THE OSCHOLARS

Special Issue

on

ARTHUR CONAN DOYLE

FEBRUARY 2015

The Hound of the Baskervilles Revisited: Adaptation in Context

Christophe Gelly

"I prefer to do my own editing" : this is Sherlock Holmes speaking—or rather, "Sherlock," a new version of the Victorian sleuth we may feel more conversant with, in the 2012 BBC series version *Sherlock*, co-written by Steven Moffat and Mark Gatiss—and this is indeed a fit epitome of the whole agenda of the series. Sherlock may be expressing his desire to curtail Henry Knight's retelling of the childhood nightmare (related to his father's violent death) which has haunted him for years because he finds it "boring", but this is also more significantly a reminder of how *Sherlock* (the series) "edits" and "updates" the source work in a personal, very daring manner. My intention in this paper is not only to study this edit/updating more closely—as the number of studies of the acclaimed, very successful series increases regularly, a more detailed focus is needed. I wish to concentrate on a specific instance of

this adaptation that appears to me both problematic and revealing, i.e. the episode entitled *The Hounds of Baskerville*.[1] The essential assumption of the series lying in a "modernization" of the diegetic context and props—through the omnipresence of digital media such as mobile phones, laptops, and various other internet-connected appliances—the adaptation of *this* Doylian novel unfolding in a rural environment and explicitly cut out from Holmes's usual London background is bound to give rise to significant reshuffling in the adaptation, which cannot revolve so much around the presence of technology in this environment. The devices that are used in this context are then likely to be more essentially representative—beyond the gadgetry-related outfit—of the particular stance at stake in the series. I will also compare and contrast this BBC 2012 version with the Granada 1988 version directed by Brian Mills which, as another, very popular and critically-acclaimed TV version, provides a fit counterpoint to the choices implemented in the 2012 version. I will first suggest an overall assessment of the episode *The Hounds of Baskerville* within the context for the whole series, so as to evaluate the critical significance of the adaptation choices that were made in it, before giving a contrastive examination of the Granada episode. The last part of this study will concern the interpretation of the 2012 adaptation as steeped in a post-modern, mass-cultural interplay with its spectators.

Sherlock 2.0: Conan Doyle Reloaded

The first appraisal that comes to mind when viewing *The Hounds of Baskerville* is likely to stress the "fun" of it, or rather its playfulness. This refers noticeably to the obvious pleasure Sherlock is taking in investigating the case as a welcome distraction away from his routine, for instance when he addresses Henry Knight in Dewer's Hollow, at the climactic moment of the revelation of how his father died, and revels in the moment of truth-telling, while Watson tries to refrain his enthusiasm:

> — Murder weapon and scene of the crime, all at once. [Laughing] Oh, this case, Henry! Thank you, it's been brilliant.
>
> — Sherlock
>
> — What?
>
> — Timing.
>
> — Not good? [1:22:50]

This type of "fun" the character is taking in the investigation is purely intra-diegetic, and easily justified by his characterization as constantly bored and craving for excitement. But the series authors also have fun, in a different way, through their many winks at the knowledgeable viewers who may be familiar with the original text(s). Thus, in a previous episode (*A Scandal in Belgravia*, itself partly inspired from "A Scandal in Bohemia"), Sherlock scoffs at Watson for the gaudy titles he chose for his online accounts of his investigations: "The Speckled Blonde," or "The Geek Interpreter". Only an informed viewer will enjoy these playful references to both the original situation—Sherlock Holmes does indeed blame Watson for his meretricious accounts in Doyle's stories— and to the original titles ("The Speckled Band", "The Greek Interpreter"). The situation is even more involved since we may wonder whether Sherlock is actually taking offence at those titles themselves *or* at their humorous, almost disrespectful relationship to the original (as if he had been a reader of Doyle himself). Sherlock thus seems to enter the "Great Game" played for over a century now by "Holmesians" like William Baring-Gould, and which consists in taking the corpus of Doyle's stories not as fiction but as real accounts of real cases, and in pinpointing the elements in them that may vouch for their truthfulness or non-fictional, historical nature, while trying to solve anomalies in the plots. Blaming Watson for the smack of the fictional rather than truthfulness his titles convey, the BBC Sherlock points—as in the original text—to the adhesion to the genre as realistic[2] *and* to his "external" position towards the Doylian fiction itself, which he seems to view from a (reader's) distance. We shall come back on this ambiguity in the character's status.

In *The Hounds of Baskerville*, the notion of game also appears very clearly through the interplay with the original novel. We know that one of the main peculiarities of the novel—beyond the fact that it was written in 1901 after "The Final Problem" (1893) staging Holmes's death but presented as the narrative of a case that had taken place before his death, hence not to be understood as a resuming of the cycle, which will take place only in 1903 with "The Adventure of the Empty House"—is the fact that Watson is supposed to lead the investigation all by himself, because Holmes has claimed he could not go to Devon with him. This is what accounts for the novel's particular enunciation in the corpus, as it is made partly of Watson's diary entries addressed to Sherlock Holmes. This peculiar quality of the novel is reminded to the viewer in *Sherlock* when the detective initially tells Henry Knight that he cannot leave London for Dartmoor before finally exclaiming: "Twenty-year-old disappearance? A monstrous hound? I wouldn't miss this for the world!" [14:01]. This apparent inconsistency in the detective's behaviour is in fact motivated by a logic of surprise which in the TV series leads the adaptors to reverse the initial

plot lines—thus the inconsistency results from an intertextual motivation with the source text. As Jean-Pierre Naugrette notices (406), a similar device is used in the first episode in the series, *A Study in Pink*, where the word "Rache" is interpreted in a contrary way to what happens in the short story (it means "revenge" in German, a relevant clue in the short story, and not the beginning of the name "Rachel", but the reverse is true in the adaptation). This type of intertextual play is particularly developed in *The Hound of Baskerville*, maybe due to the fame of the source text. Thus it seems that the figure of the "Man on the Tor"—Sherlock Holmes himself in disguise, hidden upon the moor, unknown to Watson, in the novel—, although it is not explicitly present in the series, nevertheless recurs as a hidden reference through several shots of Sherlock standing at the top of rocky cliffs and scanning the moor, as if the series was playfully referring to what it will not include *verbatim* or literally in the adaptation, i.e. Holmes's manipulation of Watson concerning his hidden presence on the moor. But the game of references—often winks to the viewer about what is excluded from the novel into the adaptation—is maybe most visible through the resurfacing of *names* of characters that do not "make it" into the series otherwise. Thus, very humorously, when Watson is investigating the mysterious flashes of light in the night which he witnessed on the moor and unexpectedly finds a meeting place of various (probably) adulterous, illegitimate couples making love in cars parked in the countryside, we can distinctly hear among the moaning sounds: "Oh, Mr Selden, you've done it again!" The original character from the novel—the escaped convict roaming on the moor—should feel flattered…

All this is clearly a good laugh to Doylian readers, but what the series is doing in terms of "editing" or updating the Doylian source is more than playful references. From the initial episodes of the series broadcast in 2010, extensive use is made of digital "props"—among which the internet-connected mobile devices feature most prominently. The whole plot of *A Scandal in Belgravia* (2012), for instance, revolves and concludes on the last minute rescue by Holmes of Irene Adler thanks to a mobile phone ringing just when she is about to be beheaded by some terrorist cell in Karachi, Pakistan (she calls Sherlock at the last moment and he turns out to be there, posing as her executioner). But these devices, as we saw, poorly fit the venture into wilderness and into the throwbacks of history which feature in the original novel. Hence we miss the topic of atavistic degeneration that pervaded the novel through the reference to Stapleton—the guilty party—as the nemesis, the evil cousin to Sir Henry Baskerville. This topic is also very present in Watson's reflexion on the travel back through time that his stay in Devon entails.

> My previous letters and telegrams have kept you pretty well up to date as to all that has occurred in this most God-forsaken corner of the world. The longer one stays here the more does the spirit of the moor sink into one's soul, its vastness, and also its grim charm. When you are once out upon its bosom you have left all traces of modern England behind you, but, on the other hand, you are conscious everywhere of the homes and the work of the prehistoric people. On all sides of you as you walk are the houses of these forgotten folk, with their graves and the huge monoliths which are supposed to have marked their temples. As you look at their gray stone huts against the scarred hillsides you leave your own age behind you, and if you were to see a skin-clad, hairy man crawl out from the low door fitting a flint-tipped arrow on to the string of his bow, you would feel that his presence there was more natural than your own. (Chapter 8, "First Report of Dr Watson," 712)

How does the adaptation then negotiate this presence of the past in the diegesis? The originality of this episode lies partly in the way it transfers the technological updating of the corpus from (mainly) prop-related devices to issues of *mise en scène*. Thus, the omnipresence of screens in the series at large entails a "scattering" of attention that results in multiple, fragmented representations of Sherlock's mental processes. In various episodes these processes appear as readings of signs, ciphers, codes, on screens that are literally superimposed on the images we get. This does happen in *The Hounds of Baskerville* too, especially in the scene where Sherlock cracks Bob Frankland's code to get access to restricted information: we see him then as he reads the information which appears in superimposition on his face, as if we saw Sherlock from the "inside" of the computer whose screen he is reading. [1:14:36]. But the main innovation in this episode lies rather in the editing choices which are new to the series and disconnected from the technical, "geeky" side of it. For instance, the very "jerky" editing of some scenes—such as the presentation of the experiments made at the Baskerville military base [57:47], or the discovery of the hound's footprint [38:10] mimic the jump cuts through which we get access to Sherlock's deductions, e.g. in the pub when he sets out to prove to Watson that he is still very much the master of his own intellectual capacities [42:56]. More generally the episode makes the most of a type of sudden juxtaposition of opposite values in the editing. The aggression of Henry Knight by an unidentified entity at night is punctuated by alternate plunges into darkness and flashes of glaring light, for instance. This alternation *as it appears in the diegesis* duplicates and provides a fit equivalent for what happens *in the narrative*, i.e. the sudden shifts from one deduction to the other, exemplified in the other

episodes in the series by the reading of screens that swiftly shift from one piece of information to another. In other words it seems that a whole logic pertaining to the transience of meaning and intermittent signification has been integrated from the characters' discourse into the diegesis. This is also testified to by Holmes's sudden temperamental changes and inconsistent suggestions, as when he declines going to Devon before actually going there or when he—almost stupidly it seems, or at least hubristically—denies any fear of the Hound: "We take you back to the moor and see if anything attacks you" [33:55]. This sudden change in mood will be even stranger when later on Sherlock unaccountably relinquishes his own feelings of self-doubt on his next visit to Henry [50:01], during which he pretends to intend to make some coffee… before actually dropping the idea (he in fact came to Henry's place only to take some sugar which he thinks may be drugged). This series of contradictions, those sudden shifts in mood are actually a *diegetic* representation of Holmes's way of thinking—by fits and starts as it were. It transposes into the *mise en scène* the movement and instability that characterizes Holmes's thought process as it is illustrated by digital devices in the previous episodes of the series.

This instability as it appears in the series derives from the binary opposition of values which in Sherlock's universe (as in the diegesis of this episode) refers us to the digitized universe, also characterized by this type of opposition.

> More precisely, detective fiction is itself symptomatic of the modern scientific, positivist, digitized universe, all ones and zeroes and positive values. (135)

> Reality is thus "coded" in Baudrillard's terms according to what is essentially a binaristic system where everything has a value, an opposite, and a meaning. Our contemporary digital culture makes this "productive" basis for modern existence—and the "hyperreality" it engenders due to its special ability to produce copies that are themselves originals—even more pervasive. (133)[3]

My contention is that *The Hounds of Baskerville* is most successful in its transposition of an *initially* binaristic novel (pitting civilization against a throwback to wilderness and barbarity) because it fittingly *projects* Holmes's binaristic, post-modern and unemotional approach of reality onto the representation of this reality not through Sherlock's vision but through the general *mise en scene*, thereby forcing the spectator into a cooperation with (and critique of?) that approach as "naturalized" and depersonalized (i.e. detached from Sherlock Holmes's perspective). This may also be the result of the specificity of the

source novel, which as we saw more or less precluded a direct "technological" updating of the corpus and called for more "integrated" devices expressing this approach.

"I saw it, John": from panoptic vision to self-doubt

This integration of an "intermittent" vision of reality within the diegesis, through the alternation of opposite values in a binary representation (light / darkness, truth / manipulation, seriousness / parody) further testifies to the overall atmosphere of doubt that pervades the 2012 series. This is what Sherlock openly states to Watson after meeting (apparently) with the Hound:

> — Wait. What happened to me last night. Something happened to me, something I've not really experienced before.
>
> — Yes, you said. Fear. "Sherlock Holmes got scared," you said
>
> — No, no, no. It was more than that, John. It was doubt. I felt doubt. [52:11]

As such, this adaptation stands in stark contrast with the 1988 episode produced for Granada TV, which not only adheres closely to the novel's plot lines, as Elizabeth Trembley points out, but also stages a much more "stable," panoptical approach of the diegesis by Holmes. While the 2012 Sherlock scans reality in a jerky, intermittent way that fits a post-modern computerized, unemotional approach, Jeremy Brett's Sherlock Holmes in this version provides a much-controlled and balanced vision. As Terry Scarborough argues, the moor landscape is treated in this episode directed by Brian Mills very much as an allegory of the urban exploration of London,[4] and this exploration serves greatly to reassert the controlling glance of the detective. Thus, Scarborough understands the use of the Ordnance map of Devonshire as a variation on the topic of the window and as a testimony to Holmes's re-ordering of the diegetic world according to a relatively omniscient perspective.

Mills furthers the significance of the window as Holmes directs Watson to the Ordnance map of Devonshire. The original scene depicts Holmes 'unroll[ing] one section and [holding] it over his knee' […], whereas the adaptation presents a draped, mounted and, most significantly, *framed* map. Through semiotic similarity to the window, this alteration symbolically fixes the gaze of both the characters and viewers from a panoptic, ordered and omniscient perspective and reinforces Mills's employment of the window trope to connect the perspectives of Holmes and the viewer. (53)

There are other possible ways to approach Mills's adaptation, noticeably through the evolving production context as Neil Mc Caw[5] pointed out by showing how the series' initial idealization of the past becomes gradually undermined by the Thatcherite policies resulting in cuts in budgets that made the "heritage-inspired" approach too costly to practice. Yet the analysis of panoptic vision in the Granada series episode will serve usefully as a contrastive term in the comparison.

This comparison is I believe most fruitful if we manage to gather distinct uses of similar devices in both adaptations, so as to highlight their specific relation to the same source text. Such devices appear prominently when Sherlock Holmes's presence—directly there in the BBC version but hidden on the moor in the Granada episode—is suggested as that of a silent, almost lurking observer. This suggested presence appears in the 1988 version when Watson, engrossed with the writing of his diary or his reports to Holmes, casts a blank gaze through the window at the moor, after which the film cuts to a shot of Sherlock Holmes in his Baker Street lodgings, apparently pondering on arduous questions related to the case [43:01]. This type of shots going "back" to Baker Street also happens when we are unaccountably given a depiction of Holmes in a train bound for London in the middle of Watson's adventures on the moor [58:06]; this type of alternation—quite rare in the episode—tends to foreground the depiction of Holmes as a looming, somehow protective presence over the scenes in which Watson seems to struggle alone. It does in any case focus on an opposition between Watson's restlessness and his feeling of being threatened, pitted against the obvious composure that characterizes the apparition of Holmes in these interludes. When we compare these sequences with the sequences in which Holmes's presence is inserted in the narrative flux in a similarly unexpected manner in the 2012 version, the contrast could not be starker. First, these insertions—as in many other instances in this series—are not juxtaposed to Watson's (or other characters') doings but are superimposed on them, Holmes's face appearing as slightly transparent over one side of the screen (see for instance [39:51]). This is especially visible after the first encounter with the Hound, when Watson and Henry Knight have come back home and Holmes has "doggedly" refused to acknowledge the reality of this encounter—when Henry wonders why Holmes denied the evidence of his senses, we see Sherlock's face appearing on the left-hand side of the screen, obviously much distracted by his recent experience. A similar, but more subtle and fleeting use of this device appears when, at the ending of the TV report with which the episode begins ([07:48], after the flashback relating Henry's father's death, that is), we see the image of the supposed monster forming a shadow on the right-hand side of the screen, immediately followed by

Holmes's face on the left-hand side—as if Sherlock was either the gazer at the Hound… or the reflection of that monstrous shadow. Both interpretations suggest, as Bran Nicol showed (127), that the detective as a "sociopath" has now become the monster, a suggestion already present in the source text through the case of the mistaken identity between Holmes and the criminal as the "Man on the Tor", but acted out more explicitly in visual terms here. It seems clear, then, that the way *Sherlock* handles this image of the detective as inserted within the diegesis "by surprise" could hardly be further from what happens in the Granada series: it points in 1988 to a panoptic, reassuring perspective from the detective whereas in 2012 it bears witness to his vulnerability and even to his uncertain status with respect to the monster he is to fight.

This is, however, a fairly expected conclusion: an anguish-ridden era was bound to produce maybe just that sort of a detective, i.e. one whose vision could no longer sustain the fiction of omniscience or even the assumption of a stable identity. That is not to say that the Granada series—or the Doylian original—do not stage precisely that type of anxiety (we saw that the case of mistaken identity concerning Watson's misinterpretation of the Man of the Tor rests on that confusion) but what happens in the 2012 series and which does not happen in the novel or in the 1988 episode is an *explicit* acknowledgement of inconsistency and the staging of self-undermining questions—again, Sherlock encounters doubt rather than fear. This is also what can account for a reversal of roles—pointing once again to the fluidity of identity between Watson and Sherlock: for instance, Watson first tries to convince Holmes that the Hound does not exist, before Sherlock tries to do the same once the detective has practiced his experiment with Watson to persuade himself of the possibility to create a hallucination of the hound in Watson's "average" (as Sherlock calls it) mind. This specific stance of the 2012 series operates for two main reasons which I eventually intend to examine: the continuous attraction exerted by the Holmes (mythical) figure (even despite his subjection to doubt and his avowal of frailty), and the mass-cultural, self-conscious assumptions in the series that contribute to diversify our modes of adhesion to it.

> "If people knew how to make a mutant super-dog, we'd know. They'd be for sale, I mean, that's how it works" [00:39]

The main "twist" in the series is maybe not so obvious as these 21st C digital props that invade the screen, both literally and figuratively. It may lie in a subtler shift that matches Sherlock's (as a familiarized version of Sherlock Holmes) mood of self-doubt, i.e. the shift into derision of the figure,

which sometimes borders upon self-derision. This derisive approach of the character harbours more than a playful perspective or an entertainment-based outlook but turns out to voice an implicit, somehow far-reaching question as to the very nature of Holmes as a mythical character. I wish to conclude this study on this approach of what I believe to be the series' most daring move—especially through the relationship it necessitates with the viewer.

Derision—or congenial mockery—first lies in an updating of our approach of Sherlock as a "cranky" character. What could pass in the 1890s as the eccentricity of genius is now more cruelly called an "Asperger's" by Watson [56:52], when commenting with Lestrade on the sleuth's peculiar, obsessive attachment to details and figures. Similarly, the notion of mystery, almost the reverence attached to Sherlock Holmes's "visionary" capacities in the source text motivates a distanced, somewhat ironical stepping in by Watson in a scene where the doctor openly criticizes his friend's "role-playing":

> —Oh, please. Can we not do this this time?
>
> —Do what?
>
> —You being all mysterious with your cheekbones, and turning your coat collar up so you look cool.
>
> —I don't do that.
>
> —Yeah you do. [31:57]

This type of move away from the acceptance of the stereotype is clearly a way both to recall and to question the Holmesian stereotype by pointing how little adapted it is if, precisely, we do not strive to *adapt* it to our reality. Thus of the hat—the famous deerstalker invented by Sydney Paget, the original illustrator of Doyle's stories, and never mentioned by Doyle. Sherlock exclaims indignantly "That's not my hat!" [30:24] which is true in both senses; it never was a Doylian creation *and* it fits poorly—but is great laughs—in the 2012 diegesis. We end up eventually with two Sherlocks here: the original 19thc myth, which is still present there with all its features (eccentricity, bad temper, etc.) *and* the 21stc version which looks upon its older counterpart with dismay. Of course this process is typical of just any adaptation, by the way it superimposes its modern interpretation of the source text over the original, but the gist of the 2012 series is that the two versions are juxtaposed rather than overlapping. That is

what makes much of the fun in it, when the "modern" Sherlock thinks of the funny meaning his sentences may have for the 19th C sleuth. When meeting Dr Stapleton again he says: "Bluebell [the rabbit] disappeared from a closed hutch—which was always suggestive" [27:17], an obvious reference to locked room mysteries and a tongue-in-cheek cue through which we seem to hear Sherlock's wondering in the 21st C at the fun of that cue *considered from a 19th C perspective*.

Applying the canonical formula—the deerstalker hat, the locked room, the mystery essential to the Holmes-Watson "couple"—in a literal but distanced way is what makes the series successful because transplanting "literally" a 19th C story into a 21st C context makes Holmes, it seems, understand the "queerness" of the initial perspective. This is what all the references to homosexuality are about in the series, as if the original way of life of the two friends and roommates in Doyle's text could not but seem ("bromantically") suspicious to a 21stC reader or viewer and necessarily suggested that Watson is more than a friend—a "live-in PA" in the words of Bob Frankland in the 2102 version [49:23]. Once again, this is adaptation with a vengeance.[6] But the twist is brought one step further through the way Sherlock as a character is integrated within this revision of the initial corpus.

The character of Sherlock seems indeed to apprehend his own relation to the Doylian novel through carefully inserted quotations of the original text that point to his implicit knowledge of and distance with it. When he enters Dr Stapleton's laboratory he exclaims—intending to accuse Frankland—"Murder, Dr Stapleton. Refined, cold-blooded murder" [1:07:32], but the viewer (and maybe the 2012 Holmes himself) guesses that this is a wink to the novel where Stapleton *is* the guilty party (although in the novel it is a male character and a woman in the series). By this ambiguous sentence hurled at a character who in the series bears that very name, the original quotation is both recalled and subverted, very much in a post-modern ambivalent relation to the original which Fredric Jameson calls "blank parody" and which Linda Hutcheon views similarly too. Several similar cases take place, for instance when Sherlock tells Watson "You've never been the most luminous of people but as a conductor of light you are unbeatable" [52:51], a quote from the original which is relocated in an episode where Sherlock runs after Watson to get in his good books again after having hurt his feelings—quite contrary to the original then, taken from the first chapter in the novel (669), in which Holmes is actually mocking Watson's wrong deductions. Sherlock goes so far as to comment himself on Henry's statement of the case as his initial, main motivation to handle it—he tells Henry Knight[7] that he took the case because of what Doyle's Sherlock Holmes would condemn as its gaudy, "Gothic" feature: "That's why I took the

case—'The footprints of a gigantic hound!'" [51:06]. Through these subtle shifts and relocations of the original quotes we get the feeling that *Sherlock*—not the series but the character—is himself entering a playful relation with the original by consciously quoting Doyle's text in varying contexts, because he approaches it with a distance.

Such subtle interplay of course includes an overall intertextuality enacted by the series as a testimony to the homage paid to various influences. One may remember the James Bondish answer by Frankland about his real activities at the Baskerville base: "I'd love to tell you but then of course I'd have to kill you" [30:58], or in the episode entitled "The Reichenbach Fall" the theft of the Crown Jewels by Moriarty, performed on a background music by Rossini (*The Thieving Magpie*) that clearly evokes Kubrick's adaptation of Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange* and its depiction of ultra violence mingled with a Beethoven score. But on the whole, the success of the series lies in its daring representation of the Victorian sleuth in a self-derisive approach that allows him to comment playfully on his own doings. Through these devices the series manages to mingle a mass-cultural outlook (deriving from the mythical aspect of the character) with a playful but serious pondering over the way such myths have to evolve to survive. By redefining Sherlock as a spectator / reader of his own mythical, mass-cultural adventures, it relocates the issue of reading and adaptation within the film itself, as embodied by the sleuth, because precisely it seems impossible for Sherlock not to know about his own mythical status as a cultural artefact. Recognizing this necessity for the integration of a mass-cultural dimension in the series eventually results, as we saw, in a renewal of its basic assumptions as to characterization and narrative development.

WORKS CITED

Baring-Gould, William S. *Sherlock Holmes of Baker Street. A biography of the world's first consulting detective*. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1962.

Doyle, Arthur Conan. *The Penguin Complete Sherlock Holmes*. London: Penguin Books, 1981.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetics of Postmodernism – History, Theory, Fiction*. London: Routledge, 1988.

Jaffe, Audrey. "Detecting the Beggar: Arthur Conan Doyle, Henry Mayhew, and 'The Man with the Twisted Lip.'" *Sherlock Holmes: The Major Stories with Contemporary Critical Essays*. Ed. Hodgson, John A.

Boston and New York: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1994: 402-427.

Jameson, Fredric. "Postmodernism and Consumer Society." *Movies and Mass Culture*. Ed. John Belton. London: Athlone, 1996: 188-189.

Naugrette, Jean-Pierre. "*Sherlock* (BBC 2010) : un nouveau limier pour le XXIe siècle?" *Etudes Anglaises* 4 (2011): 402-414.

Porter, Lynette. *Sherlock Holmes for the 21st Century*. Jefferson, North Carolina and London: Mc Farland, 2012.

Sherlock: Season One. Perfs. Benedict Cumberbatch and Martin Freeman. 2 entertain Video, a Hartswood Films Production for BBC, 2010, DVD.

Sherlock: Season Two. Perfs. Benedict Cumberbatch and Martin Freeman. 2 entertain Video, a Hartswood Films Production for BBC, 2011, DVD.

The Hound of the Baskervilles, 1988. [TV Film] Directed by Brian Mills. UK: Granada Television, WGBH.

Thomas, Ronald R. "Making Darkness Visible—Capturing the Criminals and Observing the Law in Victorian photography and Detective Fiction?" *Victorian Literature and the Victorian Visual Imagination*. Eds. Carol T. Christ and John O'Jordan. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995: 134-165.

Trembley, Elizabeth. "Holmes Is Where the Heart Is: The Achievement of Granada Television's Sherlock Holmes films." *It's A Print – Detective Fiction from Page to Screen*, Eds. William Reynolds and Elizabeth Trembley. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1994: 11-30.

Vanacker, Sabine and Catherine Wynne, eds. *Sherlock Holmes and Conan Doyle – Multi-Media Afterlives*. Chippenham and Eastbourne: Palgrave, Macmillan, 2013.

- To return to the Table of Contents of this Special Issue, please click here
- To return to the Table of Contents of all the Special Issues, please click here
- To return to THE OSCHOLARS home page, please click here

To return to THE OSCHOLARS former home page, please click here

[1] The process of de-mythification or familiarization of the source corpus already extant through the use of "Sherlock" as a single first name for the title of the series also obtains here, since the title of the adaptation is changed into *The Hounds of Baskerville*, entailing a more familiar designation of Baskerville not as a lineage but as a place name, hence implicitly operating a debunking of the social, hierarchical ranking present in the original title. It also points to the multiplicity of readings in the adaptation through the unusual, somehow surprising plural used for "Hounds".

[2] The historical determination of Doyle's short stories as realistic has long been recognized by critics, for instance by

Audrey Jaffe who read "The Man with the Twisted Lip" in the context of capitalist society and its relationship to the concept of unstable identity. A similar reading is suggested by Ronald R. Thomas, although he more directly addresses the ideological dimension of the texts.

[3] Bran Nicol, "Sherlock Holmes Version 2.0: Adapting Doyle in the Twenty-First Century", in *Sherlock Holmes and Conan Doyle – Multi-Media Afterlives*.

[4] "'Open the Window, Then!' : Filmic Interpretation of Gothic Conventions in Brian Mills's *The Hound of the Baskervilles*", in *Sherlock Holmes and Conan Doyle – Multi-Media Afterlives*, 50.

[5] "Sherlock Holmes and a Politics of Adaptation", in *Sherlock Holmes and Conan Doyle – Multi-Media Afterlives*, 36-48.

[6] A detailed analysis of the ambiguity of homosocial and homosexual references in the series is given by Carlen Lavigne, in "The Noble Bachelor and the Crooked Man—Subtext and Sexuality in the BBC's *Sherlock*", in *Sherlock Holmes for the 21st Century*, 13-23.

[7] The name itself being a playful variation on the quality of the source character as a baronet.