it is the *journalist Kitty Riley who defends Moriarty and calls Sherlock a fraud* in a small notice. The notice reappears later in the show when the paper is finally published. Cardinal

function 4 continues into number 5, where *Sherlock works on a kidnapping case*, which bears no similarity with the original story. However, it is significant as Moriarty is the mastermind behind the crime, but frames Sherlock which add to the smearing of his reputation.

Cardinal function number 6, is covering *Sherlock and Dr Watson on the run and visiting Kitty Riley* to get some answers. Opposite the short story, Sherlock and Dr Watson are fugitives and instead of being chased they are chasing Moriarty. In correlation to this cardinal function, we have number 7, where *Moriarty shows up at Kitty's place but once again escapes* and where *Sherlock has an epiphany and turn to Molly Hooper for help*.

The 7. cardinal function leads to number 8, in which *Dr Watson receives a call informing him that Mrs Hudson is dying*. Again, we see a reinterpretation, the Swiss boy with the letter is now a phone call. Due to the crucial effect in the original, it cannot be left out of the adaptation either. Once more, *Dr Watson leaves Sherlock alone to meet with Moriarty* only to discover *the phone call was a hoax*, which is the 9. cardinal function.

The adaptations final two cardinal functions, number 10 and 11, are different from the short stories final two. The 10. cardinal function covers *Moriarty killing* himself, which is contrary to the original in which he tumbles over the edge with Sherlock. It further covers Watson returning to St. Bartholomew's Hospital. *Dr Watson then receives a phone call from Sherlock*, which serve the same purpose as the letter in the original, who then commits suicide. The 11. and final cardinal function is the most crucial one, as we are left to believe Sherlock is dead, Mrs Hudson and Dr Watson attend Sherlock's funeral, but as the scene is about to end, *Sherlock is seen alive*.

Close to every cardinal function identified in the short story recur in the adaptation's cardinal functions. Some are very similar to those in the original, others reinterpreted, and few are new. As most reflect the cardinal functions from the short story, they are undeniable crucial in the adaptation as well - as leaving them out or changing them would mean changing the story thus making it a different story. With the cardinal function established, they can now be further examined.

4.1.2 Entering Moriarty

The first paragraph will examine the cardinal function (2) Introducing Moriarty and (3) Professor Moriarty pays Sherlock a visit from the short story. And function (2) Moriarty is arrested, goes to trial but is found not guilty, and (3) Moriarty pays Sherlock a visit from the adaptation as well. One

of the main differences between the short story and the adaptation is the character of Moriarty. In the short story, the archenemy of Sherlock Holmes makes his first appearance in "The Final Problem", as opposed to the adaptation where he is already a known character. Moriarty's first appearance in the adaptation is in "The Great Game", he then reappears in "A Scandal in Belgravia" and "The Hounds of Baskerville" before being introduced in somewhat the same manner as in the original. The role of Moriarty will appear in the paragraph on character functions, but for now, the focus will be on the plot. A parallel between the short story and the adaptation is Sherlock has tried to bring down Moriarty in both. However, the difference is that readers of the short story have not heard of this until "The Final Problem" whereas the audience of "The Reichenbach Fall" has. According to McFarlane, this would imitate the *story/plot distinction*, in which the order of events changes. They change as the introduction of Moriarty takes place earlier on in the adaptation as opposed to the short story.

The introduction of Moriarty as a criminal mastermind occurs in both. In the original Sherlock uses the following phrase to describe Moriarty to Watson: "He sits motionless, like a spider in the centre of its web, but that web has a thousand radiations, and he knows very well every quiver of each of them" (Doyle & Klinger 2005:719). In the adaptation, the presentation of Moriarty to the general public takes place during his trial, where Sherlock serves as an expert witness. Here Moffat and Gatiss have made an apparent reference in Sherlock's speech when asked how he would describe Moriarty: "First mistake, James Moriarty isn't a man at all. He's a spider. A spider in the centre of a web. A criminal web with a thousand threads and he knows precisely how each and every single one of them dances" ("The Reichenbach Fall" 16:11-16:26). If we look at cinematic effects, the viewer is provided with a sequence of constant shifting in focus between Sherlock and Moriarty, though it is Sherlock who does all the talking. When the camera is focusing on Sherlock, it is generally with a close-up shot. In contrast, Moriarty is shown in a medium shot nodding as Sherlock describes him as a spider in the centre of a criminal web. This apparent reference is what Hutcheon argues to be a part of the pleasure, and risk, of watching an adaptation: the recognition and remembrance.

If we shortly return to the cardinal functions and focus on function (3) from both the short story and the adaptation, it is evident that they are almost identical - they both involve Moriarty paying Sherlock a visit in which he, in a subtle way, threatens Sherlock. In the short story, Moriarty starts by insulting Sherlock "You have less frontal development than I should have expected" (Doyle & Klinger 2005:721) before threatening him:

> MORIARTY: You must drop it, Mr Holmes, you really must.
> SHERLOCK: After Monday.
> MORIARTY: Tut, tut! I am quite sure that a man of your intelligence will see that there can be but one outcome to this affair. It is necessary that you should withdraw. You have worked things in such a fashion that we have only one recourse left. It has been an intellectual treat to me to see the way in which you have grappled with this affair, and I say, unaffectedly, that it would be a grief to me to be forced to take any extreme measure. You smile, sir, but I assure you that it really would.
> SHERLOCK: Danger is part of my trade.
> MORIARTY: This is not danger. It is inevitable destruction. You stand in the way not merely of an individual but of a mighty organization, the full extent of which you, with all your cleverness, have been unable to realise. You must stand clear, Mr Holmes, or be trodden under foot.
> SHERLOCK: I am afraid, that in the pleasure of this conversation I am neglecting business of importance which awaits me elsewhere.
> MORIARTY: Well, well. It seems a pity, but I have done what I could. I know every move of your game. You can do nothing before Monday. It has been a duel between you and me, Mr Holmes. You hope to place me in the dock. I tell you that I will never stand in the dock. If you are clever enough to bring destruction upon me, rest assured that I shall do as much to you.
>
> (Doyle & Klinger 2005:722-23).

From this, it appears that Moriarty thinks highly of Sherlock - that he enjoys how Sherlock challenges him intellectually. However, somehow, Moriarty is still disappointed as he starts by commenting on Sherlock's "frontal development" (Doyle & Klinger 2005:721). In the adaptation, Sherlock and Moriarty share two conversations which are comparable to the one from the short story, both are rather long transcriptions, and therefore the transcription in its full length will be in appendix 1 and 2. However, to compare the conversations in the adaptation, the focus will be on the parts which can be "traced" directly back to the short story. From Moriarty visiting Sherlock after being found not guilty, from Appendix 1:

> MORIARTY: You need me or you're nothing. Because we're just alike, you and I. Except you're boring. You're on the side of the angels. Aren't ordinary people adorable? Well, you know. You've got John. I should get myself a live-in one.
> …
> MORIARTY: I want to solve the problem. Our problem. The final problem. It's going to start very soon, Sherlock. The fall. But don't be scared. Falling's just like flying except there's a more permanent destination.
> SHERLOCK: I never liked riddles.
> MORIARTY: Learn to. Because I owe you a fall, Sherlock. I owe you.

From their second encounter on the rooftop of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, Moriarty further insults Sherlock's intelligence, from Appendix 2:

> MORIARTY: Well. Here we are at last. You and me, Sherlock. And our problem, the final problem, stayin' alive. So boring, isn't it? It's just… staying. All my life, I've been searching for a distraction and you were the best distraction and now I don't even have you. Because I've beaten you. And you know what? In the end, it was easy. It was easy. Now I've got to go back to playing with the ordinary people. And it turns out you're ordinary, just like all of them. Oh, well.
> …
> MORIARTY: No, no, no, no, no, this is too easy. This is too easy. There is no key, doofus! Those digits are meaningless. They're utterly meaningless. You don't really think a couple of lines of computer code are going to crash the world around our ears? I'm disappointed. I'm disappointed in you. Ordinary Sherlock.
> …
> MORIARTY: Now, how did I break into the bank, to the Tower, to the prison? Daylight robbery. All it takes is some willing participants. I knew you'd fall for it. That's your weakness. You always want everything to be

> clever. Now, shall we finish the game? One final act. Glad you chose a tall building. Nice way to do it.

Taking the whole conversation into consideration, it is clearly characterised by Moriarty enjoying the intellectual 'game' the two of them share, but at the same time he finds Sherlock boring and disappointing - again a clear reference to the original, where Moriarty comments on his 'frontal development'. Yet again Moriarty subtly threatens Sherlock, this time by 'owing' him a fall. In Appendix 2, it is further emphasised that Moriarty thinks less of Sherlock, as he calls him ordinary, claims to be disappointed in him and points out that this is his weakness - always wanting everything to be clever. In the adaptation, it is more profound how little Moriarty thinks of Sherlock, which only makes his character more unlikeable. Furthermore, it shows how Moffat and Gatiss have added emphasis on his role.

We now turn to the cinematic effects from the first visit Moriarty pays Sherlock. We get almost every camera-subject distance there is; everything from extreme close-up to a long shot. The same goes for camera angles, where we have an eye-level shot as well as the high-angle shot. The extreme close-up of Moriarty's hands cutting an apple evidently puts all focus on this apple and whatever Moriarty is cutting in it. The high angle shot usually suggests an absolute superiority over the character, but in this shot, it is of Moriarty although he is the one who threatens Sherlock. However, the high-angle shot can also be used to distance the audience emotionally from the character, which in this case makes more sense, as Sherlock is the hero and Moriarty the villain. These different camera angles and distances participate in the thorough characterisation of Moriarty.

The extreme close-up of Moriarty tapping his knee is Moffat and Gatiss reinterpreting and recreating the plot but also determining what the audience should notice. For instance, Moriarty tapping his knee is Moffat and Gatiss' way of determining that this is of importance to the plot, and just like Sherlock notices the tapping and believes it to be of some significance, the audience is almost forced to do the same, not only because of the extreme close-up but equally because of the subsequent close-up of Sherlock, in which he clearly shows he has noticed the tapping.

The next section will examine Sherlock and Dr Watson on the run, as well as Sherlock being framed.

4.1.3. Sherlock On the Run

The second example covers functions (1) The letters from Colonel James Moriarty, (4) Sherlock and Dr Watson fleeing London and (5) Moriarty escaping the police from the short story. It further deals with function (4) The article by Kitty Riley claiming Sherlock to be a fraud, (5) The kidnap case and further framing of Sherlock and (6) Sherlock and Watson as fugitives pay Kitty a visit from the adaptation. First, a short presentation of function (4) and (5) from the short story: In the short story, Sherlock and Watson execute their plan of going to the Continent, but only to realise that Moriarty is following them. However, Moriarty does not catch the train Sherlock and Watson are on out of London. The escape involves shifting trains, which is not the most exciting to recreate and do a direct transfer of, which is probably why Moffat and Gatiss have chosen to change the plot. In the adaptation, which matches function (5) and (6), Moriarty frames Sherlock as the man behind the kidnapping case he has just solved. Though changing and recreating the plot, Moffat and Gatiss have kept the fleeing part, where Sherlock and Watson get arrested but escape, as the only apparent reference to the short story.

Function (1) from the short story has nothing to do with Sherlock and Watson fleeing London. However, it is comparable with function (4) from the adaptation, and more specifically the part where Watson is first introduced to the "kiss and tell" when he meets with Mycroft. To summarise function (1) from the short story, Watson mentions some letters from Colonel James Moriarty, the brother of Professor Moriarty. Watson never involves the reader in the content of these letters. However, it is tempting to believe that the letters smear the reputation of Sherlock as Watson states: "Colonel James Moriarty defends the memory of his brother" (Doyle & Klinger 2005:714). As already mentioned, in the adaptation Moriarty frames Sherlock for the kidnapping of the British Ambassador's two children. However, before the kidnapping case, Mycroft possesses a tabloid paper due to go to press for Saturday, in which the "kiss and tell" part claims Sherlock is a fraud.

The paper reappears when Sherlock and Watson are on the run. Here Watson spots the "kiss and tell" by journalist Kitty Riley and 'close friend, Richard Brook'. After mentioning the name Richard Brook to Sherlock, the two of them seek the home of Kitty. After breaking in, they wait for her to return. During their conversation with Kitty, Moriarty suddenly shows up but claims to be an actor hired by Sherlock. As Sherlock and Watson leave Kitty's house after Moriarty escapes once more, Sherlock outlines his framing in quite a telling way:

> WATSON: Can he do that? Completely change his identity? Make you the criminal?
> SHERLOCK: He's got my whole life story. That's what you do. You sell a big lie. You wrap it up in a truth to make it palatable.
> WATSON: It's your word against his.
> SHERLOCK: He's been sowing doubt into people's minds for the last 24 hours. There's only one thing he needs to do to complete his game and that's to…
>
> ("The Reichenbach Fall" 1:01:41-1:02:00).

By the comparison of the short story and the adaptation, it is evident that Moffat and Gatiss have changed the plot but kept the story, at least to some degree. Both versions include a chase. In the original Moriarty chases Sherlock while it is the other way around in the adaptation. Smearing Sherlock's name can also be found in both versions, although it is more explicit in the adaptation. By using *commentary* Moffat and Gatiss have altered the original and had a different intention with their version, but at the same time, it is tempting to suggest the use of *analogy* as well, as Moffat and Gatiss have departed from the original to create another work of art. Despite combining two strategies which depart from the original Moffat and Gatiss still manage to stay faithful to the original, as they change the plot but not the story.

Before moving on to the next example, this section will present a short review of some of the cinematic effects in the scene at Kitty's place. Starting with the camera angle on Moriarty, compared to previously the angle is now in an eye-level shot, which can indicate that Sherlock and Moriarty are equals. At one occasion the high-angle shot is in use; however, this time it is to create a feeling of superiority over him, making him appear smaller than Sherlock. Moreover, for a split second Moffat and Gatiss trick the audience into doubting Sherlock's credibility and believing Moriarty instead - Watson reinforces this belief by his confusion. However, as Sherlock and Watson leave the house and Sherlock elaborates what Moriarty has done, the setup is overthrown.

The next paragraph will deal with luring Watson away and how much this part is a reflecting the original, despite the modernisation of is.

4.1.4 Leaving and Returning

As stated, this particular scene in the adaptation is reflecting the original. In the original Sherlock and Watson have reached the falls of Reichenbach and get ready for turning back:

> The path has been cut halfway round the fall to afford a complete view, but it ends abruptly, and the traveller has to return as he came. We had turned to do so, when we saw a Swiss lad come running along it with a letter in his hand. It bore the mark of the hotel which we had just left and was addressed to me by the landlord (Doyle & Klinger 2005:737).

The letter, which appears to be from the hotel, claims that shortly after Sherlock and Watson had left the hotel an English lady "in the last stage of consumption" (Doyle & Klinger 2005:737) had arrived when suddenly she was overtaken by haemorrhage and requested to see an English doctor. Though Watson is reluctant to leave Sherlock, he eventually agrees, leaving the Swiss messenger with Sherlock and agrees to meet with Sherlock at Rosenlaui. When returning to the hotel, Watson quickly discovers that the sick English lady is a hoax conducted by Moriarty. Watson rushes back to the falls, but in his eagerness, he loses his way and it takes him two hours to reach the falls. By the time Watson reaches the falls there is no sign of either Sherlock, Moriarty or the Swiss messenger. The only thing to be found is Sherlock's Alpine stick and cigarette case, under which Watson discovers a letter addressed to him, letting him know what took place.

In order to mirror the original, the adaptation should contain a fall, a messenger, Watson losing his way back after realising the hoax, and finally the letter in which Sherlock explains it all. On the one hand, the adaptation does contain all the elements, but on the other hand, it does not. It does, however, still reflect the original. Again, Moffat and Gatiss purposely alter the plot. Replacements of the vital elements looks like this: the rooftop of St. Bartholomew's Hospital replaces the falls; the Swiss messenger is reduced to a phone call. The English lady is still English but is replaced with someone of more importance to Sherlock and Watson, namely their landlady Mrs Hudson. Instead of losing his way back Watson is now knocked over by a cyclist slowing him down, and finally, the letter to Watson is yet another phone call in which Sherlock confirms everything written about him being a fraud before he jumps.

Moving on to the cinematic effects and the scene where Watson receives the call about Mrs Hudson. The scene makes use of camera-subject distance, such as extreme close-ups, blurring out

and focusing on different objects/subjects. For instance, right before Watson's phone rings, the camera pans slowly by some flasks in the laboratory before focusing on an extreme close-up of Sherlock's hand and a bouncing ball. According to Ed Sikov, this ball now seems to be of great significance, as Moffat and Gatiss move the camera close to it and isolate it, though it is only for a short period before Watson's phone ringing interrupts the scene. The audience is unconsciously left to wonder about the significance of the bouncing ball. From here, the camera tilts upwards to put Watson in focus and blurs out Sherlock's hand - the call is now the vital part.

However, just as Watson receives the news of Mrs Hudson being shot, the camera shift to focus on a seemingly unaffected Sherlock, though Watson's voice and tone strongly suggest something is wrong:

> WATSON: Yeah, speaking. What? What happened? Is she okay? Oh, my God. Right, yes I'm coming *(hangs up)*.
> SHERLOCK: What is it?
> WATSON: Paramedics. Mrs Hudson's been shot.
> SHERLOCK: What? How?
> WATSON: Well, probably one of the killers you manage to attract. Jesus. Jesus! She's dying, Sherlock. Let's go.
> SHERLOCK: You go, I'm busy.
> WATSON: Busy?
> SHERLOCK: Thinking, I need to think.
> WATSON: You need to… Doesn't she mean anything to you? You once half killed a man because he laid a finger on her.
> SHERLOCK: She's my landlady.
> WATSON: She's dying, you machine. Sod this. Sod this. You stay here if you want. On your own.
> SHERLOCK: Alone is what I have. Alone protects me.
> WATSON: No, friends protect people.
>
> ("The Reichenbach Fall" 1:07:26-1:08:10)

During the call, the camera shifts between medium shots of Watson and Sherlock, showing a distraught Watson and Sherlock, still unaffected, with a monotone voice asking what is happening.

Watson eventually leaves angry at Sherlock. However, this is not the main difference between the original and the adaptation. Although there is no clear evidence of Sherlock arranging the call to Watson, it is still plausible due to the monotone voice and natural appearance; Sherlock could easily have arranged the call. If Sherlock is indeed behind the call, it is a clear difference between the original and the adaptation, as it was Moriarty who sent the Swiss messenger in the short story. The only apparent similarity is Sherlock knowing it to be a hoax all along.

In the short story, Watson is reluctant to leave Sherlock alone, whereas in the adaptation he is furious with Sherlock as it is Mrs Hudson, who is dying. Upon arriving back at 221B Baker Street, Watson has a clear expression of surprise on his face when an unharmed Mrs Hudson greets him and asks if Sherlock has "sorted it all out". The close-up of Watson reveals when he realises the hoax and that Sherlock has planned to face Moriarty alone, which leads to the next paragraph about the death of Sherlock Holmes.

4.1.5 The Death of Sherlock Holmes

In both versions, everything leads up to the death of Sherlock Holmes. However, in order to update the story to the 21st century, Moffat and Gatiss have once more changed the plot. Unlike previous examples, where the outcome of the functions has been close to the same, function (11) from the short story (Sherlock and Moriarty's bodies are never found) and the adaptation (Mrs Hudson and Watson visits Sherlock's grave and as Watson leaves, a very much alive Sherlock is revealed) are not the same — a crucial altering of the ending. Before turning to the ending, this example will contain an outline of the similarities and differences.

The previous paragraph listed the "replacements" for the Reichenbach Falls, Watson returning to the falls, the Swiss messenger and the letter to Watson. Such replacements are likewise possible to identify when dealing with the end and functions (11). In the short story, Sherlock and Moriarty tumble over, locked in each other's arms. In the adaptation, however, Moriarty shoots himself to force Sherlock to execute his plan of Sherlock committing suicide. Furthermore, Sherlock's call to Watson serves the same purpose as the letter did in the original story - the call is his 'note'. It is evident that Moffat and Gatiss have intended to stay faithful to the original, but due to the known outcome of the story, they alter the ending and change the plot.

The twist in Moffat and Gatiss' plot is showing the dead bodies of both Moriarty and Sherlock, something Conan Doyle left out of the short story and left the readers hanging with the following ending:

> Any attempt at recovering the bodies was absolutely hopeless, and there, deep down in that dreadful cauldron of swirling water and seething foam, will lie for all time the most dangerous criminal and the foremost champion of the law of their generation (Doyle & Klinger 2005:744).

Besides showing the bodies of Sherlock and Moriarty, the main twist in Moffat and Gatiss plot is the resurrection of Sherlock at the end of the episode. In the original, there is no resurrection of Sherlock until Conan Doyle gave in and published "The Empty House" years after "The Final Problem" in 1903. Conan Doyle first gave in two years earlier with "The Hound of the Baskerville". However, this story took place before "The Final Problem". The resurrection of Sherlock in "The Reichenbach Fall" is only revealed to the audience (and who ever helped him), whereas Mrs Hudson and Watson are let to believe that Sherlock is dead.

The resurrection of Sherlock in "The Empty House" provided several different fan theories, whereas the revelation of Sherlock being alive in the adaptation ends on a massive cliff-hanger: how did Sherlock fake his suicide? A question which results in several different fan theories. A chapter presenting the fan theories from both the short story and the adaptation will follow after examining the character functions.

4.1.6 Sub-conclusion

Before moving on to character functions, it is worth discussing the different examples used and which strategy Moffat and Gatiss appear to use in their updated version of Sherlock Holmes. Generally seen, Moffat and Gatiss use *transposition* when it comes to staying true to the original story. However, when it comes to updating Sherlock to the 21st century and his death, Moffat and Gatiss have used both the *commentary* and *analogy* strategies. The *commentary* strategy comes to show when the producers purposely alter the original intending to make Sherlock 'now'. An example is including technology such as replacing the letters with phone calls or letting St. Bartholomew's Hospital take the place of the Reichenbach Fall. The *commentary* strategy is when

there is no intention of violating or cause infidelity towards the original, which reflects the notion of Moffat and Gatiss - to stay faithful to the original.

As for the *analogy* strategy, it comes to show when changing the ending. Here, Moffat and Gatiss depart from the original, and instead of mirroring the ending, they create another work of art. They reveal what is already known, which forces the audience to wonder and eventually create fan theories as the original did when "The Empty Hearse" was published. Before reaching a final conclusion, the characters and their functions is examined.

4.2 Different Characters

In this chapter, the focus will be on characters and their function, in particular, how Moffat and Gatiss update them in the adaptation. It will concern the main characters, as well as some of the minor characters. First, there will be a paragraph elaborating on the vital characters and their functions from both "The Final Problem" and "The Reichenbach Fall". Secondly, to further show Moffat and Gatiss' use of a specific strategy, there will be a paragraph on each character function presenting the changes made in the adaptation and elaborating on the impact of these changes. Finally, this chapter will include a sub-conclusion.

4.2.1 Character Functions

The following five character functions are the important ones: the hero, the helper, the villain, the dispatcher and the false hero. The first four are all represented in both the short story and the adaptation, whereas the fifth, the false hero, is only present in the adaptation.

In the short story, the three main characters are Sherlock (the hero), Watson (the helper) and Professor Moriarty (the villain). Each of their functions is self-evident: Sherlock is the hero who faces the struggles created by Moriarty, the villain, and Watson is the friend who joins Sherlock on his 'quest' to help. Besides these three vital characters, there are two minor characters as well. The first is Colonel James Moriarty, Professor Moriarty's brother, whose function is being the dispatcher. The second is the Swiss messenger, who serves as Moriarty's helper.

In the adaptation, the three main characters, Sherlock, Watson and Moriarty, have the same functions as in the short story as the hero, the helper and the villain. But as clarified in the theory, a character may take on more than one role, which is the case with Moriarty. Not only is he the

villain, but he also takes on the second role of the false hero. As for the minor characters, there are two: Molly Hooper and Kitty Riley. It is worth mentioning that the adaptation includes several other characters, but Molly and Kitty are the most vital ones. Molly Hooper's function is the same as that of Watson. She helps Sherlock although it is never clarified what exactly she does to help, it is strongly insinuated that she plays a part in Sherlock's fake suicide. Kitty Riley manages two functions (like Moriarty), as both helper and dispatcher. As the helper, she believes Moriarty when he takes on the character of the false hero and sides with him. When doing so, she becomes the dispatcher, as she publishes a "kiss and tell"-article calling out Sherlock as a fraud, which is further indications of her siding with Moriarty. With the major and minor characters established, a further investigation of their purpose and function can take place, starting with the hero.

4.2.2 The Hero

As already stated, Sherlock's function is the same in both versions - his function is that of the hero. However, his character in the adaptation is a version of him representing a 21st century Sherlock Holmes. There are no significant changes in the function of Sherlock's character, he still goes on a 'quest' with Watson, and he still experiences the smearing of his name. Otherwise, there are no vital changes made; after all, Sherlock is the protagonist and must be recognisable. Another character who must be recognisable is Sherlock's helper, Dr Watson.

4.2.3 The Helper

In the short story, two characters have the function as helpers: Watson and the Swiss messenger, whereas in the adaptation, there are three helpers: Watson, Molly Hooper and Kitty Riley. The first helper, who appears in both versions, is Watson. In both versions of the story, Watson is Sherlock's helper. One notable change is the rejection of Watson as the narrator - Watson's point of view no longer experiences everything. Despite this change, Watson still writes about their adventures, now in the form of a blog, which is relatable and more present-day like. Another notable change in Watson's character is that Watson has not gone into private practice yet, nor has he married Mary - in fact, he has not even met her yet. Watson is still a 'confirmed bachelor' living with Sherlock. Despite those changes, Watson is still recognisable and is merely a 21st century version of himself.

Besides Watson as the helper, there is a new character: Molly Hooper. Molly is not part of the original stories. However, in the adaptation, she plays a vital role, especially in this episode. The

character of Molly is different from that of Watson, though they share the same function. In fact, Molly is more aware of Sherlock than Watson has ever been. She sees Sherlock even when he thinks no one watches:

> MOLLY: You're a bit like my dad. He's dead. No Sorry.
> SHERLOCK: Molly please don't feel the need to make conversation, it's really not your area.
> MOLLY: When he was dying, he was always cheerful, he was lovely. Except for when he thought no one could see. I saw him once... He looked sad.
> SHERLOCK: Molly.
> MOLLY: You look sad when you think he can't see you… Are you okay? And don't just say you are because I know what that means, looking sad when you think no one can see you
> SHERLOCK: But you can see me.
> MOLLY: I don't count. What I'm trying to say is, if there's anything I can do, anything you need… anything at all, you can have me. No, I just mean... I mean if there's anything you need… It's fine.
> SHERLOCK: What would I need from you?
> MOLLY: Nothing, I don't know. You should probably say thank you actually.
> SHERLOCK: Thank you.
> MOLLY: I'm just going for some crips. Do you want anything? It's okay, I know you don't.
> SHERLOCK: Well actually maybe I wo…
> MOLLY: I know you don't.
>
> ("The Reichenbach Fall" 37:48-39:08)

The conversation shared between Sherlock and Molly, proves that Molly notices what Sherlock attempts to hide for Watson. It is also evidence of how Moffat and Gatiss manipulate with the audience. Molly and Sherlock could have a relationship like Sherlock and Watson, but Moffat and Gatiss have right from the start made sure to enhance whenever Sherlock mocked Molly. The goal

is to dismiss her as a pressure point to Sherlock, which Moriarty eventually does - and if Moriarty can overlook her as pivotal, so can the audience. By removing focus from Molly, she is now the perfect helper, as she can move around unseen and thus help Sherlock fake his suicide. Sherlock eventually reveals that she does count and turns to her for help:

> SHERLOCK: You're wrong, you know… You do count. You've always counted and I've always trusted you. But you were right. I'm not okay.
> MOLLY: Tell me what's wrong.
> SHERLOCK: Molly, I think I'm going to die.
> MOLLY: What do you need?
> SHERLOCK: If I wasn't everything that you think I am, everything I think I am, would you still want to help me?
> MOLLY: What do you need?
> SHERLOCK: You. ("The Reichenbach Fall" 1:02:29-1:03:13)

Despite removing focus from Molly, she is now the centre of attention. Sherlock gains the upper hand, as Moriarty make the mistake of leaving Molly out of the equation. However, though strongly implying Molly helps Sherlock with faking his suicide, the episode ends without revealing what exactly Molly did to help Sherlock. The following episode, "The Empty Hearse", does, however, include several different theories about what took place. Some of the theories presented originate from fans debating "The Final Problem" and Sherlock's suicide, but Moffat and Gatiss confirm nothing.

The final helper, the journalist Kitty Riley, can be seen as the counterpart to the Swiss messenger. Kitty does not lure Watson away as the Swiss messenger does in the short story, and there is no clear evidence of the Swiss messenger being in league with Moriarty. The only evidence is Watson concluding the following: "The Swiss youth was never found again, and there can be no doubt that he was one of the numerous agents whom Moriarty kept in his employ" (Doyle & Klinger 2005:744). It is unlikely that Kitty is on Moriarty's payroll like the Swiss messenger was. Instead, it is more likely that when Sherlock brutally turned her down before Moriarty's trial, she was more prone to side with Moriarty and thus not needed much persuading by him. Bought or persuaded, Kitty is in league with Moriarty, and when Moriarty needs her, she is there to defend him when Sherlock and Watson visit her.

To establish Kitty's role further, foreshadowing the outcome is used twice. The first time is by Watson stating the following: "It better pass. The press will turn Sherlock, they always turn, and they'll turn on you" ("The Reichenbach Fall" 03:59-04:07). The second time is by Kitty: "Sooner or later, you're going to need someone on your side. Someone to set the record straight" ("The Reichenbach Fall" 14:20-14:28). Watson's statement is a response to Sherlock receiving a massive amount of publicity and thus foreshadowing the press turning on Sherlock. Kitty's claim is a clear response to Watson's fear and Sherlock turning her down. Kitty eventually executes Watson's fear and goes public with a story exposing Sherlock as a fraud.

Like Moriarty, Kitty has more than just one function, which leads to the next character function: the dispatcher.

4.2.4 The Dispatcher

Apart from performing the function of the helper, Kitty takes on a second function as the dispatcher. The dispatcher sends the hero off on his quest. As the dispatcher, Kitty is the counterpart to Colonel James Moriarty from the short story. However, 'sending the hero off' works differently in the two versions. In the short story, Colonel James Moriarty defends his brother's memory in some letters, which presumably smear Sherlock's name. On account of these letters, Watson feels forced to tell the truth about what took place between Sherlock and Moriarty. These letters from Colonel James Moriarty serve as the dispatcher, and although it is the helper who is sent off and not our hero, they still have the function of being the dispatcher. Similar to this is Kitty's function as the dispatcher. Much like Colonel James Moriarty, Kitty smears Sherlock's name, however, in the 21st century, she does so by publishing an article exposing Sherlock as a fraud and claims that Moriarty is an actor hired by Sherlock. Once again, it is not our hero who seeks justice for himself. As a matter of fact, Sherlock eventually claims in his suicide 'note' that everything written about him is real. Watson is the one who seeks justice and wishes to clear Sherlock's name, which is quite similar to the original story.

With the hero, the helper and the dispatcher established, there is only one character's function to elaborate: Moriarty, who similar to Kitty covers two functions.

4.2.5 The Villain and False Hero

Finally, there is the function of the villain and false hero. Moriarty takes on both roles; however, the function as the false hero is more evident in the adaptation than in the short story. First, Moffat and Gatiss have put much more emphasis on the character of Moriarty. As previously mentioned, Moriarty makes his first appearance in "The Great Game", which is the last episode from season 1. Making Moriarty appear early on is a departure from the short story, where he first appears in "The Final Problem". As for the character function as the villain, not much has changed; Moriarty, like Sherlock and Watson, has undergone an update to the 21st century. Contrary to the short story, in which Moriarty is a professor, Moriarty only appears to be a consulting criminal in the adaptation. Despite being referred to as a consulting criminal, Moriarty is still an intellectual match for Sherlock. In fact, they are each other's counterparts, as Sherlock is a consulting detective.

In his function as the false hero, Moriarty takes it upon himself to destroy Sherlock's reputation and name. In order to do so, Moriarty poses as the actor, Richard Brook, whom Sherlock has, supposedly, hired to play the criminal mastermind, Moriarty. He fabricates evidence to support his act, evidence he uses to convince Kitty and gain her trust. Even Watson is baffled. However, this is not the first time Moriarty has posed as someone else. In "The Great Game" Moriarty appears as Molly's boyfriend, whom Sherlock claims to be gay. As for the short story, there is no clear evidence of Moriarty taking on the function as the false hero; however, the letters from his brother could be interpreted as making Moriarty the victim and thus the false hero.

Adding more emphasis on Moriarty as the false hero, will not make the audience doubt Sherlock's credibility, nor will it fool the hardcore fans of the detective. Fans already know that Moriarty is real and not hired by Sherlock. However, it does add emphasis on how twisted and devious Moriarty is. An audience, who are not as familiar with the Sherlock Holmes universe, might be more prone to doubt Sherlock's credibility - after all, even Watson seems to doubt Sherlock for a second.

4.2.6 Sub-conclusion

To sum up, Moffat and Gatiss make use of updating, changing and adding new characters to their adaptation. Each modification of the characters helps identify the strategy used to adapt "The Final Problem" and its characters. As already stated, Sherlock and Watson's characters have not undergone a considerable transformation. However, the updating of the two can reflect the

transposition strategy, as not much has changed, and the characters are easily recognisable as they should be.

Moffat and Gatiss have then chosen to put a lot more emphasis on the character of Moriarty in their adaptation, where the character of Moriarty plays a more significant part compared to the original story. They introduce him earlier in the adaptation, changing his profession from professor and criminal to only being a criminal. Reinterpreting the Swiss messenger and Colonel James Moriarty can, along with Moriarty's added emphasis, be the producers' way of altering the original characters' representation in order to show how Sherlock is still relevant today without violating the original story and characters. This change reflects the *commentary* strategy.

As for adding new characters, namely Molly Hooper and Kitty Riley, they represent that Moffat and Gatiss' version is another work of art. By using the *analogy* strategy, Moffat and Gatiss depart from the original when adding new characters and providing them with vital functions. This is especially true for Molly's character. Molly does not mirror anybody from the short story, and though being a new character, who appears to be of no significance, she turns out to be very important for the plot. The importance of Molly's character leads to the next chapter, which revolves around fan theories. Without Molly, some of the fan theories might not have emerged.

4.3 Fan Theories

This chapter will begin by presenting the fan theories to the short story and then move on to present the adaptation's fan theories. The theories emerged on different terms. As for the short story, the theories first emerged *after* Conan Doyle resurrected Sherlock in "The Empty House", while revealing that Sherlock faked his suicide at the end of the adaptation sparked numerous different theories about that particular event. The adaptation has been a breeding ground for several other fan theories; one of them deals with figuring out the final problem to which Moriarty keeps referring. This theory will present the adaptations' fan theories to show how it produces other paratexts as well.

4.3.1 The Short Story

Included in Leslie S. Klinger's annotated version of Conan Doyle's short story are numerous different radical theories by Holmesians, which seek to explain the inconsistencies and illogical

events of the story (Doyle & Klinger 2012:746). Klinger has categorised these into six different main theories about what took place: 1. Moriarty is imaginary; 2. Moriarty is innocent; 3. Moriarty lives; 4. Holmes is guilty; 5. Holmes killed the wrong man, and finally, 6. Faith of the fundamentalist. A presentation of some of the theories from each "category" will follow.

As regards the first theory, about Moriarty being imaginary, Benjamin S. Clarke suggests in his "The Final Problem" that Sherlock staged the entire affair to access a three-year rest-cure for his drug addiction. While Irving L. Jaffee's essay "The Final Problem", from his book *Elementary My Dear Watson*, argues that Sherlock imagined Moriarty and travelled to the falls bent on suicide. Bruce Kennedy proposes two theories. The first proposes that Sherlock made up the entire story to take a three-year vacation, while the other suggests that Watson made up the entire story, at the request of Moriarty's brother, to memorialise Moriarty, who died saving Sherlock's life. Finally, there is a more plausible theory, suggested by Frederick J. Crosson. Here Sherlock invented the story of Moriarty as a cover-up for a secret diplomatic mission he needed to undertake (Doyle & Klinger 2012:746).

As for the second theory, claiming Moriarty is innocent, Daniel Moriarty suggests in "The Peculiar Persecution of Professor Moriarty", that Moriarty is persecuted by Sherlock as revenge for forbidding Sherlock to woo Moriarty's daughter. Nicholas Meyer, providing perhaps one of the most famous of all Holmesian pastiches, imagines Moriarty as Sherlock's childhood tutor, the seducer of Sherlock's mother, upon whom Sherlock projects a fantasy of criminality. Finally, Mary Jaffee proposes that Moriarty was an innocent bystander, killed by Sherlock at the Reichenbach Falls, while Sherlock was 'coked to the gills' while smearing Moriarty's reputation to preserve himself (Doyle & Klinger 2012:747).

Next, we turn to the theory of Moriarty being alive. One of them is provided by Eustace Portugal, who makes an elaborate case that Sherlock died at the falls and Moriarty took his place. Kenneth Clark Reeler suggests that Moriarty was never in the falls but lived to confront Sherlock in "The Valley of Fear", which Reeler dates post-hiatus. Another theory, by Auberon Redfearn, concludes that Moriarty escaped death because of his black cloak, which served as a parachute until it caught on a branch and Moran was able to rescue him. Jason Rouby claims that Sherlock let Moriarty go and he subsequently achieved moral rehabilitation and, assuming the name J. Edgar Hoover, pursued a career in law enforcement in the United States. Lastly, there is the theory by C. Arnold Johnson and Robert Pasley. Johnson suggests that Moriarty was, in fact, Count Dracula and

thus survived the falls, while Pasley claims that Moriarty was the Devil incarnate and thus could not be killed (Doyle & Klinger 2012:747).

The fourth theory is a widespread one, claiming that Sherlock was guilty and that he planned it all. Walter P. Armstrong Jr. first suggested this idea. He proposes that Moriarty's note fooled neither Sherlock nor Watson and that Sherlock had anticipated a confrontation and took comfort in his knowledge of Baritsu. Armstrong Jr. is not alone with this idea. W. S. Bristowe and Gordon R. Speck express a similar one. Albert and Myrna Silverstein express a darker view in which Sherlock was unable to provide evidence of Moriarty's guilt, and so he lured Moriarty to follow him to the falls to kill him (Doyle & Klinger 2012:747).

A fifth theory proposes that Sherlock killed the wrong man. Larry Waggoner claims that it was only a relative, a cousin or brother, of Moriarty who was thrown into the cauldron. According to Marvin Grasse, Watson and Mycroft dumped Sherlock himself into the Reichenbach Falls, while Tony Medawar suggests that Watson did it alone after Moriarty failed. Page Heldenbrand concludes that Sherlock had a rendezvous at the falls with Irene Adler and that she falls into the falls, perhaps committing suicide! (Doyle & Klinger 2012:747).

Finally, the sixth theory about the faith of fundamentalists accepts that Sherlock did indeed die at the falls. Anthony Boucher suggests that Mycroft replaced Sherlock with their cousin "Sherrinford". Monsignor Ronald A. Knox suggests that the entire post-Reichenbach Canon was made up by Watson to supplement his income. This theory is perhaps one of the earliest published (Doyle & Klinger 2012:747).

As most of the stories about their adventures are frame narratives written from Watson's point of view, it is unusual for fans to second-guess Watson's words suddenly. Nevertheless, this is what happened after Conan Doyle resurrected Sherlock in "The Empty House" - a revival which took ten years to happen, leaving plenty of time for fans to speculate and doubting Watson's words. Had the same happened in the present-day, fans would immediately start to analyse, speculate and create forensic fandom filled with anticipation, which come to show in the following section. However, in 1893 fans blindly believed Watson's words, at least until Sherlock's resurrection ten years later. With the publication of "The Empty House", came the numerous theories and speculations presented above. The fan theories, or paratexts, shows that in 1893 people already enjoyed engaging in and speculate about the death of Sherlock Holmes.

In the adaptation, it was not because of fans doubting Watson, that forensic fandom occurred. Primarily since Watson's narration is gone and the audience no longer only have his point

of view. No, instead they rose due to the revelation of Sherlock still being alive. More so, as a series in the digital age, the adaptation is bound to create paratexts. It encourages fans to engage in the mysteries and not only regarding Sherlock's fake suicide but likewise other 'mysteries' as well. The following paragraph will demonstrate how fans speculate about other elements than just Sherlock's death, as it presents one of those theories before moving on to those revolving Sherlock's fake suicide.

4.3.2 The Adaptation

As stated, the first theory included in this section is to demonstrate how fans engage in the series and analyse and speculate other elements than Sherlock's faked death. Some fans noticed that Moriarty kept referring to 'the final problem' throughout the episode. Though it could be 'just' a homage to the original story's title, it appears that this explanation is not enough, which is why some fans engage in analysing what 'the final problem' could be. A fan, with the username 'tobeotnot221B', have analysed not just "The Reichenbach Fall" episode, but likewise "The Great Game" to provide a solution to identify the final problem.

According to 'tobeotnot221B', the first problem to solve is staying alive without dying of boredom. 'tobeotnot221B' points out that the 'tea party' between Sherlock and Moriarty at Baker Street in "The Reichenbach Fall" is not the first encounter where the two of them have a conversation discussing this subject. In an earlier episode, "The Great Game", Sherlock and Moriarty share several phone calls, where Moriarty uses innocent victims as his voice, and remarks about the puzzles hint at this (tobeornot221B 2012):

> LESTRADE: Why would anyone do this?
> SHERLOCK: Oh… I can't be the only person in the world that gets bored ("The Great Game" 27:48-27:55).
>
> HOSTAGE 1: This is about you and me ("The Great Game" 29:00-29:04).
>
> HOSTAGE 1: Why does anyone do anything? Because I'm bored. We were made for each other, Sherlock ("The Great Game" 33:55-34:05).

> HOSTAGE 2: You are enjoying this, aren't you? Joining the… dots.
> ("The Great Game" 41:20-41:25)

> WATSON: So why is he doing this, then? Playing this game with you. Do you think he wants to be caught?
> SHERLOCK: I think he wants to be distracted.
> WATSON: Oh… I hope you'll be very happy together ("The Great Game" 49:54-50:06).

As stated, these fragments from different conversations in "The Great Game", suggests that Moriarty only commits his crimes to not die of boredom. To Moriarty, it is a game, and he seeks a playmate to play along with him. Moreover, just like Moriarty, Sherlock gets bored, as he states after Lestrade's question as to why anyone would do what Moriarty does. The second problem to be solved, according to 'tobeornot221B', is staying number one. In "The Reichenbach Fall", on the rooftop at St Bartholomew's Hospital, Moriarty opens with the following:

> Well. Here we are at last. You and me, Sherlock. And our problem, the final problem, stayin' alive. So boring, isn't it? It's just… staying. All my life I've been searching for a distraction. You were the best distraction and now I don't even have you. Because I've beaten you. And you know what? In the end, it was easy. It was easy. Now I've got to go back to playing with the ordinary people. And it turns out you're ordinary just like all of them ("The Reichenbach Fall" 1:08:46-1:09:31).

Another point, suggested by 'tobeornot221B', is in an earlier episode, "A Scandal in Belgravia", at the pool scene. Here Moriarty is in doubt whether or not to destroy Sherlock (and Watson) or send them 'a friendly warning' to leave him and his business alone. Despite wanting to destroy Sherlock right away, Moriarty admits that he has enjoyed this "little game of ours" (tobeornot221B 2012). The whole scene is interrupted by his phone ringing (the ringtone being *Stayin' Alive* by the Bee Gees) and he postpones his decision with the words: "Sorry. Wrong day to die" ("A Scandal in Belgravia" 2:40-2:50). As stated, this theory serves the purpose of showing how something other

than Sherlock's fake suicide can create fan theories. However, the most interesting theories are those revolving around Sherlock's death.

Faking Your Death

"I've been online and looked at all the theories, and there's one clue that everyone's missed. It's something that Sherlock did that was very out of character, but which nobody has picked up on" (Rahim 2012). This statement was made by Moffat after numerous fan theories appeared online. As fans, we know that Sherlock did not die, so how was the adaptation going to make this episode intriguing when the outcome was already known? Conan Doyle made it easy to bring back Sherlock in the short stories, as there was no recovering of his body from the falls. The adaptation appears to create an equally intriguing story and the answer seem to be rather simple: Moffat and Gatiss show a dead Sherlock on the pavement, only to reveal him at the end of the episode, very much alive. So, let us have a look at the different theories sparked by this ending.

The first theory is a theory by Yevgeniy Brikman, who has a comprehensive exposition of how Sherlock tricked us all. Brikman wonders whether he used Moriarty's body or the dummy from earlier in the episode in his place, but he concludes that this is not likely to have happened. Why? According to Brikman, Sherlock could not have bent over, hauled up a body or dummy, brought it to the edge, and pushed it over, without Watson noticing anything. Though there are some quick cuts end edits during the scene, there is no reason to believe that Watson looked away at any point during their conversation (Brikman 2012).

Another point by Brikman is the fact that Moriarty is wearing noticeably different clothes from Sherlock, the coat is different, his shirt is white where Sherlock's is black and so on. More so, as Sherlock gets ready to jump off the rooftop, he looks back, and Moriarty's body is still lying in his outfit. Brikman's final point of 'evidence' that it could not have been Moriarty's body, nor a dummy is the fact that the body falling through the air is flailing its arms and legs - something neither a dead body nor a dummy would be able to do. His final verdict is that it must have been Sherlock who jumped off the rooftop. Another vital clue, according to Brikman, is Sherlock's precise wishes as to where Watson has to stand during their conversation (Brikman 2012).

With Brikman's next theory, he concludes that when Watson arrives, Sherlock is standing on the roof of the hospital, a building Brikman estimates to be 6-8 floors tall. In front of it, there is a lower building of approximately 2-3 floors. The lower building separates Watson from having a full view of Sherlock's landing place. Sherlock even requests that Watson returns to his original

standpoint. As this seems very important to Sherlock, Brikman deduces that there must have been something between the lower building and the hospital, something that Sherlock did not want Watson to see (Brikman 2012).

As Sherlock jumps, Watson runs towards him but gets knocked down by a cyclist. Brikman states that this cannot be a coincidence and claims it leads to a second hint, namely that Sherlock needs to slow down Watson until something is out of view. There is one thing that fits both of these criteria, at least according to Brikman: a truck filled with what appears to be bin bags. The truck is parked right next to the spot where Sherlock's body ends up. The first glimpse of the truck is when Watson is coming around the corner, just before being knocked out. Furthermore, the truck is driving away and out of the scene just as Watson comes to and reaches Sherlock's body. Brikman is convinced this is out of order, as he questions that the truck would just drive away casually immediately after a body came crashing down next to it. However, this only increases Brikman's theory that the truck was part of the plot. His verdict is that the bags in the truck served as cushioning to break Sherlock's fall (Brikman 2012).

Finally, Brikman points out that, before meeting Moriarty, Sherlock sought out Molly, whom Moriarty never realised was a friend of Sherlock. More so, it was Sherlock who arranged their meeting on St Bartholomew's Hospital's rooftop - not Moriarty. Another clue, which many fans noticed, was the bouncing ball Sherlock played with at the laboratory. There is a trick where, if you squeeze the ball in your armpit, it will cut off circulation to your arm, making it seem like you have no heartbeat. Brikman further points out that all the bystanders must have been in on the scam, as they could all see the truck, suggesting they are all part of either Sherlock's homeless network or government people provided by Mycroft, whose reaction to reading about Sherlock's death is likewise somewhat ambiguous, as it is not clear whether he is sad or relieved (Brikman 2012).

Another theory is in continuation of Moffat's claim that we all missed a vital clue and "It's something that Sherlock did that was very out of character", claims Chris Harvey from *The Telegraph*. According to Harvey, the clue is the moment in "The Reichenbach Fall" when the little girl screams in fear as she sees Sherlock. Harvey suggests that this indicates that Moriarty must have been using a lookalike to discredit Sherlock. For obvious reasons, Moriarty had to kill the lookalike; we cannot have any loose ends. However, this provided Sherlock with the perfect candidate to create his fake Sherlock corpse (Harvey 2014), according to Harvey at least. Harvey's theory is not that well documented or supported by findings, but it does not exclude it from being possible.

Alex Fletcher from *Digital Spy* has written an article with different suggestions as to how Sherlock might have faked his death. Like others, Fletcher questions if a dummy could have been used, or if it was the truck with the bin bags and the ball to cut of circulation in his arm just as presented by Brikman. Fletcher points out that every question only brings on a new one, and nobody is going to answer them. However, this neither can nor will it stop fans from speculating, and Fletcher's article mentions some of the most popular theories going around forums and blogs, on how Sherlock faked his death (Fletcher 2012).

The first theory presented focuses on the bike, as it is supposedly one of the most significant clues, with Watson being knocked over by a cyclist on his way to Sherlock's body. Could the cyclist have been someone we know? Did Sherlock hire all the bystanders? Moreover, did the cyclist carry some Baskerville drug in their basket, a drug that possibly made Watson more suggestible to the idea of Sherlock being dead? If all the bystanders were in on the cover-up, what were their roles? The cyclist gave Sherlock some extra time and might even have given Watson a slight concussion, but that does not alter the fact that he saw Sherlock's cold and bloodied body with his own eyes on the pavement. This theory only asks more questions than it answers, though it provides some plausible suggestions as to what could have happened (Fletcher 2012).

The second theory provided involves the truck, as already carefully explained. A suggestion many people have been clinging to after the episode. However, Fletcher questions if Sherlock did make a soft landing on the vehicle and used the extra time provided by the cyclist to mock-up himself as dead. More so, Fletcher points out that this is the most straightforward explanation, perhaps even too easy, which is why Fletcher questions if it is the right one (Fletcher 2012).

Mycroft is the subject of the third theory. This theory asks whether or not Mycroft could have been so stupid as to leak information about Sherlock to Moriarty but suggests that he might have been in on it with Sherlock all along. However, this theory also suggests that Mycroft might have felt guilty about his leak of information and ended up helping Sherlock to fake his suicide. Something that speaks in favour of this theory is the fact that Mycroft certainly has the power and resources to help his brother fake a suicide, delay John and ensure all papers covered Sherlock's death properly to keep everyone safe. More so, Fletcher suggests that Mycroft might have been relieved in the final scene (Fletcher 2012).

Last, but not least, there is Molly Hooper. Fletcher points out that Sherlock's reaching out to her was not some sexual come-on, but a genuine request for help. So, despite Sherlock being what he is, could he have persuaded Molly to help him? After all, she has access to corpses and the

medical knowledge needed. These are all grand theories until Fletcher spirals off track and suggests that it was Molly, Mycroft or even Irene Adler on the bicycle (Fletcher 2012). Brikman's theory about how Sherlock faked his death is very well documented and supported by his findings. However, his theory is shot down by Sherlock in season 3 episode 1 "The Empty Hearse", where Sherlock claims that the truck is too far away. Fletcher's different theories only leave us with more questions than answers - which leaves us at a loss with these theories.

Similar to the short story, fans had to wait two years before getting an answer. Unlike fans in 1893, present-day fans did not wait for Sherlock's revival. The answer fans longed for was "how did he do it?". During the two-year hiatus, fans analysed, as established in the above, they speculated and created numerous paratext about his suicide. The purpose of including these fan-created paratexts is to show how relevant Sherlock continues to be. More so, to show how intertwined the series is with its fans. As Mittell states, viewers are encouraged to solve high-concept puzzles, to ask "why?" (or in this case "how?"). Furthermore, they are encouraged to presume that there is an answer to be found by probing into and analyse the show (Mittell 2015:65) and likewise by Moffat's claim about a missed clue.

The fan-created paratexts chosen, are the ones Moffat and Gatiss ended up using in "The Empty Hearse" as theories proposed by fans of Sherlock within the series. Including fan theories in this thesis, serve the purpose of showing how relevant Sherlock Holmes still is, how involved fans continue to be and finally how producers encourage fans to play along and even involve them by using their paratexts in the final product.

4.3.3 Sub-conclusion

The fan theories emerged at different times, those related to the short story first appeared *after* Conan Doyle resurrected Sherlock in "The Empty House". In contrast, the theories revolving around the adaptation emerged immediately after "The Reichenbach Fall" episode ended. Furthermore, they developed from different events. The paratexts related to the short story all emerged to "explain the inconsistencies and illogical events of the story" (Doyle & Klinger 2005:746), despite Conan Doyle explaining how Sherlock survived in "The Empty House". The theories regarding the adaptation emerged because Moffat and Gatiss chose to show Sherlock alive at the end of the episode, and thus sparked fans to wonder how Sherlock faked his death.

Like Conan Doyle, Moffat and Gatiss reveal *how* Sherlock faked his death in the following episode "The Empty Hearse" - Sherlock visits Anderson and tells him how he did it. Despite this visit and revealing, it is debatable whether or not Sherlock told Anderson the truth. As some fans around the internet have questioned: Why would Sherlock ever tell Anderson how he did it? The answer is: He would not - something even Anderson himself questions. Despite both Conan Doyle and Moffat and Gatiss reveal *how* Sherlock survived, fans still question this 'truth'.

The fan theories do not strengthen, nor do they help identify which particular strategy/strategies the adaptation uses. However, they do help to show how Sherlock is still relevant today. An article from 2015 by Amy Sturgis, *The Many Resurrections of Sherlock Holmes*, list four reasons why Sherlock is always in 'fashion'. Reason 1: Because We Are the New Victorians; Reason 2: Because Max Weber Would Approve; Reason 3: Because We Grok Spok, and Reason 4: Because Holmes Is Now (Sturgis 2015). The last of Amy's four reasons states that Sherlock was a contemporary, a neighbour. Fans even mailed him letters and mourned his death as if he were a close friend (Sturgis 2015).

The fan theories related to "The Reichenbach Fall" support the fact that Sherlock can still be relevant in the 21st century. As Sturgis further claims: "This means that every time Holmes is updated—brought to today's London, or moved to New York, or turned into a medical doctor and renamed House, complete with a Wilson for a Watson—he actually is restored to what Conan Doyle meant for him to be: here with us now" (Sturgis 2015). Despite being updated, Moffat and Gatiss' Sherlock Holmes in the 21st century still face the same chaos, wrestles with the bureaucracy and witnesses the same crime. More so, he keeps questioning, and as always, he shakes off superstition, hysteria and pseudoscientific quackery. Sturgis states that Sherlock still employs "his precise methods and challenging us to do likewise" (Sturgis 2015). Sherlock is 'now' because of Moffat and Gatiss' adjustment of him to the 21st century and the fact that he still challenges fans to question.

5. Conclusion

Throughout this thesis sub-conclusions, have sought to establish the strategies used by Moffat and Gatiss. In both the sub-conclusion following the cardinal functions and the character functions, the outcome concludes that Moffat and Gatiss uses a mix of all three strategies. Though this may be

true when dividing the episode into categories as such, however, to create a more comprehensive conclusion, it is necessary to look at the episode as a whole.

As a whole, "The Reichenbach Fall" can no longer be categorised as a mix of all three strategies. Instead, the episode – and the rest of the series – is a product of the analogy strategy. The first apparent clue that this is not a transposition or a commentary but instead an analogy, is the title. The title indicates that "The Reichenbach Fall" is a new work of art, it plays on fans' memory of the original story as the Reichenbach Fall is an apparent reference to the place where Sherlock supposedly died in the original. At the same time, it clearly tells the viewer it is a new work of art. Although Moffat and Gatiss aim to stay faithful to and maintain the story, the entire plot has changed, they add more emphasis to some characters and even add new ones as well. Should it be a transposition, the end result should have been closer to *Sherlock Holmes* (1984) starring Jeremy Brett.

However, as Moffat and Gatiss include technology, which is interpreted as a commentary in the sub-conclusion, the change from the Victorian period to the age of technology is evidence of the adaptation not only being a commentary. The producers took the whole Sherlockian-universe to the 21st century, which is not just a minor alternation. That is a modernised retelling, as Moffat and Gatiss describe their adaptation, and their modernised retelling is more comparable with an analogy. As already concluded in the sub-conclusion, the ending is a new work of art and thus an analogy, which becomes evident as Moffat and Gatiss departs entirely from the original story.

Concluding why the adaptation is a success; the changes is the focal point and must be taken into account. For instance, resurrecting Sherlock Holmes in the same episode as he dies, instead of in the following episode as Conan Doyle did in his short story. This change is the most significant one, and by doing so, Moffat and Gatiss maintain the suspense in their version. Furthermore, they make fans play along and encourage them to create paratexts, which are a huge part of complex television today. Most TV shows have their own Wikipedia-like page, on websites such as Fandom.com, and *Sherlock* is no exception. It contains not only info about each episode, it provides a full background check on most characters as well, showing that *Sherlock* is indeed relevant.

The characters must be taken into account, when looking at the episode as a whole as well. Despite the added emphasis on a character like Moriarty and creation of new characters, Moffat and Gatiss stay faithful to the original story. And it works. By using the analogy strategy, Moffat and Gatiss allow fans to recollect Sherlock and Watson from the short stories, make them recognisable

and still get away with adding new characters. As a new work of art, the show can carry the addition of new characters and added emphasis on others without violating the original.

Both Molly and Kitty appear to be of minor importance at first, especially Molly, whom Sherlock has never paid much attention. However, their addition to the plot works. Molly because she turns out to play a vital part in Sherlock fake suicide and thus become a breeding ground for forensic fandom and paratexts. Kitty's character portrays both Colonel James Moriarty and the Swiss messenger from the short story, but with a 21st century twist: a journalist showing how fast the press can and will turn on someone. Both characters are unquestionably an exceptional addition to the show and this particular episode.

By using the analogy strategy, is the conclusion then that "The Reichenbach Fall" is a success? In short, yes. However, to strengthen this claim, the fan-created paratexts must be taken into account. The purpose, of including the many fan theories, is to show how a 166-year-old detective can still be relevant in the age of technology and not just a relic. With the paratexts as evidence, Sherlock still manages to captivate viewers, implying that Moffat and Gatiss' 21st century Sherlock Holmes is successful. Despite fans being familiar with the story, Moffat and Gatiss' Sherlock manages to encourage them to create paratexts. Furthermore, by succeeding in getting fans to play along, Moffat and Gatiss show that yet another adaptation of Sherlock Holmes can still be relevant even after an endless account of resurrections and proving that the analogy strategy was the right one to use.

A final conclusion is that Sherlock is a modern man, whether it is Conan Doyle depicting him in Victorian time or Moffat and Gatiss in the 21st century. Moffat and Gatiss' *Sherlock* maintain the trademarks from the original story and remain recognisable despite being a modernised retelling. The addition of new characters, reinterpretation of some and added emphasis on others can likewise be concluded as a success. While the addition of Molly and her role in Sherlock's suicide created paratexts, the added emphasis on Moriarty gave a more varied picture of his character. And finally, given the numerous fan-created paratexts (and adaptations), it appears that the 21st century not only need the consulting detective but accepts the representation of him and Watson in BBC's *Sherlock* as well and thus must the final conclusion be that fan-created paratexts is a criterion for success when updating the consulting detective from a relic to a modernised retelling.

6. Bibliography

"A Scandal in Belgravia", *Sherlock*, season 2, episode 1, BBC, 1 January 2012. *Netflix*, https://www.netflix.com/watch/70229981?trackId=200257859

Barnes, A. (2011). *Sherlock Holmes on Screen* (1st ed.). London: Titan Books.

Barry, P. (2009). *Beginning Theory* (3rd ed.). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bigelow, P. (2014). *Love and the Science of Deduction: A Holmesian Approach to Unravelling the Mysteries of Love*. Pacifica Graduate Institute.

Brikman, Y. (2012). Sherlock, The Reichenbach Fall: What Really Happened? Retrieved from https://www.ybrikman.com/writing/2012/01/30/sherlock-reichenbach-fall-what-really/

Doyle, A., & Klinger, L. (2005). *The New Annotated Sherlock Holmes, Volume 1* (pp. 713-748). New York: W.W. Norton.

Fletcher, A. (2012). *'Sherlock': How did he fake his death?* Retrieved from https://www.digitalspy.com/tv/cult/a360476/sherlock-and-the-reichenbach-fall-how-did-he-fake-his-own-death/

Ghosh, A. (2013). *From Holmes to Sherlock: Confession, Surveillance, and the Detective*. Bowling Green State University.

Harvey, C. (2014). *'Moriarty is dead... But I'm a liar' - why we just can't trust Sherlock's writer*. Retrieved from https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/tvandradio/10564717/Moriarty-is-dead...-But-Im-a-liar-why-we-just-cant-trust-Sherlocks-writer.html

Hutcheon, L. (2006). *A theory of adaptation*. New York: Routledge.

Lancho, M. (2013). *Holmes and Watson or Sherlock and John: A homoerotic reading of Conan Doyle's Characters in BBC's Sherlock.* Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Larvik, E. (2007). *Changing Narrative: Five Essays on Hollywood History* (PhD). University of Bergen.

McFarlane, B. (2004). *Novel to film*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mittell, J. (2015). *Complex TV*. New York: New York University Press.

Rahim, S. (2012). *Have Sherlock fans missed a big clue?* Retrieved from https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/tvandradio/9027070/Have-Sherlock-fans-missed-a-big-clue.html

Robinson, S. (2018). *The Other Sherlock Holmes: Postcolonialism in Victorian Holmes and 21st Century Sherlock.* Southern Illinois University Edwardsville.

Sturgis, A. (2015). *The Many Resurrections of Sherlock Holmes*. Retrieved from https://reason.com/2015/09/12/the-many-resurrections-of-sher/#comments

"The Great Game", *Sherlock*, season 1, episode 2, BBC, 8 January 2012. *Netflix*, https://www.netflix.com/watch/70174781?trackId=200257859

"The Reichenbach Fall", *Sherlock*, season 2, episode 3, BBC, 15 January 2012. *Netflix*, https://www.netflix.com/watch/70229983?trackId=200257859