

Southeastern University

FireScholars

Master of Arts in Classical Studies

Spring 4-4-2023

**SOMETHING “TRANSCENDENTALLY STIMULATING”:
RESISTANCE AND ANTIDOTE TO EMPIRICIST BRITISH CULTURE
IN SIR ARTHUR CONAN DOYLE’S SHERLOCK HOLMES**

Crissy Preston

Southeastern University - Lakeland, cmpreston@seu.edu

Crissy M. Preston

Southeastern University - Lakeland, southshorecc2012@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://firescholars.seu.edu/classicalstudies>



Part of the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#), [Literature in English, North America Commons](#), and the [Theory and Criticism Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Preston, Crissy and Preston, Crissy M., "SOMETHING “TRANSCENDENTALLY STIMULATING”:
RESISTANCE AND ANTIDOTE TO EMPIRICIST BRITISH CULTURE IN SIR ARTHUR CONAN DOYLE’S
SHERLOCK HOLMES" (2023). *Master of Arts in Classical Studies*. 5.
<https://firescholars.seu.edu/classicalstudies/5>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by FireScholars. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Arts in Classical Studies by an authorized administrator of FireScholars. For more information, please contact firescholars@seu.edu.

SOMETHING “TRANSCENDENTALLY STIMULATING”: RESISTANCE AND ANTIDOTE
TO EMPIRICIST BRITISH CULTURE IN SIR ARTHUR CONAN DOYLE’S SHERLOCK
HOLMES

By

Crissy Marie Preston

A thesis in the field of Literature and Rhetoric
for the degree of Master of Liberal Arts in Classical Studies

Southeastern University

April 2023

Copyright 2023 Crissy Preston

Abstract

Sherlock Holmes is a name synonymous with detective and perhaps more familiar to households than his creator Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. His lasting impact as a literary figure is indisputable, but the curiosity surrounding the reasons for his longevity in popularity remain an enigma to many scholars and critics. In my thesis, I will discuss some of the reasons Holmes relates to readers from various time periods, age groups, and nationalities for more than a century. The first section of this project will establish the empiricist culture surrounding the decadent late 1800s, which compose the setting for most of Doyle's stories. Steeped in modernity, this *fin de siècle* period neglected traditionalism and exasperated its citizens with strict positivism. Examining *The Sign of Four* and "The Red-Headed League," the next section of this thesis will demonstrate that Sir Arthur Conan Doyle utilizes his character Sherlock Holmes as a literary antidote in natural resistance to his society's impositions of science and reason alone. Lastly, this analysis will examine the type of logic Sherlock Holmes employs in his stories and why it is vital for mankind to combine logic with imagination in order to be both productive and content.

Key Words: Sherlock Holmes, Arthur Conan Doyle, resistance, Empiricism, *fin de siècle*, logic, imagination

Dedication

Dedicated to my amazing husband, Aaron Preston, daughter Kayley Preston, and son Kaden Preston. Aaron, thank you for being willing to cook dinner, haul children, and allow me to fall asleep on your shoulder, so I could chase this dream. Kayley, thank you for being my largest cheerleader and listening with interest as I rambled with excitement (and sometimes dread) about my latest adventures. Kaden, thank you for being patient with mom and understanding that time she wanted to spend with you had to be spent working. I love you all more than you could know, and I could not have done this without you!

I would also like to thank my courageous and patient professor, Dr. DeBorde, who spent countless hours in this classical study of literature and rhetoric adventure, gently molding and growing each of us, making the journey one I would travel all over again.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Dedication.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Sir Conan Doyle and His Works	5
Great Britain at the Turn of the Century.....	8
Cultural Pessimism Leads to Disenchantment.....	16
Importance of Imagination for Mankind and Society.....	22
Why is Sherlock so Enduring?.....	27
Science or Positivism?.....	31
Drugs and Work Become Life.....	42
A Resistance to the “Strict Empiricism”.....	53
What Kind of Logic is Sherlock Actually Using Then?.....	56
Conclusion.....	65
Works Cited.....	67

Introduction

Introduced to the world over thirteen decades ago, Sherlock Holmes is a name as familiar to households today as it was to turn-of-the-nineteenth-century English homes. Why does this literary character appear to be etched into history with such popularity? In his thesis entitled, “Not So Elementary: An Examination of Trends in a Century of Sherlock Holmes Adaptations,” Nathan Camp provides a comprehensive examination of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes works and adaptations created to date, which include a plethora of re-written stories, television series, and movies. Doyle’s first story *A Study in Scarlet* appeared in 1887, and Holmes has been a significant literary figure ever since. Camp claims, “Even to this day the Holmes character continues to be depicted with a flurry of recent Holmes portrayals from a high-profile duology of movies featuring Robert Downy Jr. and Jude Law to a lavishly produced BBC series, a currently-airing CBS series, and a film featuring Ian McKellen, all within the last decade” (1). This burst of popularity over one hundred years after Doyle’s creation of the detective is impressive, but it is only a hint of Sherlock’s admiration. Holmes has earned the record for the “most portrayed human literary character in 2012” (1), appearing over 250 times in television and film. Camp also discusses what he calls “Fandoms,” and he notes, “one of the first major fandoms to crop up was the one around Sherlock Holmes and Doyle’s stories” (22). Sherlock Holmes “fandoms” are still extraordinarily popular today with thousands of societies and clubs dedicated to honoring Holmes worldwide over 135 years after Sir Conan Doyle’s invention of the character.

Throughout the last century, the Holmes stories have influenced generations of children and adults. In “A Tale of Three Genres: History, Fiction, and the Historical Detektiv,” Alfred J. Reiber, a Russian-American author, who in addition to other works, created his own Russian detective, credits Sir Conan Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes character as his first model, for Reiber received his complete set of stories as a gift for his twelfth Christmas (5). How does Sherlock Holmes make his way into the hands of a Russian twelve-year old in the mid-twentieth century, before television made him even more popular, impacting the pre-teen’s world enough to influence the creation of a Russian detective? Nathan Camp’s supported opinion that Holmes “remains as relevant and popular today as he was back when he first broke onto the scene in 1887” (7), begs the question: What is it that makes the detective so universally popular across so many regions and so many time periods?

Sherlock Holmes’ popularity has not wavered but instead has curiously heightened in the early twenty-first century. In “A Decadent Detective?: A Look at the *Fin de Siècle* Origins of Conan Doyle’s Most Beloved Character,” Rohase Piercy observes that over 130 years after he entered the literary scene, people are still obsessed with Sherlock Holmes. Piercy identifies the irony, “During those years, every scrap of information that Arthur Conan Doyle let drop so casually in the Canon has been probed, debated, and dissected with a meticulousness that Holmes himself could be proud of” (29). Piercy alludes to the detective’s appreciation of science, and many Doyle scholars, including Chene Heady and Yumna Siddiqi, attribute Sherlock Holmes’ popularity to his emphasis on logic and science in an era when these characteristics were exalted. However, many other literary critics such as Michael Saler, Joel Burges, and Devin Fromm, agree with Piercy and examine not only Holmes’ extreme popularity, but also his

seemingly everlasting, irresistible character. They assert that it is not Sherlock Holmes' positivism¹ that creates a lasting character, but his use of logic and science combined with his use of imagination and creativity that effectuate a relatable character. A detailed examination of Sherlock's character in the context of his *fin de siècle* British society provides some justification for why his character is relatable to readers from every time period. Two of Arthur Conan Doyle's works written just before the turn of the century include the novel *A Sign of Four* and the short story "The Red-Headed League." Typical of the many Sherlock stories, these works portray a society of people craving a return to traditionalism, which included truth, goodness, and beauty. When contextualized historically and culturally, the Sherlock Holmes stories reflect British citizens' resistance to empiricist ideas, which they viewed negatively, that neglect the whole person. A strict positivist culture, a rampant British government drug trade for monetary gain, and a derogatory view of transcendentalists created a society that struggled to find truth, goodness, and beauty in their daily lives. Sir Conan Doyle's stories are enduring because his character Sherlock Holmes encapsulates the whole human combining logic, reason, and science with

¹ Positivism will be discussed in more detail later in this project and was the strict governing scientific "philosophy" of the *fin de siècle* British society. Miriam Webster's dictionary defines positivism as "a theory that theology and metaphysics are earlier imperfect modes of knowledge and that positive knowledge is based on natural phenomena and their properties and relations as verified by the empirical sciences." The Oxford English Dictionary contains a philosophical definition, "a philosophical system elaborated from the 1830s by the French thinker Auguste Comte (1798–1857), recognizing only observable phenomena and empirically verifiable scientific facts and laws, and rejecting inquiry into ultimate causes or origins as belonging to outmoded metaphysical or theological stages of thought; a humanistic religion based on this system. In later use: any of various philosophical systems or views based on an empiricist understanding of science, particularly those associated with the belief that every cognitively meaningful proposition can be scientifically verified or falsified." It also contains a helpful law definition, "An empirical theory of law; *spec.* one treating law as a system of rules whose validity is based on their having been enacted by a sovereign or derived from an authoritative source, rather than from any considerations of morality, natural law, etc."

imagination, innovation, and mystery. In Holmes, Doyle at once creates a resistance to his rigidly empiricist government and an antidote to the despair that many British likely endured in the decadent *fin de siècle* period. Doyle's natural resistance created a timeless character because readers, then and now, can relate to Holmes' (and Doyle's) frustrations.

This analysis is built on the assumption that universalities exist, and mankind possesses universal desires. Mankind is created uniquely from every other character. While personalities differ in each person's uniqueness, certain physical and psychological characteristics are present in humanity, including the desire to utilize both sides of the brain in combination with the heart in the search for truth, goodness, and beauty. When any of these faculties is severely limited in a culture, it is a poor representation of humanity, and authors will naturally use literature to resist that occurrence. This project will begin by discussing the zeitgeist during the decadent late-nineteenth century that established the *fin de siècle* British period steeped in modernity. Empiricism and positivism were exalted while traditionalism was neglected, leaving people craving more than science and reason alone can provide. Next, it will demonstrate that Sir Conan Doyle's natural resistance to his culture is evident in his Sherlock Holmes character as a literary antidote for the positivist ideas of his era. Lastly, this analysis will examine the type of logic Sherlock Holmes employs in his stories and why it is vital for mankind to combine logic with imagination in order to be both productive and content.

Sir Conan Doyle and His Works

The popularity of Sherlock Holmes far surpasses that of his author Doyle. In an interview conducted in 1929, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle explained that he received frequent letters addressed to Sherlock Holmes, and many readers thought Holmes was real (Fox). Indeed, Sherlock is fictional, but his character was partially inspired by reality. In his early medical career, Conan Doyle was a clerk for Dr. Joseph Bell, who was famous for “deducting” things about his patients based on his powers of observation, and Doyle based Holmes’ reasoning skills on his observations of Bell. In his 1929 interview, Doyle stated his frustration with the detective stories he had read to date because many included detectives who rely on “annoying dumb luck” and simply stumble upon solutions to the cases they study. It is some fault of the perpetrator, rather than skill of the detective. Doyle thought authors should provide the reasons the detectives were able to solve cases, and he desired to create mysteries in which the detective provides those reasons. As a doctor himself, Doyle appreciated science, logic, and reasoning, and he also claimed the desire to offer a detective who “uses the scientific method” to solve cases. His methods worked, for Sherlock Holmes quickly became the new detective model. Many authors note that some of the first detective stories originate with Edgar Allen Poe, Dickens, Gaboriau, and Collins,² but Camp accurately argues, “After the emergence of Holmes, the classic detective was set in stone” (21). Doyle’s answer that the cases should be solved based on more than

² For an interesting discussion of which detective can claim to be the first, see Reiber 355. Many authors note that Poe, Dickens, Gaboriau, and Collins were among the first. See Saler’s book (109). Sherlock and Watson also comically mention some of their predecessors in Doyle’s stories, and Piercy records discussion of some of Sherlock and Watson’s dialogue about Poe and Gaboriau in Doyle’s books (29-30).

“annoying dumb luck” displays his appreciation of logic and reasoning. However, in the same interview, Doyle ironically states that he never considered Sherlock to be his important work; rather, he would like people to read his work on Spiritualism.³ A closer look at a few of his detective stories will reveal that some of those qualities included in Spiritualism that were important to Doyle are more prevalent in Doyle’s detective than he may have recognized, but first, a summary of Conan Doyle’s works is important to depict the *fin de siècle* period in which he is writing.

Doyle’s novel *A Study in Scarlet* written in 1887, was Sherlock’s debut, and Holmes was instantaneously popular. In 1890, a few short years after his first novel, Sir Conan Doyle published a second novel, *The Sign of Four*, at which point he began his regular short stories, which were first published in the magazine *The Strand*. From 1891-1893, Sherlock Holmes and his sidekick Watson appeared in two twelve-story collections entitled *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* and *The Memoirs of Sherlock Holmes*, but Sherlock abruptly died at the end of “The Final Problem”, the last story of his second collection. Doyle attempted to kill his famous character in this story in order to focus his efforts on other work, but the public and his friends were utterly dismayed and asked him to bring Holmes back. However, after two novels and twenty-four short stories in only three years, Arthur Conan Doyle took a short recess from writing and earned his knighthood for his support of Great Britain’s decisions in the Boer War, where Doyle had the opportunity to serve as a doctor in Bloemfontein. After the war, in 1902, he

³ In *As If*, Michael Saler discusses the public’s critique of Doyle’s belief in spiritualism and fairies, along with the irony that the same critiquing public truly thought that Sherlock Holmes was real, and Doyle fictitious (105-107). Saler also notes the culture’s critique of any scientist’s support of Spiritualism and traditionalism and claims they were ridiculed for combining science and religion (602).

published his third novel, *The Hound of Baskervilles*, but it was set before Holmes' death. One year later, he buckled under pressure and resurrected Sherlock Holmes in "The Adventure of the Empty House," part of his *The Return of Sherlock Holmes* collection published 1903-1905. Once again, it appeared Doyle would be done with Holmes, who retired in the final story of this collection, but in 1908, Sir Conan began writing more stories, although they came a little more slowly than his first ones. These stories were eventually published as part of *His Last Bow* collection in 1917. In the midst of his short stories written from 1908-1917, in May of 1915, Doyle also published another novel, *The Valley of Fear*, which he began just prior to World War I. Publishing stories even more sparsely with his next collection, Doyle nonetheless continued writing his detective stories and published another twelve-story collection in 1927, entitled *The Case Book of Sherlock Holmes*. On July 7, 1930, Sir Conan Doyle died which finally brought an end to the Sherlock Holmes stories. Nathan Camp states, "The legacy of England's most famous detective was however seemingly enshrined for all time: from plays to films to radio to early television broadcasts, the character's legacy endures even to this day" (3). In addition to his everlasting popularity, Sherlock Holmes is popular in many regions as well. At the very least, he appears to intrigue nearly everyone. Those who are not obsessed with Holmes, or do not belong to one of his "fandoms," have usually at least read one of his stories or watched one of his shows with interest in Sherlock's character. Although he was "seemingly enshrined for all time," this late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century period that distinguishes the Sherlock stories is a bleak spot in British history and reveals a dismal society often termed the *fin de siècle* period.

Great Britain at the Turn of the Century

In his second novel, *The Sign of Four*, Doyle's immediately famous character exclaims, "Love is an emotional thing, and whatever is emotional, is opposed to that true, cold reason which I place above all things" (774). However, does Sherlock place "true, cold reason" above all things? This would certainly have been the popular opinion in positivist turn-of-the-century Britain when Doyle penned these works, but Sherlock's actions, words, and addictions depict a different story. In "A Decadent Detective?: A Look at the *Fin de Siècle* Origins of Conan Doyle's Most Beloved Character," Rohase Piercy analyzes the political and social situations surrounding the time period of Conan Doyle's crowd-pleasing Sherlock Holmes stories,

The earlier stories of the Canon were written, and most of the later ones still set, in the last decade and a half of the nineteenth century—a period when the cult of Aestheticism, with its languid celebration of all things beautiful, had evolved, under the influence of French writers such as Verlaine and Huysmans, into the cult of Decadence, which was unraveling the frayed edges of Victorian society with its pursuit of social, spiritual, and sexual ambiguity. Holmes is a child of the *fin de siècle*. (31)

Piercy notes the shift that occurred in Britain — from the traditional⁴ and the celebration of the beautiful and spiritual — to the elevation of ambiguity and the glorification of the rational and empiricism. Piercy establishes the scientific, logical, and reasoning characteristics in Sherlock

⁴ For scholars discussing the *fin de siècle*, Traditionalism is viewed as a period before the Enlightenment that celebrated religion, and all things "beautiful": ornate architecture, clothes, and art and social, spiritual, and sexual purity. In late-nineteenth-century England, traditionalism was viewed as unsophisticated. See Piercy (31) and Saler (600-605).

Holmes, while pointing to the fact that it is actually the mystery surrounding him that captivates the public. He claims that Holmes' character is a product of the *fin de siècle*, and Sherlock represents this shift, making his character somewhat dark and, as his character grew, depressing. At the beginning of *The Sign of Four*, Sherlock and Watson are discussing Holmes' drug of choice for the day, and when Sherlock chooses cocaine, Watson begs him to reconsider. Sherlock replies, "Perhaps you are right, Watson. I suppose that its influence is physically a bad one. I find it, however, so transcendently stimulating and clarifying to the mind that its secondary action is a matter of a small moment" (713). Although his solution is deeply misplaced, Sherlock's search for something "transcendently stimulating" is a natural part of mankind. Wrestling with the "celebration of all things beautiful" evolving into the demand for the opposite, Holmes' character likely displays the frustrations of many, not only from his period, but also from the many eras suffering from decadence and positivism, and his readers presumably find his struggles terribly relatable. In fact, all people have the capability to relate to this dilemma because all readers are human, craving the ability to operate using all faculties, those involving both logic and the imagination. In "The Red-Headed League," Sherlock's dissatisfaction is most evident in the last few lines of the story. After Watson's compliment on solving the case so remarkably, Holmes responds, "It saved me from the ennui," he answered yawning. 'Alas! I already feel it closing in upon me. My life is spent in one long effort to escape from the commonplaces of existence. These little problems help me to do so" (30). In *Webster's 1828 American Dictionary of the English Language*, Ennui is defined as, "Weariness; heaviness; lassitude of fastidiousness" (295). The Oxford English Dictionary defines Ennui as, "the feeling of mental weariness and dissatisfaction produced by want of occupation, or by lack of interest in present surroundings or

employments.” Holmes’ “dissatisfaction” is apparent in these lines, and he references weariness in many stories. When Disenchantment consumes literature, consumerism, and politics, people feel hopeless.

In a culture that exalted materialism, secularism, and rationality, but ridiculed imagination and spiritualism, one can see the effects must have left many British citizens feeling the same weariness and heaviness that Sherlock Holmes exudes, including Doyle, which is likely one reason his Holmes character is so popular. Readers are afforded the opportunity to view glimpses of the traditional characteristics they value and to see beauty in art. In ““Clap If You Believe in Sherlock Holmes’: Mass Culture and the Re-Enchantment of Modernity,” Michael Saler also discusses the fact that British empiricism and modernity with a heavy emphasis on reason and logic leaves no room for imagination. Saler asserts, “By insisting on the integration of reason and the imagination, these thinkers — and popular icons such as Holmes — gainsaid the fashionable cultural pessimism of the period and made it possible to see modernity and enchantment as compatible rather than antagonistic” (605). Saler analyzes a convincing disparity between British society and how Sir Conan Doyle uses his character Holmes to prove rationalism and imagination can, and should, coincide. Holmes provides an example of the combination in *The Sign of Four* when Watson is admiring Holmes’ skills in “deduction,” but more specifically, his appreciation of small details. Sherlock correctly determines what Watson has been doing and where he has been that morning, and Watson replies,

“Right!” said I. “Right on both points! But I confess that I don’t see how you arrived at it. It was a sudden impulse upon my part, and I have mentioned it to no one.”

“It is simplicity itself,” he remarked, chuckling at my surprise, “so absurdly simple that an explanation is superfluous; and yet it may serve to define the limits of observation and of deduction.” (715)

Holmes continues the conversation with how he arrived at these correct conclusions, but his own statement here acknowledges that it is something more than observation and deduction that allows him to arrive at his conclusions. Saler argues that this mystery surrounding Sherlock is why mass audiences are so enchanted with Holmes.

The *fin de siècle* period that Doyle occupied offered little enchantment. Establishing the climate in Britain during the late 1800s when Sir Conan Doyle coined these Sherlock Holmes stories, Saler affirms, “Many at the turn of the century mourned the apparent absence of communal beliefs and higher ideals in an age that seemed dominated by positivism and materialism, and turned to alternative sources of spiritual sustenance” (602). Notice Saler’s use of “apparent absence.” While the British elite attempted to impose strict empiricism⁵, and logic and reason were praised, the “higher ideals” and enchantment that people mourned can never be completely absent because humans will never cease to crave a combination of both logic and imagination. However, Saler contends these attempts to escape “the iron cage of rationality” (602) were not satisfactory compromises. This is likely because they were met with such negative attention. He explains,

Modernity was widely associated with progress towards the rational and away from the supernatural, and efforts were frequently greeted with skepticism if not outright disdain

⁵ For a discussion of late 19th century empiricism, See Saler (602), Debrasi and Laracy (124-142), and Mary Warnock’s book, *Imagination*, especially chapter 1.

by contemporary commentators. Thus physical research and spiritualism, both nineteenth-century efforts at finding *via media* between science and religion, tended to be marginalized by established science at the turn of the century. (602)

When mankind attempts to reconcile its natural inclination, which opposes society's imposition of ideals, he discovers himself feeling frustrated, unsatisfied, and angry. Sherlock's character reflects these feelings in Sir Conan Doyle's Holmes stories as his exasperation with "real life" is frequently evident. In *The Sign of Four*, Watson hesitantly presents a case to Sherlock. He asks,

"Would you think me impertinent if I were to put your theories to a more severe test?"

"On the contrary," he answered, "it would prevent me from taking a second dose of cocaine. I should be delighted to look into any problem which you might submit to me." (715)

His attempts to satisfy his longings for something more than life can offer him depict a man that is suffering in his current surroundings. It is probable Sherlock's creator, Doyle, felt similarly, and many scientists, including Doyle, who supported spiritualism, were viewed by their peers as unsophisticated supporters attempting to prove their faith, but lacking in evidence. Unfortunately, society's positivist views discounted many scientists' and doctors' work if any of their work was not deemed empiricist; For many like Doyle, this felt like society was dejecting them as humans. As a doctor and scientist who greatly appreciated reason and logic, but also longed for traditionalism aspects, which was evident in his work on Spiritualism, Doyle was among these

intelligent men who were frustrated. While these views would slowly change,⁶ at the turn of the century, when Sir Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes stories were published, Britains were understandably discouraged and miserable. In *Ten Ways to Destroy the Imagination of Your Child*, Dr. Anthony Esolen discusses the importance of imagination and perfectly describes the attitude of Sherlock, which also represents the state of British citizens, in the late-nineteenth-century, "Our days pass by with the regularity of a conveyor belt at an airport, which we duly get on, and make our way with bland uniformity... If we can but deaden the imagination..., we can make him that solid, dependable, and inert space filler in school, and later, a block of the great state pyramid" (x-xi). Holmes' attitude is in direct resistance to his strict empiricist culture, and he yearns for more than a "conveyor belt" life.

The two previous examples from Doyle's stories demonstrate that strong yearning, but they also demonstrate what occurs when people do not have the opportunity to exercise both their logic and their imagination. Saler appropriately argues, "Because Holmes represented the values of modernity in ways that addressed the criticisms of the cultural pessimists, he spoke to the dissatisfactions and hopes of adults as well as to the imaginations of children. Like many of his readers, Holmes yearned for enchantment" (603). Doyle's stories point to a character that is aggravated and completely bored with the mundane, and yet at the same time, he recognizes "there is nothing so unnatural as the commonplace" ("A Case of Identity" 31). Holmes' creator recognizes that reason and imagination are inseparable, and his character provides a solution for his audience. Saler affirms, "Holmes' dramatic use of animistic reason was the mass culture

⁶ After Conan Doyle's death, the 1930s saw a slight shift from modernism. See Saler's *As If*, especially chapter 5.

exemplification of a complex of ideas that circulated as part of the *fin-de-siècle* revolt against the dominant discourses of positivism, materialism, and scientific naturalism” (605). Society’s resistance to ideas stemming from the Enlightenment belief in the imaginary as one “more suited to children, the lower classes, or primitives than to bourgeois adults” (606), is a completely natural, and even logical resistance. Everyone’s perceptions of reality differ greatly based on experiences; how could each individual’s reasoning even be the same? In his conclusion, Saler asserts,

Cultural pessimists of the *fin-de-siècle* promoted a concept of instrumental rationality that distinguished reason and the imagination, rendering modernity as disenchanted... We now acknowledge that what we call ‘real’ is also provisional and contingent construct; that so called ‘objectivity’ is always tinged with our imagination. Holmes was the first fictional character to embody this synthesis overtly, through his animistic reason. (622)

The issue is just that. We can not “distinguish” between reason and the imagination. The attempt to do so is an attempt to separate the human. Holmes’ disenchantment with life and attempts to combine the two are reflections of what occurs in the individual when society surmises they must be separated.

Early philosophers including Hume, Kant, Locke, Berkeley, and Descartes examine empiricism, but their sense of empiricism is less suffocating than Britain’s during the *fin de siècle*. Contrastingly, their discussions establish the idea that imagination plays a vital role in thinking. Mary Warnock addresses these philosophers’ ideas and the importance of imagination in her book *Imagination*. She discusses the idea that Hume wrote in empiricist thought which included Locke and Berkeley and originated earlier with Descartes. Warnock proposes,

It seemed self-evidently obvious to philosophers after Descartes, however critical they may have been of the details of his solutions, that in order to answer questions about knowledge, belief, perception, or indeed about causation and substance, one had to turn one's attention inwards, and examine the objects of one's consciousness. These objects were, generally speaking, mental objects or ideas. Thus, for these philosophers there was always one problem which had to be solved, above all others, namely the problem of the relation between ideas in my head and things which are apparently not in my head but in the outside world. I seem to perceive the world. But, in another sense, Descartes had taught that what I perceive is my own ideas. How are these two perceptions related? (13)

In other words, all these philosophers who wrestled with empiricist thought must admit that man has "ideas and perceptions" that affect even what he determines with the immediate senses. In her discussion of Hume, Warnock avers, "It is to be noticed that Hume actually defines ideas as images. From the outset, then, he regards imagination, the image-making faculty, as playing a crucial role in our thinking" (15). If even empiricist philosophers argue that imagination "plays a crucial role in our thinking," Doyle's frustration, which is evident in his character Sherlock, is a clear and understandable resistance to his British culture's insistence on extreme empiricist ideas.

Cultural Pessimism Leads to Disenchantment

As the Enlightenment⁷ turned into a more empiricist society, British citizens lamented lost aspects of traditionalism, and they recognized that modernity created a less fanciful culture. Among its other adjectives, this *fin de siècle* era in late-nineteenth-century England is often termed a period of disenchantment. However, despite demands from the culture to dismiss the mysterious, fantasy is a genre that still consistently drew readers. In “We Are All Geeks Now’: Fantasy as a Mode of Social Practice in Disenchanted Modernity,” Joel Burges provides a review of Michael Saler’s book *As If: Modern Enchantment and the Literary Prehistory of Virtual Reality*. Summarizing the history of fantasy as told by Saler, stemming from the Disenchantment period in Great Britain, he examines some of the causes for negative views of fantasy, despite its overwhelming popularity and consistency. First, he considers the cover, which includes a picture of Sherlock Holmes and Gandalf from Tolkien’s *Lord of the Rings*. Burges comments, “What, in short, allows Gandalf and Sherlock to share the cover of *As If*? Saler can draw persuasively on wizards and detectives alike because he contends they both instantiate a specifically modern form of enchantment” (495). Burges points to Saler’s claim that readers in the late-nineteenth century had grown, “disenchanted with keeping imagination and reason apart in slavish adherence to mid-nineteenth-century positivism” (496). The majority of the Sherlock stories are set in this late-nineteenth century that Saler discusses, where readers were likely aching for a

⁷ Max Weber, Max Horkheimer, Fromm, and Theodor Adorno all discuss the characteristics of the Enlightenment period and the concern that it did not have the intended effects, but instead, led to the disenchantment of the time period. See Weber “Vocation Lectures,” Burges (499), and Fromm (310-312).

character like Sherlock. In his book *As If*, Saler explains a “double-minded consciousness” that “yields a form of modern enchantment that delights but does not delude” (160). In his discussion of *The Lord of the Rings*, Saler argues that it “radiates such a mixed light: while a lavish fantasy, Tolkien’s invented world is also rigorously rational. Its genealogical charts, detailed chronologies and appendices, and scholars’ discussions about nomenclature, geography, history, and languages encourage the reader to approach Middle-earth analytically as well as imaginatively” (159). In other words, Sherlock’s position in this “As If” mentality differs from the role that Gandalf plays, yet they contain more similarities for readers than one might imagine. Burges contends it is this duality that gives Saler his title “As If” and places Gandalf and Sherlock Holmes, an unlikely pair, on the front cover. Although Sherlock mirrors the rationality that would have been popular in his society, he also contains a magical element that provides relief for his burdened readers. Burges alleges,

According to Saler, Holmes’ preternatural capacity for hermeneutic ratiocination entailed the belief that, ‘every detail of modern life, ranging from the footprints of a giant hood to advertisements in the mass-circulation newspapers was charged with meaning and hidden import.’ Sherlock in this sense came to embody an ‘as if’ mentality differently than Gandalf and *The Lord of the Rings*. On the one hand, Sherlock trafficked in both musing reverie and logical analysis, much as Tolkien mixed the fantastic and the rational through a variety of textual strategies that let the contingent and the provisional mingle in the reader’s mind vis-a-vis his ‘Primary World.’ On the other hand, Sherlock’s, ‘method provided [readers] a much-sought alternative to the purely means-end rationality that cultural pessimists believed characterized modernity and rendered it sterile. (498-499)

Holmes' character assuredly displays reasoning, but it also introduces mystery and creativity that provides an example for his readers to feel whole. In Holmes, readers can see a solution to the demands for science and logic from society in combination with their yearnings for aspects of traditionalism. It is likely that Doyle felt the same exasperation and a need for wholeness as well. His character demonstrates this combination frequently. In the ending of "The Red-Headed League" as Holmes solves the case and explains his reasoning to his audience, Sherlock's character provides an example that utilizes both reason and imagination. A character named Jabez Wilson, who has vividly red hair, has been offered a great deal of money to sit and copy an encyclopedia for hours each day, but he must leave his current business and do it in another office. Sherlock has recently explained how he surmised the reason for such a peculiar job is certainly to get the man out of the building for hours a day so that he could build a cellar, when Holmes explains the final piece of the mystery,

“So far I had got when we went to visit the scene of action. I surprised you by beating upon the pavement with my stick. I was ascertaining whether the cellar stretched out in front or behind. It was not in front. Then I rang the bell, and, as I hoped, the assistant answered it. We have had some skirmishes, but we had never set eyes upon each other before. I hardly looked at his face. His knees were what I wished to see. You must yourself have remarked how worn, wrinkled, and stained they were. They spoke of those hours of burrowing. The only remaining point was what they were burrowing for. I walked round the corner, saw the City and Suburban Bank abutted on our friend's premises, and felt that I had solved my problem. When you drove home after the concert

I called upon Scotland Yard and upon the chairman of the bank directors, with the result that you have seen.”

“And how could you tell that they would make their attempt to-night?” I asked.

“Well, when they closed their League offices that was a sign that they cared no longer about Mr. Jabez Wilson’s presence — in other words, that they had completed their tunnel. But it was essential that they should use it soon, as it might be discovered, or the bullion might be removed. Saturday would suit them better than any other day, as it would give them two days for their escape. For all these reasons I expected them to come to-night.” (29-30)

The reader can clearly see, if she is not easily influenced by Sherlock’s constant claims that it is solely his powers of deduction, that there is innovation combined with Holmes’ keen observations here. Yes, he “reasons beautifully,” as his sidekick admirer feigns, but he also provides the mystery that Saler and Burges observe.

Burges notes that it is more than the “as if” mentality that “binds Gandalf and Sherlock” (499). The underlying, “historical cause fueling the rise of this mentality, sparking the formation of this enchanted reaction to the rational world in which rationality can itself be a means of enchantment is the disenchanting modernity famously described by Max Weber” (499). He is referring to Max Weber’s timely 1917 lectures that argue the strict process of rationalization had caused the disenchantment of the modern world. He contends that modern subjects were left with the bleak prospect that no mysterious forces exist, that science and reason are the only means of existing in the world, and that everything can be mastered by calculation.

It is no wonder British citizens relished a character like Sherlock Holmes, who combines mystery, creativity, innovation, and the fanciful with logic, reason, and science. In Holmes, Doyle offered them an opportunity to feel human again. Saler's book provides multiple case studies of fantasy as an approach when disenchanting modernity consumes a culture, and according to Burges, *As If* is, "part of a wider effort by recent scholars to rethink modernity. Saler's book effectively reconstructs the cultural history of fantasy for contemporary cultural historians, critics and theorists. He releases fantasy from its status as a geeky genre...in which reason and reverie, pragmatics and play interpenetrate" (500). Mankind's desires have not changed, and Burges recognizes Saler's valid point that fantasy is a necessary part of humanity. It is ironically logical that mankind craves all the traits represented in the character of Sherlock Holmes: science, reason, and deduction, *and* inference, imagination, and fantasy. Burges maintains, "In fact, it is Saler's contention that Conan Doyle's character constitutes a historical turning point in the cultural history of fantasy as a widespread mode of social practice in modernity" (501). Sir Conan Doyle created a character that represents not only British constituents' frustrations, but also the discontentments of audiences from many generations. Without imagination, even science would not advance. When mankind brings his experiences, his ideas, and his creativity to science, it is much like Sherlock's performance in discovering truths. Doyle provides an example at the beginning of *The Sign of Four* when Sherlock announces that he "deduces" where Watson has been all morning,

"For example, observation shows me that you have been to the Wigmore Street Post-Office this morning, but deduction lets me know that when there you dispatched a telegram... Observation tells me that you have a little reddish mold adhering to your

instep. Just opposite the Seymour Street Office they have taken up the pavement and thrown up some earth which lies in such a way that it is difficult to avoid treading in it in entering. The earth is of this peculiar reddish tint which is found, as far as I know, nowhere else in the neighborhood. So much is observation. The rest is deduction.”

“How, then, did you deduce the telegram?”

“Why, of course I knew that you had not written a letter, since I sat opposite to you all morning. I see also in your open desk there that you have a sheet of stamps and a thick bundle of postcards. What could you go into the post-office for, then, but to send a wire? Eliminate all other factors, and the one which remains must be the truth.” (715)

Once again, Sherlock demonstrates that there is more to his conclusions than deductions and observations. He has combined them with an air of mystery and creativity. The disenchantment that followed Britain’s strict positivism made it difficult for the British to experience this beautiful combination, but Doyle’s resistance through his character Holmes likely created hope.

Importance of Imagination for Mankind and Society

Imagination breeds innovation, but more importantly, it plays a crucial part in making men and women feel whole. The strict empiricism in Britain in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries attempted to force a pure dichotomy between “science” and imagination. One could argue that true science requires imagination, but regardless, Britain’s culture in the *fin de siècle* created frustration because people did not feel whole. In *Ten Ways to Destroy the Imagination of Your Child*, Dr. Anthony Esolen aims to discuss issues with modern education, but he actually discusses humans more. Esolen is known for his witty, engaging writing style, and he does not disappoint in this book, which even includes a satirical title. His book emphasizes imagination in learning, pointing out the valid fact that knowledge by itself is pointless and rather boring. He insists, “A Fact, by itself, does not seem to rouse the imagination. It merely is. It sits there like a rock. Yet its apparent impenetrability is a challenge to the mind” (5). The knowledge itself is stale, but when one begins to wonder, or imagine, the fact comes alive. For wonder to be absent, one would almost need to be taught to memorize facts with no consideration, which is an unnatural state for mankind. In fact, the opposite is true; when given any sort of opportunity, people naturally begin to wonder about the details they learn.

Sherlock practices this with the information he obtains about a case. The information itself is dull, and so is his vast array of arbitrary knowledge. However, when he contemplates, imagines, and considers them together, it becomes the seemingly profound solution, and he demonstrates his excitement at this precise moment in his cases. In “The Red-Headed League,” he is pondering the case quietly with a pipe when, “he suddenly springs out of his chair with the

gesture of a man who has made up his mind” (23), and he asks Watson to go on an excursion with him. While they are in front of the business where his client performed his odd work, “Sherlock Holmes stopped in front of it with his head on one side, and looked it all over, with his eyes shining brightly between puckered lids” (24). He is never as joyful as he is when he is combining all of his reasoning skills with his innovation skills and solving a case. Similarly, in *The Sign of Four*, as he is piecing facts together about the case, Sherlock returns home, and Watson perceives, “He was bright, eager, and in excellent spirits — a mood which in his case alternated with fits of the blackest depression” (719). The fact that he needs the ability to stretch his mind to avoid depression demonstrates the impossible situation the British culture had designed for its people. Depression was likely something that affected Doyle himself and many of the British citizens due to their exasperation⁸. In his satirical tone, Esolen declares that when educating our children, we should, “Demand drudgery, but not drudgery that has as its end the mastery of facts, or of an intellectual structure within which to retain and interpret the facts, or of a great work of imagination for which the facts of grammar or arithmetic or whatever are the doorkeepers. Keep the students busy *and* idle at the same time” (25). If this does not sound like the strict empiricism described for Britain’s middle-aged working class, which were also Conan Doyle’s own surroundings, what does? Unfortunately, many turned to drugs as an answer to the drudgery, but what their hearts really longed for was something mysterious and wonderful. Esolen also wisely claims, “In the deepest heart of man, the motive for art and the motive for worship are bound together... the heart seeks out something beyond itself- a beauty or power

⁸ Depression as a result of Britain’s decadent culture which included too many hours at work, drugs, and a strict emphasis on empiricism and positivism, is discussed later in this paper and includes analyses from Fromm, Keep and Randall, and Small.

that is not its own” (225). In turn-of-the-century Britain, art and worship were considered “traditional,” “old,” and, “silly,” which left people feeling much like Doyle expressed repeatedly in his Sherlock Holmes stories, “bored, frustrated, agitated, and stagnated.” They were left seeking something “transcendentally stimulating.”

The decadence experienced in turn-of-the-century Britain is a result of society’s demand to turn away from everything spiritual and traditional. David Hicks, a modern scholar and philosopher, discusses this idea in *Norms and Nobility*. Hicks’ book analyzes many of the faulty ideas and practices of modern education, but as he critiques education, he also examines the most crucial aspect of the human psyche — the soul. In order to explore modern education, *Norms and Nobility* also inspects modern philosophy in general, which very closely resembles the inauspicious modernity in Conan Doyle’s Britain. Hicks perceptively inspects what occurs when a society abandons the transcendental ideals and replaces them with solely modern ideas and “science.” His work sets the tone nicely for what occurred historically and politically to create Doyle’s readers’ feelings of dismay and what they would have been left craving. Hicks’ main premise is that we may have, “outsmarted ourselves by allowing utilitarian ends to replace the less obvious and personal transcendent ideals” (12). This clearly describes the society that Sherlock represented. It is a form of humanism, and generally, when mankind sets out to serve and idolize itself, it becomes more miserable than it was at the start. Hicks also asserts, “For when we accept the tyranny of the real over the ideal, we deny the human spirit — the better half of learning and the better half of man” (13). The term “tyranny of the real” closely illustrates the bleak, helpless mindset of late-nineteenth-century readers. There seems to be a desperate cry for something more, and their spirits were “crushed,” as Hicks describes, “We are at risk because

modern pedagogy has severed the vital link between knowing and doing, because the moral marrow of who we are and what our purposes are is being schooled out of our children, because we have become uncertain of our norms and have abandoned education's transcendent and ennobling ends" (ix). Hicks explains that norms are not clear for students in today's schools. In fact, it often feels as though there are no norms defined at all, and therefore confusion and chaos reign. Hicks contends, "The end of all natural religion, however well-meaning and good natured, is a corrupt and decadent society rolling downhill to stampeding mass hysteria and maniacal warfare" (13). This is exactly how Conan Doyle and his readers would have felt: chaotic and helpless as transcendentalism was slowly ripped from them. Several of the articles presented in this analysis establish this state of mind in many different ways.

The decadence that many historians describe during this time period is worth noting when readers compare it to modernity today. Many modern, secular humanists and current education experts would agree that education as a whole is not meeting the needs of students within this country. However, those same "experts" would never admit the need to return to educating the whole person in the transcendental aspects of truth, goodness, and beauty, for in their minds, each person's view of those attributes is his own. It seems the pendulum swings too far, eliminating one aspect of the human. Therein lies the predicament David Hicks and many other philosophers, educators, and theologians are attempting to explain: if no one is able to dictate or agree upon what truth, goodness, and beauty is, then how can a government or society dictate what it will "teach" its next generation? Using their modern, humanistic view that each person's truth is his own would paradoxically create a society with no need for education in the first place. Ironically, everything is based on emotion and how certain people feel (the

aristocratic elite who are making the rules), which is about as far from the supposed empirical or positivistic ideals of Sherlock's day as possible, yet it is not that far at all. When transcendentalism is completely replaced, the faulty idea that science and only the senses will dictate everything is quickly corrupted by men and women and their own ideas. Furthermore, no one should have the ability to dictate each person's own truth. Hicks' claim is not only a valid argument, but is also clearly evident in today's modern American society as well as the empiricist British society of Sherlock Holmes' day. This is one reason he is so popular. Each individual soul craves the beauty of both science and reason *and* transcendentalism and imagination. By clinging so tightly to a strict positivism, the British dictated "truth" for everyone and inadvertently created not only bad science, but also a depressed and frustrated society. In his Holmes character, Doyle offered an antidote.

Why is Sherlock So Enduring?

Sherlock Holmes has intrigued audiences for more than a century, and his popularity has crossed economic, generational, and national boundaries. In the introduction to *Great Works of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle*, Patricia Horan questions, “What other literary invention can boast a full-length biography, an immediately identifiable silhouette, or a name that, as a household word, reaches so far beyond class or nation to be startlingly universal?” (xxiv). Many critics argue that Sherlock’s character was so incredibly appealing during his time period because he represented the empiricist ideas of his culture. With his keen observation and logical reasoning, they claim he embodies the positivism that the British society aimed to strictly embrace.

Although it is true that Sherlock utilizes keen observation and logical reasoning, these are not the only reasons he piques curiosity with readers and viewers for more than a century. Intentionally or not, Sir Conan Doyle and his lasting character wholeheartedly resist the ideas from the *fin de siècle* time period that strict empiricism is best for mankind. In *Anxieties of the Empire and the Fiction of Intrigue*, English professor Yumna Siddiqi takes an interesting look at imperialism⁹ in Great Britain through the lens of detective fiction writers, which of course includes Conan Doyle’s Sherlock stories. She asserts that authors like Conan Doyle, Kipling, and Buchanan serve to support Empire and imperial interests in their writing. Although she admits, “This is not to say that their stories uniformly endorse imperial rule; on the contrary, they often reveal the

⁹ Imperialism and empiricism ran concurrently in Britain during the late-nineteenth century, and an influx of drugs also brought imperialism to its height at the close of the nineteenth century in Britain. See Keep (whole article), Wynn, especially chapters one and four, and Siddiqi (chapter one).

contradictions of Empire, as I explicitly argue” (8), her underlying premise is that authors like Conan Doyle with characters like Sherlock Holmes, are attempting to tell citizens that all will be well in their empiricist society. She claims, “Through his efforts, identities are established and social relations are rendered transparent — he makes an increasingly bewildering social terrain knowable and hence manageable” (19). Siddiqi informs us that although there are some frustrations, and he is eccentric, Sherlock always solves the case with his government-sanctioned methods, so through literature, Doyle is supporting the culture and telling readers everything will be okay (8-33). However, quite the opposite is demonstrated in the character of Sherlock and even in Siddiqi’s own work. She rightly notices,

However, alongside this general enthusiasm for Empire, one finds in late-Victorian literature a current of anxiety about incursions from Empire, and its influence upon the established pattern of English life. Articulated as a concern about the instability of individual identity, the disintegration of the social and moral order, and the eruption of crime and violence, this vein of anxiety runs below the surface and emerges in certain discernible patterns in popular literature of Empire, notwithstanding its largely jingoistic tone. (18)

This is a perfect synopsis of the *fin de siècle* issues in Britain at the turn of the twentieth century, but Siddiqi argues that Sherlock presents a solution in the form of the positivistic ideas that would have been celebrated by Empiricist Britain, “The detective story celebrates the mastery of disorder through the application of scientific methods and logical deduction. His perspicacious intelligence, his keen powers of analysis, and his encyclopedic knowledge distinguish the detective. He pieces together obscure and seemingly unrelated fragments of knowledge to

construct an intelligible totality” (19). Regrettably, in their attempts to create “order” through “science” alone, the disorder that Siddiqi refers to is what ensued instead in British culture.

Sherlock’s audience likely appreciated more than his scientific reasoning alone. Additionally, it is not the only characteristic that has kept his character alive all this time. Later, in the same chapter of her book, Siddiqi admits that Sherlock “refuses” to give up the space for “individual agency” (27). In this respect, Holmes is an answer to what his readers feel is lacking, but not through scientific reasoning. Instead, it is his individuality and creativity. She claims, “And though Holmes is professional and eminently practical..., he is at the same time something of an artiste — he regards his *métier* as an art; he is reclusive and moody; he has a taste for cocaine...

Sherlock Holmes’s method reflects his ambivalent characterization. He stands both inside and outside the knowledge practices of European modernity” (27). Siddiqi would assert that Holmes’ popularity stems from his ability to combine the modernity of his day with the individualization to restore order and settle anxieties. However, his popularity would be limited to *fin de siècle* Britain if this was the case. Sherlock’s enduring popularity stems from Doyle’s resistance to the modernity and his frustrations with it. Holmes’ stories include a dismal, bleak look on life until he has something to motivate his imagination, or “prevent stagnation.” While Sherlock is a fictional character, his author was not. Doyle’s discontentment and his opposition to society’s demands is what makes Sherlock appealing.

Siddiqi also intriguingly discusses the fact that many critics have attempted to study modernity and imperialism separately when looking at literature, but the, “Sherlock Holmes stories attest to the fact that their discourses overlap” (26). She notes that the most aggressive imperialist years occurred from 1880-1914, and Conan Doyle’s stories span 1886-1927, the latter

part of the Victorian period and the “decades of high modernism” (26). Sherlock Holmes represents the thoughts of many in society during a time when they felt their lives lacked meaning and beauty compared to the traditionalistic views from the 18th and early 19th century. Sherlock is a character who combines the beauty of the old with the new, despite his consistent claims that he is “all reason and logic.” Siddiqi says it well, “Contrary to common perception, he does so not by adhering rigidly to scientific, rational principles but by combining these principles with an instinctive, conjectural style that better equips him to contend with the variegated elements of an expanding imperial world” (30). Although this sentence appears to contradict Siddiqi’s ideas in her book, perhaps that is entirely the point. Doyle was not telling readers all would be well with society’s strictly positivist ideas with his character Sherlock. Instead, his work was a way to stand in resistance to those ideas and demonstrate that the strict dichotomy could never work because mankind is not designed to operate in the separation. This is what all people crave. No one possesses the desire to view and act solely upon what his immediate senses enable him to see. Without implication, innovation, individuality, and imagination, reasoning is useless.

Science or Positivism?

Intriguingly, modern scholars frequently discuss the British late-1800s positivism in a negative context. In their strict emphasis on “science,” are positivists actually practicing science? Reasoning combined with imagination produces cures, discoveries, and inventions. Just as Sherlock and other detectives cannot solve their cases without combining creative thinking with what they already know and observe, scientists and doctors can not obtain new discoveries without using what they know to solve what they do not know. If a society only creates based off what everyone can see or experience in the moment, all progress is halted, and mankind feels helpless. Dialogue between Sherlock and Watson paints a clear picture of British empiricist ideas of science, while also providing the reader with some insight into Doyle’s exasperation with those ideas of science. In *The Sign of Four*, Sherlock’s assistant Watson admires his work on their previous case in a pamphlet, but Holmes is frustrated with Watson’s version of the details. Watson exclaims,

“Yes, indeed, I was never so struck by anything in my life. I even embodied it in a small brochure with the somewhat fantastic title of *A Study in Scarlet*.”

He shook his head sadly. “I glanced over it,” said he. “Honestly, I cannot congratulate you on it. Detection is, or ought to be, an exact science, and should be treated in the same cold and unemotional manner. You have attempted to tinge it with romanticism, which produces much the same effect as if you worked a love story or an elopement into the fifth proposition of Euclid.”

“But the romance was there. I could not tamper with the facts.”

“Some facts should be suppressed, or at least a just sense of proportion should be observed in treating them. The only point in the case which deserved mention was the curious analytical reasoning from effects to causes by which I succeeded in unraveling it.” (714)

While the reader can almost hear Sherlock’s first passage dripping with the author’s satire, Watson’s response provides further insight into Doyle’s own views, and Watson’s frustration with Sherlock mimics Doyle’s weariness with political and societal views of science. Although Sherlock’s second response represents the disenchanting view of the British *fin de siècle* period, it is not a view that even Sherlock himself represents consistently throughout his stories. His own words in “The Wisteria Lodge” prove his craving for the romantic. Holmes tells Watson, “My mind is like a racing engine, tearing itself to pieces because it is not connected up with the work for which it was built. Life is commonplace, the papers are sterile; audacity and romance seem to have passed for ever from the criminal world” (777). This constant battle is apparent in Doyle’s stories, and while Sherlock’s empiricist claims combined with his use of modern science would have appeased the British positivist views, Holmes’ conflict in the stories resonates with the dissatisfaction of men and women attempting to abide by them.

Although he did not consider it his “important” work, in Holmes, Doyle successfully created a character that represented his resistance to his culture’s definition of “science.” Sherlock represented an example of what science more accurately achieves and likely what Doyle thought true science should resemble. In “Not So Elementary: An Examination of Trends in a Century of Sherlock Holmes Adaptations,” Nathan Camp analyzes Sir Conan Doyle’s character Sherlock Holmes’ influence on criminology media. Inadvertently, his discussion of

Holmes' application of science also points to the detective's use of innovation and imagination to adapt and solve crimes. Comparing Sherlock to modern-day crime shows, Camp concedes that obviously Holmes did not use the same technology prevalent in shows like the popular *CSI*, but he did employ elements of forensic science available to him in the Victorian era (26).

Additionally, he attempts to use science and physical evidence to approach solving crimes, including foot prints, a magnifying glass, a chemistry set, and even a microscope on occasion, something that was new for his era (143-145). Incidentally, this use of science and reason actually highlights Holmes' innovation and imagination. In one example from *The Sign of Four*, Holmes can not contain his excitement,

“Here is the print of a foot in mold upon the sill. And here is a circular muddy mark, and here again upon the floors and here again by the table. See here, Watson! This is really a very pretty demonstration.”

I looked at the round, well-defined, muddy disks. “This is not a footmark,” said I.

“It is something much more valuable to us. It is the impression of a wooden stump. You see here on the sill is the bootmark, a heavy boot with a broad metal heel, and beside it is the mark of the timber-toe.” (730-731)

Sherlock has just discovered that the suspect is the wooden-legged man, but he must also have a strong accomplice who helped him out the window and down the wall. Although it includes elements one can use the senses to explore, Holmes innovatively applies the science and his powers of observation to solve crimes to demonstrate the power of reason and science combined with imagination. His excitement demonstrates his joy in utilizing both. Camp explains that many public expectations extend from fictional portrayals, and this occurs because readers infer,

just as the character Sherlock does. It is Camp's contention that creativity precedes actual science, which usually follows closely behind. In other words, as humanity utilizes its current scientific tools in unison with its ability to reason and create, science advances. True science and new inventions require the whole mind.

Similarly, in "Nation, Identity and the Fascination with Forensic Science in Sherlock Holmes and CSI," Ellen Harrington compares modern-day CSI stories to Doyle's Sherlock Holmes stories from the Victorian era. She argues that Doyle is the first author to create a series-like detective and the first to produce a character with a "cult-like status" (369), and many detective series now follow his same pattern. In her comparison, she discusses the idea that while both modern-day CSI and Victorian-era Sherlock Holmes pride themselves in using the latest science and utilize clever forensic scientists who are able to reason their way to a conclusion, the irony is that they both actually use a significant amount of imagination, mystery, and creativity to arrive at those conclusions as well. In the same scene discussed above from *The Sign of Four*, while Sherlock and Watson are discussing the wooden-legged man and his accomplice, Holmes uses his magnifying glass along with some blood clues to arrive at another conclusion, "My lens discloses more than one blood-mark, especially toward the end of the rope, from which I gather that he slipped down with such velocity that he took the skin off his hands" (731). This seems like a logical conclusion from the clues, and while many quality detectives would begin looking for someone in the wooden-legged man's circle whose hands are wounded, strictly positivist ideas would not allow this consideration, or the plethora of other ways in which the blood could have appeared on the rope, because strict positivism demands that any rational idea can be scientifically or mathematically proven with the senses. Since this story occurs long before DNA

tests, that is not possible. Some inference would be necessary. Harrington explains why readers and viewers prefer, as Camp describes it, “these kinds of investigations even though they have little resemblance to the real world, both in the realms of CSI and Sherlock Holmes” (27).

Harrington alleges that “readers and viewers are encouraged to set aside scientific skepticism and immerse themselves in a fantastic world where ambiguous or disruptive identities can be fixed by traces of DNA left by the individual; a world where crime can be solved, the truth known with certitude” (366). While her point is that readers prefer this type of investigative skill because it provides closure, her argument demonstrates that even in the extremely scientific world of forensic science, one must use logic, reasoning, and imagination at the same time. People can not separate them to “solve” problems or cases. Most things can not be proven with complete certainty, and Sherlock’s use of them both creates a character to whom people can relate.

Additionally, Harrington argues that while the “Holmes stories fit well into the late-Victorian, post-Darwinian context that foregrounds science and reason over mysticism and values superior physical and mental capability” (370), his, “logic in many of the stories is flawed. This factor does little to decrease public acceptance and enjoyment of the fiction” (370). In other words, while Conan Doyle’s Holmes stories were praised for their science, logic and reason, his natural resistance depicts a man who uses science and reason to exalt mystery and innovation.

This resistance to strict positivism and modernity is not limited to *fin de siècle* Britain. Mankind’s natural resistance continues to appear in scholars’ work. Stratford Caldecott is a modern scholar with a convincing argument for the combination of reason and imagination in the sciences and mathematics, and though his book is written centuries later, he perfectly describes what strict empiricism does to mankind because unfortunately, positivism continues to persist.

His book *Beauty for Truth's Sake: On the Re-enchantment of Education* focuses on the importance of the liberal arts as a way to free the mind and Spirit. He asserts that it should not be a matter of Faith vs. Reason, but rather the two are so intertwined in humanity that they must live together in order for mankind to live in a state of joy and “beauty.” Caldecott discusses “beauty,” the practicality of the Quadrivium, and the idea that everything is integrated because one Creator created all of it, including humans. Caldecott clearly writes from a Christian perspective, but his ideas about science mirror those of Sherlock’s actions so closely that he provides perceptive insight for Doyle’s resistance.

Caldecott’s work includes a synopsis about Western Civilization’s move away from an education that combined faith and reason: the arts and the sciences. He reviews the idea that, at some point, we segmented, fragmented, and compartmentalized these things, which also trivialized them. This fragmentation and separation are what leave men and women feeling empty and lonely, and they pull us away from observing and appreciating the beauty of everything from architecture to books. Sherlock exhibits a frustration with this fragmentation in his stories, but it is interesting to note the change in his behavior, attitude, and words when he obtains a case. It is frequently paradoxical. For instance, in “The Red-Headed League,” Holmes attempts to convince Watson that real life is just as interesting as his cases,

“You will remember that I remarked the other day, just before we went into the very simple problem presented by Miss Mary Sutherland, that for strange effects and extraordinary combinations we must go to life itself, which is always more daring than any effort of the imagination.”

“A proposition which I took the liberty of doubting.” (16)

Because he says this while he has a potential client with an interesting case, Sherlock's attitude is the complete opposite of what he displays between cases, or as a case is coming to an end. In the ending of this same story as the case closes, he reveals the "ennui closing in on him." The proposition of an exciting case almost awakens his soul. Watson's response here is intriguing as well, for Doyle's frustrations are often evident in both characters. The fact that Watson, a more optimistic character, can not possibly conceive that "real life" is more interesting than Sherlock's cases demonstrates a bleak mindset.

Caldecott discusses the idea that education (due to political demands) moved away from the liberal arts education. This is a mirror description of the climate in late-nineteenth-century Britain. In his introduction, Caldecott argues, "The classical 'Liberal Arts' tradition of the West once offered a form of humane education that sought the integration of faith and reason, and that combined the arts and the sciences, before these things became separated, fragmented, and trivialized" (12). He also references TS Eliot, who analyzes information well, "We need to retrace our steps, to find, 'the wisdom we have lost in knowledge, the knowledge we have lost in information'" (12). He explains that this lost knowledge and wisdom he is referring to, traces back to the ancient philosophers: Boethius, Augustine, Plato, and Socrates. However, before Socrates came Pythagoras. This is an important point for his book because mathematics is part of the quadrivium and the original Liberal Arts. While mathematics is now closely tied to reason and logic, in the forefront of Western Civilization, mathematics was a beautiful part of the Arts and included the creative and imaginative part of the mind as well. Consider what would happen if Pythagoras was suffocated with a truly empiricist mindset, or other great scientists and mathematicians like him. We would not have the Pythagorean Theorem (or many other math

laws and scientific inventions); it is Pythagoras' reasoning combined with imagination that brought the world a new math law. Historically, this demonstrates the shift in ideology and why society is left feeling discouraged in Conan Doyle's harsh British society that demands only logic and the senses must dictate the actions of mankind. Caldecott includes a modern thinker's ideas and emphatically claims, "Pope Benedict XVI has attacked in the name of the whole Christian tradition the modern misconception that faith is the enemy of reason. Faith, he says, cannot be opposed to reason if it is placed in the second person of the Trinity, who is the Word, the Logos, in whom, the archetypes of the world's order are contained" (13). The British government during the time that the Sherlock stories were written claimed the opposite of this idea. In his conclusion, Caldecott explains what this does to man,

Under the conditions set by secular modernity, it appears that the legitimate autonomy of the intellectual disciplines, especially the human and natural sciences, must inevitably be threatened by any controlling influence from the side of faith - so that, in order to defend academic and intellectual freedom, the Church must not be allowed to influence academic appointments or the curriculum...As we have seen, the Liberal Arts were intended to conduce to freedom of mind...But the post-nominalist world has a very strange and dangerous conception of freedom, and this conception distorts the way we think. (138-139)

This is precisely what occurred in *fin de siècle* Britain. Rather than the Enlightenment producing more "freedom" of the mind, society created an atmosphere that restrained man and limited his thinking.

Ironically, through Britain's attempt to ensure that science remained all about reason and the senses, "science" became something else entirely. Authors Richard DeBrasi and Joseph Laracy support Caldecott's ideas in "An Empirical Critique of Empiricism." De Brasi and Laracy present an intriguing look at empiricism in this article. They admit that the nuances involved create a difficulty in defining empiricism, but one of their direct claims is that it "has never been a uniform doctrine" (124). However, they continue their discussion with a comparison of British empiricism, which they view as quite strict and distinct from empiricism as defined by philosophers like Thomas Aquinas or Aristotle. De Brasi and Laracy argue the ancient philosophies say that "human knowledge *begins* sense experience" (125), while British empiricism "tends to ultimately reduce knowledge to sense experience" (125). They make the valid argument that discoveries in science and mathematics over the last 250 years, "raise serious questions about any version of strict empiricism" (125), as they should. Without imagination in the form of innovation, not one of those advances would have occurred. Mankind would be quite limited, and as seen in Doyle through his character Sherlock, frustrated and bored. De Brasi and Laracy note, "But human reason 'sees' something the senses do not" (126). This is one of the significant characteristics that separates man from animal and every other creation. This description that humans "see" more than the senses allow for is beautiful, and Doyle's resistance to his surroundings present a convincing argument that he likely had a difficult time portraying in his society. Consider Sherlock's following inferences based on facts he has gained in *The Sign of Four*,

"Look at it in this way, then. Captain Morstan disappears. The only person in London whom he could have visited is Major Sholto. Major Sholto denies having heard that he

was in London. Four years later Sholto dies. Within a week of his death Captain Morstan's daughter receives a valuable present, which is repeated from year to year, and now culminates in a letter which describes her as a wronged woman. What wrong can it refer to except this deprivation of her father? And why should the presents begin immediately after Sholto's death, unless it is that Sholto's heir knows something of the mystery and desires to make compensation? Have you any alternative theory which will meet the facts?" (720)

Sherlock illustrates that a human's mind possesses the unique capability to reason, infer, experience, imagine, consider a vast amount of information at one time, and then somehow logically piece it all together into something new. Doyle, and plausibly many scientists in the Victorian era, were exasperated with the inability to reason the way in which Doyle does vicariously through Sherlock.

De Brasi and Laracy's work not only critiques empiricism, but also fortuitously establishes it as the prevailing thought of the day in the British empire. Their ideas resemble Caldecott's discussion of quantum physics. The authors assert, "To think that my thoughts are only appearances or non-existent is absurd" (126). This is a unique, yet delightful way to explain what must have been a huge frustration for British constituents during the Victorian era when "strict" empiricism was praised, and the transcendentals of traditionalism were viewed as laughable. Contrastingly, DeBrasi and Laracy note the language of Aristotle and Aquinas in which, "there is an essential distinction between sense knowledge and intellectual knowledge" (133), and they argue "strict empiricism" does not allow for this difference. Specifically, referring to British empiricism, they maintain, "Empiricists of the British kind never seem to

consider that someone's thoughts or understanding of a triangle need not be accompanied by a sense-image" (137). They proceed with the idea that it would be impossible for any mathematician to accomplish anything if he had to compare every triangle (or any other idea inserted here) in the world. In other words, the wonderful ability of the human to use his knowledge of *one* triangle in combination with his imagination at the same time, affords him the unique capability of applying that knowledge to not only all other triangles but also many other areas of life. This is precisely the description of what Sherlock practices. He uses a myriad of life experiences and a vast knowledge about the many things he has studied to apply reason to solve cases. Conan Doyle and his readers likely craved this combination, but this idea also explains why Sherlock Holmes has been popular among so many other societies as well. If mankind is intended to function utilizing reason and imagination to produce true science and innovation, Doyle's resistance to his positivist environment echoes the frustrations of many.

Drugs and Work Become Life

In addition to strict empiricism, another contributing factor to the dismal feeling experienced by Britain's subjects in the decadent British *fin de siècle* period included drugs. For the British government, the drug trade was too enticing to avoid because of the monetary gain it provided. Unfortunately, Doyle's resistance to his culture includes a character that is so desperate, he is willing to participate in something destructive to enter a realm outside the rational. At the beginning of *The Sign of Four*, one of Conan Doyle's most infamous but also most analyzed passages, is in reference to drugs. It begins,

Sherlock Holmes took his bottle from the corner of the mantelpiece and his hypodermic syringe from its neat morocco case. With his long, white nervous fingers he adjusted the delicate needle, and rolled back his left shirt-cuff. For some little time his eyes rested thoughtfully upon the sinewy forearm and wrist, all dotted and scarred with innumerable puncture-marks. Finally he thrust the sharp point home, pressed down the tiny piston, and sunk back into the velvet-lined armchair with a long sigh of satisfaction. (713)

For modern readers, this graphic passage can be understandably disturbing, but historical context creates some perspective. Benjamin O' Dell's article, "Performing the Imperial Abject: The Ethics of Cocaine in Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Sign of Four*," contains an interesting discussion of the rhetoric behind why Conan Doyle's character uses drugs, and he provides pertinent historical facts regarding cocaine studies and information surrounding the drug in the 1890s. Ironically, in this positivistic culture, it was necessary for people to use keen observation to evaluate the effects of the heightened use of cocaine occurring in their society. Just before Doyle

wrote *The Sign of Four*; in the 1880s, experts and laymen began to notice the negative affects of cocaine, including addiction. O'Dell observes, "The proliferation of cocaine and morphine use amongst upper and middle classes as a result of medical experimentation and the appearance of the hypodermic syringe brought with it an unprecedented era in public knowledge of the risks associated with narcotic drugs" (985). Drug use was an experimentation the British government was willing to risk because of the potential profit, and Britains discovered the expense of that experimentation through considerable side effects. In "Sherlock Holmes's Addictions," Dr. Andrzej Diniejko provides further historical context for drugs during the Victorian age. Diniejko claims that drugs like cocaine were misunderstood, yet prevalent. In his discussion about Sherlock's use of drugs, he argues, "This was nothing unusual in Victorian times because sale of opium, laudanum, cocaine, and morphine was legal. Victorians took these dangerous drugs as self-medication and as recreation" (1). Intriguingly, the article also notes the affect the drug had on the imagination, "A great number of cocaine enthusiasts, including scientists and medical practitioners, wrote letters, pamphlets and essays about the miraculous properties of the 'divine drug' which excited human imagination and seemed to be a panacea for many ailments, from toothache to hysteria, labour pains, hay fever, and melancholy" (1). Sigmund Freud was one of the many doctors who sung the drug's praises, and Sir Conan Doyle was a doctor himself. Dr. Diniejko explains their misconceptions about the drug and the idea that it is unsurprising that Doyle included use of cocaine in his detective. In "Sherlock Holmes and Cocaine: A 7% Solution for Modern Professionalism," Douglas Small provides more clarity for Diniejko's claims. He refutes the "conventional interpretation" of Holmes' cocaine use in the Sherlock Holmes stories. *The Sign of Four* begins with Sherlock using a 7% solution, which is a substantial amount.

Small's article provides a detailed account of cocaine and its research, uncertainties, and public concerns in the years surrounding the publication of Doyle's second novel, published in 1890. Cocaine only gained public attention six years earlier in 1884, and at that time, the scientific community praised cocaine for its local anesthetic properties. A few years later, in the late 80s, cocaine became more controversial, but was still praised by many. It was not until the early 1890s that the drug was being grouped with more addictive substances like morphine, opium, and alcohol. By that time, Sir Conan Doyle had already recorded his first two novels and several short stories.

It is O'Dell's argument that Sir Conan Doyle, a doctor and scientist himself, may have included the conversation between Watson and Holmes in *The Sign of Four* intentionally as a catalyst to inform the public. The passage in *The Sign of Four* continues with Watson's concerned thoughts,

Three times a day for many months I had witnessed this performance, but custom had not reconciled my mind to it. On the contrary, from day to day I had become more irritable at the sight, and my conscience swelled nightly within me at the thought that I had lacked the courage to protest. Again and again I had registered a vow that I should deliver my soul upon the subject, but there was that in the cool, nonchalant air of my companion which made him the last man with whom one would care to take anything approaching to a liberty. His great powers, his masterly manner, and the experience which I had had of his many extraordinary qualities, all made me diffident and backward in crossing him.

(713)

However, Watson's own words here contradict O'Dell's theory. He implies that if it is the drugs that make Sherlock the exquisite detective he is, despite his eccentric behavior, then perhaps they are worth it. Holmes' popularity and constant dismissive behavior towards Watson would likely have had the opposite affect, if that was Doyle's desire. It is more probable that this scene is just an accurate picture of Doyle's observations about his culture. Nonetheless, O'Dell's article depicts a British society during the time that Doyle wrote *The Sign of Four*. The abundance of drugs contributed to the mindset of society. Holmes' behavior and his use of drugs created a fantastical character that could conquer the mundane, using the imagination, but all within the parameters that people felt were necessary to please the predominant disenchanting philosophy.

Regardless of Doyle's intent behind his addicted character, the attitudes of Sherlock and Watson about the drug in *The Sign of Four* tell the readers a story of a bleak society in which citizens are depressed and frustrated. Additionally, whether or not the drug was dangerous, arguments surrounding the drug related to modernism. Douglas Small continues his discussion about this scene, "Conan Doyle makes use of both sides of this dichotomy to portray Holmes as a modern personality and to portray the fundamental supremacy of his relationship with the modern world of work" (343). Small focuses on the intellectually over-stimulated, middle- and upper-classes that made work an addiction as Holmes tends to, and he claims, "In these early years, there is a palpable sense of both the omnipresence and the omnipotence of cocaine in therapeutic discussions" (344). This sentence portrays the dark state of mind of the British citizens, if they feel the necessity to turn to drugs for creativity. Small also argues, "For the overworked scholar, anything from strong tea or coffee to opium could become the essential means of accomplishing their work. It was a narrative that seemed to hint at the troubling notion

that the use — and abuse — of stimulants was a potentially destructive symptom of modern professional existence” (348). What a disparaging claim. The British “strict empiricism” created a devastating society for its members. Unfortunately, people on cocaine felt they were on a high and could accomplish anything, but as more was discovered about the drug, it became apparent that their writings while on a “high” were unintelligible. Small claims, “Although wryly comic, the underlying message is obvious: the chimerical (and chemical) promise of using cocaine to augment creativity, industry, and intelligence vanishes into the nonsensical rambling of the clown, or the addict” (350). In other words, in a search to feel human, or combine creativity and industry with logic and reason, the British citizen became his own worst enemy and became less human. Watson decides to confront Holmes as their conversation continues, and Sherlock’s responses are again disturbing:

“Which is it to-day?” I asked. “Morphine or cocaine?”

He raised his eyes languidly from the old black-letter volume which he had opened. “It is cocaine,” he said; a seven per cent solution. Would you care to try it?”

“No, indeed,” I answered brusquely. “My constitution has not got over the Afghan campaign yet. I cannot afford to throw any extra strain upon it.”

He smiled at my vehemence. “Perhaps you are right, Watson,” he said. “I suppose that its influence is physically a bad one. I find it, however, so transcendently stimulating and clarifying to the mind that its secondary action is a matter of a small moment.” (713)

Small’s argument is that Holmes is a man made entirely of reasoning, and he conquers all: his appetite, his work, the drug, and the drug is actually just a vessel to fuel his passion for his work.

However, one idea alone contradicts Small: passion. Holmes is passionate, and he is in such a desperate search for something “transcendentally stimulating” that he turns to cocaine, or opium, or tobacco, or even alcohol throughout his stories. This is not a picture of conquering the drug, but rather, he is searching — searching for something larger than himself, larger than the senses alone can provide.

Sherlock’s inner struggle is evidence of Doyle’s contrary view of his culture. It is likely that Doyle recognizes an extreme desire for more than “science” in himself, and his character Sherlock presents solutions. Devin Fromm discusses this larger battle in “Sherlock Holmes, Addiction, and the Price of Enlightenment: The Case of a Cautionary Tale.” Fromm’s article accentuates the “price of enlightenment” as it suggests, but it does so using Sherlock’s drug use in Conan Doyle’s works. The Enlightenment preceded Empiricism and the *fin de siècle* period that forms the setting of the Sherlock stories, and Fromm reveals why the Enlightenment “broadly defined as the advance of thought” (310) did not produce what it had hoped in terms of citizens. He claims that rather than an “increased sense of humanity” it led to a “new level of barbarism” (310), which is an interesting way to view Doyle and Sherlock’s oppressive society. Examining the reasons for the failure of Enlightenment, Fromm examines the humanity of mankind and the idea that people can not live in a state of positivist science and reason alone. Doyle reflects Fromm’s claims in Sherlock. In an effort to live and feel human in a society that was completely negative to all things mysterious, citizens resorted to some “self-destructive” tendencies (310), i.e. Holmes’ drugs.

Fromm’s article is a discussion about drugs, and it references the above passage from *The Sign of Four*. However, in light of addiction, Fromm addresses Holmes’ knowledge and powers

of reason almost like a drug themselves, which is evident as Watson and Sherlock's conversation continues. First, Watson pleads with Holmes, and then Sherlock responds,

“But consider!” I said earnestly. “Count the cost! Your brain may as you say, be aroused and excited, but it is a pathological and morbid process, which involves tissue-change, and may at last leave a permanent weakness. You know, too, what a black reaction comes upon you. Surely the game is hardly worth the candle. Why should you for a mere passing pleasure, risk the loss of those great powers with which you have been endowed? Remember that I speak not only as a comrade to another, but as a medical man to one for whose constitution he is to some extent answerable.”

“My mind,” he said, “rebels at stagnation. Give me problems, give me work, give me the most abstruse cryptogram, or the most intricate analysis, and I am in my own proper atmosphere, I can dispense then with the artificial stimulants. But I abhor the dull routine of existence. I crave for mental exaltation.” (714)

This passage very clearly depicts a problem with addiction, but not simply to drugs. Holmes implies that he needs some sort of stimulant to survive in life — if not the drugs, then he must have a stimulating case, which as Fromm contends, becomes a drug itself. Fromm alleges,

In this way too, Holmes' adventures effectively critique the Enlightenment discourse they would seem to reinforce...Holmes demonstrates that his method of producing knowledge does not flow from reality itself, but rather emerges bound up in the complex process of its construction. Indeed, his detective work often does not amount to solving crime at all, so much as it does reconfiguring the dynamics of a situation he encounters. (320)

Fromm's argument further proves the point that science and reason are important, along with powers of observation and knowledge. However, without some inference or imagination, reality is not actually even reality. Holmes alludes to this problem frequently himself in his stories as he consistently points out that things are not usually what they first appear to be. In "The Red-Headed League," he notes, "As a rule, the more bizarre a thing is, the less mysterious it proves to be, It is your commonplace, featureless crimes which are really puzzling" (23). Douglas Kerr makes a similar argument to Fromm's in his book *Conan Doyle*, insisting that Sherlock is creating the narrative and the knowledge in his stories, not simply listening to it. He argues the extreme,

Sherlock is not addicted to cocaine. For him it is a recreational drug, and he stops using when he has an absorbing case to work on. He is not even addicted to crime; quite a few of his cases contain none. His addiction is to knowledge, and specifically to those strings or sequences of information that constitute a story. When their right place in such a sequence is found, the most prosaic and uninteresting of details — the label in a coat, a smudge of paint, a dog that didn't bark — become clothed in shining significance, as if they were angels. (144)

There are many debatable points in Kerr's statement. One includes Holmes' drug addiction. Watson, who sings Sherlock's praises in every other way, calls his cocaine use a vice in multiple stories, including *The Sign of Four*, and is greatly disturbed by it. However, most importantly, what Kerr has just described here is not an addiction to knowledge, or even a "string" of facts. If Sherlock were solely addicted to knowledge, he would not constantly seek something else to stir his mind, and his character would not be so dissatisfied and consistently miserable. He would not

need the cocaine, or the cases, or anything else. He could simply study continuously and gain more knowledge to satisfy his desire. What Sherlock is addicted to is something that every human craves — the opportunity to use his entire mind and his unique abilities to combine reason with imagination in order to wonder and discover.

Fromm's point about Sherlock's drug use is that it counters the predominate view of the detective as an established representation of the positivist view of his day. He proposes, "It instead brings to the foreground exactly the sort of epistemological doubt that the detective would seem to struggle to erase, and thus highlights the sort of social anxiety he appears to calm" (321). In other words, Sherlock's need for more than empiricism highlights Doyle's disenchantment with modernity. Holmes exemplifies these anxieties in "The Adventure of the Cardboard Box" when he questions, "What is the meaning of it, Watson? What object is served by this circle of misery and violence and fear? It must tend to some end, or else our universe is ruled by chance, which is unthinkable. But what end? There is the great standing perennial problem to which human reason is as far from an answer as ever" (200). Fromm even calls Holmes' character "a glaring contradiction" (322), but that is incorrect. Although Conan Doyle claims Sherlock is analytical and scientific, he can not help but create a character that also grows weary of his *fin de siècle* surroundings. Mankind is created for so much more, and unfortunately, the positivist, bleak society that Britain created from the mid- to the late-nineteenth century made those drugs incredibly appealing. Sadly, because they dulled the senses, many felt the drugs allowed their imaginations to run free.

Regretfully, drugs were not an accidental part of Doyle's British culture. His frustrations and resistance to the climate surrounding drugs may have been intentional. In "Addiction,

Empire, and Narrative in Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Sign of the Four*" authors Christopher Keep and Don Randall analyze Britain's role in the drug trade that contributed to the demise of their citizens. Critiquing the same passage previously discussed from *The Sign of Four*; they compose a literary article with a clever argument. As they compare the "puncture" of the cocaine drug in Sherlock's body in *The Sign of Four* with the "puncture" or invasion of the British empire, the authors also discuss the drug trade in Britain and the idea that Britain had become heavily dependent upon trade with other countries, "The degree to which British imperialism of the nineteenth century was invested in and maintained by the global traffic in addictive substances is well documented. At mid-century, for example, opium was a major export commodity for Britain's largest colony, India, and the British government was very sensitive to the profits that could be realized through the sale of the drug" (207). The government was excited at the prospect of cocaine as well. The profits from drug sales drove imperialistic Britain to compromise their ideals. Meanwhile, British officials were presenting a positivistic, empirical attitude, and Sir Conan Doyle's works depict the confusing message his society is digesting. Keep and Randall recognize Holmes's commitment to positivist science, claiming that he attempts to adhere to, "nineteenth-century typologies of gender, class, race and thus created a detective designed to enforce the fixity and naturalness of the established social order" (215). However, they also recognize the fact that Doyle's work is not entirely positivistic. They do "not challenge the coherence of his works, but rather point to their inadequacy as representations of the late-Victorian social world and to the sociogenetic anxieties and insecurities that presumably determine Conan Doyle's narrative articulation" (215). In other words, everyone is feeling exasperated by positivism, and that frustration and confusion is represented in Doyle's narrative.

Keep and Randall also specifically examine Sherlock's drug use in this passage in *The Sign of Four*; stating, "its insidious, primitive, and dangerous essence threatens to reduce the user to a mere 'slave,' and reverse the relationship of colonizer to colonized. Narcotics, then, are to Britain what cocaine is to Holmes — the enormous cost to the nation's constitution that is entailed in any investment in the eccentric" (210). This is a powerful claim. The country knew there were costs for the drug trade, and they were not solely monetary. In the same way, Sherlock Holmes knows there are costs for his drug use, and they are not solely monetary. He believes the benefits of the drug, and the fact that they enable him to do his "work," outweigh the physical costs. Unfortunately, many British agreed. During the *fin de siècle* period in which Conan Doyle creates his disenchanted detective, it is mainly a generation of overworked, middle-aged members of society that long for the "good ole days," something that both Doyle and Sherlock experience, which is another reason readers likely relate to the Sherlock stories. As mundane work becomes life, and culture dictates positivism, the search for something more is natural, yet strict empiricism combined with encouraged drug use for economic gain, spelled disaster for turn-of-the-century British citizens. Using his Holmes stories as a platform, Doyle resisted these changes he reluctantly witnessed.

A Resistance to the “Strict Empiricism”

Ironically, the only *logical* response to the strict empiricism experienced by the late-nineteenth century British is resistance. A true dichotomy between logic and imagination cannot exist because humans are uniquely designed to utilize both. Doyle’s resistance to the attempts of the British culture to limit mankind are not only ironically “logical,” but are also apparent in his narrative. In “The Method Effect: Empiricism and Form in Sherlock Holmes,” Ben Parker discusses some of the effects of empiricism on narrative specifically. He argues, “And what they do concurs with the limits to subjectivity drawn by empiricism and its attendant temporal complications” (451). In other words, although Sherlock often claims to use “pure reason” and “deduction” in his stories, Parker contends that Holmes, or ultimately Doyle, can not perform adequately within the “limits” the strict British empiricism places on its citizens, and in an attempt to create a detective who does, his narrative is faulty. Similarly, in his book *The Theory of the Novel*, George Lukacs dissects the structure of novels and explains some strategical issues that occur in novels. He agrees with Parker, “The dissonance special to the novel, the refusal of the immanence of being to enter into empirical life, produces a problem of form whose formal nature is much less obvious than other kinds of art” (71). Lukacs proposes the idea that it is natural for an author to resist empirical life, but when he does, it affects the form of his narrative. Parker would argue this is what occurs in the Sherlock stories, and he asserts that Doyle’s form is impaired, especially in its claims to be “scientific.” But is it an issue of form, or a reflection of mankind’s need to represent more than empirical life? Curiously, Parker’s argument supports the idea that it is impossible to *only* use the sense experiences to solve any sort of puzzle. Sherlock

uses the empiricist ideas of his day, but Conan Doyle's character is begging for imagination, creativity, and something to break up the "mundane" in British modernity.

In his opposition to the pressure surrounding him, Doyle creates a character who uses the "science" his society supports, but he practices more pure science — science that allows for advancement and innovation. Parker also includes philosophical information in his discussion about empiricism and narrative. He inspects Hume's philosophy that every idea begins with an impression, and he notes, "Empiricism denies the conceptual structure of the sense experience; we are to form our ideas *from* experience (i.e., *after* experience)" (461). In other words, strict empiricism robs humanity of a vital portion of itself. Telling someone his ideas are non-existent because they are not already in existence is ludicrous. It is also devastating for society. Any new idea is considered irrational, which stunts growth, invention, and creativity. Parker emphasizes, "Hume's famous skepticism as to causality is another instance of empiricism denying our mode of reason can appertain to the outside world" (462). In *The Sign of Four*, Watson asks Holmes if he has "any professional inquiry on foot at the present?" (717). Holmes replies,

"None. Hence the cocaine. I cannot live without brain-work. What else is there to live for? Stand at the window here. Was ever such a dreary, dismal, unprofitable world? See how the yellow fog swirls down the street and drifts across dun-colored houses. What could be more hopelessly prosaic and material? What is the use of having powers, doctor, when one has no field upon which to exert them? Crime is commonplace, and existence is commonplace, and no qualities save those which are commonplace have any function upon the earth." (717)

Sherlock describes his world as “dismal” and “hopelessly prosaic,” and so it would be if imagination, which is actually his speciality, was so frowned upon. Parker’s article creates a picture of a character who is suffocating, but Sir Conan Doyle’s narrative is a resistance to the “suffocating” empirical ideas of the British government. Parker’s point that Sherlock does not realistically use only deductive powers to solve his cases is valid because he *cannot* use *only* deductive powers.

What Kind of Logic is Sherlock Actually Using Then?

Sherlock's "deductive" powers are a significant topic of conversation. Most can agree on the idea that Holmes uses some sort of reasoning combined with keen powers of observation to solve his cases. However, whether or not he uses deduction is debatable. P.N. Johnson Laird is a philosopher and studier of "mental model theory." He has spent over fifty years studying how minds work, teaching as a professor, and developing theories about reasoning. His book entitled *How We Reason* contains several chapters about different types of reasoning, and he devotes one entire chapter to the type of reasoning that Sherlock Holmes utilizes in his detective stories. It is interesting to note that Laird uses analogies and examples to help his readers understand complex topics, but he also provides further room for the reader to think and analyze. Just as he claims there is almost always something we have not thought of, his examples allow the reader to consider things he may not have thought of, which is the beauty of the combination of logic and innovation at work. In chapter fourteen, Laird discusses the type of reasoning that Sherlock Holmes and Watson use in Sir Conan Doyle's stories. He begins the chapter with a Scottish doctor's interview of a patient and explains that Conan Doyle was a clerk for the great doctor, Joseph Bell, who was also known for "uncanny inferences" (185). Sir Conan Doyle himself said, "I used and amplified his methods when later in life I tried to build up a scientific detective who solved cases on his own merits and not through the folly of the criminal" (186). Holmes impresses a potential client with his inferences in "The Red-Headed League:"

“Beyond the obvious facts that he has at some time done manual labor, that he takes snuff, that he is a Freemason, that he has been in China, and that he has done a considerable amount of writing lately, I can deduce nothing else.”

“How, in the name of good fortune, did you know all that, Mr. Holmes?” he asked. “How did you know, for example, that I did manual labor. It’s as true a gospel, for I began as a ship’s carpenter.”

“Your hands, my dear sir. Your right hand is quite a size larger than your left. You have worked with it, and the muscles are more developed.”

“Well, the snuff, then, and the Freemasonry?”

“I won’t insult your intelligence by telling you how I read that, especially as, rather against the strict rules of your order, you see an arc and compass breast pin.”

“Ah, of course, I forgot that. But the writing?”

“What else can be indicated by that right cuff so very shiny for five inches, and the left one with very smooth patch near the elbow where you rest it upon the desk.”

“Well, but China?”

“The fish which you have tattooed immediately above your right wrist could have been done in China. I have made a small study of tattoo marks, and have even contributed to the literature of the subject. That trick of staining the fishes’ scales of a delicate pink is quite peculiar to China. When, in addition, I see a Chinese coin hanging from your watch-chain, the matter becomes even more simple.” (17)

Once Holmes explains how he reasons these inferences, the client Jabez Wilson exclaims, “I thought you had done something clever, but I see that there was nothing in it after all” (17).

Johnson-Laird argues that Holmes claims he is using deductive reasoning (Holmes uses the word deduce in this passage, and some form of the word deduction can be found in most of his stories as a self-proclamation), but his inferences are actually fallible. Although he certainly uses the positivist idea of the senses to observe details along with his own research to “deduce” conclusions, if we examine almost every one of Holmes’ responses, there could possibly be another explanation. However, Laird also explains that Holmes and Watson are definitely using reasoning in their stories; it is simply an example of adductive reasoning rather than deductive reasoning, or reasoning almost backwards. They are working from “effects to causes” (186). In other words, why are the hands calloused with the right larger than the left? Why does he have a small fish tattooed above his hand, etc.? Holmes is looking at the end results questioning what caused them, which arguably requires imagination. Notably, Holmes usually uses more than one “inference” or clue to arrive at results, and while Johnson-Laird argues it is fallible, he does admit that adductive reasoning is most useful and most practical in our daily lives (186-196), which is further evidence that logic alone is less effective than logic combined with imagination. Michael Saler explains this same process with nuance, “He expanded the definition of rationality beyond a narrow, means-ended instrumentalism to include the imagination” (604). Indeed, in *The Hound of the Baskervilles*, Sherlock calls his method “the scientific use of the imagination” (548). Historically, how have scientists made giant break-throughs? It generally includes thinking outside the box and combining concrete scientific evidence, or what they can see, hear, smell, taste, and experience, with their own inventive ideas. In many of his cases, Holmes frequently outsmarts the local investigators. Saler claims that these men “tend to be unimaginative positivists who miss everything that is not presented directly before their senses,

or are unable to interpret creatively those facts...” (604). The positivist narrows his options. Preconceptions blunt imagination, and man is not meant to use solely logic or solely imagination. Michael Saler notes about the character Holmes, “He always managed to establish the logical, but not necessarily obvious, connections among all the empirical facts that he observed. Through careful scrutiny, analytical reasoning, and imaginative insight, Holmes demonstrated that modern experience could be holistic and legible — but also wonderfully variable” (616). Some inference is needed in Holmes’ “deduction.” As Johnson-Laird points out, Holmes uses analytical reasoning to arrive at his conclusions, but what makes him such a successful detective is combining that reasoning with the innovation he brings to the situation. The “whole” man works more effectively, which Sherlock consistently demonstrates.

After years of studying logic and reason, Johnson-Laird joins his long-time friend, Keith Oatley, who is a psychology professor and colleague as well, and together they have begun studying how emotions affect reasoning, demonstrating further that Sherlock’s reasoning is more practical than positivist science. Their research in “Cognitive Approaches to Emotions” discusses how different emotions affect reasoning differently. Throughout their research, they recognize that emotions can actually assist reason at times. After dedicating years of studying to reason alone, their new discoveries are compelling. Additionally, their findings about which emotions assist in reasoning and which ones make it difficult, are logical. The authors assert, “a common belief is that emotions impair reasoning. Certainly, a person in a panic attack is not a paragon of inferential competence. A crucial distinction, however, is whether an emotion is incidental to a reasoning task or emerges naturally from it” (3). They explain that when emotion arises naturally from a task, recent research suggests that reasoners are more likely to consider possibilities they

would not have without the emotion. In other words, when someone is in a stable state of mind, completing a task, “emotions” can actually assist in creating new ideas. Their use of the word “emotion” is intriguing, and while we would not necessarily consider it exactly the same thing as imagination, imagination does fall into the same area of the human psyche. Imagination stems from pathos, just as emotion does.

If one studies ancient philosophers, it is evident that many understood logos, pathos, and ethos to be equally important in mankind. Just as it is unreasonable to expect humans to operate in positivism alone, it is nonsensical to expect them to operate in logos alone. In *Rhetoric Companion: A Student's Guide to Power in Persuasion*, apologist professors N.D. Wilson and Douglas Wilson offer a modern view of the ancient ideas *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*. Discussing the importance of using all three in the art of rhetoric, the authors can not help but overlap those ideas with the human psyche.¹⁰ The Wilsons argue the idea that humans are not created to be *only* logical. Just as emotions (pathos) alone would be a poor representation of mankind, so too would logos alone. In Sir Conan Doyle’s culture, logos alone was not only encouraged, but also demanded from people. We have already seen that if a doctor or scientist in this society did not operate under the strict empiricism of his culture, people no longer respected his ideas. *The Rhetoric Companion* contains several sections that demonstrate why it is impossible for anyone to operate in logos alone, and Doyle’s resistance in his character Sherlock would have been

¹⁰ The Wilsons approach ethos, pathos, and logos from a clearly Christian perspective, and because they bring a Biblical view to ethos, pathos, and logos, the Wilsons encompass every aspect of mankind, including the traditionalism that *fin de siècle* Britain so deeply neglected, and Conan Doyle so desperately desired. While discussing modern ideas, the authors evaluate ancient rhetoricians and compare their ideas to the ideas of modern philosophers. In the process of looking at the importance of all three being a significant contributing factor to persuasive speech and writing, they examine the importance of all three in a human.

natural. In chapter nine, the authors claim that many have a poor view of rhetoric because they are examining poor rhetoric. They contend, “Ethos and pathos are greatly neglected in our day. It is assumed that they are what make sophistry wrong, and that what we should strive for is a talk or composition that is a masterpiece of logical perfection, delivered with all the energy of a computer printout. But this is seriously misguided” (47). This is a comical description of what would have been the British political/societal environment for Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. He was admired as a physician, but only if he was always thinking logically. Are the best physicians and scientists not the ones who are able to think logically through a dilemma and then add creativity and imagination when the “formula” does not work? This idea is what Johnson-Laird and Oatley are discovering in their studies of “emotions” paired with logic. What they term “emotion” is a human’s distinct capability to add to logic in the form of thinking and/or imagining. If a doctor can only think through what he has been taught or what he can experience with the senses, new medical cases will stump him, rendering him useless for a suffering patient. If a scientist can only use what is right before him, or what he has been told, innovation is dead.

Pathos, which is extremely helpful in demonstrating the importance of including both emotion and reason, is what was lacking in the *fin de siècle* strict empiricist culture. The Wilsons discuss using sympathy, a word which comes from pathos, in appeals. Rationalists tend to think it is dishonest to appeal to emotions, but the authors claim, “there are times when it is dishonest not to appeal to them” (54). Instead, they argue we should learn to “distinguish without separating” (54) the mind and the affections, or “the head and the heart,” as we tend to call it today. The Wilsons assert, “In the biblical worldview, the head and the heart go together. An absence of one destroys the other. So here we make a crucial distinction. Our emotions are *not* to

be subject to our reason” (55). Historically, this is not always a popular argument, but it is one that includes the whole human. It sounds ridiculous to separate the head and the heart, but in the strict British empiricism, that is exactly what was asked of people. Laird and Oatley’s research supports this claim as well. Their article focuses on literature’s enhancement of empathy, and the authors note, “These emotions are not just those of literary characters; more importantly, they are our own” (3). It logically follows that empathy, evoked by emotion, can help someone reason better when dealing with others. If one has experienced an emotion, even vicariously through literature, one can offer grace and understanding that he may not otherwise have been capable of when others are going through the same circumstances. Under these conditions, “imagination” is required, and it assists reason beautifully.

The idea to intentionally separate pathos and logos in mankind appears preposterous, but this is precisely what the strict British empiricism was asking of its citizens. The Wilsons assert that once this dichotomy is put in place, people can only choose one: an Apollonian (rationalistic) view of the world or a Dionysian (subjectivist) view of the world. They ask the readers to compare the Neo-classical and the romantic eras, or the more recent late fifties and late sixties. They claim, “The common assumption is that if reason does not rule our emotions, then nothing will. This supposition is often supported by the emotional among us, who proceed in the most nonlinear fashion imaginable (giving emotions a rather tarnished reputation)” (55). When the pendulum swings far in one direction or the other, a crucial portion of the human is neglected. The Wilsons accurately maintain,

Our emotions cannot be autonomous, but neither can our reason be. And we do not escape the trap by subjecting one to the other. Rather, both must be subject to the

authority of Scripture. This means that the rule to have in pathetic proofs is a scriptural rule and not a rational rule. This means the question is whether it is scriptural to feel a certain way and not whether it is *rational* to feel that way. (55)

This is an extremely relevant argument for why Sir Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes character is so popular, especially in light of a current government attempting to fashion robotic-like people who appealed to, and utilized, logic only. Sherlock is definitely a character who employs logos, but what makes him so appealing to people from all time periods, is his ability to combine logos and pathos effectively. As he gains more clues from a case — some through scientific tools and some through inference — Holmes becomes more intrigued, which is indicative of his author's excitement in combining pathos, and logos. In a scene from *The Sign of Four*, Sherlock demonstrates both. Watson narrates, and Sherlock responds:

He held down the lamp to the floor, and as he did so I saw for the second time that night a startled, surprised look come over his face. For myself, as I followed his gaze my skin was cold under my clothes. The floor was covered thickly with the prints of a naked foot — clear, well defined, perfectly formed, but scarce half the size of those of an ordinary man... “I cannot conceive anything which will cover the facts,” I answered.

“It will be clear enough to you soon,” he said, in an off-hand way. “I think that there is nothing else of importance here, but I will look.”

He whipped out his lens and a tape measure, and hurried about the room on his knees, measuring, comparing, examining, with his long thin nose only a few inches from the planks, and his beady eyes gleaming and deep-set like those of a bird. So swift, silent, and furtive were his movements, like those of a trained blood-hound picking out a scent,

that I could not but think what a terrible criminal he would have made had he turned his energy and sagacity against the law, instead of exerting them in its defense. As he hunted about, he kept muttering to himself, and finally he broke out into a loud cry of delight.

(731-732)

Holmes' emotions arise as he ponders cases. He becomes excited, and then he thinks creatively *and* rationally — objectively *and* subjectively. It appears paradoxical, but mankind is a paradox. Men and women are unique from every other creature and possess the remarkable capability to utilize logic, reason, emotion, and imagination at the same time. Finding an appropriate balance is not always easy, but it is a necessary task for mankind. Otherwise, people find themselves in the “dismal” state Sherlock often describes.

Conclusion

Sherlock Holmes' enduring imprint as a literary figure is not a matter for dispute. His character has prompted television shows, movies, re-writes, and world-wide clubs for more than a century. The issue that remains debatable is what it is about Holmes that captures the attention of people from around the globe nearly every generation since the *fin de siècle* late 1800s in Great Britain. Is it coincidental that Sherlock Holmes' popularity has seen a resurgence in the early twentieth century? Modernity and decadence have heightened once more, and anything related to traditionalism and religion is yet again ridiculed. It is Doyle's instinctive resistance to positivism and Holmes' logic and science combined with his imagination and innovation that achieve a character that intrigues so many. Providing some context for Sherlock's dismal behavior, the strict empiricism of Doyle's *fin de siècle* British society portrays a bleak culture longing for the truth, goodness, and beauty that was found in traditionalism before the Enlightenment. Because of rigid positivism in science, unbridled drug trade stemming from the government, and a contemptuous view of transcendentalists, the British citizens fought to find purpose in their daily lives and work. Sir Conan Doyle created a character in Sherlock Holmes who combines logic, reason, and science with imagination, innovation, and mystery. In Holmes, Doyle dually creates a resistance to his unyielding empiricist government and an antidote to the despair that many British likely endured in the decadent *fin de siècle* period. Doyle's natural resistance created a timeless character because readers can relate to Holmes' (and Doyle's) frustrations. Some scholars claim Sherlock is "the perfect embodiment of scientific empiricism" (Heady 5), but the Holmes character is obviously miserable attempting to live in a strict

empiricist culture. He is most satisfied with life when he possesses the ability to combine his imagination with logic and reason. If he is the perfect representation of anything, it is the idea that man's existence is meager attempting to live in a state of empiricism or positivism alone. His attitude is one reflective of his creator, Conan Doyle, who was also frustrated with harsh empiricist ideas that ridiculed anything in his beloved scientific community that resembled traditionalism.

Works Cited

- Burges, Joel. "We Are All Geeks Now": Fantasy as a Mode of Social Practice in Disenchanted Modernity." Duke University Press, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24246911>.
- Caldecott, Stratford. *Beauty for Truth's Sake*. Brazos Press, 2009.
- Camp, Nathan. *Not So Elementary: An Examination of Trends in a Century of Sherlock Holmes Adaptations*. Pro Quest, May 2018, <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2120448457/fulltextPDF/872B68C3FCCE4E64PQ/1?accountid=43912>.
- De Brasi, Richard, and Joseph R. Laracy. "An Empirical Critique of Empiricism." *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture*, vol. 16, no. 4, 2013, pp. 124–63. EBSCOhost, <https://doi-org.seu.idm.oclc.org/10.1353/log.2013.0039>.
- Diniejkko, Dr. Andrzej, and D. Litt. "Sherlock Holmes's Addictions." *The Victorian Web*, Dec. 2013, <https://victorianweb.org/authors/doyle/addiction.html>.
- Doyle, Arthur Conan, et al. "A Case of Identity." *Great Works of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle*, Chatham River Press, New York, NY, 1984, pp. 31-42.
- Doyle, Arthur Conan, et al. "The Adventure of the Cardboard Box." *Great Works of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle*, Chatham River Press, New York, NY, 1984, pp. 188-200.
- Doyle, Arthur Conan, et al. "The Adventure of Wisteria Lodge." *Great Works of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle*, Chatham River Press, New York, NY, 1984, pp. 777–792.
- Doyle, Arthur Conan, et al. "The Hound of Baskervilles." *Great Works of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle*, Chatham River Press, New York, NY, 1984, pp. 529-631.
- Doyle, Arthur Conan, et al. "The Red-Headed League." *Great Works of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle*, Chatham River Press, New York, NY, 1984, pp. 16-30.

- Doyle, Arthur Conan, et al. "The Sign of Four." *Great Works of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle*, Chatham River Press, New York, NY, 1984, pp. 713–774.
- "Ennui, n." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, March 2023, www.oed.com/view/Entry/62506. Accessed 15 March 2023.
- Esolen, Anthony M. *Ten Ways to Destroy the Imagination of Your Child*. ISI Books, 2013.
- Fox, William. "Sir Arthur Conan Doyle Interview." 1929.
- Fromm, Devin. "Sherlock Holmes, Addiction, and the Price of Enlightenment: The Case of a Cautionary Tale." *English Literature in Transition 1880-1920*, vol. 61, no. 3, 2018, pp. 310–32. *EBSCOhost*, seu.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mlf&AN=2018581696&site=ehost-live&scope=site.
- Harrington, Ellen Burton. "Nation, Identity and the Fascination with Forensic Science in Sherlock ..." *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, Sage Publications, 2007, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1367877907080149>.
- Heady, Chene. "Autobiography as mystery: Father Brown and the case of G.K. Chesterton." *Renascence: Essays on Values in Literature*, vol. 69, no. 1, winter 2017, pp. 49+. *Gale Literature Resource Center*, link.gale.com/apps/doc/A491201811/LitRC?u=southec&sid=bookmark-LitRC&xid=b0562b14. Accessed 3 Dec. 2022.
- Hicks, David V. *Norms & Nobility: A Treatise on Education*. University Press of America, 1999.
- Johnson-Laird, P.N. *How We Reason*, e-book ed., Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Keep, Christopher, and Don Randall. "Addiction, Empire, and Narrative in Arthur Conan Doyle's The Sign of the Four." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 32, no. 2, Spring 1999, p. 207. *EBSCOhost*, <https://doi-org.seu.idm.oclc.org/10.2307/1346223>.

- Kerr, Douglas. *Conan Doyle - Writing, Profession, and Practice*. Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Lukacs, Georg. *The Theory of the Novel: A Historico-Philosophical Essay on the Forms of Great Epic Literature*. MIT Press, 1971.
- Oatley, Keith, and P N Johnson-Laird. *Cognitive Approaches to Emotions* - Modeltheory.org. Cell Press, 1 Mar. 2014, <https://modeltheory.org/papers/2014tics-emotions.pdf>.
- O'Dell, Benjamin D. "Performing the Imperial Subject: The Ethics of Cocaine in Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Sign of Four*." *The Journal of Popular Culture*, vol. 45, no. 5, Oct. 2012, pp. 979–99. EBSCOhost, <https://doi-org.seu.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1540-5931.2012.00969.x>.
- Parker, Ben. "The Method Effect: Empiricism and Form in Sherlock Holmes." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 49, no. 3, Nov. 2016, pp. 449–466. *The Method Issue*.
- Piercy, Rohase. "A Decadent Detective?: A Look at the *Fin de Siècle* Origins of Conan Doyle's Most Beloved Character." *The Baker Street Journal: An Irregular Quarterly of Sherlockiana*, vol. 65, no. 4, 2015, pp. 29–37. EBSCOhost, <https://search-ebSCOhost-com.seu.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mlf&AN=2017422240&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- "Positivism, n." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, March 2023, www.oed.com/view/Entry/148321. Accessed 15 March 2023.
- "Positivism." Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/positivism>. Accessed 15 Apr. 2023.

- Rieber, Alfred J. "A tale of three genres: history, fiction, and the historical Detektiv." *Kritika*, vol. 15, no. 2, spring 2014, pp. 353+. *Gale OneFile: World History*, link.gale.com/apps/doc/A369129107/PPWH?u=southec&sid=oclc&xid=a6e0b347. Accessed 29 Nov. 2022.
- Saler, Michael T. *As If: Modern Enchantment and the Literary Prehistory of Virtual Reality*. Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Saler, Michael. "'Clap If You Believe in Sherlock Holmes': Mass Culture and the Re-Enchantment of Modernity, c. 1890–c. 1940." *The Historical Journal*, vol. 46, no. 3, Sept. 2003, pp. 599–622., <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0018246x03003170>.
- Siddiqi, Yumna. *Anxieties of Empire and the Fiction of Intrigue*, Columbia University Press, 2007. ProQuest Ebook Central, <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.seu.idm.oclc.org/lib/seu/detail.action?docID=908400>.
- Small, Douglas. "Sherlock Holmes and Cocaine: A 7% Solution for Modern Professionalism." *English Literature in Transition 1880-1920*, vol. 58, no. 3, 2015, pp. 341–60. *EBSCOhost*, seu.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mlf&AN=2015582112&site=ehost-live&scope=site.
- Warnock, Mary. *Imagination*. University of California Press, 1976, <https://archive.org/details/mary-warnock-imagination-university-of-california-press-1976/page/14/mode/2up>.
- Weber, Max. "The Vocation Lectures." *Google Books*, Hackett Publishing, 12 Mar. 2004, https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Vocation_Lectures.html?id=__sYjFoyjtwC.
- Webster, Noah. "Ennui." *Webster's 1828 American Dictionary of the English Language*, Waking Lion Press, 2010, p. 295.

Wilson, Nathan D., and Douglas Wilson. *Rhetoric Companion: A Student's Guide to Power in Persuasion*. Canon Press, 2012.

Wynne, Catherine. *The Colonial Conan Doyle: British Imperialism, Irish Nationalism, and the Gothic*. Greenwood Press, 2002.