

UNIVERSITY OF VAASA

Faculty of Philosophy

English Studies

Friendship between Sherlock Holmes and John Watson

Niina Korpi-Hallila

Master's Thesis
Vaasa 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	3
1 INTRODUCTION	5
1.1 Material	8
1.2 Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Crime Fiction	10
1.3 Adaptation	13
2 ELEMENTS OF FRIENDSHIP	23
2.1 Masculinity and Men's Friendships	23
2.2 Triangular Desire and Homosociality	29
2.3 Humour	35
3 THE FRIENDSHIP THROUGH A MAGNIFYING GLASS	40
3.1 Different but Similar	41
3.2 Triangles of Desire	50
3.3 Homosocial bond	52
3.4 Importance of Laughter	56
4 CONCLUSIONS	61
WORKS CITED	62

UNIVERSITY OF VAASA**Faculty of Philosophy**

Discipline:	English Studies
Author:	Niina Korpi-Hallila
Master's Thesis:	Friendship between Sherlock Holmes and John Watson
Degree:	Master of Arts
Date:	2015
Supervisor:	Tiina Mäntymäki

ABSTRACT

Sherlock Holmes ja John Watson ovat kirjallisia hahmoja, joiden ystävyys on yhtä tunnettu kuin heidän seikkailunsa. Ystävykset loi 1800-luvulla kirjailija Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, ja sen jälkeen he ovat esiintyneet useissa eri kirjoissa, sekä elokuvissa että näytelmissä. Tämä pro gradu -tutkielma selvittää Holmesin ja Watsonin ystävyyttä. Tämä tehdään vertailemalla Sir Conan Doyle'n alkuperäistä ensimmäistä Sherlock Holmes -romaania *A Study in Scarlet*, joka julkaistiin vuonna 1887, kahden eri tv-sarjan jakson kanssa. Nämä jaksot ovat nimeltään *A Study in Scarlet* (1968) ja *A Study in Pink* (2010).

Tutkielmassa lopputuloksiin käytettiin muun muassa René Girardin (1961) kehittämää teoriaa halun kolmiosta, sekä teoriaa homososiaalisuudesta, huumorista ja maskuliinisuudesta. Maskuliinisuusteoria sisältää ajatuksia esimerkiksi miesten välisen ystävyuden stereotyyppioista ja ennakkoluuloista. Huumori puolestaan on yksi ystävyuden kantavista voimista, sillä se yhdistää samanlaiset persoonat ja lieventää stressiä. Homososiaalisuus, kahden samaa sukupuolta olevan välinen suhde, tarjoaa näkökulman miesten ystävyteen. Halun kolmio on tärkeä, koska erityisesti John Watson haluaa tutkia rikoksia Sherlock Holmesin esimerkin kautta, mikä vahvistaa heidän ystävyttään.

Sherlock Holmesin ja John Watsonin ystävyys koostuu molemminpuolisesta luottamuksesta, lojaaliuudesta, hyväksynnästä ja kunnioituksesta. Miehet ovat erilaisia, mutta samalla hyvin samankaltaisia, mikä tekee heidän suhteestaan vahvan ja tasa-arvoisen. Ystävykset enemmän kuin täydentävät toisiaan: he ovat sielunsukulaisia.

KEYWORDS: Sherlock Holmes, John Watson, Friendship, Triangular Desire, Humour.

1 INTRODUCTION

Consulting detective Sherlock Holmes and Doctor John Watson are good friends whose friendship consists of different elements such as trust and humour. These two men are characters that were created by author Sir Arthur Conan Doyle in the 19th century, and since then they have been represented in, for example, numerous films and TV shows. When searching for material about Sherlock Holmes, the description “world’s greatest detective” is what one usually comes across. Respectively, John Watson is Holmes’s “loyal friend and companion”. Together these two characters form one of the most popular and well-known friendship in the history of literature.

The aim of this thesis is to study of which elements the friendship of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson is constructed by comparing an original story written by Sir Conan Doyle and two episodes of TV series that are from different time periods. The friendship of these men consists of homosociality and humour resulting in a strong and equal partnership. The original story that the two episodes are based on is called *A Study in Scarlet* (1985/1887; hereafter SISa in references), and the episodes in question are *A Study in Scarlet* (1968; hereafter SISb in references), and *A Study in Pink* (2010; hereafter SIP in references). I have chosen this material because *A Study in Scarlet* (1887) is the first story that Sir Conan Doyle wrote about the duo, and it shows how the friendship started and sets a base for the formula which the other stories use. The two TV episodes have adapted the original story differently, for example they differ in how loyally the original story has been followed.

Theories about masculinity, men’s friendships, triangular desire, homosociality, and humour form the theoretical background of the analysis of the friendship of Holmes and Watson. Since Holmes and Watson are men, the theory begins with notions of masculinity and men’s friendships. With the help of a theory by René Girard (1961) on triangular desire, I discuss the relationship of John Watson and Sherlock Holmes from the point of view of Watson. They are in a triangle of desire in which Holmes is Watson’s mediator and the crimes they solve are the desired object. With the theory on

homosociality I focus on the non-sexual aspect of the friendship, and humour is one of the traits that binds the men together.

Sherlock Holmes is, as stated above, a consulting detective. This is the title he has made for himself already in the original novel: "I'm a consulting detective, if you can understand what that is" (SISa: 24). This means that the police and other detectives can ask for help in their investigations from Holmes. Sherlock Holmes is a complicated character who uses his skill to make deductions of small clues as his strength when he solves crimes. He is somewhat eccentric and easily bored, but when he is on the right mood, anything can happen. There have been many representations of Holmes after Conan Doyle wrote the first story which featured the character. According to Coppa (2012: 210), the things that we identify with Holmes, such as the deerstalker hat and Inverness cape, originate not from the stories but from the illustrator Sidney Paget's drawings. Usually, the films and TV series about the detective are situated in the 19th century London. Holmes and Watson are dressed in top hats, they carry walking sticks, and their means of transportation in the city is hansom. Their travels often take them outside the city, but London and the flat in Baker Street are the centre of Holmes and Watson's adventures.

John Watson is the other main character in Conan Doyle's stories. The character of Watson, the sidekick narrator, has been inspired by Edgar Allan Poe's stories. Holmes's companion needed to be his opposite in parts so that he could give Holmes the impulses to use his skills but at the same time have enough in common with him in order to be his friend. This companion should have enough time in his hands to write and have the opportunity to live near Holmes. He should be active but on the other hand like to sit down to write. The narrator would also have to be extremely reliable because the readers had to trust him for the sake of the stories and game the readers were playing with Holmes. (Rzepka 2005: 122-123.) A character who would fill the criteria was created by Conan Doyle and is as widely known as Holmes.

All of the criteria for the sidekick narrator in the original Holmes-story come together in the character of Watson. Watson is a wounded war veteran and a doctor. He is therefore

trustworthy because he is patriotic and belongs to a respectful line of professionals. Doctors have to do with science and diagnostics which is a good match with Holmes who can be described as a scientific detective. Watson has some amount of bohemianism in him and his injury stops him from practising medicine right after he has returned from Afghanistan. Watson has time and opportunity to take part in Holmes's cases. (Rzepka 2005: 123-124.) The doctor is a faithful narrator who repeats things that he sees and hears as he sees and hears them.

The adventures of Sherlock Holmes and Doctor Watson have remained popular throughout the years. The numerous adaptations made of them include, for example, films such as *Sherlock Holmes* (2009) and *Sherlock Holmes: A Game of Shadows* (2011), starred by Robert Downey Jr. and Jude Law, and a TV series called *Elementary* (2012-) which is situated in the 21st century New York City and features Jonny Lee Miller as Holmes and Lucy Liu as Doctor Joan Watson. There is also a popular TV series called *Sherlock* (2010-) which is situated in the 21st century London. It is the series from which the other episode of the material has been taken. It remains to be seen what the following years have in reserve for Holmes and Watson, but if the stories keep stimulating the imaginations of readers and viewers, perhaps the list of adaptations made of them will grow longer.

The relationship of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson has been the subject of several studies. For example Lavigne (2012) writes about *Sherlock* (2010-) and the potential homoeroticism between Holmes and Watson. In the series Holmes and Watson's possible homosexuality is used to create humour but since the matter is constantly referred to, the idea does not disappear (Lavigne 2012: 13, 22). Atkinson (1998) has an opposite view on the matter of Holmes's sexuality. He writes about Holmes who is a virgin because he must stay pure in order to be a brilliant detective:

But hints of homosexual leanings, as disquieting to himself as to his author and his public, provide a less comprehensive and ultimately less satisfying explanation for Holmes's position than do the literary traditions of romantic devotion to the ideal and male virginity as a source of superhuman power (Atkinson 1998: 51).

Toadvine (2012) discusses Holmes and Watson in *Sherlock* (2010) and writes that they are so close since they are so alike, and Watson resembles Holmes in having sociopathic tendencies. This thesis does not focus on Holmes and Watson's sexual orientation but examines what constructs their friendship.

1.1 Material

The first Sherlock Holmes novel by Arthur Conan Doyle is titled *A Study in Scarlet* and it was published in 1887. The story of the original novel begins after Dr. Watson comes back home from the second Afghan war and is healing from his injuries in London. The second Anglo-Afghan war took place in 1878-1880. In the story Watson is looking for a cheaper place to live when he meets an old acquaintance, Stamford. Stamford introduces Watson to Mr. Sherlock Holmes and these two gentlemen decide to share rooms in No. 221B Baker Street. Holmes, as it turns out, is a consulting detective who solves crimes with the help of a method called the science of deduction. (SISa.)

The novel describes an investigation that Holmes carries through and that Watson witnesses and reports later in his reminiscences. One day Holmes is summoned by a police detective Gregson to help the police to solve a mysterious murder. The victim of the crime is an American man called Enoch J. Drebber who was in England with his secretary Joseph Stangerson. The scene of the crime is a deserted room of a flat in Lauriston Garden. Among the clues are a woman's wedding ring and the word 'RACHE' which has been written with blood on the wall of the room. Holmes has little difficulties in deducing that Mr. Drebber has been poisoned and that the murderer brought his victim to the house with a cab. Holmes also concludes that the word on the wall is the German word for revenge. On the next morning, after the discovery of the first victim, Mr. Stangerson is found stabbed to death. In his hotel room is a box which contains two pills, one is poisonous and the other one is harmless. These pills confirm Holmes's theory about the murder and all that remains is to arrest the murderer and to reveal his motive. (SISa.)

The original novel is divided into two parts. The first part describes how Holmes and Watson meet for the first time and how Watson makes notes about Holmes's work when he investigates the Lauriston Garden mystery. The second part features Holmes and Watson hardly at all, instead, it explains the tragedy that has led to the murders of Drebber and Stangerson. This story depicts the lives of John Ferrier, his adopted daughter Lucy, and Lucy's fiancé Jefferson Hope who all live in Utah in the city of Mormons, Salt Lake City. The last two chapters of the novel continue the story in England where Watson and Holmes hear the whole tale from the murderer Jefferson Hope. (SISa.)

One of the adaptations of the story that is studied in this thesis is *A Study in Scarlet* from the year 1968. This TV series features Peter Cushing as Sherlock Holmes and Nigel Stock as Dr. Watson. The episode begins in 19th century London where Mr. Sherlock Holmes is complaining to his friend Dr. Watson that "there are no crimes and no criminals" in the city anymore. (SISb.) This adaptation follows quite closely the plot of the original novel when it comes to the investigation of the crime. However, Holmes and Watson's first encounter and most of the events that are set in Utah are omitted from the screenplay. Watson and Holmes share a flat and Watson observes keenly how Holmes does his work.

The second adaptation which is studied is an episode called *A Study in Pink*. It is the first episode of *Sherlock* (2010-) that is a TV series by BBC. There was a great deal of doubt about the series before it was shown on TV because the expensive pilot episode was rejected by the BBC at first (The List 2010). However, the show became immensely popular after it was launched (*Mirror* 2014). According to The Internet Movie Database (2014), the show has been nominated for one Golden Globe and it has 32 wins and 47 nominations from different award ceremonies. The role of Sherlock Holmes is acted by Benedict Cumberbatch and Doctor John Watson by Martin Freeman. Hereafter in the thesis I will use the names Sherlock and John when I refer to *A Study in Pink* (2010).

In the 21st century version London John Watson is an army doctor who has just returned from Afghanistan. As in the original novel, he happens to meet an old friend and mentions to him that he is looking for a flatmate. This friend introduces him to Sherlock Holmes who has also mentioned that he is having difficulties finding someone to share a flat and the rent with. The two men move into 221 B Baker Street. John discovers that Sherlock is a consulting detective and John is also swept into solving crimes. (SIP.)

The city of London and the police force are puzzled by three deaths which seem to be serial suicides. These three people have taken poison by themselves but they have not left notes or have had any known reason to kill themselves, and nothing seems to connect them. When a fourth body is discovered Detective Inspector Lestrade has no choice but to call Sherlock Holmes. The fourth victim Jennifer Wilson is different because she has left a note. Jennifer has scratched with her fingernails the word 'RACHE' to the floor. Sherlock notes that Jennifer's suitcase has gone missing and because Jennifer's favourite colour seems to be pink, judging from her clothes and makeup, he decides that he needs to find the pink suitcase. This suitcase leads Sherlock to a serial killer. (SIP.)

The two men bond quickly in *A Study in Pink* (2010) like in the original novel. Although John's therapist writes in her notes that John still "has trust issues" (SIP 1:27), there is something about Sherlock Holmes that John is ready to trust. An example of the bond is that John refuses to spy on Sherlock and take money for it from Sherlock's brother Mycroft Holmes on the same day he moves into their flat in Baker Street (SIP 37:28). As Mycroft notes to his assistant Anthea at the very end of the episode about John: "He could be the making of my brother... or make him worse than ever" (SIP 01:26:59).

1.2 Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Crime Fiction

The creator of Sherlock Holmes, Arthur Conan Doyle, was born in Edinburgh on the 22nd of May in 1859. *A Study in Scarlet* was published in *Beeton's Christmas Annual* in 1887. This first story was not very successful, but two years after it was released, an

American magazine, *Lippincott's Monthly*, ordered a second novel. However, Sherlock Holmes became truly popular when Conan Doyle began to write short stories about the character for *The Strand Magazine*. (Smith 2009: 11-14.)

In 1902 Arthur Conan Doyle was knighted and the title Sir was attached to his name. He wrote Holmes stories until the year 1927. Three years after the last appearance of Sherlock Holmes, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle died on the 7th of July in 1930. (Smith 2009: 15-19.) Sir Conan Doyle wrote many other works besides the Holmes stories, such as *The Lost World* (1912) (sherlockholmesonline.org 2000). He is, however, mostly known for creating Sherlock Holmes. The Canon includes four Sherlock Holmes novels and 56 short stories (Smith 2009: 20).

The most important influence behind the character of Sherlock Holmes is probably Dr. Joseph Bell. According to Smith (2009: 72-73), Arthur Conan Doyle was Dr. Bell's student when he studied in Edinburgh University. Dr. Bell's list of accomplishments included that he was a professor of clinical surgery, A Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, a Justice of Peace and Queen Victoria's personal surgeon. Conan Doyle was first Dr. Bell's student in 1877 and then, two years later, his out-patient clerk at the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary. Dr. Bell looked like Sherlock Holmes: he was tall and lean, had hawkish nose and piercing eyes. Among his friends was Dr. Watson who had served in the Crimean War. But the most influential fact to Conan Doyle was the way Dr. Bell worked:

Endowed with a remarkable power to notice and deduce, Bell's show-stopping trick was to diagnose a patient and provide details of his background without being given a word of history. He was reputedly able to discern a sailor by a rolling gait, a traveller's route by the tattoos he bore, and any number of occupations from a glimpse at a subject's hands. (Smith 2009: 73.)

Anyone who is familiar with either the filmed or literary Sherlock Holmes knows that Holmes works just like Dr. Bell in the quotation above: he pays attention to the smallest details and makes deductions about them.

Crime stories have a long history. Stories of crimes have always fascinated people; early examples can be found, for instance, in the Bible. Detective fiction and the stereotype of a detective in the form we know them now were created gradually during the 10th century. As Scaggs (2005: 19) writes:

During the same period that science was first being pressed into the service of crime-solving, the first detective stories, in which the analytical and rational deductive ability of a single, isolated individual provides the solution to an apparently inexplicable crime, were being published.

Scaggs (2005: 19) continues by noting that usually the credit of writing the first detective stories is given to Edgar Allan Poe. Poe's work 'The Murders in the Rue Morgue' was published in 1841. The stories feature Monsieur C. Auguste Dupin who solves crimes with the help of his analytical genius.

From the works of Arthur Conan Doyle can be found influences of other crime fiction. Scaggs (2005: 19) writes that Wilkie Collins' novel *The Moonstone* (1868) is usually regarded as the first detective novel written in English and the treasure theme and Indian sub-plot can also be found in Conan Doyle's second Holmes novel *The Sign of Four* which was published in 1890. Also the works of Edgar Allan Poe had a great effect on Conan Doyle's writing. Poe's private detective Dupin is eccentric, reclusive and more brilliant than the police. The narrator of Dupin's story lives with him and is his friend. Dupin also meets a villain who is almost his equal. When thinking about Dupin's way of solving the mysteries the emphasis is on his ability to make deductions. In addition to Poe, Conan Doyle's novels have similarities with the works by Emile Gaboriau. One of Gaboriau's heroes is the amateur detective Tabaret who has the same kind of deductive intellect as Holmes and Dupin. In his novels Gaboriau uses split narrative "in which long sections describing events that have led to the current crisis are embedded within a framing narrative of investigation and deduction in the present" (Scaggs 2005: 20-24). Conan Doyle uses the split narrative, for instance, in his novel *A Study in Scarlet* (1887).

1.3 Adaptation

The method of this thesis is to compare the original novel to two TV films. This way it is possible to study what happens when the story is transferred from a book to a TV film and further to a newer TV film which draws its inspiration from the story as well as previous adaptations. Both TV series studied in this thesis have been adapted for the television from Sir Conan Doyle's story. However, they follow the original text differently. *A Study in Scarlet* (1968) is more loyal to the novel, whereas *A Study in Pink* (2010) chooses material from a wider range such as all the Holmes-stories. As Polasek (2012: 45) writes, almost every adaptation of Sherlock Holmes receives some negative feedback from the fans who say that the Canon of the original stories should have been observed better so that they would not contain too many errors. The critical views of those who are passionate about the original written stories have not discouraged filmmakers and other adapters from making new versions of the stories. It is important to keep in mind that in the process of adaptation the original work will inevitably go through some changes.

As stated above, the older adaptation in the material (SISb) presents a more faithful view about the original work. If you glance through the contents page of Conan Doyle's novel (SISa: 9), you will see how the novel has been divided into two parts. As described in the introduction, the first part goes through the meeting of Holmes and Watson and how they work to solve the murder that has been committed in Lauriston Garden. The second part is set in Utah, the United States of America, and it explains the background story of the murder. (SISa.) The older adaptation follows the plot of the original novel quite faithfully but all the scenes, except one, that are set in Utah have been omitted. That one scene is the opening scene of the episode and it shows how the future murderer Jefferson Hope takes a wedding ring from his dead lover's finger (SISb: 00:19).

The newer adaptation (SIP) has set out to modernize the original story and has brought the characters into the 21st century. It may be that the most important change has happened in the technology but the newest technological devices were not strange either

to the Holmes of the Victorian era. As Coppa (2012: 212) notes: “Conan Doyle’s Holmes employs Victorian technologies – he rushes for trains, sends cablegrams, and makes strategic use of mass media forms like the classified ad and the agony column”. Another noticeable change is that Sherlock and John are quite young compared to the middle-aged Holmes and Watson of the older adaptation. There are many connections between the original story and this newer adaptation such as the first time meeting of Sherlock and John, the way the murderer makes his victims choose between two pills and the fact that the murderer is a cab driver. In the end, though, *A Study in Pink* (2010) uses a wide range of adaptations and Holmes-stories as its material which makes it a great deal different from the original novel.

Adaptations are all around us, for instance if we think about the film industry in general, many film versions that are based on novels have been made over the years. However, according to Linda Hutcheon (2006: xi), we cannot understand adaptations simply by looking at novels and films. This means that there are almost endless possibilities of what can be adapted. For example, the Victorians adapted such things as poems, paintings, songs and dances back and forth between different media. In our contemporary world we have many more media such as theme parks and virtual reality experiments. However, no matter what form the adaptation takes, it is usually regarded as inferior in comparison to the original work. This kind of negative view is quite a new way of reacting to adaptations in Western culture in which the habit of sharing stories used to be common. (Hutcheon 2006: xi-xii, 4.) A contest between the original and the adaptation seems useless since both categories include many fine works. On the other hand, many of us can recognize the feeling that some cultural works are superior when compared to others.

However, adaptations are not just underdogs. As Hutcheon (2006: xiii) points out: “One lesson is that to be second is not to be secondary or inferior; likewise, to be first is not to be originary or authoritative.” Sometimes it can be so that people see, for example, a film first and only then realize that there is a novel to which the film is based. An adaptation draws its appeal from the way it repeats the familiar formula but with a twist. It offers something old and new at the same time. Adaptations are independent works

that can be valued also as individuals. (Hutcheon 2006: XIII, 4-6.) It would be pointless to argue that all adaptations are something less than the original. Adaptations change the source text but that is not for the worst since different media require different approaches.

How can adaptations be defined, then? Hutcheon (2006: 7) thinks that there is a purpose behind the fact that the word ‘adaptation’ means both the product and the process, and she continues by listing three definitions for the word the first of which is: “[S]een as a *formal entity or product*, an adaptation is an announced and extensive transposition of a particular work or works.” This kind of transposition can mean, for example, a change in the medium or genre. Secondly, adaptation is a process of creation which includes (re)interpretation and (re)creation. Words such as appropriation or salvaging can describe this process. Adaptation can be called salvaging, for instance, if an old myth is adapted in order to make it more accessible for present day audiences. The same act can be seen in other cases as appropriation which is done in such a manner that it seems like mere stealing. Thirdly, if we think of adaptations from the point of view of audiences, adaptation is a process of reception and a form of intertextuality since we remember the other works we have experienced and compare the present one with them. (Hutcheon 2006: 8.) When different persons have adapted the Holmes-stories throughout the years, they have been in contact with all these three different meanings of the term. There has been a change in the media, for example, when the written stories have been transformed into films, a loyal fan of the written stories could feel that an adaptation is merely taking its idea from Conan Doyle’s text without being faithful enough to the work, and when a new adaptation of Sherlock Holmes comes into a movie theatre we watch this film comparing its contents to all the previous information we have about the subject.

It is also interesting to wonder what kinds of narratives fascinate people and deserve to be repeated in the form of adaptations. According to Abbott (2002: 118), “[c]ulture constrains all narrative.” Audiences decide what they want to watch and what is acceptable, and what they reject disappears. For unexpected reasons some deviations from the general cultural norms may, however, become popular and get access to

“culture’s narrative pool” and then they transfer to norms. (Abbott 2002: 118.) Homosexuality, for instance, had to be in the shadows for a long time in films and on TV but in today’s Western world a homosexual character is nothing special. Because of the power of audiences, it is difficult to know if a film is going to be a success or not and that is why the film industry feels that it is best to be on the safe side as the following quote shows:

If the cost of producing plays is high, the cost of producing films can be astronomical. In fact, films represent such an enormous outlay in capital that the reliance on type characterization and only mildly adapted masterplots is commonplace in the industry. Written by teams and tested on audiences, films from the large companies fall into “high concept” molds, deploying characters, actors, and situations with proven market potential. (Abbott 2002: 119.)

In the end the power is in the hands of the audiences and consumers. Adaptations receive appreciation because they are more than just repetitions of old; they are also something new.

Making adaptations of any kind is complicated. According to Abbott, some theorists and directors such as George Bluestone and Ingmar Bergman feel that an adaptation is like “creative destruction” and, in Abbott’s words, that “[a]dapters, in other words, if they are at all good, are raiders; they don’t copy, they steal what they want and leave the rest” (Abbott 2002: 105). According to this view, a filmmaker should not try to translate faithfully a novel into film but s/he should take the things s/he wants from the original work and leave the rest. Other directors and theorists, such as André Bazin and Dudley Andrew, do not view the matter as strictly but believe that there could be more connections between, for instance, novels and films meaning that these two forms of media should not be separated completely. Sometimes it seems that those who have made the film have not even intended that the film would follow the original work to the letter and sometimes the filmmakers would seem to want to do so but they do not succeed in it and that is why one should be careful by which criteria he/she wants to judge the films before doing so. (Abbott 2002: 105-106.) Adaptations tend to raise all kinds of emotions especially if the original work is well known like the adventures of

Sherlock Holmes and John Watson. The more one knows about adaptations the more it is possible to enjoy different works and how they have been put together.

The first aspects under consideration are duration and pace. People read differently; for example, they can read a novel for a long time, and if they do not have the energy, they can stop reading and put the book away. This is not possible with a play or a film if you are watching them in a theatre, and that is why plays and films are usually not longer than two hours. The main reasons for this are that productions are expensive and that there are limits to how long people can sit down on their seats. When watching a film in a theatre means quite often an unbreakable experience and that has an influence on the pacing as well. A filmmaker must, for example, see to that everyone can follow the storyline, and that it is understood during that showing, whereas a novel can include additional material such as more information about the past of the characters. All this results in that a film shows its constituent events better than a novel and that is because films need to be kept in certain lengths. (Abbott 2002: 107-109.)

Usually the duration of an episode of a TV series is shorter than that of a film. Quite often a TV episode might be 30 minutes or 60 minutes long. The older adaptation *A Study in Scarlet* (1968) runs about 48 minutes and its duration is that of a traditional TV episode. The newer adaptation is longer. According to Steve Tribe (2014: 33), it was originally intended that a 60-minute episode called *A Study in Pink* from the year 2009 would be the first one of six episodes. This episode is now the pilot episode of *Sherlock* (2010-) and it has never been broadcast on TV. BBC commissioned a series of three 90-minute episodes of the show in question and that is how it was made in the end. *Sherlock* (2010-) became a series of films for television. As one of the creators, writers and executive producers of the series, Steven Moffat, says “the new format allowed the strong central characters and their developing relationship to co-exist with the cases they were working to solve” (Tribe 2014: 33). The relationship between Sherlock Holmes and John Watson is as important to the stories as are the crimes they are investigating because it is the chemistry of the two men that keeps the stories alive. With the help of the longer format there is enough time to concentrate on their beginning friendship and not just following clues.

Pacing is also important technique in making adaptations. New technology has an influence on the pacing of *A Study in Pink* (2010) as the following example shows: Paul McGuigan who is the director of the episode noticed from the scripts that “a lot of the dramatic moments were said to a phone screen or a computer – which is *not* dramatic – [...]” (Tribe 2014: 100). In order to avoid shots of different phone screens with text on them, the team decided to put the texts onscreen and frame them and made them move within the environment (Tribe 2014: 100-101). For instance, when John sits alone in his apartment after meeting Sherlock for the first time he reads the text message which Sherlock sent from John’s phone. The viewer sees John’s bed in the picture and the wall behind it. The shot has been filmed so that John is on the right bottom corner and a wallpaper fills most of the picture. When John takes the phone out from his pocket and begins to use it the texts he sees appear on the wallpaper next to him. First he opens ‘messages’, then chooses ‘sent messages’ and finally the message “If brother has green ladder arrest brother. SH” becomes visible. (SIP: 10:53.) Thus the text is framed by the wallpaper and it appears only when the viewer sees that John is using his mobile phone. All this makes the story more understandable for the viewers because you do not have to try to make out what is written on a small electric screen and still you can follow what is happening between the characters.

The next aspect that is studied is the character. When we read a novel and think about its characters we all imagine different things:

But it is clear that in some way we draw upon pre-existing *types* that we have absorbed from our culture and out of which, guided by the narrative, we mentally synthesize, if not the character, something that stands for the character. What we synthesize is to a greater or lesser extent unique, yet as a rule sufficiently flexible to accommodate new information. (Abbott 2002: 109.)

Abbott (2002: 110) continues by writing that when we actually see the character in flesh on a stage or a screen “much of this flexible indeterminacy is foreclosed”, and to an extent, that character becomes fixed for us “both visually and aurally.”

For the audience of the Holmes-stories, no matter what the format is in which they have explored them, Holmes can have different appearances and different traits that either make him appealing or unpleasant. In the original story Watson describes Holmes's appearance as follows:

In height he was rather over six feet, and so excessively lean that he seemed to be considerably taller. His eyes were sharp and piercing, save during those intervals of torpor to which I have alluded; and his thin, hawk-like nose gave his whole expression an air of alertness and decision. His chin, too, had the prominence and squareness which mark the man of determination. His hands were invariably blotted with ink and stained with chemicals, yet he was possessed of extraordinary delicacy of touch, as I frequently had occasion to observe when I watched him manipulating his fragile philosophical instruments. (SISa: 20.)

There have been many actors who have played the part of Sherlock Holmes over the years in films, on stage, on radio, and on TV and there have also been many images made of him. This means that there is, for instance, a wide range of male actors and their representations of the character from which to choose the Holmes that fascinates you and is the best fit for the role in your mind. But because the original stories were written, there are countless of possibilities of what Holmes may look like in the minds of the readers.

It is not just Sherlock Holmes's appearance but also his manners, habits and methods that form in the minds of the readers and viewers. When Doctor Watson first moves in with Holmes in the original story he finds Holmes somewhat odd, or rather, mysterious and decides to find out what exactly his new roommate does for a living. Watson starts to make observations about Holmes:

Nothing could exceed his energy when the working fit was upon him; but now and again a reaction would seize him, and for days on end he would lie upon the sofa in the sitting-room, hardly uttering a word or moving a muscle from morning to night. On these occasions I have noticed such a dreamy, vacant expression in his eyes, that I might have suspected him of

being addicted to the use of some narcotic, had not the temperance and cleanliness of his whole life forbidden such a notion. (SISa: 20.)

The pre-existing types that were mentioned above can, for example, tell us that Holmes is a white, middle class, English gentleman who behaves strangely as people sometimes do. Nevertheless, everyone who has experienced a Holmes-story in one form or another can form in their minds an image of him. Sherlock Holmes could have the appearance and manners like the actor Jeremy Brett or he could be presented by a pipe.

Just as Sherlock Holmes, John Watson's character could be represented by almost anything. Because Watson is the narrator of the story, there are not many descriptions of him in the novel besides the comment Stamford makes at the beginning: "You are as thin as a lath and as brown as a nut" (SISa: 16), and the one Holmes gives when he explains how he knew that Watson had been in Afghanistan:

'Here is a gentleman of a medical type, but with the air of a military man. Clearly an army doctor, then. He has just come from the tropics, for his face is dark, and that is not the natural tint of his skin, for his wrists are fair. He has undergone hardship and sickness, as his haggard face says clearly. His left arm has been injured. He holds it in a stiff and unnatural manner. Where in the tropics could an English army doctor have seen much hardship and got his arm wounded? Clearly in Afghanistan.' (SISa: 24.)

Watson is in the older adaptations portrayed as a gentleman with moustache as he is also in *A Study in Scarlet* (1968). In *A Study in Pink* (2010) Sherlock is tall and thin with hypnotic eyes and John more plain looking.

There is also the problem of figurative language. In a novel, for instance, what happens inside the character, is usually expressed in metaphorical language. It is very difficult to do the same in a film without using dialogue, soliloquy or a voice-over. On the other hand, a film can make a powerful juxtaposition between metaphors and the image. For example, when Romeo compares Juliet's beauty to that of the sun the audience might see before their eyes an ordinary looking girl, and that can show us something about the power of love. (Abbott 2002: 111-113.) All the adventures of Sherlock Holmes and

John Watson can be seen from the point of view of translating figurative language into action. In the original story Holmes says to Watson: “Why shouldn’t we use a little art jargon. There’s the scarlet thread of murder running through the colourless skein of life, and our duty is to unravel it, and isolate it, and expose every inch of it” (SISa: 36). The stories and adaptations bring to life this metaphor of a study in scarlet. The detective and his sidekick investigate crimes and try to shed light on the matters so that the truth can be revealed.

Gaps are also part of the process of adaptation. There can be a great gap in the events of a novel between two chapters. The protagonist can be in a middle of a dangerous situation but the next chapter begins when he wakes up in the morning in his own bed. According to Abbott (2002: 114), prose narrative is full of gaps. The readers have to use their imagination all the time to fill them. In the art of cinema performance is not dependent on clock time but it can be as fluid as the prose narrative. This is possible through montage. Montage means that by using many different pieces of film that are of different lengths, a filmmaker can make a continuous narrative such as a car chase. The car chase does not have to be a half an hour long as in real time but a few moments can tell what is happening. With the help of montage it is also possible to create other kinds of scenes: if the film is about a war, in the middle of a battle the film can cut to images of children playing and by doing this convey a different kind of meaning. (Abbott 2002: 114-115.)

Both adaptations studied in the present thesis use the cinematic tools of gaps and montage to tell the story. An example of gaps is taken from the older adaptation and of montage from the newer adaptation. In the older adaptation Holmes and Watson are first at the crime scene in Lauriston Garden and after Holmes tells about his deductions to the police detectives he and Watson leave by descending the stairs (SISb: 15:17). The next scene shows the two men in a hansom discussing the case (SISb: 16:16) and the next how they are in the apartment of police constable Rance (SISb: 17:41). With the help of gaps it is possible to leave out all the unnecessary information such as how the men exit the house at Lauriston Garden and how they come out of the hansom. The newer adaptation includes a scene where Sherlock and John try to capture the murderer

by chasing the cab in which they assume he is travelling. Because Sherlock has the map of London in his mind they are able to run after the cab using a faster route. This scene consists of many little scenes: the camera zooms to different street signs, the men run on rooftops, John almost runs to a wrong direction etc. (SIP: 51:08.) With the help of montage all these short scenes are put together and they form one bigger scene which directs the story forward.

The last aspect is focalization. Abbott (2002: 115) writes that focalization is “in verbal and written narrative [...] the point from which (or the eyes through which) you are given the illusion of seeing the action.” He continues by stating that there could be shades of the emotions of the viewer in focalization, meaning that it does not matter through whose eyes we see the action. S/he can still leave something of his/hers in the point of view. When watching a film in a movie theatre we see the whole screen from that point where we sit, but the eye of the camera is our on-screen focalizer. This is also possible because of the invention of montage. With the help of editing we may be anywhere and everywhere almost like in a novel. The camera eye can be a cold external focalizer but, on the other hand, it can look through the eyes of the characters, and see what they see even if they are, for example, drunk. (Abbott 2002: 115-116.)

Focalization is an important element because it enables filmmakers to tell different kinds of stories and, for instance, go under the skin of the characters or let their audience watch the action from the sidelines. Through focalization the crew behind *Sherlock* (2010-) has, for example, found a way to show the audience how Sherlock thinks. An example of this is a scene where Sherlock examines Jennifer Wilson’s body and there appears texts on the screen. When Sherlock sees the word ‘RACHE’ there appears a text which says: *German* (n.) revenge, and then Sherlock shakes his head and the letters are completed into a name, Rachel. (SIP: 24:42.) For a viewer it is worthwhile to get to see how Sherlock’s mind works because it adds more excitement and wonder to the story and it decreases the distance between Sherlock and his audience. Next chapter discusses different theories with the help of which the material is analysed. These theories give tools that clarify the friendship between Sherlock Holmes and John Watson.

2 ELEMENTS OF FRIENDSHIP

In this chapter I explain the theoretical background of the thesis. The concepts linked to the friendship of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson are masculinity, men's friendships, triangular desire, homosociality and humour.

2.1 Masculinity and Men's Friendships

In the original novel and both of the adaptations studied in this thesis Sherlock Holmes and John Watson are men. Their behaviour and relationship are influenced by masculinity. According to Whitehead (2002: 15), the idea of masculinity has not always been the same. In fact, there have been many descriptions of what makes a man during centuries. Masculinity changes through history and social groups. The concepts men and masculinity are more or less born from the social conditions and/or ideologies that have influenced during different time periods. (Whitehead 2002: 16.) Haywood and Mac an Ghail (2003: 10) refer to Arthur Brittan's (1989) work and write:

For instance, Brittan argues that we can talk about these styles of male behaviours almost like fashions. In England, in the 1960s, males had different hair styles which changed during the 1970s. Similarly, males experimented with macho and androgynous forms of identity. At the present time, fatherhood is a popular masculine style.

Since the two adaptations portray different times – one is set in the Victorian age and the other one in the 21st century - the styles of masculinity are different. Still, the core of the masculinities that Sherlock Holmes and John Watson perform are essentially the same in the material. Loyalty, duty and brotherhood are very important to them.

Those adjectives that are at the centre of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson's friendship and masculinity appear also when men's friendships are discussed in general. According to Nardi (1992: 1), friendships were historically male-dominated in myths and everyday life and that bravery, loyalty, duty, and heroism were important to them. This kind of "true" friendship was meant for men whereas in our time the perfect or

ideal friendship demands qualities such as intimacy and trust in addition to being caring and nurturing. These skills are often regarded as more feminine and out of the reach of more traditional men because “friendships between men in terms of intimacy and emotional support inevitably introduce – in ways they never had done before – questions about homosexuality” (Nardi 1992: 1). Nardi (1992: 2) refers to the work of G. Herek (1987) and continues by noting that ‘heterosexual masculinity’ which includes such traits as independence, dominance, toughness, and success does not embrace femininity and homosexuality. Consequently, to be masculine means that men should not have emotionally close friendships with men because it may seem like homosexuality. Sherlock Holmes and John Watson’s friendship is in the sense of heterosexual masculinity a unique one because it develops towards a tight union of two men without sexuality.

However, as close friendships as Sherlock Holmes and John Watson’s have always existed. In ancient Greece and medieval Europe close friendships between men were about chivalry, comradeship, virtue, patriotism, and heroism. Manly love and masculinity were closely linked. (J. Richards quoted in Nardi 1992: 2.) In the late 19th century people started to stigmatize the intimate feelings of persons of the same sex because the idea of a distinction between homosexuality and heterosexuality was introduced. Because of this intimacy between men can be seen as homosexuality. (Nardi 1992: 3.) However, the 21st century has introduced a new word which concerns men’s friendships. Bromance meant initially a friendship between a homosexual man and a heterosexual man but “[i]n the United States, bromance quickly lost its homosexual complications, and has become the love and affection shared by two straight males.” (Peel, Reed & Walter 2009: 345.) The friendship that Holmes and Watson have in the 19th century is close and the other people of their time do not seem to think that it is strange. In the 21st century Sherlock and John have to encounter the smiles and assumptions about the nature of their relationship.

There are many stereotypes of masculinity and femininity. One of them is that men and relationships are a complicated mixture. According to this notion, women are much more skilful when it comes to relationships and emotions. It would seem, accordingly,

that men do not have skills such as empathy, sensitivity and maturity that are needed in order to have equal, committed relationships. This view of traditional masculinity also includes that it is designed for hunting, competing and proceeding with one's career but it does not work on the emotional side. Of course, when we think past the stereotypes, we notice that all men are not the same. (Whitehead 2002: 156, 158.) The world is full of individuals and different ways to be a man and a woman, or something else. If we think about the lack of empathy, sensitivity, and maturity in the range of emotions, that is equal to Sherlock Holmes at his worst. John Watson, however, is just the opposite at his best.

Men form two types of bonds with each other in war in all male groups. In his article Lyman (1997/1987: 179) quotes the work of J. Glenn Gray (1959) who writes about men and how during war times they share experiences of suffering and danger. In these circumstances it is possible to distinguish two kinds of male bonding, comradeship and friendship. "Comradeship is based upon an erotic of shared danger, but is based upon the loss of an individual sense of self to a group identity, while friendship is based upon an individual's intellectual and emotional affinity to another individual." Lyman (1997/1987: 180) continues by noting that the bonds of males in groups are formal or rule-governed instead of being personal or based upon emotions such as intimacy and commitment. The relationship of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson has features of comradeship since they face dangers together but it deepens quickly to friendship which is more than mere seeking something to do.

Men need friendships just the same as women do but for them it may be difficult to admit that. Seidler (1992: 17) quotes the work of Stuart Miller (1983) and writes that men consider their childhood friendships as true friendships and they cherish those memories. However, Seidler (1992: 15) also writes that men usually are brought up to be independent and self-sufficient, and that is why they learn to cope without others. Men identify themselves with their work, and the need for friends can be seen as a weakness and that would be losing the control of their lives. Men can also feel uncomfortable if they must share emotional issues with other men because relationships between men usually are competitive, and if you share a weakness with someone, it

might be used against you. It is easier to form trusting relationships with women and end up living without male friends. (Seidler 1992: 18.) Yet, according to Whitehead (2002: 158-159), friendships between men are important because they maintain masculine subjectivity and manly identity. It is important to have friends with whom you can share your life, since most people need support in the roughness of the world.

Friendships can offer support and company but, on the other hand, be difficult to maintain and deserve. Seidler (1992: 20) notes that the connection between male friends can break because of the fear of rejection and being vulnerable. Sometimes men are ready to share what they feel only in desperate or extreme situations. This fear of rejection is behind the idea that men often are on their “best behaviour” when they spend time with their male friends because they can think that their friends do not after all really know them and if they did they would definitively reject them. (Seidler 1992: 21-27.) Although it can be argued that the friendship of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson is a strong one, it is not without any problems and conflicts. One of the reasons to that is the behaviour of Sherlock Holmes which can be cold and rude. It is through this friendship that Holmes can grow and learn something about human relationships.

Men’s friendships are not always what they seem to be either for the men or for the researchers. Walker (1997/1994: 234) studies men’s friendships from the point of view that gender is “an ongoing social creation rather than a role individuals learn or a personality type they develop that causes differences in behavior.” Gender is constructed both ideologically and behaviourally. The ideological construction means that men and women both believe that something characterizes better one gender than the other, for example intimacy is often seen to describe more women than men. The behavioural construction can be seen in what activities the different genders undertake and how they do them. (Walker 1997/1994: 226.) Because intimacy is often associated with women, the friendship of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson is considered to be unmanly by many people. That the characters live together and are loyal to each other can cause gossips. Holmes and Watson are thus breaking the ideological convention but not as much the behavioural one. Mrs Hudson has to cook and clean for the men which is partly because of the class division and partly because she is a woman.

The traditional roles of men and women are not strict and unchangeable; sometimes they are followed and sometimes not. According to Walker (1997/1994: 226), in some cases ideology and behaviour are one and the same, but sometimes they are not. For instance, both men and women see friends for dinner and visit them, although this is usually seen to be more female's behaviour. There are some reasons why ideology is not challenged by men although their behaviour in reality differs from the ideology: If a man does not act according to the masculine ideal, he can be censured by his friends. Also the social class has its influence: for example when it comes to intimacy, professional men are a little more likely than working-class men to follow the norms of their gender. There are also differences in behaviour between the genders and these differences reinforce the existing stereotypes. Men construct masculinity in friendships in many different ways such as joking, talking about women and talking about sports. The notion that men talk about sports, for example, is part of the cultural ideology of gender. It is worth of noting that not all men like to talk about sports, but participate in the discussion just because it is expected of them. (Walker 1997/1994: 223-226, 232-233.) In the end, both genders have unspoken rules and it is the individual's choice how far he or she is going to follow them.

The 21st century has introduced new challenges for friendships. According to Peel et.al (2009: 346), one very important question is how new technologies are shaping friendships. It is possible, for example, to send emails, keep a blog and send texts. With the help of these new means it may be easier, for instance for younger men, to find new friends and maintain their friendships. Also people who are shy or feel themselves awkward with others can gain more courage to approach possible friends through these new technologies. One significant challenge that has an effect on friendships is that it is possible to meet many new people in real life and in the virtual world but these encounters happen across a narrower social range. You may have countless possibilities to meet people because you may travel, you share elements of a globalized culture and you can speak English. At the same time, for instance, schools, mass workplaces and marketplaces can become smaller or be changed so that they maintain social divisions. "[I]t's harder to make friends with a range of others, or to make the kinds of accidental

friendships that can be very important in self-discovery, when you're sitting in business class." (Peel et.al 2009: 346-348.) Although the 21st century offers new possibilities, it also constrains us. While we meet new people we can simultaneously limit ourselves to certain groups or places.

In the end it does not matter that a large part of the world is open to you since you may still end up without any friends. As Peel et.al (2009: 348) note, if you do not have enough money to buy a mobile phone or an Internet connection, what happens to your social life? On the other hand, if you have friends, is there intimacy in your relationship if you only sent text messages? Society may come to the point at which people choose to care more about certain few friends and less about the good of the whole, and this in turn may lead to a situation in which nobody cares for those who do not have friends. It is an interesting notion, though, that the most popular books for the younger audiences of early 21st century, for example the Harry Potter-novels of author J.K. Rowling, include intense, real friendships. (See Peel et.al 2009: 346-349.) When thinking about the 21st century Sherlock, he could end up without friends despite the fact that he is skilful when it comes to using new technology, since he lacks the knowledge how to behave with other people. It is important that Sherlock meets John, and their friendship becomes one of the examples of friendships which are strong and intimate no matter what the time or the place is.

In the end friendships are needed and they do matter to people. A friend who, for example, understands the environment you are living in or the work you do can be immensely important. Sometimes a friend of the same gender can have a valuable insight in your life:

I think that men who cannot or have not established deep friendships with other men – men who have no main man or say that their best friends are their wives or their women – are men without strong psychological support, without another worldly male view, without a truly empathetic understanding of the social and political forces at work in the jungle, so they are often too paranoid, prudent or alone to challenge the world (Martin Simmons 1997/1981: 270).

It does not matter how many friends one has if you have at least one reliable and this is the case when it comes to Sherlock Holmes and John Watson in the material.

2.2 Triangular Desire and Homosociality

We all desire something, whether it is a pair of new shoes or to be recognized as a writer. Desire can affect our lives by putting us as one of the apexes of a triangle. René Girard writes about this triangular desire in his book *Deceit, Desire and the Novel* (1965). Girard refers to the works of well-known European writers when he goes through the theory of the triangle. One of them is Miguel de Cervantes and his novel *Don Quixote* which was published in two volumes in 1605 and 1615. The protagonist of this novel Don Quixote regards Amadis of Gaul as the greatest of knights and the best example of true chivalry. Amadis is Don Quixote's mediator of desire which means that Don Quixote chooses what he desires via Amadis: "Chivalric existence is the *imitation* of Amadis in the same sense that the Christian's existence is the imitation of Christ." (Girard 1965: 1-2.) Imitation or mimesis plays a very important role in this theory. Girard (1965: 2) continues by writing that spontaneous desire connects subject and object and this connection "can always be portrayed by a simple straight line [...]." In simpler cases the subject, for example you, is connected with this line to the object, for example the new shoes, that you desire. But in more complex scenarios the mediator is above that straight line giving its influence to both the subject and the object. The image that portrays these relationships is a triangle. The object can change but the mediator is constant. (Girard 1965: 2.)

There are several examples in literature of triangular desire. Girard (1965: 3-4) writes that also Sancho Panza, Don Quixote's squire, has, in addition to simpler desires, more ambitious dreams. Sancho would like to be a governor of some island and to give the title of Duchess to his daughter. He has received the spark for these desires from Don Quixote who is the mediator of Sancho's triangle. Another example is the character Emma Bovary from Gustave Flaubert's novel *Madame Bovary* (1857). Emma Bovary desires through the heroines of the romantic books she has read. Also in the novels of

Stendhal, imitation has its own part. (Girard 1965: 5.) If applied to the world of Sherlock Holmes, triangular desire can be found in, for instance, John Watson. The interest towards crimes is awoken in Watson by the friendship with Sherlock Holmes. Holmes is Watson's mediator and the crimes that change from case to case are the object. Watson as the subject desires the investigations and his mediator has an influence on him as well as on the objects because Holmes also investigates the crimes and is Watson's friend.

Triangular desire is not always the same, and that is why it can be divided into two categories. Within these categories there are countless of possibilities what the triangles may include. The categories in question are external mediation and internal mediation. The distance between the mediator and the subject is what determines the category into which different triangles belong. The distance between, for example, Don Quixote and Amadis is great because they can never meet each other. Emma Bovary, on the other hand, receives information about her heroes via books, tales, and the press but she will never be able to leave for Paris. In the novels of Stendhal the distance between the heroes and their mediators is very short. For instance, Stendhal's character Julien Sorel in the novel *The Red and the Black* (1830) manages to become the lover of Mathilde de la Mole whom he desires. External mediation resembles that of Don Quixote and Amadis. Their "spheres of possibilities" will never meet, meaning that it is not possible for them, for example, to actually speak with each other. Internal mediation, like between Julien and Mathilde, means that their spheres can penetrate each other and they can meet and share the same desires. (Girard 1965: 8-9.),

The problem in the heart of internal mediation is that the mediator and the subject desire the same object, or at least they could desire. This makes them rivals. The lack of rivalry separates external mediation from internal mediation. Don Quixote, for instance, can honour Amadis without a care because Amadis cannot do what Don Quixote can such as kill giants. In internal mediation it can happen that the subject only desires the object because the mediator desires it or because s/he thinks that the mediator desires it. Inevitably the mediator becomes both a model and an obstacle for the subject and this could lead towards the feeling of hatred. The subject of external mediation is open about

his admiration of the mediator whereas the subject of internal mediation tries to hide it. (Girard 1965: 7-10.) One can notice in the friendship of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson evidences of rivalry. They work with same investigations and try to solve the crimes. For them solving the mystery is a valued prize.

When the distance between the mediator and the subject becomes smaller, their relationship develops towards a more difficult one. Girard (1965) has also studied the works of Marcel Proust and Fyodor Dostoyevsky and how triangular desire is evident in their works. As Girard (1965: 23) writes, “[t]he hero’s imagination is the mother of the illusion but the child must still have a father: the mediator.” This means that the subject’s imagination creates the desire towards the object but the mediator has an equal part in the process of creation. According to Girard (1965: 26), how close the mediator and the subject end up to each other also dictates that their so called spheres of possibilities near each other. This means that the lives of the mediator and the subject can collide, for instance, they can be part of the same social networks. This leads toward a situation in which the two rivals set impossible obstacles to hinder each other and that is why the closer the mediator and the subject, the more painful the experiences of these persons. The characters of Proust, for example, encounter more negative challenges than those of Stendhal. Dostoyevsky takes internal mediation to its other end. As Girard (1965: 43) notes: “This distance is smallest in familial mediation of father to son, brother to brother, husband to wife, or mother to son, as in Dostoyevsky and many contemporary novelists.” Because the relationship of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson develops into a really close one, almost like brothers, there is always the possibility that they will begin to hate each other.

There is a difference between passion and desire. According to Girard (1965: 19-21), in the works of Stendhal passion and vanity are opposites. The vain person desires through others, whereas the passionate person finds the necessary strength within himself. True desire requires a mediator. As Girard (1965: 18) puts it: “From the mediator, a veritable artificial sun, descends a mysterious ray which makes the object shine with a false brilliance.” Triangular desire explains human relationships by showing us how the minds of people work. Many of our passions are spontaneous and need only a subject

and an object but that does not exclude the mediated desire from our lives. Another concept that concerns relationships and friendships is homosociality, and that is the issue I will discuss next.

‘Homosocial’ refers to social bonds that persons of the same sex have with each other. This word reminds us of the word ‘homosexual’ but differs from it when it comes to meaning. There is a continuum between male homosociality and male homosexuality. A similar continuum between female homosociality and female homosexuality is not so dichotomous for women and the idea that women who love women and women who promote the interests of other women are closely linked is not extraordinary. (Kosofsky Sedgwick 1985: 1-3.) Kosofsky Sedgwick (1985: 21) draws on René Girard (1965) and notes that Girard writes about erotic triangles that take place mostly between two males and a female. According to Girard, these kinds of triangles are symmetrical but if we take into account the different continuums of female and male homosocial desire, the triangles become asymmetrical. This happens also because females and males have different amounts and different kinds of power in our society. (Kosofsky Sedgwick 1985: 21-23.) Females and males cannot have symmetry in a triangle because their positions are so different, for example some people can have many more problems in accepting the relationship between two males than two females.

There are many kinds of homosocial bonds. In order to illustrate the functions of male homosocial desire in one of its forms, Kosofsky Sedgwick (1985: 49) uses as an example William Wycherley’s play *The Country Wife* which was written in 1675. For the aristocratic characters in the play, cuckoldry is very important and “[i]ts central position means that the play emphasizes heterosexual love chiefly as a strategy of homosocial desire.” (Kosofsky Sedgwick 1985: 49.) The men characters of the play want to achieve mastery over other men through cuckoldry which is a hierarchical activity. This means that the relationship of cuckoldry includes two participants or subjects of whom the “active” one is dominant and the other “passive”; the passive one does not even realize that he is being fooled. To cuckold is an act which needs a woman in the middle of it to be, for instance, used as an exchangeable object. When the woman is used as a part of the triangle the men can have relationships with each other without the fear of anyone

thinking that they are feminine. What is worth noticing is that “[t]he homosociality of this world seems embodied fully in its heterosexuality; and its shape is not that of brotherhood, but of extreme, compulsory, and intensely volatile mastery and subordination.” (Kosofsky Sedgwick 1985: 50-51, 66.) Cuckoldry is not present in the relationship of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson as a competition over a woman but rather that place can be seen taken by the crime mystery. There is a need to be better in crime solving than the other one which can lead to the point where the other is ridiculed.

Because homosociality means bonding in same-sex groups the concept is strongly linked to homophobia which means fear of homosexuality. The pressure towards an individual from the direction of other people and society can lead to a difficult inner conflict. Kosofsky Sedgwick (1985: 97) analyses James Hogg’s work *Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (1824) from the point of view of the homosocial spectrum and homophobia. As mentioned above, homosociality can be seen as a triangle which includes two men and a woman. In the example of Wycherley’s play *The Country Wife* (1675) men use women as instruments for male homosocial desire because it is assumed to be the norm and ultimately because of the fear of homophobia. The men cannot be mistaken for homosexuals if they are competing over a woman. (Kosofsky Sedgwick 1985: 51, 82.)

In Hogg’s (1824) work the main character is young Robert Wringhim who does not appreciate women at all but who does not get along with men either. He, for example, acts passive-aggressively towards his brother and lets himself to be feminized so that he can get close to his brother who is from a higher class and more powerful. At the same time when Robert is apparently persecuting his brother George he is fighting an inner battle with a man called Gil-Martin. (Kosofsky Sedgwick 1985: 100-103.) This battle is about homophobia:

As he pushes blindly, with the absurdly and pathetically few resources he has, toward the male homosocial mastery that alone and delusively seem to promise him a social standing, the psychologized homophobic struggle inside him seems to hollow out an internal space that too exactly matches the world around him (Kosofsky Sedgwick 1985: 114).

Sherlock Holmes and John Watson become great friends but they are mistaken for lovers all the time in *A Study in Pink* (2010). In *A Study in Scarlet* (1968) this possibility is not mentioned at all. In both adaptations they have a homosocial relationship that can be further analysed by using the theory of triangular desire. Homophobia is hiding in the minds of the people who doubt the possibility of such a good friendship. In the end Holmes and Watson themselves know what they feel although their relationship may seem mysterious for others.

In the TV series *Sherlock* (2010-) the potential romance between Sherlock and John is seen as a joke and it is laughed at again and again. It is not surprising that the series covers the matter of romantic relationship because the idea has existed for a long time, as examples can be taken a novel by Larry Townsend from 1971, *The Sexual Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*, and many slash fiction stories that are found for instance on the Internet. Slash fiction stories are written by fans of the characters and in them the characters have same-sex relationships. In *Sherlock* (2010-) references to their potential homosexuality is meant to be fun because in the series John is presented as heterosexual and Sherlock as asexual. However, the series can be read from a queer point of view. (Lavigne 2012: 13-17.) Holmes himself, for example, does not take a definitive position when it comes to his own sexuality, as Lavigne (2012: 18) notes “[...] he is assuredly queer, in the most generic, non-heteronormative sense of the word, and he could be gay, straight, bisexual, asexual, or pansexual. He does not commit himself in any way.” Lavigne (2012: 21-22) continues by noting that *Sherlock* (2010-) is in many cases quite conservative when it comes to sexuality, for instance it uses gay men openly as a source of humour, but in the end the series makes a queer reading possible and does not forget it.

As noted above, the relationship of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson has intrigued people for a long time and continues to be an open question. This is clearest when the TV series *Sherlock* (2010-) is considered. However, a question whether the main couple’s homosocial relationship is platonic or not is nothing unusual. According to Lavigne (2012: 16), Sherlock and John’s relationship which seems homosocial on the

surface and which is open for homosexual tension situates them into a category reserved for “buddy cop” pairings. These pairings are common in Western popular culture and the category includes Riggs and Murtaugh of *Lethal Weapon*, McGarrett and Dann-o of *Hawaii Five-O* and Crockett and Tubbs of *Miami Vice* among others. These buddies have many similarities:

The buddy cop pattern occurs in narratives that center on a closely bonded platonic relationship between two men who share professional and domestic intimacy, who form two halves of one powerhouse whole, but whose frequent looks and physical proximity must constantly struggle against their own romantic implications (Richard Sparks quoted in Lavigne 2012: 17).

In other words Sherlock and John form a duo which functions poorly without the other. They share a home and work closely together with the same criminal cases. All this creates thoughts in the heads of other people whether the relationship is strictly platonic or not.

2.3 Humour

One of the bricks that builds the foundation of Holmes and Watson’s friendship is humour. It strengthens their relationship by helping them to bond with each other, and it eases the stress that hard investigations cause. There is humour in the original novel (SISa) as well as in the older adaptation (SISb) but the most humorous is *A Study in Pink* (2010). In the original novel Holmes’s sometimes eccentric behaviour is one source of humour, for example when Watson and Stamford meet Holmes in the laboratory of St Bartholomew’s Hospital he is in a very good mood because he has just invented a test with a help of which blood stains can be distinguished from other stains (SISa: 18). Holmes’s striking enthusiasm is very different from Watson’s calm behaviour. However, Watson is not alarmed by this, but is willing to share a flat with Holmes. In the older adaptation already the first scene that features Holmes and Watson is amusing. In it Watson is criticising an article that turns out to be written by Holmes (SISb: 07:25). As said, in *A Study in Pink* (2010) humour plays a significant role. It is a part of the fast paced style of the series and one of its distinctive features.

It is clearest to begin to explain the theories of humour that are discussed in this thesis by defining the term humour and how it is used. According to Weitz (2009: 2), “[h]umour’ is a social transaction between at least two people – and, by extension, between a performer or writer and audience – through which one party intends to evoke amusement or laughter”. Raskin (1985: 2) writes that humour is a similar universal human trait with language, morality and logic and like them, it is partly natural and partly acquired. The humour act, “an individual occurrence of a funny stimulus” has some distinct characteristics: the humour act takes place between a speaker and a hearer, the life experience and psychology of the individual(s) in question determine his or their inclination(s) to humour, the situational context and society in which the humour act take place are also important since shared social values etc. are important for the humour act to work (Raskin 1985: 3-5). Humour, then, requires the minimum of two participants and favourable circumstances in order to work in the best possible manner. Sherlock Holmes and John Watson, for example, are similar enough to understand each other’s jokes and humour.

Humour has many functions in relationships and in society. According to Ojanen (2014: 152), humour has many benefits. The world of medicine has acknowledged for a long time the power of laughter as part of well-being. Humour is also used as a tool with the help of which it is possible to resist authorities and oppressors. In this way and in relationships humour is a way of releasing or restraining anger and aggressive feelings in a safe environment. This holds true also in demanding and hard circumstances such as during wars and among challenging professions such as doctors, police and firefighters because humour defuses tensions. (Ojanen 2014: 152-153.) All these aspects are evident in the friendship of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson. Their work with criminals and crime cases is exciting and stimulating but at times difficult if, for example, time is of the essence or the police are not co-operating. Though most of all, humour and the tolerance are needed when the duo builds their relationship.

Especially relationships and humour go hand in hand. As Ojanen (2014: 152) notes, it is more demanding to create humour between persons that are strange to each other

because one needs to know what that other person's strengths and weaknesses are in order to realise what kind of humour is suitable. This means that one should genuinely care about the other person's feelings in order to achieve the intended reactions. With the help of jokes one can also avoid being vain and making oneself more important than others. Humour often reveals what kind of person someone is, for instance, if you are able to laugh gently at yourself it means that you understand your own faults and at the same time you can understand the faults of someone else. On the other hand, the other side of humour is aggression. This includes teasing and mentally oppressing other people, seen for example in the way in which people like to laugh at the failures of others. (Ojanen 2014: 153-154.) Humour can be used to strengthen bonds or to break them. It matters if friends share a similar sense of humour, since it is empowering when you laugh together at something.

Some films and books among others are full of humour. Ojanen (2014: 154) lists four aspects that are central in humour: First on the list is the formula that makes us laugh. An odd combination or a conflict is usually the basis of jokes because they deviate from what is normal or usual. Secondly, humour is used to defy authorities in order to diminish their status and to show that you are above them. The third aspect has to do with social circumstances. Humour can be used to save an awkward conversation or to get out of a difficult situation. It also is a way out of frustration and offers catharsis. The fourth and final aspect is playfulness which includes repetition and whimsy. As this list reveals humour can be used in many situations and for different purposes. It can be about criticizing and mocking or building bridges and making allies.

Humour is a very ambiguous issue. Those who have a great sense of humour are usually more sociable and popular than others. This tells about social intellect and a person who understands the subtleties of human interaction. On the other hand, humour is not able to fix everything, for example, a depressed person does not have the energy for humour. (Ojanen 2014: 160.) Humour and laughter can either heal or destroy. Bullying that can occur in schools or workplaces is based on laughing at the expense of the victim and leaving him/her outside of the fun others are having. Alternatively, if you manage to find someone with whom you can share some laughs, it may save your day.

The concept called ‘framing’ is useful when writing about humour. Weitz (2009: 3) explains the work of sociologist Erving Goffman (1974) and what framing means there. Framing is the way in which we organize our experiences and with the help of which we know how to act right in the situation at hand. You act differently, for example, with your teacher in the classroom than if you happen to meet him/her in a grocery shop. Thus, framing has a significant influence to how we interact in the social world, and it also tells us how we make sense of different texts such as plays. (Weitz 2009: 3.) It is important when, for instance, you know how you should behave on a party or with strange people. Life is full of these rules, but sometimes a break is needed and that break can be fun. Weitz (2009: 3-4) writes that “[i]n Goffman’s system, what we think of as ‘real’ or original experience is mediated by two kinds of ‘primary frameworks’, classified as physical or social.” A job interview, for example, is an important event because the result could give us an income and a better place in society. In this kind of situation we take the world seriously or we are functioning on a serious mode. Sometimes, though, we do not act according to the serious mode but we take a break from it. When this happens, we follow ‘a secondary framework’, and we do not behave as in the so called real-world. This could mean that we tell a joke and laugh after it. (Weitz 2009: 4.) This is also important when considering the sense of humour Sherlock Holmes and John Watson share between them. Sherlock Holmes knows, for instance, how gentlemen should behave but he is sometimes distracted from that, but for John Watson this is not a problem because he knows his friend.

Humour and jokes are one part of the construction of male groups. Lyman (1997/1987: 177) discusses a case study on an inappropriate joke that college fraternity students played on the sorority of the same college. After the situation the women wanted to have a discussion with the men about the joke, and at this event the men defended their actions by saying that jokes are meant to be play and that the jokes they do are important when creating a special male bond. The first argument makes more sense to the men because they are used to do sports and games that are rule-governed aggression, and for them to say that the jokes are play also means that aggressive behaviour is play. The second argument tells about the social function of sexist jokes among the men.

These jokes are meant to prevent individual men from having intimate emotional relationships with women and thus leaving the group. From these arguments the conclusion can be drawn that male group friendship is mostly about defending the group against vulnerability. (Lyman 1997/1987: 177-178.) All this has a meaning in the world of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson: For Holmes solving mysteries is mostly a game in which he is good at. The crimes take place in an aggressive world and Holmes and Watson know how to handle aggression. With the help of humour they become a team that is protected and maintained partly by having their own jokes and experiences.

Jokes are important for the function of groups. According to Lyman (1997/1987: 179), [j]okes can create group solidarity only if they allow dangerous things to be said; allow a physical catharsis of tension through laughter; or create the solidarity of an “in group” through shared aggression against an “out group.” A group does not have to be very large, two people can be enough. Jokes do create solidarity between Sherlock Holmes and John Watson. They can laugh at each other and they form an in group of their own against, for example, the out group of the police. In the original novel (SISa) and in the older adaptation (SISb) Holmes and Watson can laugh at Lestrade and Gregson, the incompetent detectives of Scotland Yard. In *A Study in Pink* (2010) Detective Inspector Greg Lestrade is almost a friend with Sherlock but Crime scene investigator Anderson and Sergeant Sally Donovan cause amusement and laughter. In difficult situations Holmes and Watson can think that they are “us” against “them”. An example of this is the drugs bust that the police does in the flat of Sherlock and John. Lestrade is trying to bully Sherlock in order to get him to help with the investigation, but Sherlock and John know that they already are a step further than the police (SIP: 56:12).

The similar sense of humour which helps Sherlock Holmes and John Watson to bond and to relax after dangerous situations is an important part of their friendship. Humour smoothens the edges of their relationship when they are angry or otherwise upset with the world or with each other. It also strengthens their friendship when they team against crimes.

3 THE FRIENDSHIP THROUGH A MAGNIFYING GLASS

The friendship between Holmes and Watson begins quickly. In the original novel they move in together the day after they have met (SISa: 19-20). It takes some weeks before Watson learns the profession of his new roommate but right after the discovery he finds himself at a crime scene. The older adaptation does not show how the men meet but jumps to the point where Watson criticizes the magazine article that Holmes has written (SISb: 07:40). Everything happens even faster in the newer adaptation as Mycroft Holmes summarizes to John: “Mmm, and since yesterday you’ve moved in with him and now you’re solving crimes together. Might we expect a happy announcement by the end of the week?” (SIP: 36:37). In the two versions that show the first meeting of the characters it is money troubles that are behind the quick decision to move under the same roof. Both men are looking for a flatmate to share the rent with that they can afford to live in London, and after they are introduced they move into 221B Baker Street.

In all works included in the material the friendship starts to build up steadily when Watson hears how Holmes makes his deductions. Instead of mocking and doubting Watson is very interested and fascinated about the method after Holmes has demonstrated it. Because Watson understands that Holmes has special abilities a trust starts to form between the men and this trust is in turn the basis of their friendship. In the newer adaptation the trust is finally sealed after the climax scene of the episode in which Sherlock measures his intelligence with the serial killer Jeff Hope by playing the killer’s game of two identical pills. Whoever deduces which one of the pills is not lethal will survive after they have swallowed the pills. John who has followed Sherlock and Jeff Hope to an empty school sees this from the next building and shoots Jeff Hope before he and Sherlock manages to end the game. (SIP: 1:09:24). Holmes shows Watson a new world of adventures and Watson offers to Holmes his whole-hearted support and admiration. The mutual trust is the strongest brick in the foundations of their friendship.

3.1 Different but Similar

In the beginning of their friendship Holmes is to Watson an intriguing mystery himself. Although Holmes may seem like a man who has an answer to everything and that his deduction skills know no limits there are areas that are unknown to him. Dr Watson writes a list about Holmes' limits in *A Study in Scarlet* (1887) when they had not known each other for that long:

Sherlock Holmes – his limits

1. Knowledge of Literature. – Nil.
2. “ “ Philosophy. – Nil.
3. “ “ Astronomy. – Nil.
4. “ “ Politics. – Feeble.
5. “ “ Botany. – Variable.
Well up in belladonna, opium, and poisons generally. Knows nothing of practical gardening.
6. Knowledge of Geology. – Practical, but limited.
Tells at a glance different soils from each other. After walks has shown me splashes upon his trousers, and told me by their colour and consistence in what part of London he had received them.
7. Knowledge of Chemistry. – Profound.
8. “ “ Anatomy. – Accurate, but unsystematic.
9. “ “ Sensational Literature. – Immense.
He appears to know every detail of every horror perpetrated in the century.
10. Plays the violin well.
11. Is an expert singlestick player, boxer, and swordsman.
12. Has a good practical knowledge of British law. (SISa: 21-22.)

Holmes is like a superhero for those who first encounter him and may witness his skills of deduction. He also is as remarkable person for Watson but when Watson learns to know Holmes better he discovers the limitations that lower Holmes closer to people without Holmes's skills, and that is what makes their friendship possible, because Holmes is not just an ideal; he is a friend with whom one can argue and disagree but who you can respect.

Some of Sherlock Holmes's qualities such as the habits of being impolite and impatient do him little credit. In the next example from the adaptation of the 21st century London

Sherlock shows his arrogant side: When he has realized how he can trace the murderer with the help of Jennifer Wilson's phone and more importantly, what the password to Jennifer's email account is, he expects that everyone else has arrived to the same conclusion. Because they have not he says: "Oh. Look at you lot. You're all so vacant. Is it nice not being me? It must be so relaxing." (SIP: 01:00:12). This arrogance compensates with other qualities which make the character easier to approach. Martin A. Kayman (2006: 49) writes about Holmes that appears in the original stories: "[a]lthough an intellectual, he [Holmes] has no cultural pretensions, and is always eager for action. He remains intimidating, frequently brusque, arrogant and aloof, but he is never morally repulsive." In spite of his blunt manners he is also a reassuring figure. That is evident from the fact that he is concerned about what happens to his clients and worries especially about the outcome in family matters. Holmes has emotions underneath after all. (Kayman 2006: 49.) Those sides of Holmes that compensate his less admirable qualities are the ones Watson can turn to in his mind if the behaviour of his companion is too much to take in.

The most important role of Watson in the original work as well as the adaptations is to be the link between the readers and viewers and Holmes. In the novel Watson is the narrator and in the adaptations he works as the focalizer. According to Kayman (2006: 49), if Holmes proved to be too eccentric, Watson is the one who is the cushion between us. "But for the reader it is of course a blessing to have the rigour of logic and the demands of science filtered through the informed admiration of our friendly intermediary." (Kayman 2006:49.) Watson is therefore very important character for the success of the stories since he understands and forgives Holmes but, on the other hand, challenges and criticizes him. This is needed because otherwise the character of Holmes might prove to be cold in a sense that he would focus too much on science. From the point of view of the audience that follows the stories it is important that Holmes explains to Watson what he is doing and how he has deduced everything.

Sherlock Holmes and John Watson are depicted so that Watson is the more ordinary part of the duo. One of Watson's qualities is that he brings out the best in Holmes. Holmes himself says in the novel *The Hound of the Baskervilles* (Conan Doyle

1985/1902: 669): "It may be that you are not yourself luminous, but you are a conductor of light. Some people without possessing genius have a remarkable power of stimulating it." Thomson (1995: 29) references to Holmes's statement and writes:

As a personality, Watson may indeed not glitter quite as brightly as Holmes, but nevertheless there is a warm, steady glow about him which was to illuminate their friendship as much as Holmes' more pyrotechnic brilliance. Without it, it is doubtful if their relationship would have survived intact for all those years.

A character such as Holmes who says things bluntly, has energetic moments, and deduces things quickly can be frustrating for other people that he encounters but Watson manages to keep his feet on the ground. Despite the darker sides of Holmes's character Watson is willing to be his friend. In the end neither of the characters are perfect and that is why they can understand each other's frustrating qualities. It is not just that Watson brings out the best in Holmes but Watson himself is able to shine because of Holmes. Watson has many fine qualities: he is honest, reliable and patient, and these traits are emphasized when Holmes is behaving arrogantly and impatiently.

One of the matters that determine the friendship is that the two characters have their differences but they are at the same time similar. Both Sherlock Holmes and John Watson are drawn to excitement and adventures. From the material can be seen that after Watson discovers Holmes's profession he is eager to assist Holmes in his work. The background of Watson as an army doctor has taken him into different kinds of battlefields and he has seen violence and death before. Although he mentions in the original novel that "I object to rows because my nerves are shaken [...]" (SISa: 19), Watson is not afraid of violence even though Stamford tells him that Holmes has beaten "the subjects in the dissecting-rooms with a stick [...]" (SISa: 17). Watson still has his old service revolver which he can take out when needed (SISb: 24:08) and, as Mycroft Holmes notes after studying John's steady left hand in a threatening situation, "You're not haunted by the war, Dr Watson... You miss it" (SIP: 38:45). Holmes, in his turn, has chosen to apply his skills and intelligence to crime solving and deals with dangerous individuals and situations.

The similarity of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson is also evident because they are both fascinated about crimes and adventures, in fact they seem to be addicted to them. There is a conversation in the newer adaptation between Sherlock and John when Sherlock is leaving for the crime scene of Jennifer Wilson:

Sherlock: You're a doctor. Actually, you're an Army doctor.
 John: Yes.
 Sherlock: Any good?
 John: Very good.
 Sherlock: Seen a lot of injuries, then. Violent deaths.
 John: Well, yes.
 Sherlock: Bit of trouble too, I bet?
 John: Of course. Yes. Enough for a lifetime, far too much.
 Sherlock: Want to see some more?
 John: Oh, God, yes.
 (SIP: 16:09.)

This exchange marks for the beginning of Sherlock and John's mutual understanding of what they have in common. It is the excitement and sharing that feeling that draws them together.

John Watson is an equally important part of the duo as Sherlock Holmes. According to Toadvine (2012: 48), the character of John Watson has been a puzzling one throughout its history. The classic portrayal of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson in films and on TV is that Holmes is very intelligent and Watson less bright than the detective. This image is mostly caused by a series of films from the 1940s in which the part of Watson was played by actor Nigel Bruce. In newer adaptations such as in *Sherlock* (2010-) John Watson has undergone changes and is now more similar to the character of Sherlock Holmes and they share some personality traits. (Toadvine 2012: 49.) The companionship of Holmes and Watson has been and still is an example of a duo formed by a detective and his/her sidekick. These partnerships are usually based on the idea that the detective is the one who does the meaningful thinking and the sidekick the one who asks questions and is amazed about the final outcome. This basic concept has not

changed entirely while the genre of crime fiction has developed but nevertheless sidekick such as John Watson have received more possibilities.

In the original novel (SISa) John Watson represents an average middle-class man in many ways. As Toadvine (2012: 52) writes, the original character of Watson is far from being a buffoon. A proof of his middle-class status is his title, Doctor, which is used more often than his first name. The professional title tells that Watson is a well-educated and capable person. In addition he is a military veteran who can use this background in difficult situations to help Holmes. Watson is also interested in science and progress which in turn helps him to appreciate Holmes's expertise. Watson is not a genius but possesses an average intellect and he is the moral authority of the duo. All of these qualities make him a good representative of an average Victorian middle-class man and societal norm. Watson is not a medical specialist but a general practitioner of medicine whereas Holmes is outside the usual categories of professional and a crime specialist instead of being a regular detective. (Toadvine 2012: 52, 54.) All in all Doctor Watson is a good man who has gone through many hardships and he can give value to friendship and home. Although he represents the average it does not mean that he is somehow less capable instead he is the ideal person of his time.

John in the 21st century adaptation *Sherlock* (2010-) has same kind features as the original Watson but he has also changed. Toadvine (2012: 55-56) notes that although John has the same professional background as, for instance, the Watson of the original stories, he is very ordinary, almost "blend-into-the-woodwork average." John returns home from the war in Afghanistan and he needs to start practicing medicine again in calmer circumstances but he has difficulties finding a new job. Thus John is struggling with financial and emotional problems that are familiar for many because of the difficult economic situation in the 21st century and the unstable circumstances in many countries. John has more social skills than Sherlock, and he is the one who makes remarks of Sherlock's morality, for example if Sherlock is enjoying the crimes too much. The character of John benefits from the work of the actor who plays the part:

Martin Freeman's quiet delivery makes John seem almost monotone when compared to the varying degrees of emotion exhibited by Benedict Cumberbatch's Sherlock. The juxtaposition of this monotone with John's moments of frustration, which is the only time he seems to become louder and more animated, allows the audience to see his attempt to keep his emotions in check. John's calmness could either be seen as self-discipline or the loss of emotional range as a result of trauma. (Toadvine 2012: 55.)

The idea that John could have lost part of his ability to feel is interesting and is closely linked to the idea that Sherlock and John have some things very much in common.

Sherlock Holmes is usually depicted as an eccentric man and his very mental health is sometimes questioned. In *A Study in Pink* (2010) when the police do not move forward in their investigations concerning the suicide murders Inspector Lestrade decides to search Sherlock and John's flat under the name of drugs bust. While they search for drugs Lestrade tells that they have found out why Jennifer Wilson scratched the name Rachel on the floor but the Crime scene investigator Anderson has another point he wants to make about Jennifer Wilson's suitcase which Sherlock found earlier:

Anderson: Never mind that, we found the case. According to someone, the murderer has the case, and we found it in the hands of our favourite psychopath.

Sherlock: Not a psychopath, I'm a high-functioning sociopath. Do your research.

(SIP: 57:21.)

Thus Sherlock labels himself as a sociopath who has some social skills. If Sherlock of the 21st century has sociopathic tendencies, Sherlock Holmes of the Victorian age is not without instability either. According to Toadvine (2012: 50), in the 19th century persons who were antisocial were treated as mentally ill and the condition that they had was called "moral insanity". These patients were not intellectually inferior when compared with healthy persons. The Holmes of the original stories could easily be seen as suffering from this illness but since he is from higher class his behaviour is seen as a proof of his intellect. (Toadvine 2012: 51.) In the original story (SISa) Watson is an

ideal middle class man but when he is represented in *A Study in Pink* (2010) he has followed the path of Sherlock Holmes.

One personality trait that is common to both Sherlock and John of the 21st century is especially worth attention, namely that they are both sociopaths. Sociopathy or antisocial personality disorder includes lack of empathy and inability to form meaningful relationships among other symptoms (Toadvine 2012: 51). These tendencies are typical of the character of Sherlock Holmes but they have traditionally not been linked to John Watson. However, in her article Toadvine (2012) writes about new adaptations such as *Sherlock* (2010-) that have done just so and as an example of John's sociopathy in the first episode of the series (SIP) she takes a scene from the end of the episode. John shoots the cab driver and serial killer Jeff Hope in order to save Sherlock's life and afterwards Sherlock realizes who hold the gun:

Sherlock: Are you all right?
 John: Yes, of course I'm all right.
 Sherlock: Well, you have just killed a man.
 John: Yes, I... That's true, isn't it? But he wasn't a very nice man.
 Sherlock: No. No, he wasn't, really, was he?
 John: Frankly, a bloody awful cabbie.
 Sherlock: (Laughs). That's true, he was a bad cabbie.
 (SIP: 1:23:19.)

According to Toadvine (2012: 60), a clear sign of John's sociopathy is the lack of remorse he feels after killing Jeff Hope. Another example of John and Sherlock's similar personality is that they both need excitement or stimulus consistently, Sherlock is easily bored and John was lost in a world without danger before he met Sherlock. (Toadvine 2012: 60.) The similarity between Sherlock Holmes and John Watson during their adventures is important because it is a good base for their friendship.

The characters of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson have received new qualities in the recent adaptations but their friendship is still the core of the stories. According to Toadvine (2012: 63), John Watson in the original stories represents the ideal average Victorian middle-class man and in the same way John of the recent adaptations

represents the early 21st century middle-class norm of capable sociopaths who can survive in society. The relationship between Sherlock Holmes and John Watson is so tense because, rather than being too different, they are too much alike. (Toadvine 2012: 59.) Nardi (1992: 1-2) writes about the ideal friendship that is popular today but he also mentions the term heterosexual masculinity. The ideal friendship includes such traits as trust and caring but, on the other hand, these traits are considered feminine in heterosexual masculinity. Although Sherlock Holmes is independent, tough and career centred that does not mean that he lacks the need to talk to someone and take care of his close relationship. Watson is the one who worries more about the well-being of others and good manners but he can be as moody and dangerous as Holmes. Holmes and Watson have such a goof friendship because they do not care too much about what other people say about them. These characters can find a similar soulmate from each other but they also have enough differences to complement each other.

There have been during decades many different representations of the original *A Study in Scarlet* (SISa) and they have followed the spirit of the work differently. This is also the case with the material of this thesis. The older adaptation of the material (SISb) is situated in the Victorian era and it depicts the story very closely to the original with the exceptions that the first encounter of the main characters and the scenes in Utah have been omitted. The second adaptation has transferred the events into the 21st century and introduces new characters and elements among the world of the story. There also are other differences between the adaptations, for example, the character of Sherlock in *A Study in Pink* (2010) resembles more the original Holmes when it comes to temperament. Sherlock is more visibly bored or energetic depending on his mood whereas the Holmes of *A Study in Scarlet* (1968) is more benign. At the same time the character of John in the newer adaptation (SIP) has gone through some changes that the Watson of the older adaptation (SISb) has not. All in all these two representations are both faithful and different when compared to the original text.

As written above, Sherlock Holmes has had sociopathic personality traits from the very beginning which are both good and bad for his friendship with John Watson. These characteristics, such as lack of empathy and inability to form relationships with the

constant need of excitement are known in our time by the name antisocial personality disorder. In the original work, for instance, when Holmes receives a note from detective Gregson who asks Holmes to help with the mystery, Holmes is at first not sure if he will go but decides to overcome his laziness because “I may have a laugh at them [the detectives], if I have nothing else” (SISa: 27). In the older adaptation Holmes’s deviant behaviour is not as evident, on the contrary, he is on a good humour and polite throughout the episode (SISb) whereas in the other adaptation Sherlock is clearly different in some matters. After Lestrade has told Sherlock and John that Jennifer Wilson tried to scratch the name Rachel to the floor because that was the name of her stillborn daughter, Sherlock asks: “But that was ages ago. Why would she still be upset?” (SIP: 57:22). When the friendship is considered, the need of excitement connects Holmes and Watson. Also the inability to form relationships is for the best in the sense that Holmes does not accept just anyone to help him, but chooses those who are genuinely interested to be his friends and assistants. On the other hand, his quick temperament and lack of empathy mean that he can be very difficult to understand and tolerate at times.

In the newer adaptation of the material (SIP) Sherlock and John are even more drawn together than in the two other works because they are so similar. Since John might also be sociopath, he and Sherlock can understand the difficultness in finding a friend who does not judge the need for adventure and rough situations. As Sherlock announces he is high-functioning sociopath which enables him to work with people and take care of himself. John and Sherlock form a good partnership which brings joy and companionship for both. This is also the truth in the two other works in the material, but in them Sherlock Holmes and John Watson complement each other, whereas Sherlock and John of the newer adaptation (SIP) are soulmates.

The strength of Holmes and Watson’s relationship is precisely the fact that they are different but similar. Although as written in Seidler (1992: 18) a friendship between men can be about competition and therefore fear of trusting, Holmes and Watson choose to overcome those feelings. Holmes is, in Seidler’s (1992: 21) words on his best behaviour, in a sense that he is polite to Watson when they first meet. He also tells, in

the original novel, what his habits are and asks what Watson's faults are before they buy the flat because "[i]t's just as well for two fellows to know the worst of one another before they begin to live together" (SISa: 19). As written above, the characters bond quickly after this first encounter and start to trust each other. They have the potential to become lonely without this friendship, since Sherlock Holmes is an arrogant eccentric and John Watson a war veteran who is looking for a new place in the world. These two men meet at the right time in their lives and are such a good match that it enables them to forget possible fears and become friends.

3.2 Triangles of Desire

In Girard's (1965) theory of triangular desire people have simple desires that require only the subject and the object. When the desire changes into a more complex one, the mediator emerges and the triangle of desire is complete. Desire plays an important role in relationships. The first things that may come to mind are romantic relationships but triangular desire can have its part in friendships and family ties too, as Girard (1965: 43) notes, for instance with the example from Dostoyevsky's work. Sherlock Holmes and John Watson develop a tight friendship between them and, as mentioned above, one of the reasons behind the strong union is that Holmes is Watson's mediator of desire, and that means that Watson chooses what he desires through Holmes. Holmes is the one who decides which cases are interesting enough, and then the two act based on his decision and desire.

If we think of the theory by Girard (1965) and a triangle of desire with its three apexes, a mediator, in this case Sherlock Holmes, is on the top. Underneath the mediator are situated a subject, John Watson, and an object, the mystery. In the original novel (SISa), Watson does not know what Holmes does for a living when he decides to share the flat with him. Watson is, however, intrigued about the matter and even more so when Holmes reveals that he is a consulting detective. The older adaptation (SISb: 09:03) begins with the scene in which Watson discovers Holmes's methods and is given a demonstration how his companion works. In the newer adaptation (SIP) John is puzzled by Sherlock when they first meet but does not hesitate when Sherlock asks him to join

the investigation. The fact that John does not hesitate is common to all these three portrayals of John Watson in the material that is studied. First he is curious, and then he decides to find out more, and finally he is drawn into the world of solving mysteries. Sherlock Holmes is his idol whom he imitates in crime solving. He is the mediator who influences Watson since he is the detective whose example Watson follows. Holmes also influences the mysteries because he is the one who chooses what is worth investigating and he usually finally solves the crimes.

The distance between Sherlock Holmes and John Watson is physically very short. They live under the same roof in all of the three examples. In Girard's (1965) terms, their spheres of possibilities penetrate each other and that is why one can call their relationship 'internal mediation'. However, John Watson does not hide his admiration towards Sherlock Holmes and his methods, which is typical to 'external mediation'. John Watson knows that Sherlock Holmes is not a perfect man in everyday life, but when Holmes solves crimes he is almost infallible. An example from the original novel shows both sides of Holmes when Holmes and Watson are discussing the case:

“[...] I'm not going to tell you much more of the case, Doctor. You know a conjurer gets no credit when once he has explained his trick; and if I show you too much of my method of working, you will come to the conclusion that I am a very ordinary individual after all.” “I shall never do that,” I answered; “you have brought detection as near an exact science as it ever will be brought in this world.” My companion flushed up with pleasure at my words, and the earnest way in which I uttered them. I had already observed that he was as sensitive to flattery on the score of his art as any girl could be of her beauty. (SISa: 33-34.)

Watson has put Holmes on a pedestal when detective work is concerned but otherwise he discovers that Holmes is also an ordinary man with faults.

In all the three works studied in this thesis the relationship of Holmes and Watson is somewhere between external and internal mediation. Nonetheless, it leans more towards internal mediation because the two men are so close and the objects they pursue are the same, and that is why there is inevitably some rivalry between them. Watson is fascinated about crime solving and tries to ponder the puzzles himself but Holmes

manages to have the upper hand in deductions. However, it must be noted that in the original *A Study in Scarlet* (SISa) as well as in the two adaptations of the material Watson is still getting to know Holmes and his methods, and that is why he does not yet challenge him as much as in the later stories. Watson is inspired by Holmes's work, and after admiring it and learning about it he tries to use the methods himself. On the one hand Holmes is beyond Watson because he has made an art of his work but, on the other hand, Watson discovers that Holmes can make mistakes. In *A Study in Pink* (2010: 56:22) John finds out that Sherlock is a recovering drug addict.

In the case of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson it is hard to place their friendship either in the category of external or internal mediation but, as mentioned above, the friendship seems to be more based on internal mediation. It must be noted that although these two characters are rivals up to a certain point it seems unlikely that they would start to hate each other. In fact their friendship develops towards mutual respect and love because in all the three versions they both crave for the thrill of a chase. Though Sherlock Holmes is John Watson's mediator of desire and they desire what Holmes desires Watson has passions and simpler desires of his own. In the newest adaptation John tries to become friendly with Mycroft Holmes's assistant Anthea although that has nothing to do with the crime he and Holmes are investigating (SIP: 34:43). The theory of triangular desire portrays well one very important side of the friendship in question. Because it does not fit neatly in the categories, that is merely a proof of the complexity of relationships.

3.3 Homosocial bond

Sherlock Holmes and John Watson have a homosocial bond throughout the material. There are no straightforward evidence of anything else but according to Polasek (2012: 52-53), the possible homoerotic relationship between Sherlock and John is one of the most popular themes in fan fiction around *Sherlock* (2010-). The living arrangement of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson does not cause amusement in the original novel (SISa) or in the older adaptation (SISb). In the newer version the new flatmates are treated with humour when Sherlock and John's landlady Mrs. Hudson assumes that they

are a couple (SIP: 13:30). In the end they are two characters who become friends in the middle of an adventure story and they have a strong homosocial bond.

Whether Sherlock Holmes and John Watson are mere friends or not depends on how one wishes to interpret the material. As noted above, the older works in the material do not mention anything specific about the nature of Holmes and Watson's relationship. The newer adaptation (SIP), however, tries to make a point on behalf of the homosocial friendship. Sherlock and John are eating in a small restaurant and they are yet again mistaken for lovers, when John starts a conversation about the fact that people do not have arch-enemies in real life:

Sherlock: What do real people have, then, in their "real lives"?
 John: Friends? People they know, people they like, people they don't like... Girlfriends, boyfriends...
 Sherlock: Yes, well, as I was saying, dull.
 John: You don't have a girlfriend, then?
 Sherlock: Girlfriend? No, not really my area.
 John: Mm. Oh, right. Do you have a boyfriend? Which is fine, by the way.
 Sherlock: I know it is fine.
 John: So, you've got a boyfriend, then.
 Sherlock: No.
 John: Right. OK. You're unattached, like me. Fine. Good.
 Sherlock: John, um... I think you should know that I consider myself married to my work and while I'm flattered I'm not really looking for any...
 John: No, I'm not asking, no. I'm just saying it's all fine.
 Sherlock: Good. Thank you.
 (SIP: 49:31.)

This conversation tells a great deal about the characters and their thoughts. John is willing to accept Sherlock as he is and Sherlock cares about his new acquaintance enough to answer politely to his prying. After this talk they know where they are standing and can continue to deepen their friendship. As other "buddy cops", that Lavigne (2012: 16) mentions, they will form a tight union in which they are so close that they know already from the facial expressions of the other one what he means.

The act of cuckoldry, which is one type of homosocial desire and which Kosofsky Sedgwick (1985) mentions in her work, is not evident in the friendship of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson in its typical form which would require a woman as part of the triangle. Their relationship also avoids the cuckoldry in the sense that there is not any desire to subordinate the other with ridicule. This creates solid base for their friendship. However, their competitive attitude towards crime solving is bound to cause some friction between the men. The following example from the newer adaptation is an excerpt of a discussion which the characters have after Sherlock has found Jennifer Wilson's suitcase:

John: Pink. You got all that because you realised that the case would be pink?
 Sherlock: It had to be pink, obviously.
 John: Why didn't I think of that (?)
 Sherlock: Because you're an idiot. No, no, don't look like that. Practically everyone is.
 (SIP: 45:13.)

The mystery solving makes it possible for these characters spend time together and build their homosocial bond without disturbance. This way the crimes function like the act of cuckoldry meaning that they can spend all day together if necessary without anyone else wondering what they are doing.

The adventures of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson are not completely without the presence of women. Mrs Hudson and Watson's wife, for example, make an appearance in some of the original works, and in later versions they are given more space from time to time. It is interesting to note that Holmes and Watson are not interested in the same women, and while Watson has his wife, the most important woman for Sherlock Holmes is Irene Adler. A book by Michael Atkinson from the year 1998 concentrates in one of its chapters on the first Holmes short story *A Scandal in Bohemia* (1891). In this story Holmes and Watson encounter a woman named Irene Adler to whom Holmes after the adventure always refers to as 'the Woman'. During the story Irene Adler manages to fool Holmes and survives as winner out of the situation, which shows that she is a rare woman and worthy of the attention of Holmes.

Irene Adler is notable also when the friendship of Holmes and Watson is concerned. According to Atkinson (1998: 40, 47-49), romances can be found in many detective stories and that one of the conventions of this genre is present in this Holmes-story, namely “preserving one’s virginity under siege”. The virginity in question is that of Holmes, he is supposedly a biological virgin and in the end a symbolical virgin because he manages to preserve his integrity in spite of the threat imposed by his client the king of Bohemia. Holmes must hold on to his chastity because it enables his powers as a detective but that does not stop him from having a spiritual marriage with Irene Adler who remains as an ideal in his mind. Virginity has special place in the romance tradition and it also has an influence on the character of Holmes: “Like Galahad and the other Grail knights, he [Holmes] draws his power (specifically his power to *see*) from his purity. Holmes is grounded firmly in the long tradition that sees male chastity as a source of heightened abilities” (Atkinson 1998: 49). One could also think that Holmes may safely carry on his friendship with Watson if Holmes is ‘married’ with Irene Adler because this way Holmes’s heterosexuality is proven and is not a question mark anymore. If he is spiritually married in his mind and he is otherwise unmarried merely because he must keep himself pure then the case is closed and the friendship with Watson may continue without fear of homosexuality.

There is not a definitive answer to the question about the ‘real’ nature of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson’s relationship. In the original stories and later adaptations at least one thing becomes evident: Holmes and Watson are great friends. The age of social media and the Internet along with computers have changed the possibilities to write, for example fan fiction to others and for own pleasure. There will be numerous more speculations and ideas about the relationship between these characters and the homosexual element is unlikely to disappear. In the end it does not matter whether Holmes and Watson are romantically involved or not. Their friendship consist of many different components and the homosocial bond is one of them.

3.4 Importance of Laughter

Humour and friendships go hand in hand since it is difficult to think of a pair of friends who do not understand each other's sense of humour or laugh together. According to Weitz (2009: 2), a humour act requires at least two participants: whether it is a book and its reader or a person with a friend, it is the intent towards laughter that counts. Sherlock Holmes and John Watson form, applying the terms used by Raskin (1985: 2-5), a pair of speaker and hearer that works well together because they both enjoy criminal puzzles and solving mysteries and are not afraid of the dangers they may encounter along the way. As Ojanen (2014: 152-154) mentions, humour is one of the elements that belong to relationships for different reasons and it has different functions: It makes people bond with each other and helps them handle their negative feelings among other things. Humour is also very entertaining to witness and that is why many novels and films use it as a way to keep the audience interested.

Despite the fact that Holmes and Watson work with crimes and therefore serious matters that have a deep impact on people's lives, the investigations are also about fun and games. Especially for Holmes, as mentioned above when Lyman's (1997/1987) article was discussed, the cases he solves are a form of play. This is evident already in the beginning of the original novel when Holmes prides himself of finding a new way of identifying blood stains: "His eyes fairly glittered as he spoke, and he put his hand over his heart and bowed as if to some applauding crowd conjured up by his imagination" (SISa). In the older adaptation Holmes complains about the laziness and lack of imagination among the criminals: "For a criminal expert, London has become a singularly uninteresting city" (SISb: 08:35). The other adaptation takes matters a step further, after hearing that there has been yet another suicide Sherlock jumps in the air laughing and cries: "Brilliant! Yes! Four serial suicides and now a note. Oh, it's Christmas!" (SIP: 15:14). Although Watson is the voice of morality of the duo, he cannot resist a good mystery either and for him Holmes is a mystery. After meeting Holmes in the novel he speaks to Stamford about Holmes: "Oh! a mystery is it?" I cried, rubbing my hands. "This is very piquant. [...]" (SISa: 19). This kind of enthusiasm is a solid base for humour which can be accidental or deliberate depending on the situation.

Sherlock Holmes and John Watson form a tight group of two which functions as a shelter and basecamp against others. As written above, in the older material Holmes and Watson work alongside with Gregson and Lestrade who are two detectives from Scotland Yard. They are very much the humour element in the works since Holmes is more capable than them but, as Holmes predicts (SISa: 27), they receive all the credit after the case has been solved. At least that would be the case if Holmes had not met Watson who promises to make the facts known to the public (SISa: 86). In *A Study in Pink* (2010) the Crime scene investigator Anderson is mostly Sherlock's favourite subject of ridicule. Although Sherlock makes fun of practically everyone he is gentler towards John. After they have texted to the murderer in order to scare him to appear, the following discussion takes place:

John:	Have you talked to the police?
Sherlock:	Four people are dead, there isn't time.
John:	So why are you talking to <i>me</i> ?
Sherlock:	Mrs Hudson took my skull.
John:	So I'm basically filling in for your skull?
Sherlock:	Relax, you're doing fine.
(SIP: 46:20.)	

Sherlock's last comment in the discussion shows that he already takes John's feelings into account, and after this exchange they leave the flat and go to wait for the murderer to arrive. The mutual loyalty and respect grows gradually when the characters learn to know each other and realize that they understand each other. They can have fun and joke about others as well as themselves but they know that together they are a team. Lyman (1997/1987: 179) mentions the concepts 'in group' and 'out group'. Sherlock Holmes and John Watson form in all three versions an in group against the out group of others.

Sherlock Holmes does not always follow the rules of everyday life, but John Watson chooses to overlook most of his friend's eccentricities. Sherlock Holmes tends to act according to the secondary framework that is part of the theory of framing by Goffman quoted in the work of Weitz (2009: 3-4). He stops being bored and starts to use the

serious mode with his work after the case proves to be interesting. Holmes loves to surprise people with his deductions and John Watson is among the stunned audience. In the original novel (SISa) Holmes and Watson are having a discussion about Holmes's methods for the first time. Watson becomes annoyed by the way Holmes talks and tries to change the subject. He glances through a window and sees a man walking on the street. He asks Holmes what the man might be looking for and Holmes answers: "You mean the retired sergeant of Marines?" After Watson learns from the man in question that this is true Watson is amazed. (SISa: 25-26). In the older adaptation Holmes looks for the murderer with the help of the wedding ring he/she has left on the crime scene. After the supposed murderer sees Holmes's announcement in a newspaper she comes to collect the ring. Holmes is amazed that the murderer seems to be a woman and Watson can in turn laugh at Holmes. (SISb: 26:20). The 21st century adaptation also introduces John who is amazed at Sherlock's abilities and eager to help him, so eager that he chases the murderer on foot through the centre of London and forgets his cane in the restaurant although he is injured and cannot otherwise walk properly without it. (SIP: 51:07). The friendship strengthens when John Watson does not only witness Sherlock Holmes's seemingly odd ways but joins them. The eccentricities are about accepting the other and thus choosing to be his friend. Holmes and Watson can both laugh at the expense of the other one and point out where he went wrong. However, when this is done gently enough it is not mocking but empowering.

Humour is present in and around the relationship of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson throughout the material. It is gentler and more restrained in the older material than in the newer adaptation that represents the fast and unrestricted style of the 21st century. For instance, in the original novel Holmes and Watson have many discussions and there is subtle humour in them such as when Watson realizes that Holmes does not know that the Earth goes around the Sun:

"But the Solar System!" I protested. "What the deuce is it to me?" he [Holmes] interrupted impatiently: "you say that we go round the sun. If we went round the moon it would not make a pennyworth of difference to me or to my work." (SISa: 21.)

In this example Holmes and Watson are gathering more information about each other and trying to learn what the limits of their humour are. After the discussion Watson does not ask what Holmes does for a living because he feels that it is not the right time to do that (SISa: 21). Although Watson is surprised, he does not laugh or mock Holmes, which shows that Watson is trying to understand his new companion. In the older adaptation of the material Holmes has just told Watson that he is waiting for the murderer to come in their flat and get the wedding ring he/she lost at the crime scene. Watson takes out his revolver and stands stiffly and tries to hide the gun behind his newspaper. Holmes rolls his eyes and says to him: “Watson just sit down and try to look as natural as possible.” (SISb: 24:56.) These examples show that both of the characters are a source of laughter by turns.

In the 21st century adaptation Sherlock and John use a great deal of humour and jokes when they build their relationship and interact with other characters. After they have run around London chasing a cab by which the murderer assumingly travelled, Sherlock and John return to 221B Baker Street and catch they breath in the hallway:

John: “That was the most ridiculous thing... I’ve ever done.”
 Sherlock: “And you invaded Afghanistan.”
 (SIP: 55:09.)

After Sherlock’s comment both men start to laugh which could be mere relief after an adrenaline rush but seems to be about something more: they know enough about each other that they can laugh freely together even to John’s traumatic past. Although Sherlock can be a bully and insulting towards characters that do not appreciate his skills, like Anderson and Sergeant Donovan, with John he is more relaxed. This is true also in the case of John since they develop a mutual respect and understanding which grows stronger when their friendship deepens.

Humour plays an important part in relationships. For Sherlock Holmes and John Watson humour offers a way to let go of frustration and anger that the crimes and doubts bring with them. The humour they use help them to bond. This in turn is a good base to build

a friendship that fights against suspicions and prejudices. In addition the use of humour is very entertaining and therefore nice to follow for the reader or viewer. The unexpected behaviour and other eccentricities of the character of Sherlock Holmes are a typical source of humour, but what is most important is that he and John Watson can find a way to be friends and laugh together.

4 CONCLUSIONS

This thesis set out to study what the elements that construct the friendship between Sherlock Holmes and John Watson are. The material consisted of the original novel by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, *A Study in Scarlet* (1887), and two adaptations of the novel: *A Study in Scarlet* (1968) and *A Study in Pink* (2010). The bricks that build the friendship were found with the help of different theories such as triangular desire and humour.

The analysis of the material showed that the core of the friendship has remained the same through different versions. The characters of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson meet by chance but they are personalities that complement each other and develop to the best of friends. The men are different to an extent, but they have also many things in common. They are both drawn to excitement and adventures and they know how to act in dangerous situations. On the other hand, neither one is perfect which enables them to identify with each other. Sherlock Holmes is, in addition, John Watson's mediator of desire and thus Watson's idol in crime solving. However, in other aspects of their lives Watson is able to recognize that Holmes is just a man. Holmes and Watson are a good match and they form a duo which functions well.

The friendship of Sherlock Holmes and John Watson has some fine features. Friendships between men are not uncommon but the mutual trust, respect, acceptance, and loyalty that Holmes and Watson share make their friendship what it is: strong and equal. There were not many differences in the friendship in the material, but the most significant result is that in *A Study in Pink* (2010), the men are not just a pair of friends that complement each other, they are soulmates.

The study of friendship between Sherlock Holmes and John Watson has covered the male friendships, but if this subject were developed, it would be worthwhile to look into the women in the lives of these friends and what kind of influence they have on the duo. That could broaden the subject greatly.

WORKS CITED

Primary sources

Conan Doyle, Arthur (1985/1887). "A Study in Scarlet." In *The Penguin Complete Sherlock Holmes*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books. 15-86.

A Study in Pink. Sherlock. Dir. Paul McGuigan. Creators Steven Moffat, Mark Gatiss. Perfs. Benedict Cumberbatch, Martin Freeman. Hartwood Films, BBC Wales. (2010).

A Study in Scarlet. Dir. Henri Safran. Perfs. Peter Cushing, Nigel Stock. BBC. (23 Sep. 1968).

Secondary sources

Abbott, H. Porter (2002). *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Atkinson, Michael (1998). *Secret Marriage of Sherlock Holmes and Other Eccentric Readings* [Web address]. University of Michigan Press. [Cited 6th October 2014]. Available at: <http://site.ebrary.com.proxy.tritonia.fi/lib/tritonia/reader.action?docID=10355560>

Conan Doyle, Arthur (1985/1902). "The Hound of the Baskervilles." In *The Penguin Complete Sherlock Holmes*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books. 667-766.

Coppa, Francesca (2012). "Sherlock as Cyborg: Bridging Mind and Body." In *Sherlock and Transmedia Fandom: Essays on the BBC Series*. Eds. Louisa Ellen Stein and Kristina Busse. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company. 210-223.

Elementary. Perfs. Jonny Lee Miller, Lucy Liu. Hill of Beans Productions. (2012-).

Girard, René (1961/1965). *Deceit, Desire & the Novel. Self and Other in Literary Structure*. (Transl. by Yvonne Freccero.) London: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Haywood, Chris & Máirtín Mac an Ghaill (2003). *Men and Masculinities*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hutcheon, Linda (2006). *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge.

- The Internet Movie Database (2014). [Web address]. [Cited 22 April 2014]. Available at: <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1475582/>
- Kayman, Martin A. (2003). "The short story from Poe to Chesterton." In *The Cambridge Companion to Crime Fiction*. Ed. Martin Priestman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 41-58.
- Kosofsky Sedgwick, Eve (1985). *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lavigne, Carlen (2012). "The Noble Bachelor and the Crooked Man: Subtext and Sexuality in the BBC's Sherlock¹." In *Sherlock Holmes for the 21st Century: Essays on New Adaptations*. Ed. Lynnette Porter. [Web address]. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company. 13-23. [Cited 29 August 2014]. Available at: <http://site.ebrary.com.proxy.tritonia.fi/lib/tritonia/docDetail.action?docID=10589662&p00=sherlock%20holmes>
- The List (2010). "BBC's 800k Sherlock Mistake." [Web address]. [Cited 22 April 2014]. Available at: <http://www.list.co.uk/article/25956-bbcs-800k-Sherlock-mistake/>
- Lyman, Peter (1997/1987). "The Fraternal Bond as a Joking Relationship: A Case Study of the Role of Sexist Jokes in Male Group Bonding." In *Men's Lives*. 4th edition. Compiled by Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner. Boston, Mass: Allyn and Bacon. 171-181.
- Mirror* (2014). [Web address]. [Cited 22 April 2014]. Available at: <http://www.mirror.co.uk/all-about/sherlock>
- Nardi, Peter M. (1992). "Seamless Souls' An Introduction to Men's Friendships." In *Men's Friendships*. Ed. Peter M. Nardi. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc. 1-14.
- Ojanen, Markku (2014). *Positiivinen psykologia*. [Psychology of Positivity.] 2nd edition. Helsinki: Edita.
- Peel, Mark, Liz Reed & James Walter (2009). "The Importance of Friends: The Most Recent Past." In *Friendship. A History*. Ed. Barbara Caine. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd. 317-356.
- Polasek, Ashley D. (2012). "Winning "The Grand Game": *Sherlock* and the Fragmentation of Fan Discourse." In *Sherlock and Transmedia Fandom: Essays on the BBC Series*. Eds. Louisa Ellen Stein and Kristina Busse. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company. 41-54.
- Raskin, Victor (1985). *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

- Rzepka, Charles J. (2005). *Detective Fiction*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Scaggs, John (2005). *Crime Fiction*. Abingdon: Routledge; New York.
- Seidler, Victor J. (1992). "Rejection, Vulnerability, and Friendship." In *Men's Friendships*. Ed. Peter M. Nardi. Newbury Park, Sage Publications, Inc. 15-34.
- Sherlock*. Creators Mark Gatiss, Steven Moffat. Perfs. Benedict Cumberbatch, Martin Freeman. Hartswood Films, BBC Wales. (2010-).
- Sherlock Holmes*. Dir. Guy Ritchie. Perfs. Robert Downey Jr., Jude Law. Warner Bros. (2009).
- Sherlock Holmes: A Game of Shadows*. Dir. Guy Ritchie. Perfs. Robert Downey Jr., Warner Bros. (2011).
- Sherlockholmesonline.org (2000). The official website of the Sir Arthur Conan Doyle Literary Estate. [Cited 14 October 2013]. Available at: <http://www.sherlockholmesonline.org/Bibliography/bibliography1.htm#pcstories>
- Simmons, Martin (1997/1981). "The Truth About Male Friendships." In *Men's Lives*. 4th edition. Compiled by Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner. Boston, Mass: Allyn and Bacon. 267-270.
- Smith, Daniel (2009). *The Sherlock Holmes Companion: An Elementary Guide*. London: Aurum Press.
- A Study in Pink* (Original version). Dir. Coky Giedroyc. Perfs. Benedict Cumberbatch, Martin Freeman. Not broadcast (DVD release: 30 August 2010). BBC. (2009).
- Thomson, June (1995). *Holmes and Watson*. London: Allison & Busby.
- Toadvine, April (2012). "The Watson Effect. Civilizing the Sociopath." In *Sherlock Holmes for the 21st Century: Essays on New Adaptations*. Ed. Lynnette Porter. [Web address] Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company. 48-64. [Cited 29.8.2014] Available at: <http://site.ebrary.com.proxy.tritonia.fi/lib/tritonia/docDetail.action?docID=10589662&p00=sherlock%20holmes>
- Tribe, Steve (2014). *Sherlock Chronicles*. London: BBC Books.
- Walker, Karen (1997/1994). "I'm Not Friends the Way She's Friends": Ideological and Behavioral Constructions of Masculinity in Men's Friendships." In *Men's Lives*. 4th edition. Compiled by Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner. Boston, Mass: Allyn and Bacon. 223-236.

Weitz, Eric (2009). *The Cambridge Introduction to Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whitehead, Stephen M. (2002). *Men and Masculinities: Key Themes and New Directions*. Malden (MA): Blackwell.