

ABSTRACT

One of the most intriguing characters in Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes stories is the "Napoleon of Crime", Professor James Moriarty. Originally a one-story villain devised to kill off Holmes, Moriarty has transformed over a century of adaptations and retellings into a much more prominent part of the franchise, a byword for "arch-enemy", and – it might be argued – a prototype for other pop-culture nemeses such as Batman's Joker and James Bond's Blofeld. His most iconic incarnation in later years is likely the homicidal maniac portrayed by Andrew Scott in BBC's *Sherlock* (2010), interestingly enough a version that differs considerably from Doyle's original.

This thesis attempts to explain this rise in prominence, and the chancing nature of the character, by viewing Moriarty through the lens of Otherness. A philosophical concept related to Hegel and Sartre, as well as Said's Orientalism, this theory states that we perceive ourselves in contrast to others. On the assumption, described by Neil McCaw, that Sherlock Holmes represents the interests and standpoint of the audience – a symbol of both good and law, but also (due to his origins) England and the West – it analyses some of the most prominent Holmes adaptations to discover what Moriarty represents in turn. The answer differs with each adaptation, according to historical context, but Moriarty is always more than a simple academic turned rogue. During Doyle's day, the time of the British Empire, he is ultimately a dangerous nuisance. Immediately prior to World War Two, he channels Hitler and the spectre of war. During the Cold War, there are shades of the KGB and international espionage, and in *Sherlock* (2010) Andrew Scott portrays one of two Moriarty analogues who offer equally nefarious opposites to today's values of peace and freedom. Whatever their nature, however, they all share one thing: a burning hatred for Sherlock Holmes, and everything he, and the audience, stand for.

Cover picture credit, clockwise from the upper right: George Zucco in *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* (Werker); Andrew Scott in a publicity shot for *Sherlock* (Moffat, Gattis et. al.); Eric Porter in Granada Television's version of "The Final Problem" (Grint); Sidney Paget's Moriarty (Doyle "The Final Problem" 832).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The game was afoot...

But it wouldn't have gotten very far with only me playing it. Very much like Sherlock Holmes himself, I relied on the kindness of others to offer a satisfactory conclusion to the case.

My most heartfelt of thanks to my supervisor, Associate Professor Eli Løfaldli, a wealth of information on both adaptation theory and Holmesian lore.

Much appreciated were the coffee breaks with Signe Karmhus, Irene Adler-esque scholar of anything sufficiently nerdy to be relevant.

For helping to ensure that this thesis didn't lose itself in Sherlock-like babbling, I owe a debt to Cecilie Pedersen, lecturer in geography.

A toast to my Hungarian psychologist, Maria Abrahamsen Østhassel, for her consultation on the subject of sociopathy versus psychopathy.

A very great thanks to those manning the desks of Reading Room 6301 and the couches of the Fubar Collective. My dear ladies and gentlemen, it wouldn't have been the same without you.

And finally, a salute to Steven Moffat, Mark Gattis, and Andrew Scott, without whose Jim Moriarty this thesis would not have existed, and to Benedict Cumberbatch, without whose Holmes he could not have thrived. If you ever read this, gentlemen, I may just fall over a rooftop from the shock.

Espen Gabrielsen
Trondheim, May 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
1.0 – Introduction.....	1
2.0 – The Napoleon of Crime: Moriarty in Literature, 1893-1914.....	7
2.1 – Doyle's Holmes.....	7
2.2 – Doyle's Moriarty.....	9
3.0 – Napoleon Lost: Moriarty on Stage and Screen, 1899-1939.....	21
3.1 – The <i>Sherlock Holmes</i> Play, 1899.....	22
3.2 – <i>The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes</i> , 1939.....	27
4.0 – Back to Reichenbach: Moriarty on Television, 1984-2014.....	35
4.1 – Granada's <i>Sherlock Holmes</i> , 1984.....	35
4.2 – <i>Sherlock</i> , 2010.....	41
5.0 – Conclusion and Future Research.....	49
Works Cited.....	51
Works of Fiction Cited Featuring Holmes and/or Moriarty.....	53
Printed Texts Cited.....	53
Films and TV Episodes Cited.....	54
Works of Other Fiction Cited.....	55
Printed Texts Cited.....	55
Films and TV Episodes Cited.....	55
Appendix: Relevance for the Teacher Profession.....	57

It is necessary that you should withdraw. You have worked things in such a fashion that we have only one resource. It has been an intellectual treat to me to see the way in which you have grappled with this affair, and I say, unaffectedly, that it would be a grief to me to be forced to take any extreme measure. You smile, sir, but I assure you that it really would.

– Professor Moriarty (Doyle "The Final Problem" 834)

Kill you? N... no, don't be obvious. I mean, I'm gonna kill you anyway, someday. I don't want to rush it though. I'm saving it up for something special. No, no, no, no, no. If you don't stop prying... I will *burn* you. I will burn... the *heart* out of you.

– Jim Moriarty (McGuigan "The Great Game" 01:25:31)

The interplay of ideas and the oblique uses of knowledge are often of extraordinary interest.

– Sherlock Holmes (Doyle "The Valley of Fear" 354)

1.0 – INTRODUCTION

Sherlock Holmes was killed on May 4, 1891, at the Reichenbach Falls near Meiringen, Switzerland. Alongside him died a man called Professor Moriarty, who had chased Holmes across Europe in retaliation for the destruction of his criminal organization. At Reichenbach, the two fought and ultimately fell to their deaths. These events were chronicled two years later by Holmes's biographer, Doctor John Watson, in a text called "The Final Problem".

On another level, the fictional character of Sherlock Holmes was killed in the pages of *The Strand* magazine in 1893, at the very end of author Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's short story "The Final Problem" (846). Sherlock Holmes was just as popular in the late nineteenth century as he is in the early twenty-first, and public demand for new stories was enormous. Eventually Doyle tired of this pressure, and decided to stop writing stories about his famous "Great Detective" by killing off the character (Panek 78). To give Holmes a suitable farewell, he created a writer's murder weapon. Professor Moriarty, certified academic genius, London's criminal mastermind, and the "Napoleon of Crime" (Doyle "The Final Problem" 833), was a character designed solely to give Holmes a worthy opponent who could finally destroy him. Once he had sent the Great Detective to his doom, Doyle started writing historical fiction, a type of story he had developed a greater interest in (Panek 78-79).

However, the public demand for Holmes stories did not weaken with the character's death. In need of funds (Doyle *Memories and Adventures*), Doyle started writing a play, eventually being credited co-writer in 1899 of his second effort to do so (Doyle and Gillette *Sherlock Holmes. A Drama in Four Acts*). The play does not fit with the timeline of Doyle's published texts. Instead it is an adaptation, featuring a more romantic Holmes and a less competent Moriarty as its antagonist. By 1901, Doyle had relented even more by writing *The Hound of the Baskervilles*, set before "The Final Problem". Two years later he finally gave in to the pressure entirely, continuing his series of short stories by sensationally resurrecting the Great Detective ("The Empty House" 849).

Despite Holmes's return, the Moriarty of the short stories was still dead. The professor was mentioned throughout "The Empty House", but in later stories he was only given sporadic mentions. Doyle really only gave Moriarty another significant part in the final Holmes novel, 1914's *The Valley of Fear*, where the Professor is a powerful but ultimately unseen character (Doyle "The

Valley of Fear" 307-428). The end result: out of Doyle's fifty-six short stories and four novels, Moriarty features or is mentioned in six of the former and one of the latter.

In the greater universe of Holmes adventures by later writers, however, Moriarty seems to be everywhere. He has seemingly become something of an obligatory arch-enemy that any Holmes must face, often in stories that take their cues from or retell "The Final Problem". Versions of Moriarty have been portrayed by Orson Welles in *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* for the BBC radio (Cohen), Sir Laurence Olivier in *The Seven Per-Cent Solution* (Ross), and Vincent Price in *The Great Mouse Detective* (Michener et al.). He has played the part of a villainous protagonist, such as in *Professor Moriarty: The Hound of the d'Urbervilles* (Newman) and the Image Comics series simply titled *Moriarty* (Corey and Diecidue). He has even featured as an antagonist in fiction where Holmes is not present at all, for example in the *Star Trek: The Next Generation* episodes "Elementary, Dear Data" (Bowman) and "Ship in a Bottle" (Singer), and the first volume of *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen* comic series (Moore and O'Neill).

This list seems to suggest a process in which the prominence of the character has grown alongside the list of Holmes productions and interpretations. From a sort of evil *deus ex machina*, a simple hero-killer, Moriarty has become a well-loved, or well-loved-to-hate, part of the franchise. He is, simply put, the most recognizable Holmes villain, and as such has influenced other villainous characters in later works.

In order to investigate this process, Doyle's originals as well as chosen adaptations will be subjected to close reading. One definition of this process is "the mindful, disciplined reading of an object with a view to deeper understanding of its meanings" (Bummet 9). The results of this process will then be analysed in the greater context surrounding the various texts; the views of the writer, events in history, the society and politics at the time of writing, and so forth. The point of departure of this thesis is that each version of Moriarty owes his articulation to the context in which he was created. Fiction has said to either shape society, or be reflected by it (Inglis); the iconic character of Sherlock Holmes has certainly done both. The question, then, is whether his arch-enemy has done so as well.

A close reading should not be performed on a large texts. As it deals with attention to detail, it benefits instead from analysing the most crucial portions of a text, using them to investigate the aforementioned deeper understanding of the entire piece. In the case of this thesis, it would be counterproductive to study Doyle's entire bibliography of Sherlock Holmes stories; instead, those

sections of short stories and novels that explicitly feature Moriarty have been close-read. In a similar vein, a study of all Moriarty adaptations would fill an entire book. This thesis will focus on some of the most prominent versions of the character, those found in the most iconic Holmes adaptations of their times. These are:

- the nineteenth century's literary Moriarty, with a principal focus on Doyle's original character as presented in "The Final Problem", "The Adventure of the Empty House", and *The Valley of Fear*.
- the early twentieth century's cinematic Moriarty, with a principal focus on William Gillette's play, later adapted into a recently-rediscovered silent film from 1922, as well as George Zucco's portrayal of the character opposite Basil Rathbone's iconic Great Detective in *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* (Werker 1939).
- the modern era's televised Moriarty, with a principal focus on the Eric Porter version featured in Granada's defining 1984 TV series, and the two analogues (that is, those characters who are based on the original version) presented in BBC's *Sherlock* (Gattis and Moffat): Jim Moriarty (Andrew Scott) and Charles Augustus Magnussen (Lars Mikkelsen).

This master's thesis will investigate the hypothesis that, while much of the character's appeal stems from his being an opposite or foil to the character of Holmes, it also stems from Moriarty being a foil to the *symbol* of Holmes. Rather than being the arch-enemy of one man, each specific Moriarty is the arch-enemy of not just a specific Holmes, but what that Holmes represents. This may explain the character's prominence. He is something more than the man who once killed the Great Detective, just as Holmes is more than simply a man who is good at solving murders. Sherlock Holmes represents something greater than mere crime-solving, and his arch-enemy represents something more than mere crime.

To this end, each discussion of a particular Moriarty must also contain a discussion of that adaptation's Sherlock Holmes. The Great Detective's character in each text will be briefly summarised. As stated, a key part of this discussion will also revolve around what a particular Holmes symbolizes, and what each particular Moriarty symbolizes in turn. Holmes has, since his creation, become one of the world's most recognizable characters. Neil McCaw suggests that he may in fact be "the 'original pop culture icon'" (McCaw 19). He is not just a symbol of law and good, however, but also of a narrower kind: Holmes represents England (McCaw 19-39), which brings different connotations depending on where and when England is viewed from. Seen from

outside the United Kingdom, England stands for the entire nation. It might be a stuffy place of tweed and tea, a bastion of high art, a former colonial oppressor, or America's collaborator in a just or unjust War on Terror.

What does being an arch-enemy entail? Merriam-Webster defines the term simply as "someone's main enemy", dating the word to around 1550 (Merriam-Webster "Arch-Enemy"). A similar term that has also been used to describe Moriarty as he relates to Holmes is *nemesis*, from "the Greek goddess of retributive justice". Merriam-Webster's definition is also related to arch-enemy, "an opponent or enemy that is very difficult to defeat (...) a formidable and usually successful rival or opponent" (Merriam-Webster "Nemesis"). The Oxford Dictionaries use the definition of "the inescapable agent of someone or something's downfall" (Oxford Dictionaries "Nemesis"). Interestingly, all of these definitions mirror Moriarty in his quest to punish Holmes. Traditionally the Great Detective interrupts or destroys Moriarty's crime organization, which becomes his main motive for destroying Holmes in turn. At least for the characters of Holmes and Moriarty, *nemesis* seems an even more fitting term to use than arch-enemy.

For the *symbols* of Holmes and Moriarty, however, arch-enemy may be a better term than *nemesis*. As noted, Holmes has become a symbol of Englishness, but may also be one of the United Kingdom or indeed the Western world, in which the nation is a leading voice. It is this varying symbol, it will be shown, that Moriarty opposes. Edward Said (XII) described the concept of a Western world (or Occident) as "made up from human effort, partly affirmation, partly identification of the Other", in opposition to an Eastern world. The Other and Otherness are philosophical terms, related to Hegel and Sartre; "the [S]elf must learn to recognize itself in the [O]ther" (Frie 55). The Self's self-perception will orient itself around this Other – which is the origin of the term "the Orient", for centuries used by Westerners to vaguely define foreign regions of Asia.

Applying such philosophy to the adversarial relationship between Holmes and Moriarty yields some interesting results, as Moriarty is far from being Holmes's opposite in every way. The similarities between the two characters are usually quite apparent. However, they also serve to highlight crucial differences. Something of the same applies to the symbols of Holmes and Moriarty. It is noteworthy that Holmes, the symbol of England, is only matched by the intellect and power of a fellow Englishman. However, while Holmes represents England at its most civilised, intelligent and potent, Moriarty is an English academic gone rotten. His nationality and his former profession both

establish him as a symbol of the lawless Orient in that he is a Quisling figure aligned with their ideals. He shares their ill wishes for the lawful Occident represented by Holmes, while still retaining much of the power associated with that world by right of his Occidental birth and position.

This thesis will use this hypothesis as a point of departure to close read some of the most enduring Holmes adaptations of the last century (see page 7). Chapter 2 will deal with Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's original Moriarty. Chapter 3 will present the Professor of stage and screen in the first half of the twentieth century. Chapter 4 will investigate Moriarty on television in the modern era. Finally, Chapter 5 will present a conclusion and touch on future research opportunities within the subject.

2.0 – THE NAPOLEON OF CRIME: MORIARTY IN LITERATURE, 1893-1914

As has been stated, Professor Moriarty was featured as a major part of three of Doyle's stories: "The Final Problem", "The Empty House" and *The Valley of Fear*. These, then, are the first pieces of fiction in which the character first appeared. Adaptation scholar Gérard Genette coined a more academic phrase for such an original text which invents its own ideas, calling it a hypotext. A later piece that borrows or adapts ideas from a hypotext, he termed a hypertext (Genette 9).

Another term commonly used for Doyle's stories is canon, a word usually associated with a particular class of literature that is commonly acknowledged as the most important of a time period (Merriam-Webster "Canon"). However, McCaw problematises the word in regard to Doyle's Holmes by pointing out that such an elitist term "does not sit easily with the popularcultural Holmes". Adaptations of the Great Detective, he argues,

often disagree with each other, and sometimes with themselves, in aligning that authority with Doyle's authorship, generally focusing instead, like biblical adaptations, on either some microtext (the figures of Holmes and Watson, who are assumed to be malleable within certain limits) or some macrotext (the franchise as an enterprise larger than Doyle) (McCaw 22).

In other words, Doyle's original bibliography of Holmes texts, while containing of the most recognisable stories in history, is also one of those most often used as a departure point rather than a strict rulebook. In other words, Holmes stories often do not "follow the books"; the academic term for this is fidelity. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan waste little time in discrediting the belief that "if a film is to be a good adaptation, it needs to be faithful to its literary source and that the best adaptations are those that come closest to preserving and revering the literary text" (Cartmell and Whelehan 2). While it is of interest to examine how closely a hypertext follows a hypotext, recent adaptation studies have treated close-fidelity adaptations as only one kind of many. Fidelity, it is agreed, does not necessarily impact the quality of the hypertext (Sanders 20).

2.1 – DOYLE'S HOLMES

The hypotextual Moriarty was created in 1891 as a foil to the hypotextual Holmes. As mentioned, to analyse an antagonist it is first necessary to analyze the protagonist, both as characters and as

symbols. The following chapter must be read in the knowledge that Doyle's Holmes, at the time of his depiction in 1893, is and was seen as a mostly heroic figure. The largest societal blemish on his character so far is perhaps his infamous and unhealthy use of cocaine, introduced in *The Sign of the Four* three years earlier. Holmes is eccentric, ignorant of common subjects and almost obsessed over others, but is "certainly not a difficult man to live with" ("A Study in Scarlet" 18) and "a privilege to be associated with" ("The Naval Treaty" 801). He sometimes takes the law into his own hands, letting criminals escape, but this is not problematised within the stories themselves: Doctor Watson consistently agrees with Holmes's actions (McCaw 28), leading to Doyle's canon presenting the Great Detective as a force not just of the law, which is fallible, but of justice, which is not. At this point Holmes is an international figure, having solved cases for inspectors from France and Germany, as well as the King of Scandinavia ("The Final Problem" 832).

Even before becoming a twentieth-century cultural megastar, then, the character of Sherlock Holmes was an example of Englishness, and a very conscious one of that. McCaw notes that Doyle followed the trend of

displac[ing] the decrease in national self-confidence caused by economic decline (...), foreign policy disaster (...), and the rise of aspirant nations as leading world economic and military powers (...), with an over-compensating reassertion of a superior Englishness. (McCaw 25)

Doyle's Holmes, and the stories about him, must be understood as patriotically supportive of the British Empire and its laws, which extended far beyond Europe. This, then, is the first Holmes's symbolic Self, which means that his symbolic Other represents the opposites of these sides. The line of minor antagonists faced prior to Moriarty are not just technical lawbreakers, but moral criminals. Indeed, if a person breaks the law in a Doyle story, it does not mean that he or she is the true antagonist. The hypotextual Holmes has a tendency to let a morally good killer go free if he feels that he or she ultimately acted in self-defence, and that the true antagonist of the story was actually the victim. However, all of these real antagonists share the trait of (when all is said and done) ultimately being inferior to Holmes. If they are not slain by someone they have oppressed, they are usually arrested. Before "The Final Problem" the counterfeiters of "The Engineer's Thumb" were the only antagonists of the canon to wholly escape justice, and even then, that story ends on a light note with a laughing Holmes ("The Engineer's Thumb" 595). Some of their murderous colleagues ("The Five Orange Pips" 520; "The Greek Interpreter 800"; "The Hound of the Baskervilles" 296)

also escape Holmes, though karma strikes them dead soon after. In other words, the justice that Holmes symbolises overtook them after all. The crucial difference between these antagonists and Moriarty lies in their relation to Holmes himself. They may be a threat to his clients, but to Holmes themselves they are only minor nuisances. It was not until "The Final Problem" that Doyle faced his Great Detective with a better class of criminal.

2.2 – DOYLE'S MORIARTY

Moriarty, like Holmes, also changed over time. Differences can be noted in each of the Professor's appearances. These, however, can be explained by the purpose Moriarty serves in a given Doyle-penned hypotext. As will be explained more fully in this section, in "The Final Problem", Moriarty is Holmes's equal; in "The Empty House", his inferior; and in *The Valley of Fear*, his superior. Of these, the first and the last are the most similar, playing up Moriarty as a formidable enemy, while the portrayal in "The Empty House" is somewhat less flattering.

In "The Final Problem", Moriarty's character has several facets that together form the nemesis who fights Holmes at Reichenbach. The short story itself is a modest work of 7,158 words, only twenty of which are "Moriarty". It is also something of a departure from Doyle's norm. Jeremy Hawthorn points out that most detective stories, Doyle's *Holmes* adventure "Silver Blaze" being his cited example, consist of two parallel sequences of events that are combined into the following:

[The criminal's] motivation → [the criminal's] planning and crime → [the detective's visit to] the crime scene → [the detective's] investigation → solution. (Hawthorn 53)

According to this formula, the traditional Holmes story itself begins with the third event, the detective visiting the crime scene. As Holmes solves the case, the first two parts of the formula are revealed, and together they reveal the plot (and the villain). "The Final Problem", on the other hand, presents a different sequence of events, which can be formulated as follows:

The detective's motivation to bring down the criminal → the criminal's failed retaliation → the criminal's loss of power, but not liberty → the flight of the detective to escape retribution → the final confrontation that leaves both detective and criminal dead.

In other words, "The Final Problem" is not strictly speaking a detective story. Instead of a typical

Doyle-written murder mystery, it is an almost Hitchcock-like tale of power and revenge. This change in narrative pace seems to reflect the nature of Moriarty himself, whose role is not revealed at the end of the story, but rather at the beginning. This is in clear contrast with Holmes's other opponents, who are not his equal and thus warrant only the role of a detective story antagonist. As Moriarty *is* Holmes's equal, he necessitates a different kind of genre: this is what shifts him from antagonist to nemesis. It is also noteworthy that "The Final Problem" features no client. The conflict of the story is solely between Holmes and Moriarty, again separating it from Doyle's more formulaic detective fiction.

"The Final Problem" begins with a note from Doctor Watson, implying that his friend is dead, coming to the first mention of Moriarty in the fourth sentence (830). This does not actually relate to the Professor himself, but rather the individual who has forced Watson into finally chronicling the events that are to follow: Colonel James Moriarty, the Professor's brother. One of the first things we learn about Moriarty, then, is that he has a sibling who works or has worked for the British government – exactly like Holmes himself, whose brother Mycroft is said to sometimes *be* the British government ("The Bruce-Partington Plans" 1147). Another is that Moriarty is implied to be deceased, much like Holmes. Already, then, the similarities between Holmes and Moriarty are on display. Throughout the following paragraph, Watson alludes to a confrontation between the two. Despite being little more than a name and a title at this point, Moriarty is being placed into the position as someone more powerful than a usual Holmes antagonist.

The mystery of Professor Moriarty lessens once Holmes himself enters the story, the rest of which is told in a customary flashback. A haggard-looking Great Detective appears, keeping away from the windows in fear of air-guns. Watson, naturally, asks what has caused the usually impeccable Holmes to act so strangely. Holmes answers with a question of his own.

'You have probably never heard of Professor Moriarty?' said [Holmes].

'Never.'

'Aye, there's the genius and the wonder of the thing!' he cried. 'The man pervades London, and no one has heard of him. That's what puts him on a pinnacle in the records of crime. I tell you, Watson, in all seriousness, that if I could beat that man, if I could free society of him, I should feel that my own career had reached its summit, and I should be prepared to turn to some more placid line in life.' ("The Final Problem" 831-832)

This, then, makes explicit what Watson has been hinting at: Holmes has encountered a criminal so intelligent that defeating him would be the logical conclusion to his career. In this paragraph, too, Holmes explains why we have not heard of such a notable figure before: Watson has not, and thus has not been able to tell of us. At this point, Moriarty is still being played up as mysterious, before Holmes at last exposit some details: Moriarty is a scholar – "his career has been an extraordinary one" – and a one-time professor of mathematics at "one of our smaller universities", but Holmes states outright that "a criminal strain [runs] in his blood, which, instead of being modified, was increased and rendered infinitely more dangerous by his extraordinary mental powers". Eventually, he lost his post of Mathematical Chair, and "dark rumours" compelled him to leave for London (832).

Thus, we are introduced to the first facet of Moriarty's character, the legitimate professor, a general role he retains in most hypertexts, that we might term Moriarty the academic. More than merely having a brilliant and genuine interest in legitimate fields of study, usually astronomy ("The Valley of Fear"), the academic is also Moriarty's respectable cover identity. In many texts, his double life as a respected member of the scientific community is what initially makes him unassailable. The academic, however, rarely appears in the Holmes stories directly, as the Great Detective usually concerns himself with bringing down (and interacting with) the other facets. In fact, Holmes "inconveniencing" Moriarty often leads to the facade of the academic disappearing entirely.

Doyle's original version of Moriarty the academic, however, is not quite as spotless as his later incarnations. Indeed, at this point Moriarty is not technically even a professor at all, having changed his profession to army coach. Considering that "no-one has heard of" the former Mathematical Chair of a university ("The Final Problem" 832), it seems Moriarty does not move in social circles. A likely conclusion is that Moriarty has learned from his earlier mistake. If he maintains anonymity, "dark rumours" are less likely to harm him. Interestingly, then, Doyle's first academic is already a thing of the past – it is implied that the Moriarty of "The Final Problem" is a full-time crime-lord. The symbolism of the gentleman gone rotten is apparent from the very first. This is someone who represents the worst and most uncivilised aspects of the English upper classes, hiding his criminal and barbaric – i. e., foreign – face under a mask of a respectable Victorian. However, as noted, Moriarty's mask has cracks.

While the symbolism remains the same, in that Holmes is aware of Moriarty's true nature, the Professor possesses a much better public image in 1914's *The Valley of Fear*, the last of the four

Holmes novels. As mentioned, this is the only Doyle work other than "The Empty House" to feature Moriarty to any significant degree, and here he fulfills a different role in that he is actually *more* formidable than Holmes. Interestingly, the novel introduces something of a discrepancy in Doyle's continuity. Set a year prior to the events of "The Final Problem", here Watson learns of Moriarty in a way that contradicts the beginning of the earlier short story. Its opening is a retelling of the dialogue that has been discussed in the last few paragraphs. There is, however, a vital difference: in *The Valley of Fear*, Moriarty the academic is active. Here, Holmes states that to publically accuse Moriarty of crimes would actually be libel, as he is "aloof from general suspicion, so immune to criticism..." ("The Valley of Fear" 308). However, Watson also mentions that Moriarty is "as famous among crooks as he is unknown to the public" (307). In other words, the Moriarty of the novel seems well-known only to two very different groups: the scientific community and the criminal one.

Moriarty's impeccable status in *The Valley of Fear* is demonstrated through the statements of Inspector MacDonald of Scotland Yard, who has visited him to reassure Holmes that the Professor is not a criminal at all. "He seems to be a very respectable, learned, and talented sort of man", MacDonald says of him. Whereas "The Final Problem" features Holmes's account of the arch-criminal, it is the affable academic who appears in this way in *The Valley of Fear*. Seated in a large study, Moriarty is a solemn-talking man who "would have made a grand meenester with his thin face and grey hair" (sic). He is obviously charismatic: "when he put his hand on my shoulder as we were parting, it was like a father's blessing before you go out into the cold, cruel world" (315). Compared with the also-charismatic Holmes, who meets with his clients in a study and has a thin faced, the parallels are once again obvious. However, an opposite is introduced when specifics on Moriarty's career are given. *The Valley of Fear's* Professor is "the celebrated author of *The Dynamics of an Asteroid*, a book which ascends to such rarefied heights of pure mathematics tht is is said that there was no man in the scientific press capable of criticising it" (308). Holmes's interest in astronomy is famously minimal. Doyle describes the Great Detective's knowledge on the subject as "nil", and also mentions that Holmes does not know that the Earth travels around the sun ("A Study in Scarlet" 20). Doyle's choice to focus Moriarty's studies on one of Holmes's weakest fields is likely not unintentional. It reinforces the Professor's mental prowess, and might be a foreshadowing of Moriarty's victory at the story's end.

The second facet to Moriarty's character might be termed the arch-criminal. Defined by his power over the underworld, this is the Moriarty Holmes first becomes aware of. Usually in control of a criminal organisation and reluctant to take physical action, the arch-criminal is also the Moriarty

who has a tendency to fatally underestimate Holmes. The arch-criminal usually tries to intimidate the Great Detective into backing off, sending murderous henchmen to prove his sincerity when Holmes declines. In "The Final Problem", after discussing the academic, Holmes introduces the hypotextual arch-criminal with some of the most iconic lines on his enemy:

'He is the Napoleon of crime, Watson. He is the organiser of half that is evil and of nearly all that is undetected in this great city. He is a genius, a philosopher, an abstract thinker. He has a brain of the first order.' (833)

The choice of the phrase "Napoleon of Crime" is, viewed through the lens of Holmes as a symbol of Englishness, an admission of Moriarty's dangerous worth. In 1893, Bonaparte's France was the most recent force to have directly threatened Britain itself. Though both France and the UK had been empires, Napoleon had been an autocratic Other to Britain's parliamentary Self, but a brilliant general, an able if dictatorial leader, and a successful conqueror. In other words, he was someone to be both loathed and admired. The Duke of Wellington, for example, stated that Napoleon's "whole life, civil, political, and military, was a fraud" (Croker "Vol 2" 285), though also admitted that "with his prestige, he was worth 40,000 men" (Croker "Vol 3" 277).

This means that the English Holmes implicitly becomes the Wellington to Moriarty's Napoleon; his eternal opponent, but also an admirer. From Holmes, "a brain of the first order" is another acknowledgement that Moriarty is his equal. In *A Study in Scarlet*, Holmes explains that he considers the brain to be "like a little empty attic, and you have to stock it with such furniture as you choose" (20). Moriarty, then, has furnished his very carefully, much like Holmes himself. The difference, of course, is that Holmes uses his mind for justice, while Moriarty uses his to oppose justice. This theme is brought up again in *The Valley of Fear*, where Holmes describes his enemy as "(t)he greatest schemer of all time, the organiser of every devilry, the controlling brain of the underworld, a brain which might have made or marred the destiny of nations" (308). As mentioned, this section of the fourth Holmes novel is very much a retelling of "The Final Problem", and it serves the same purpose: it informs the reader that Moriarty, as a person and a character, is very much a match for Holmes. In "The Final Problem" itself, the Great Detective explicitly states that he has, at last, met his match: the normally unstoppable Holmes has spent a whole three months trying to find evidence of his crimes. To Watson, he names Moriarty "my intellectual equal... my horror at his crimes was lost in my admiration at his skill" (833).

In "The Final Problem", Holmes elaborates on how Moriarty uses this formidable intellect. The Professor "sits motionless, like a spider in the centre of its web, but that web has a thousand radiations, and he knows well every quiver of each of them. He does little himself. He only plans" (833). Here, Moriarty gains an animal motif for the first time, a spider, seen as a predatory, unpleasant creature both now and then. In addition, it is the source of arachnophobia, one of the more common phobias; quite literally, the spider is a fearsome creature.

Moriarty's administrator-like role might seem to differ from that of Holmes, who, as we know, regularly performs field work himself. However, in *A Study in Scarlet*, Holmes describes his own methods in much the same way: "I listen to their stories, they listen to my comments, and I pocket my fee" (23). Watson asks him if this means he generally works without leaving his room, to which Holmes replies that he does. However, Holmes's habit of abandoning this method is also mirrored in Moriarty's actions later in "The Final Problem".

To carry out his plans, Moriarty is described as having a vast network of henchmen and criminals. Holmes also employs agents, the Baker Street Irregulars featured in *A Study in Scarlet* (43-44) and *The Sign of the Four* (139-140), but these are street urchins. Thus, the theme of alike-yet-different continues to be expanded upon. These methods and henchmen are further featured in *The Valley of Fear*, where they are shown to be terrifyingly effective: that story ends on a somber note when co-protagonist John Douglas is revealed to have been killed off-screen by one of the Professor's assassins (425). The plot of the novel is set in motion when one of Moriarty's henchmen, Porlock, tries to defect and warn Holmes of this assassination. Porlock disappears soon after "he" visits him. "When any of that party talk about "He", you know whom they mean", Holmes says. "There is one predominant "He" for all of them" (309-310). Written as it is in early twentieth century Britain, the implication of this phrase is clear: for His henchmen, Moriarty is God (or, perhaps, the Devil).

At this point, the arch-criminal Moriarties of "The Final Problem" and *The Valley of Fear* are equally formidable, and even superior to Holmes. However, "The Final Problem" then introduces the chink in the armour that makes the Great Detective able to attack the Professor:

'But at last he made a trip – only a little, little trip – but it was more than he could afford when I was so close upon him. I had my chance, and, starting from that point, I have woven my net round him until now it is all ready to close. In three days – that is to say, on Monday next – matters will be ripe, and the Professor, with all the principal members of his gang,

will be in the hands of the police.' (833)

This twist may seem jarring, but it actually represents the second instance of Moriarty's fallability in the short story. As mentioned previously, he once allowed "dark rumours" to cost him his Professor's chair – obviously something of a defeat, given that he still clings to that academic title. Now he has made a second mistake, an even more grievous one, and he knows it; rather than costing him a career, it could cost him his freedom. According to Holmes, Moriarty has been aware of his efforts for almost the entire three months he has been at them. Although he is fallible, he is still a force to be reckoned with. He has tried to outwit Holmes, and failed. This leads to something we already know is highly uncharacteristic of this Moriarty: he takes matters into his own hands, and pays Holmes a personal visit. All of this suggests that, just as Holmes considers Moriarty his equal, the same applies for Moriarty in regard to Holmes. For Moriarty, Holmes is someone for whom the rules can be broken, because Holmes has already broken the principal rule that applies to him – Professor Moriarty always wins. This theme of upsetting the status quo, of course, can also be applied to the short story itself and its intended purpose. "The Final Problem", as it was originally written, breaks the aforementioned rule that justice, usually personified by Holmes himself, always wins.

As Moriarty eventually goes to the step of paying a personal visit to 221B Baker Street, Holmes is able to give Watson (and the readers) a physical description of him:

'He is extremely tall and thin, his forehead domes out in a white curve, and his two eyes are deeply sunken in this head. He is clean-shaven, pale, and ascetic-looking, retaining something of the professor in his features. His shoulders are rounded from much study, and his face protrudes forward, and is forever slowly oscillating from side to side in a curiously reptilian fashion.' ("The Final Problem" 833)

Even in appearance, then, Moriarty mirrors his nemesis, who was described in *A Study in Scarlet* as "rather over six feet, and so excessively lean that he seemed to be considerably taller". In addition, the very next part of each description focuses on the eyes – Holmes's are "sharp and piercing, save during those intervals of torpor to which [Watson has] alluded" (19). Both Moriarty and Holmes are then compared to animals. Moriarty's physical form brings to mind a reptile – an interesting choice of animal, considering that the analogy of a spider was used earlier to describe his position as a crime-lord. Both spiders and reptiles, however, are patient and ruthless hunters.

Meanwhile, the unpleasantness of the latter is an old perception, perhaps best summed up by Carl Linnaeus in his *Systema Naturae*, which describes them along with snakes as "the ugliest, most cruel and most poisoning" (Tibell). Holmes's nose, on the other hand, is identified as hawk-like (Doyle "A Study in Scarlet" 19). The hawk, too, is a patient hunter, but it is much more familiar to English sensibilities, and brings connotations of nobility and vigilance. Reading the two passages next to each other makes it more apparent than ever that Doyle is playing up similarities, but still introducing subtle differences. This is all that is told about Moriarty's physical appearance in "The Final Problem". In "The Empty House", however, we are given an additional feature: his eyes are grey, which reinforces the connotations of a coldly intellectual mind (853).

Moriarty's manner of speech matches his appearance. He begins by insulting Holmes, before stating the facts of the case from a memorandum-book and noting that he is now "now in serious danger of losing [his] liberty", before finally trying to intimidate the Great Detective into dropping the case entirely. As their conversation goes on, however, it becomes that apparent that he holds Holmes in high regard, even admiring him: "It has been an intellectual treat to me to see the way in which you have grappled with this affair, and I say, unaffectedly, that it would be a grief to me to be forced to take any extreme measure. You smile, sir, but I assure you that it really would" ("The Final Problem" 834). Again, there is the notion of equality: Holmes and Moriarty both consider each other their finest adversary. The difference lies in their preferences for the conflict's end: Moriarty would like to maintain the status quo, while Holmes would like seeing him in jail. Even here, however, there are similarities: they would both prefer to win, and for the other to admit defeat.

The meeting ends with a stalemate, but as Holmes explains, Moriarty is "not a man who lets the grass grow under his feet" (835). Holmes has already evaded two assassination attempts, and, as seen in the beginning of the story, he fears a third (830-831). At this point, Moriarty is still the arch-criminal: he is acting to eliminate a threat to his criminal empire. He attempts to set fire to 221B Baker Street, although no real harm is done, and as Holmes and Watson leave for Europe in order to avoid repercussions, they witness him futilely attempt to stop their train (838). He later engages a special to track them down. Twice, then, Moriarty appears in person, and Holmes does not doubt that he intends to kill him (839).

At this point, Holmes's plan comes to fruition. Moriarty's organization is brought down, but the Professor evades arrest. At this point, he fully enters the third facet of his character, not found in *The Valley of Fear*, but reappearing in those hypertexts that adapt this sequence of events. This facet

can be called Moriarty the avenger. Generally, sometimes robbed of his academic title entirely, this Moriarty is the one whose only goal in life is revenge on Holmes. The avenger usually undertakes this task personally, using whatever remains of his criminal organization to help him. Crucially, in the works that use him, it is Moriarty the avenger who enters the final, fatal confrontation with Holmes. In "The Final Problem", Holmes states flatly that: "This man's occupation is gone. He is lost if he returns to London. If I read his character right he will devote his whole energies to revenging himself upon me." (840) However, as Moriarty goes from arch-criminal to avenger, Holmes becomes a fugitive; both have lost access to their prior resources. In fact, Holmes tries to send Watson back to England, for fear of his life. It is interesting to note that both their predicaments come from the fact that although they are formidable, they are not infallible: Moriarty may have failed to stop Holmes, but Holmes has failed to have Moriarty apprehended.

The story now departs not only London, but England, for the first time in Doyle's canon, a rarity in Doyle's stories. Along with the fire at Baker Street, this is a signifier that the Holmesian status quo is about to dramatically change. Holmes and Watson go to Europe to escape retribution for Moriarty's downfall. The story morphs into a sort of travelogue, and Moriarty disappears until Holmes and Watson reach the fateful Reichenbach Falls in Switzerland. At this point, Moriarty and Holmes have, in an unspoken agreement, realize that the endgame has come. They conspire to trick Watson to safety – he is summoned to help an allegedly dying English lady in a Swiss village – while Detective and Professor settle their grievances between themselves (841-843).

This emphasises another element of Doyle's Moriarty; even in his avenger persona, he still maintains something of the honour of a Victorian gentleman. Holmes maintains as much in his last letter to Watson, where he explains the particulars of what happened next. Rather than attacking him immediately, Moriarty has taken the time to explain how he escaped from England – in other words, the two nemeses have compared notes. In addition, he has allowed Holmes "the courtesy" of finishing the final letter itself, "await[ing his] convenience for the final discussion of those questions which lie between [them]" (844-845).

The details of that "final discussion" are unclear in "The Final Problem" itself, where Watson can only deduce that Holmes and Moriarty have grappled at the very edge of the waterfall, a brawl ending in their deaths (846). While savage and desperate, it can be argued that there is still a sort of honour in this combat, an echo of a gentleman's duel. In the end, it underlines one final time the equality between Holmes and Moriarty: on an even setting, without weapons, they were evenly

matched, and the two characters died together.

It is noteworthy, however, that even in "The Final Problem" Holmes trumps Moriarty in death. Both characters have the details of their deaths published in-universe, written by a biographer sympathetic to his cause, but only Watson's account appears in Doyle's canon. Therefore, the legacy of Sherlock Holmes is that of a great and heroic man who fought for the law, while Moriarty's is that of a great, but despicable man who fought against it. In other words, while Doyle wrote Holmes and Professor Moriarty as equals, he did not do so with Dr. Watson and Colonel Moriarty. In addition, Holmes's allies in law enforcement – Scotland Yard and his brother Mycroft – remain active, while Moriarty's gang has been dismantled. Though Holmes is dead, what he stood for is alive and well.

Symbolically, the situation is different. Moriarty's own downfall, if Holmes is removed from the equation, mirrors that of those antagonists who escaped the Great Detective only to suffer karmic deaths; justice has, though belatedly, caught up with him. But if the symbolic Other of crime has suffered a grievous defeat, has not the symbolic Self also done so with the loss of Holmes? While a champion of the law is also dead, it is noteworthy that Holmes, prior to his demise, speaks of retiring once the case is done. In a metafictional context, Doyle had decided Holmes's career was coming to a close in any case, and the same was true for the in-universe Great Detective.

Or so it seemed. Ten years later, Doyle was forced to revisit the ending of "The Final Problem" when he resurrected Holmes in "The Empty House". As mentioned, the Professor's role in this story differs dramatically from his other portrayals. He is mentioned fifteen times, most of them in the context of Holmes's explanation to a shocked Watson, who had thought him dead ("The Empty House" 852). The Great Detective is revealed to have faked his death in order to take down the rest of Moriarty's gang, and when he reveals himself to Holmes he explains the details of the Reichenbach brawl.

He drew no weapon, but he rushed at me and threw his long arms around me. He knew that his own game was up, and was only anxious to revenge himself upon me. We tottered together upon the brink of the fall. I have some knowledge, however, of baritsu, or the Japanese system of wrestling, which has more than once been very useful to me. I slipped through his grip, and he with a horrible scream kicked madly for a few seconds and clawed the air with both his hands. But for all his efforts he could not get his balance, and over he

went. With my face over the brink I saw him fall for a long way. Then he struck a rock, bounded off, and splashed into the water.' (853-854.)

In other words, the formidable Professor of *The Valley of Fear* and the criminal mastermind of "The Final Problem", Holmes's superior and equal respectively, is unceremoniously and almost effortlessly defeated over the space of a single paragraph. For only three sentences is there an actual struggle, before Holmes demonstrates his superiority and sends Moriarty to his doom. The Professor's actions in "The Final Problem" have still happened, but it is also noteworthy that the avenger of "The Empty House" becomes less gentlemanly and more of a savage, lacking the knowledge of baritsu, the (fictional) martial art that gives Holmes the advantage. In other words, Holmes of "The Empty House" had not just the greater physical strength, but the greater mental faculties. The dynamics of the series have changed with Holmes's return, and Moriarty has been reduced in rank. Rather than a nemesis, he is now reduced in rank to a mere antagonist, such as those who preceded him before "The Final Problem". However, evidence of the late Professor's organisational genius still remains. The antagonist of "The Empty House" is Colonel Sebastian Moran, who is eventually revealed to be the late Professor's chief of staff. Moran, it is revealed, was also present at the Reichenbach Falls, ordered to dispose of Holmes should Moriarty himself fail. The Colonel's failed assassination attempt was what inspired Holmes to go underground – it revealed to him that at least some of Moriarty's henchmen were still unaccounted for ("The Empty House" 862-864).

3.0 – NAPOLEON LOST: MORIARTY ON STAGE AND SCREEN, 1899-1939

We now leave Doyle's hypotexts and enter the world of its adaptations. Scholars within this field of literature will discover that a wide array of terms have been coined to describe the relationship of a hypertext to its hypotext. Some are related to fidelity, as mentioned in 2.0; Linda Hutcheon takes the position that the term adaptation covers *all* forms of intertextuality (McCaw 10), and that it "has run amok" (Hutcheon XIII). Julie Sanders, on the other hand, introduces the term appropriation as a looser form of borrowing. According to her,

while an adaptation signals a relationship with an informing sourcetext or original (...) appropriation frequently affects a more decisive journey away from the informing source into a wholly new cultural product and domain (Sanders 39).

Given the popularity of the Holmes stories, it is perhaps unsurprising that they would be retold, reimagined and parodied across a spectre of mediums during the first half of the twentieth century. The new medium of film eagerly embraced the Great Detective, starting with *Sherlock Holmes Baffled* (Marvin) in 1900 (Barnes 216). Interestingly enough, as the title suggests the first 35 seconds of Holmes on screen was a parody, ending with an escaping criminal and a clueless "Great" Detective. It started the trend, mentioned in 2.0, of Holmes adaptations appropriating from several stories, or, as in *Baffled*, just the general character. Indeed, as time wore on, hypertexts started using other significant adaptations as hypotexts, appropriating elements from both text or film, or sometimes films exclusively. They entered into the realm of bricolage, defined by Sanders as "a collage or collection of different allusions, references and quotations" (Sanders 161), adapting elements from some sources, appropriating lesser details from others, and filling in their own elements to complete the script.

One of those elements was Moriarty, who was at this point already established as Holmes's eternal opponent. The first Professor on screen was played by Gustav Lund in 1908's *Sherlock Holmes i Livsfare* (Larsen), the first in a series Danish silent films; however, in its sequels, the role of "Professor Moriarty, Esq" as Holmes's enemy was usurped by another literary figure, gentleman thief Raffles, interestingly enough created as a criminal counterpart to Holmes by Doyle's brother-in-law Ernest William Hornung (Barnes 220-221).

In the crowd of Great Detectives on the screen, two Holmeses stood out to become the definite

portrayals of their respective periods: William Gillette and Basil Rathbone. Each of them would, early in their careers, face their respective Moriarties. The Otherness of those Moriarties, though, would change with the times and the political realities of Europe.

3.1 – *THE SHERLOCK HOLMES PLAY, 1899*

In a discussion of Moriarty's prominence as a character, it is interesting to note that one of the very first Holmes adaptations used him as the villain – an adaptation initially written by Doyle himself, and predating the medium of film. While he was tired of producing Holmes stories for *The Strand* magazine, Doyle had always wanted to write a play, and the financial benefits of creating one starring Holmes was not lost on him (Doyle "Memories and Adventures"). However, he was persuaded by theatrical producer Charles Frohman that his draft was unfit for publication, and agreed to let playwright William Gillette both rewrite and star in the play. Part of what convinced Doyle is especially interesting in the context of audience reception: Gillette visited Doyle wearing a deerstalker and a cape. In this uniform of the early Holmes fandom, Gillette successfully lobbied not just for the right to adapt Holmes closely, but loosely. "You may marry him, murder him, or do anything you like to him", Doyle told him later, when he requested only to do the marriage. In the end, Doyle was credited as co-author, as Gillette had used "[his] characters and to some extent [his] plots" ("Memories and Adventures").

The finished play, titled *Sherlock Holmes. A Drama in Four Acts*, was a sensation at its 1899 New York City premiere. In its first run it had 200 performances in both the United States and Europe. As mentioned in 1.2, it introduced Holmes's pipe; indeed, as Gillette was unable to perform his lines with a straight pipe in his mouth, he was the first to employ the curved calabash pipe (Leitch 209). In this way, then, Gillette added another iconic item to the character's silhouette. While Doyle himself would never reappropriate the calabash, it was clearly there to stay. In the same way as the unorthodox-looking deerstalker and Inverness cape, the calabash is distinctive, large and out of the ordinary; as a *symbol* of a pipe, it did the job better than a more conventional version. A few film versions were made; a 1916 effort starred Gillette himself. The film was long thought lost and only rediscovered in France in October 2014 (Noonan); as it is currently being restored for screening, it is regrettably impossible to consult it.

If the play expanded on Holmes, it did so even more with Moriarty. It is notable in the context of

Moriarty because it gives us our first true look at a version of the character. Rather than appearing second-hand in Watson's transcriptions of Holmes's descriptions, the Professor acts and speaks directly to the audience. Thus, the play takes Doyle's original, hypotextual character and builds on him. Where "The Final Problem" tells us of Moriarty, *Sherlock Holmes* shows him to us. In terms of plot, this fleshed-out Professor is the villain of a bricolage that variously quotes, adapts and appropriates "The Final Problem", *A Study in Scarlet* and "A Scandal in Bohemia".

The play delays introducing Moriarty at first. Instead, it invents a husband-and-wife pair of criminals, Madge and Jim Larabee, who have invaded the home of the old and senile Mrs Faulkner. They are torturing her daughter Alice for the code to a desk safe containing documents that will enable them to blackmail a wealthy foreign noble family – here, we see the first traces of elements from "A Scandal in Bohemia", with Alice, as mentioned above, being a possible analogue or counterpart of that story's strong-but-imperiled female figure, Irene Adler. Since Alice resists them, the Larabees eventually hire safe cracker Sid Prince to get the documents, but Prince warns them that Holmes has been hired by the noble family. It is at this point that Moriarty is first mentioned, as Prince tells the Larabees to contact him:

Moriarty is king of ‘em all in London. He runs everything that’s shady — an’ ‘Olmes ‘as been settin’ lines all round ‘im for months — and he didn’t know it — an’ now he’s beginnin’ to find out that ‘Olmes is trackin’ ‘im down — and there’s the devil to pay. ‘E wants any cases ‘Olmes is on — it’s a dead fight between ‘em! ‘E’ll take the case just to get at ‘Olmes! ‘E’ll kill ‘im before ‘e’s finished with ‘im, you can lay all you’ve got on it. ("Act I")

This, then, is the first element appropriated from "The Final Problem", specifically of the game of cat and mouse played by Holmes and Moriarty prior to the short story's start. The conversation continues after Prince telegraphs the Professor, warning him of Holmes's involvement:

Madge: I’ve heard of this Professor Moriarty.

Prince: If you ‘aven’t you must’ve been out in the woods.

Madge: You say he’s king of them all.

Prince (working): Bloomin’ Hemperor — that’s wot I call ‘im.

Madge: He must be a good many different things.

Prince: You might see it that way if you looked around an’ didn’t breathe too ‘ard!

Madge: What does he do?

Prince: I'll tell you one thing he does! He sits at 'ome — quiet and easy — an runs nearly every big operation that's on. All the clever boys are under him one way or another — an he 'olds them in 'is 'and without moving a muscle! An' if there's a slip and the police get wind of it there ain't never any 'old on 'im. They can't touch him. And wot's more, they wouldn't want to if they could. ("Act I")

Presumably to build up the tension related to the unseen Moriarty, Holmes's first conversation with Watson in the short story is essentially retold here from the perspective of Madge and Prince. Any academic achievements are not noted (though a street criminal like Prince would likely not know of them), but his methods are essentially unchanged from the "spider's web" speech given in "The Final Problem". Prince's statement that anyone who has not heard of Moriarty "must've been out in the woods" initially seems to reference Watson's ignorance. In Act II, scene 2, however, the short story's dialogue between the Detective and the doctor appears in a rewritten form. Holmes has just made a reference to Watson's biographical work, which itself is a nod to Doyle's literature, and continues:

Holmes: I merely refer to this in case you should see fit at some future time — to chronicle the most important and far-reaching case in my career — one upon which I have laboured for nearly fourteen months, and which is now rapidly approaching a singularly diverting climax — the case of Professor Robert Moriarty.

Watson: Moriarty! I don't remember ever having heard of the fellow.

Holmes: The Napoleon of crime. The Napoleon! Sitting motionless like an ugly venomous spider in the centre of his web — but that web having a thousand radiations and the spider knowing every quiver of every one of them. ("Act II")

As seen at the end of Holmes's first line, Moriarty now has a first name – Robert. Of Germanic origin, the name means "bright with glory" (Harper), which would make it deeply ironic. It is, however, also possible that Gillette chose the name because of its first syllable, *rob*, which would instead make it highly appropriate. The name, then, is an invention that expands the character from Doyle's original work. The rest is a retelling: Holmes is stalking Moriarty, Watson has never heard of him, and the Professor is likened to both Napoleon and a spider. This latest part is emphasised, playing up the symbolism of something non-British and inhuman. The near-quotation continues when Holmes explains that he is very closing to catching Moriarty:

By ten o'clock to-morrow night the time will be ripe for the arrests. Then the greatest criminal trial of the century ... the clearing up of over forty mysteries ... and the rope for every one. ("Act II")

This sentence mirrors the original's "on Monday next", but adds even more urgency. Indeed, the plot is over and done with well before this appointed time.

Who, then, is Professor Robert Moriarty? Act II, Scene 1 presents the first on-screen appearance by the main antagonist himself. The stage directions present him as dwelling in an ominous underground office, and then specify what Moriarty should look like:

He is a middle-aged man, with massive head and grey hair, and a face full of character, overhanging brow, heavy jaw. A man of great intellectual force, extremely tall and thin. His forehead domes out in a white curve, and his two eyes are deeply sunken in his head. Clean-shaven, pale, ascetic-looking. Shoulders rounded, and face protruding forward, and for ever oscillating from side to side in a curiously reptilian fashion. Deep hollow voice. ("Act II")

Again, we encounter a near-quote from "The Final Problem". The main addition, the voice, seems tailor-made for a medium in which the audience needs to hear rather than just read Moriarty's voice. This voice is used to present Moriarty in his typical environment, running the day-to-day business of his criminal empire. In his first scene, Moriarty is shown dispatching one henchman (Alf Bassick) to aid in a job, and sending another (Craigin) to execute a disloyal associate. Like his literary counterpart, his methods place an emphasis on ruthlessness and anonymity. "No one sees you — no one knows you", Bassick says. "That has meant safety for years" ("Act II"). Indeed, when approached by the Larabees, Moriarty initially has Bassick pose as him before deciding to reveal himself and take over the conversation directly. Moriarty's arch-criminal role is played up, then, as he rules both directly and indirectly over London's underworld. Even criminals who are not part of his organization must deal with him. In this way, he appears almost a nineteenth century mafia don, the Godfather of Victorian London.

Moriarty's motivation to deal with the Larabees is, of course, their encounter with Holmes. When the Great Detective is brought up, we see how this particular Moriarty views his nemesis. Two other persons are noted as having tried to bring the professor down, both of whom are implied to have

been killed on his orders. Unlike his literary counterpart, this currently undefeated Moriarty regards Holmes, while certainly dangerous, as just the latest in a line of would-be heroes, but someone who is ultimately his inferior:

This Holmes is rather a talented man. He hopes to drag me in at the Underwood trial, but he doesn't realize what can happen between now and Monday. He doesn't know that there isn't a street in London that'll be safe for him if I whisper his name to Craigin — I might even make him a little call myself — just for the satisfaction of it — just for the satisfaction of it. ("Act II")

As we know that Holmes is getting ready to capture Moriarty the very next day, however, it is clear that the Professor is underestimating his foe. Rather than visiting Holmes because the situation is dire, he does so for the sake of his own arrogance. Robert Moriarty the arch-criminal is fully secure of his own supremacy. To summarise, then, Holmes views Moriarty as his equal, but Moriarty views Holmes as an inferior.

This perspective changes drastically when Moriarty makes his visit to Holmes in Act II, Scene 2, which cites but drastically rewrites the similar event from "The Final Problem" – in a way, it almost seems to parody it. In the short story, we remember Holmes and Moriarty as equal sparring partners, leaving each other after a draw. In the play, on the other hand, Moriarty is utterly humiliated. Holmes sees right through his scheme of luring off his associates with henchmen, covers him with a gun the entire time, and alternates between acting cheerful and bored. Moriarty, on the other hand, is driven to angry threats before finally being escorted out, not by someone like Holmes or Watson, but by Holmes's page boy. With a sense of irony the audience can clearly see how we have been misled by both the Great Detective and his enemy as they pretended that the latter was more powerful than the former. Here it is Robert Moriarty who, although certainly dangerous, is ultimately inferior to Holmes.

This incompetence continues to feature in the play. In Act III, he seemingly makes a return to form when he visits his henchmen in a gas chamber that is being prepared as a trap for Holmes, giving out orders and acting much as he did in Act I. In Act IV, however, his final assassination attempt on the Great Detective is effortlessly thwarted, and his humiliation is complete when he is arrested, dressed as a simple cab driver (a clear allusion to the villain of *A Study in Scarlet*). However, Robert Moriarty does go out on a high note, giving a citation of his far more competent counterpart in "The

Final Problem":

Moriarty: Are you quite sure the police will be able to hold me?

Holmes: I am quite sure of nothing.

Moriarty: Ah! I have heard that you are planning to take a little trip — you and your friend here — a little trip on the Continent.

Holmes: And if I do?

Moriarty: I shall meet you there. ("Act IV")

Moriarty's nature in the play is certainly not as clear-cut as other versions. As mentioned, his arch-criminal persona seems to dominate his surroundings, and his organisation survives all but unscathed until the play's climax. On the other hand, Robert Moriarty the academic is nowhere to be found, and no explanation is offered for his title. Within in the context of the narrative, the professorate seems self-declared as a sort of criminal honorific. Viewed from the outside, it is a direct citation of Moriarty's literary original, the legitimate professor of mathematics. The question is when arch-criminal turns to avenger. The snarling prisoner of the denouement is certainly the latter, but it could also be argued that it is Moriarty's humiliating meeting with Holmes in Baker Street that signals his change of primary motive. However, Moriarty's incompetence in this version is what defines him.

In any case, in terms of symbolism this Moriarty is very much an adaptation of the Other found in "The Final Problem". He threatens the lawful England and Britain as personified by Holmes, plotting from a dark basement while Holmes reclines upstairs in Baker Street. Moriarty's primary narrative function seems to be the glorification of his opponent: seemingly terrifyingly competent when alone, he is easily humiliated by Holmes. Of the literary versions, the seething Professor Robert is most like the one who loses to Holmes in "The Empty House", which would be released four years later. As a speculation, it is very possible that Doyle reappropriated the incompetence of Gillette's Moriarty to make Holmes's survival seem believable. In any case, Gillette's play is an unambiguous and effortless triumph for law over crime.

3.2 – THE ADVENTURES OF SHERLOCK HOLMES, 1939

Arguably the best remembered Holmes actor of the twentieth century (Barnes 255), Basil Rathbone

portrayed the Great Detective during the Second World War. His Watson was played by Nigel Bruce who, in his own right, redefined the character. Rather than the competent military doctor of Doyle's originals, the overweight Bruce portrayed the character as a source of comic relief. Rathbone, in contrast, was a more straightforward Hollywood protagonist. He is described as a an action hero, a sophisticated mid-century British gentleman who could survive "repeated brushes with death" (Leitch 222), whose "buffoonish" Watson was necessary to counterbalance this perfect movie Holmes. The formula worked. Beginning with the runaway success of *The Hound of the Baskervilles* in 1939, a series of thirteen additional films starring Rathbone and Bruce was produced over the next eight years. The two also made their mark on American radio. Though almost overlooked today, *The New Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* ran the length of Rathbone and Bruce's cinematic careers as Great Detective and bumbling sidekick, with the pair appearing together in 220 episodes. It is perhaps telling that when Rathbone finally left the part, he did it due to fears of being typecast (Loew 133-134).

As mentioned, the first Basil/Rathbone film was Twentieth Century Fox's *The Hound of the Baskervilles* (Lanfield), a film that arguably focuses more on Sir Henry Baskerville (Richard Greene) than on Holmes and Watson; notably, Greene received top billing. This was also the first Holmes movie to return to the character's Victorian roots; all previous cinematic adaptations had proximated the material to a contemporary setting. The same is true of its sequel, released the same year under the name *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* (Werker). This time, the focus was explicitly on the Great Detective, whose name was now a part of the title – and for its villain, the filmmakers at Fox used Professor Moriarty. The title card states that the film is "based on" the 1899 play (Werker 00:00:41), but in reality it appropriates little more than Gillette's antagonist and the inclusion of a female main character.

After *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*, the series was taken over by Universal, who, beginning in 1942, transposed the plots back to contemporary roots, filmed on lower (wartime) budgets, featuring Nazis and other Axis agents as villains. Leitch describes these later films as "resurrecting (...) the master criminal as the image of the Third Reich" (Leitch 223), and indeed, Moriarty himself appears as a Nazi collaborator in 1943's *Sherlock Holmes and the Secret Weapon* (Neill), portrayed by Lionel Atwill.

However, the earlier, Victorian Moriarty from 1939 is also very much an appropriation of the Nazi threat. Notably, *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* was released on September 1, the very day

Germany invaded Poland; the United Kingdom declared war two days later. For British audiences, viewing the opening scene must have brought keen associations to the political unease of the last few years. After an extract from Holmes's diary describing Moriarty as "the most dangerous criminal England has ever known" (Werker 00:01:24), the movie begins in a court of law, where the judge reluctantly finds the Professor (George Zucco) not guilty on the charge of murder. This, however, does not mean that he is exonerated. The judge does not find him innocent, and expresses his dismay over a man of Moriarty's intelligence committing murder. The Professor himself is silent throughout these proceedings, almost unaffected.

In appearance Zucco's Moriarty resembles Sigmund Freud, with a neat beard and elaborate glasses, retaining little of the severe, reptilian man found in Doyle and his earlier adaptations. It must be remembered that Freud, though at the time dying from cancer in London as a political refugee from his homeland, was an Austrian countryman of Adolf Hitler. The Fuehrer had annexed Czechoslovakia the previous year, and then signed a peace treaty with British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain – a treaty opposed by some layers of British society, such as the Labour party (Attlee and Churchill). Chamberlain's government was now being presented on screen (through the institution of the 1894 incarnation of its legal system) as being as powerless to stop Professor Moriarty from going free as it had been in stopping Hitler from acquiring Czechoslovakia and invading Poland. Later in the film, Moriarty shaves; without the glasses and beard, the balding, craggy-faced Zucco looks suspiciously like Benito Mussolini. Another representative of the fascist Other to Britain's democratic Self, the Italian dictator had signed a military alliance with Nazi Germany a few months earlier. Crucially, at no point in the film is Moriarty identified as the "Napoleon of Crime", the term that earlier surrounded him. The absence of this dubious honorific is conspicuous, but it seems there was simply no need for it. In 1939, there was a new foreign dictator to fear.

As mentioned in McCaw, a part of Holmes's appeal – and his symbolism of Englishness – is his ability to do what the government can not, which in this case is stopping Moriarty. Though he triumphs in the end, Holmes's first attempt is a narrow but bitter defeat. Storming into the courtroom with evidence to "destroy [Moriarty's] alibi" (Werker 00:02:37), he is curtly informed that Moriarty has already been exonerated, and cannot be tried twice. In other words, the system is to blame for Moriarty's continued liberty, just as it was to blame for Hitler's continued success. The status quo after this first scene is the same as it was the time of the film's production: tense and uneasy.

In the context of earlier Moriarties, this Professor is a new breed. Doyle's Moriarty, as we remember, stated that he would never be put on trial (Doyle "The Final Problem" 835), but Zucco's version has been incarcerated "for six whole weeks in a filthy prison cell" (Werker 00:09:18). This also means that he is no longer, or has never been, the publically spotless academic; everyone is aware of his wickedness, though they cannot prove it. For a character supposedly based on Gillette's stage version, it is interesting that the Professor played by Zucco has a completely different personal life. Where the Moriarty of the play schemes safely from an underground lair, relying on complete anonymity, the movie version lives in a lavish house that includes a greenhouse and a resident butler. This is no hidden villain, but someone who goes about his lawless business openly and brazenly; not a shadowy terrorist, but a wealth-flaunting dictator.

Moriarty's methods, however, are all but identical to those presented in the earlier texts. Moriarty does not work alone, but is the master of a criminal organisation. The movie adapts the name of the henchman Bassick from the play, but Gillette's ruthless, hired killer is transformed into a far more pathetic figure whose main purpose is to cluelessly follow his master's directions. When he questions the Professor's orders, he receives a thinly-veiled death threat in return; Moriarty has killed underlings before. The butler, Dawes, is similarly terrorised by his employer. While shaving Moriarty, he is belittled, "You'd like to let that razor slip, wouldn't you, Dawes?" (00:51:23-00:51:25.) When Dawes insists he does not, Moriarty sneers, "You're a coward, Dawes. If you weren't a coward, you would have slit my throat a long time ago." (00:51:28-00:51:32.) When Dawes again replies in the negative, Moriarty replies, "Then you're worse than a coward, you're a fool. You have as much hatred for me as I have contempt for you." (00:51:40-00:51:45.) At this point in the movie, Moriarty is clearly portrayed as so theatrically evil as to be utterly foreign, the very opposite of the quiet, erudite gentleman we first encounter at his trial.

While it may seem strange for the Moriarty played by Zucco to surround himself with incompetents, it must be remembered that so does Rathbone's Holmes. However, while Moriarty loathes and derides his inept underlings, Holmes is fond of his. As mentioned, Nigel Bruce's Watson is a buffoonish figure, but one who immediately prior to the shaving scene is commended by Holmes as "the most dependable person [he] know[s]" (00:51:12). This may be an embellishment, as Holmes is certainly not blind to the doctor's defects; however, when he earlier says that "Watson? I'm afraid you're an incorrigible bungler" (00:27:46), he immediately follows it up with an affectionate pat on Watson's back. Doyle's theme of the two nemeses being similar, yet crucially

different, reappears here and is shown by their relationships with their respective associates.

Holmes and Moriarty's methods, then, are similar, but as with the earlier stories their morality differs wildly (and their differing natures impact their methods, as seen above). In this film, both Holmes and Moriarty are revolver-wielding men of action, but also masters of disguise; the Great Detective at one point appears as a nearly unrecognisable music hall entertainer (00:52:37), just after Moriarty has himself shaved in order to assume the identity of a policeman, to great effect (00:51:23). In terms of their personal relationship, they are already nemeses by the time the movie begins. The trial is a victory for Moriarty in that he escapes justice, but a defeat in that he has been to prison; conversely, the outcome of the trial is a defeat for Holmes, but that it took place in the first place is a victory. Thus, the beginning of the film is a draw between the two.

As with "The Final Problem", there is a mixture of loathing and respect between the two adversaries. A key scene of the movie, the second, starts with Moriarty politely offering Holmes a ride to Baker Street. Once they are alone in the coach, a conversation starts that perfectly describes the nature of this specific relationship between Detective and Professor:

Moriarty: Holmes, you've only now barely missed sending me to the gallows. You're the one man in England clever enough to defeat me. The situation has become impossible.

Holmes: Have you any suggestions?

Moriarty: I'm going to break you, Holmes. I'm going to bring off right under your nose the most incredible crime of the century, and you'll never suspect it until it's too late. That will be the end of you, Mr. Sherlock Holmes. And when I've beaten and ruined you then I can retire in peace. I'd like to retire; crime no longer amuses me. I'd like to devote my remaining years to abstract science. (00:03:42-00:04:15)

There is, however, a crucial departure from "The Final Problem" in that it is Moriarty, not Holmes, who promises to be the active part. Unlike Doyle's hypotext, in which Moriarty states that Holmes should withdraw, the film offers no possibility of peaceful coexistence. In addition, the equality of the two when sparring face-to-face presents genuine tension, a departure from the play that the film is ostensibly based on, where Moriarty was quickly outwitted upon meeting Holmes. At no point in the film before the very climax is the Great Detective clearly established as the Professor's superior.

As with the play, the movie's plot is a new invention. Unlike the play, however, it has little in

common with any previous tales of Holmes vs Moriarty. It presents an even game of wits between the two; after the aforementioned trial, Moriarty (in touch with his resemblance to Freud) psychoanalyses his opponent, and discovers Holmes's weakness of constantly needing a challenge. Moriarty exploits this weakness by presenting him with a murder case; a South American assassin who once elaborately killed a British mine owner is enlisted to murder the dead man's heirs. Faced with homicide, Holmes completely disregards Moriarty's real intent, which initially seems to be the theft of the world's largest emerald from the Tower of London. It is only after foiling the assassin that the Great Detective deduces that both the murder and the emerald were decoys; Moriarty is stealing the Crown Jewels. Holmes rushes to the Tower, where the movie returns to "The Final Problem" to adapt the nature of Moriarty's death; Holmes literally punches him off the building after a brawl, and he falls to his death (01:16:53-01:16:58). The Great Detective is unharmed, and is free to sum up a happy ending with Watson the following day.

What is particularly notable here is the scope of Moriarty's plans, and the symbolism of his goals. In "The Final Problem", as well the 1899 play, the Professor as the symbol of a threat to the law was content with his place as a crime lord. However, the Moriarty of 1939 is no longer just an appropriation of a threat to the law. His target, the Crown Jewels, were and are seen as a powerful symbol of the British monarchy. Dating back to the reign of Edward the Confessor, who reigned from 1042-1066 ('The Crown Jewels'), the ceremonial treasures are among the oldest objects associated with the English crown. Furthermore, to steal them Moriarty must break into the Tower of London, constructed by William the Conqueror (Tower of London website). Moriarty's phrase, a "crime to stir the Empire" (Werker 00:08:05), places more of a focus on the last word more than the first; combined with his outwitting of the courts, his plot reads as not merely an attack against British law, but Britain itself.

This theme is emphasised by the fact that one of Holmes's two clients is Sir Ronald Ramsgate, the Constable of the Tower. The position might be largely ceremonial, but in earlier days, the Constable was military commander of the fortress that defended London from enemies. Constables were former officers; Ramsgate's real-life counterpart in 1894 was Sir Daniel Lysons, a retired general and veteran of the Crimean War (Aldershot Military Museum website). The fictional counterpart of this man, then, is the one who asks Holmes for help. Holmes as a defender of the Tower is thus a double symbol, both a paragon of Englishness and a soldier of Britain; adding to this, he has just saved an innocent English woman from a foreign killer.

Moriarty, on the other hand, is a credible and insidious threat to the nation. Indeed, it must be noted that Holmes initially disregards Ramsgate's request for assistance as comparatively insignificant, precisely as Moriarty intended. Holmes only wins the day by a stroke of luck. Once again, Holmes and Moriarty are equals, until the very end, when Holmes proves himself superior. When viewed in a symbolic light, with Holmes as a symbol of Britain and Moriarty as one of Hitler's Germany, this near-equality becomes interesting because of its moral. "England *can* stop Germany", it seems to say, "*if* she would only act. The criminal in Berlin might posture and plot, but he is not our equal, and if we fight against him, we will win."

Compared to both Doyle and Gillette's versions, then, the Moriarty of 1939 reflects a different, more dangerous kind of Otherness. It matched a different, more dangerous world for Britain's Self. As will be seen, later Moriarties also followed this trend. Even if they remained in that foggy London where it was always 1891, they always reflected that those who wrote and played them did not.

4.0 – BACK TO REICHENBACH: MORIARTY ON TELEVISION, 1984-2014

The postwar years saw several further Holmes adaptations, but Rathbone remained the public image of the character. Hollywood produced several adaptations, including an animated Disney film about a Great Mouse Detective (living in Holmes's basement) that featured an audio clip of Rathbone for a brief cameo (Michener et al), but did not truly present an A-list adaptation until Robert Downey, Jr. and Jude Law entered Baker Street in 2009's *Sherlock Holmes* (Ritchie). Its sequel (Ritchie *Sherlock Holmes: A Game of Shadows*) featured a Moriarty (Jared Harris) who plotted to start World War I; however, this second film received markedly less praise. True praise for Holmes adaptations in this period was awarded to British television; a remarkably faithful series starring Jeremy Brett ran in the 80s and early 90s, while Benedict Cumberbatch is widely considered to have reinvented the character for the digital age in *Sherlock* (2010-). The differing nature of these series reflect on the prominence of their respective Moriarties, but one thing is unchanged from the 1899 and 1939 versions. The character continues to represent the Otherness of not just Holmes, but what Holmes symbolises.

4.1 – GRANADA'S SHERLOCK HOLMES, 1984

As Gillette was the Great Detective of the early twentieth century, and Rathbone of its middle part, Jeremy Brett became the defining Holmes as the new millennium approached (Barnes 23-27). In 1984, Granada Television starred Brett in *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*; later seasons would repeatedly change titles, and while the show as a whole is officially called *Sherlock Holmes*, it is most often referred to as "the Granada series" or "the 1984 series".

Unlike both Gillette's and Rathbone's versions of the franchise, which often formed bricolages, loose retellings or new stories entirely, the Granada series explicitly aimed for "an almost dogmatic sense of 'the canon' as an indicator of cultural value" (McCaw 36). It was made in the era of British heritage TV, a reaction to the often tumultuous political landscape of the day. McCaw points out that the idyllic setting of the show starkly contrasts with the scandals the police were facing at the time of production, in addition to the social problems of miner strikes and riots. In the face of such issues, the "Thatcherite political rhetoric" was one of "moral and political order, and (...) celebration of its Victorian past" (26). The media obliged by offering heritage productions, a retreat to a more idyllic past, re-establishing it

as a property or possession, which, by "natural," or better, "naturalized," right of birth, belongs to the present, or, to be more precise, to certain interests or concerns active in the present. (Voighs-Virchow 123)

The nineteenth century British literary canon was a treasure trove for heritage productions, offering celebrated stories that could easily be adapted into costume dramas. Of particular interest was Jane Austen's world of gentlemen, cultured countrysides and breathtaking mansions, as the infamous grubbiness of nineteenth-century London was not really suited for the sensibilities of the genre. However, Granada managed a reasonable facsimile of a relatively clean capital, populated by cheery urchins, top-hatted gentlemen and stately Victorian ladies – as well as hardened criminals.

Matching this aesthetic, Brett's Holmes retained something of Rathbone's strong-jawed heroism, presenting a stern, but not unkind figure as he strode the cobbled streets. He, was, however was a much more excitable figure than his Hollywood predecessor, suffering from a "clinical case of manic-depression" (Leitch 225), mirroring Doyle's original in his nature as a sometimes insufferable genius. Watson, portrayed by David Burke, was once again a competent and legitimate medical professional far removed from Nigel Bruce's comic-relief bumbler. Taking a faithful approach to Doyle's writings, Granada closely adapted the original stories while, as per the needs of heritage, emphasising intriguing mystery over gruesome murder, giving a cosy, nostalgic feel to the Great Detective's adventures. However, this atmosphere would soon be challenged by the story in which Holmes would be temporarily killed off: the finale of the first series was announced to be "The Final Problem".

As will be seen, Granada's Moriarty is extremely faithful to Doyle's original, as is his relationship with Holmes. However, the context of that relationship is very different, simply because of the time difference of ninety-two years between hypertext and hypertext. As mentioned, while Holmes's sovereign was Victoria, Brett lived under Thatcher, whose political platform focused even more on law, order and pride in being British. Brett's Holmes, then, is all of these virtues summed up – which makes Moriarty their opposite. He has no morals but profit and revenge, no regard for the political order, and where Holmes is excitable and likeable, Moriarty is a clinical, angry soul. He seemingly channels and appropriates other Victorian villains, such as a pre-epiphany Ebenezer Scrooge with his stoop and top hat (Dickens "A Christmas Carol"), and Fagin with his malicious organisational skills (Dickens "Oliver Twist").

However, taking into account Zucco's earlier Hitler-esque symbol of anti-Britishness, it is interesting to look at this Moriarty's foreignness. Thatcherism was also characterised by renewed opposition to Communism. In 1985, Reagan was the President of the United States and Gorbachev had just been installed as Premier of the Soviet Union; the first half of the decade had been marked by increased tensions, and nuclear scares such as the Cuban missile crisis were still in recent memory. However, Communism was more than just an external threat. There was a fear of KGB spies and British double agents, the latter personified by the "Cambridge Five" of the 1950s, two of whom had defected to Russia when unmasked (Boghardt).

Since Rathbone's time, another great fictional symbol of Englishness had emerged, and had been fighting Soviet or symbolically Soviet agents for decades: the then-latest James Bond film, *Octopussy* (Glen), explicitly featured a USSR general as a co-antagonist. It is difficult not to see shades of Bond villains such as Ernst Stavro Blofeld in the scowling figure with a multinational and dangerous criminal organisation working under him, whose plots are repeatedly foiled by an agent of British law, and who ends his days fighting hand to hand with his arch-enemy. Just as with the hypotextual Moriarty, Granada's version is a drastic departure from the norm of earlier antagonists featured in the series. In 1985, however, the Bond villain was a stereotype that lent itself well to this kind of super-antagonist. Such antagonists "had appearances utterly out of the ordinary", and were "relaxed, confident, exuding a strong animal magnetism". They came in two flavours (Wandrup 137-139), over-the-top, physically disfigured creatures such as Dr. Julius No (Young *Dr. No*), and more sombre figures such as Bond's own classical arch-enemy, Ernst Stavros Blofeld (Young *Thunderball*). Of these, Granada's Moriarty bears a stronger resemblance to the first. It might also, however, be more correct to say that Bond villains and Granada's Moriarty are drawn from the same mould, that of the covert (Soviet) spymaster plotting against Western civilisation in general and Britain in particular.

To play up even more the idea that this is no ordinary villain, Moriarty makes an early and surprising debut in the penultimate episode of the first series, "The Red-Headed League" (Bruce). The original 1891 story concerns a pawnbroker being tricked into leaving his office so that a criminal named John Clay can dig a tunnel from his basement into the bank next door (Doyle "The Red-Headed League"). In a departure from strict fidelity to foreshadow the series finale, the episode's mid-way point introduces Moriarty as Clay's superior, overseeing events from the shadows (Bruce 00:23:40-00:24:08). It is noteworthy, however, that his involvement does not escape notice; Holmes recognises the mark of Moriarty, whose "name echoes and re-echoes

throughout the criminal underworld" (00:37:54). He quotes his speech on the Professor from "The Final Problem", then goes on to say that "[Moriarty] is never caught; his agent is caught, but the central power is never caught" (00:37:55-00:38:38). His words come true; Clay and his accomplice are arrested, but the "central power" remains free. Later, Moriarty declares Holmes to be an amateur, but a lucky and clever one, and notes that this is the third time he has been inconvenienced by him (00:44:43-00:46:17). At the very end of the episode, the Professor is seen eavesdropping on a conversation between Holmes and Watson, scowling with hatred (00:50:16).

In appearance, this Moriarty (portrayed by sixty-three year old actor Eric Porter) is clean-shaven, with a domed forehead and slicked-back grey hair. Through casting and costuming, he looks, as is typical for the show (Leitch 214) all but identical to Sidney Paget's 1893 illustration (Doyle "The Final Problem" 832). At several points, including at Reichenbach (Grint 00:46:14), he replicates a genuinely unnerving version of the reptilian head movements mentioned in Doyle ("The Final Problem" 833-834). Though convincingly portraying anger in this episode, in the next, Porter shows an affable side of the Professor that brings to mind the faux "grand meenester" (sic) Inspector MacDonald recalls in *The Valley of Fear* (see 2.2). Moments later, however, he returns to scowling when news of Holmes's involvement reaches him. In essence, then, we are given a brief glimpse at Moriarty the arch-criminal, unencumbered by the Great Detective, before the angry, bitter avenger role is assumed.

This transition continues into the series finale, "The Final Problem" (Grint). Largely a close adaptation of Doyle's short story, it utilises the medium's ability to show rather than tell, opening with Holmes struggling to evade assassins on the streets of London. After the title card, Watson narrates that in the early part of 1891 he had been away on "a short holiday" (00:02:47), the series' version of his literary counterpart's marriage; the year, then, is the same as in the hypotext. At this point, Watson briefly and offhandedly mentions Holmes's exploits in France. Mrs Hudson, the landlady, appears to offer some additional exposition: after being away for four months, Holmes reappeared at Baker Street that morning. He soon left again, however, after having words with an elderly gentlemen with a face like "the wrath of God... or should I say the Devil?" (00:04:08) – the first mention of Moriarty's visit to Holmes, as adapted from the short story. When Watson looks out the window, he sees that Baker Street is being watched, and he and Holmes later discover that someone is placed across the street with an air-gun.

At this point Holmes himself appears. Dignified but ruffled, he enters through the window, mutters

about air guns and sports bloodied knuckles. He proceeds to narrate a flashback that describes the precise nature of his business in France. Expanding upon the brief quote from Doyle's hypotext that Holmes "had been engaged by the French government upon a matter of supreme importance" ("The Final Problem" 830), the flashback introduces a plot by Moriarty to steal the Mona Lisa from the Louvre.

It is interesting to compare this attempted theft with that of the Crown Jewels in the 1939 film, of which it seems like an appropriation; like the royal regalia, the famous painting is a famous symbol. It is not only a French national treasure, but an Italian one, having been painted in Florence (Lavana). Its attempted theft by the English Moriarty signals a change in his character; unlike his predecessors, this Moriarty is working abroad. Rather than being a British criminal, seeking British national treasures, he is now an international concern. In addition, rather than being foiled by Holmes before he can get to the painting, Moriarty has already masterminded its theft. His scheme is not yet over, however, as he plans to fence off near-perfect forgeries as originals, making a fortune and still keeping the original for himself. Thus, his plan is much more elaborate than that of Zucco's version, who merely planned his theft as a sort of criminal magnum opus before retiring. Here, we most clearly see the elements of the Bond villain creep into the character.

This Moriarty, then, is more formidable than any one of his predecessors. In addition to employing a sizeable organisation of various nationalities (English, Swiss and Spanish agents are explicitly seen; Frenchmen are hinted at), he employs a dedicated assistant instead of the Zucco version's bungling butler. Again, there is a symmetry here with Holmes's friendship with the now-competent Watson. There is something of the stage play's antagonists in the sinister nature of Moriarty's henchmen, but they differ here in their effectiveness. While the Professor's assassins are unable to kill Holmes, they are capable of ruffling him more than Moriarty himself ever could in the play. After Holmes eludes them and appears in Baker Street, Watson sums up his appearance by severely telling him that he does "not look well" (Grint 00:07:20), a line nowhere to be found in the short story. In the medium of a TV series, where we can actually see Holmes, the uncharacteristic nature of his haggardness is more pronounced than in the short story, where he was merely "paler and thinner" (Doyle "The Final Problem" 830). "I have been using myself rather too freely," Holmes quotes from the hypotext (Grint 07:30; "The Final Problem" 830), and the Cold War symbolism seems clear: the fight against the enemy has gone on for a long time, and it is not over yet.

A second flashback shows an elaboration upon Moriarty's visit to Baker Street. As mentioned, the symbolism of the characters echo the Cold War, and it is underscored with the choice of quotations from the short story. "This is a duel between you and me, Mr Holmes", Moriarty says, underlining the political realities of the day; when he snarls "if you are clever enough to bring destruction on me, rest assured, I shall do as much for you", two thirds of the term Mutually Assured Destruction are present. The threat of nuclear war had recently been chillingly dramatised for British citizens by the BBC TV drama *Threads* (Jackson); when Holmes and Watson share the following scene in a dim Baker Street, only illuminated by candlelight, "under siege in this very room", it may be an appropriation of that film's post-apocalyptic Sheffield.

As mentioned, Moriarty remains silent for the rest of the episode after his gang is broken up and he follows Holmes and Watson to Switzerland. When he surprises Holmes at Reichenbach (Grint 00:46:14), he does little but give his enemy a cold stare. The fight between the two men is an adaptation of "The Empty House", with a bestial Moriarty giving an animal roar and going for Holmes's throat, with Holmes seemingly gaining the upper hand. The first episode of the second season (Baker) is an explicit adaptation of "The Empty House", continuing to mirror Doyle's canon as it existed after Holmes's return from the dead: Brett's Great Detective returns to a bewildered Watson, but Moriarty remains dead.

All in all, rather than the agent of Mutually Assured Destruction Moriarty presents himself as, the series offered as a dangerous antagonist in the mould of a Bond villain – but still someone who is ultimately inferior to Holmes, and what Holmes symbolises. After all is said and done, all of Moriarty's plots fail, and the status quo is upheld. Prior to "The Final Problem", his earliest scheme had already been foiled in "The Red-Headed League"; at the beginning of the second season, the Mona Lisa has been recovered, Moriarty's criminal organisation is shattered, the Professor himself is dead, and Holmes is alive and well. As a close adaptation of Doyle's canon, the Granada series follows its hypotext's lead in downplaying the post-mortem Moriarty. While he is certainly memorable as a character, his legacy within the show's universe is as absent as it is in the world of the *Strand* stories. Of course, the difference between the two is that Granada's Moriarty was never a true Holmes-killer, as he was for Doyle's readers until 1903; everyone who watched the series knew that Holmes would be back. For all his well-channeled menace, this is perhaps the character's greatest weakness. Trapped by the closeness of the adaptation, Porter's Professor was doomed to lose in a way that would surprise no-one familiar with Doyle's canon.

4.2 – SHERLOCK, 2010

While Granada's Moriarty was a closely adapted character who went over a waterfall in Switzerland, a looser approach was taken with the Moriarty faced by Benedict Cumberbatch's Great Detective in the currently ongoing 2010 series produced by BBC Drama. In fact, series creator Mark Gatiss explicitly outlined his philosophy on appropriation and reappropriation to *The Guardian*: "everything is canonical" (Mumford). Arriving shortly after the 2009 Hollywood film starring Robert Downey Jr as a suave Victorian action-hero (Ritchie "Sherlock Holmes"), Cumberbatch portrayed a contemporary Holmes as a self-described "high-functioning sociopath". Adapting every eccentricity Doyle ever mentioned, the series offered a socially inept, but frustratingly brilliant anti-hero who is only kept somewhat in check by his relationship with a long-suffering straight man called John Watson, played by Martin Freeman.

Though the series adapts several Doyle stories, it was perhaps the first to build a greater storyline that spans not just a few episodes, but all of them. It was quite postmodern in character, to some extent being a show just as much about the Sherlock Holmes phenomenon as it was about Sherlock Holmes itself, playing with the fandom and their expectations of what an adaptation would bring. To that end, Sherlock and John (as these specific versions of the pair are commonly referred to both in and out of universe) are pitted against a greater behind-the-scenes antagonist from the very first episode on. This antagonist, unsurprisingly, is Moriarty.

The postmodern nature of the series is demonstrated as early as the first episode, "A Study in Pink" (McGuigan), based on *A Study in Scarlet*, where Watson is at one point abducted and taken to see a man (played by the aforementioned Gatiss in an uncredited role) who identifies himself as Sherlock's nemesis. Drawing on the Moriartian arch-criminal archetype and misleading the audience into thinking he is the show's version of the Professor (Barnes 170), he turns out instead to be Sherlock's brother Mycroft. This narrative sleight of hand is a testament to just how vital Moriarty, at this point, is to the Holmesian universe. It relies entirely on the fact that the audience expects the Professor to appear sooner rather than later.

As it is, the series' Moriarty is no professor at all. Revealed at the end of the first and second episodes as the architect of the nominal villains' crimes, Moriarty (portrayed by Andrew Scott in a BAFTA-winning role) is introduced incognito at the beginning through the third episode, "The Great Game" (McGuigan 00:18:14). Going by Jim rather than James, *Sherlock's* Moriarty seems

quite different from any previous version of the character. Like the original from "The Final Problem", he is a blend of similarities and opposites to his Great Detective – but the nature of this equation is somewhat different. Like Sherlock, who is only grudgingly tolerated (and in some cases loathed) by Scotland Yard, Jim is a rogue agent with a similar flair for theatrics; gone is the age difference and the title of Professor. This Moriarty takes the step of dispensing entirely with the role of the academic; like Sherlock, he starts off as an unknown factor who will only gain notoriety as the series progresses. However, he does have control over a sizeable criminal organisation, where Sherlock has only a few allies. In "The Great Game", he marshals a team of snipers; in "The Reichenbach Fall" (Haynes), he has enough expertly placed inside men to masquerade as the owner of a key that can open any electronic lock, and he also has a team of assassins move into flats across Baker Street.

Unlike the original Moriarty, who was calmer and more methodical than the often excitable Holmes, Jim counters the anarchic Sherlock by being completely unhinged. Sherlock memorably describes himself as a "high-functioning sociopath". What, then, is Moriarty? A full discussion of these specific characters would fill an entire thesis in itself, but some key points can be gained by a cursory glance at the field of psychology. Sociopathy is not always distinguished from the more popular term psychopathy, which was described in the form of a checklist of 20 points by psychologist Robert Hare (Lilienfeld et al.). It lists four facets; the interpersonal, the affective; the lifestyle, and the antisocial. The interpersonal and affective traits apply somewhat less to Sherlock than to Moriarty; he is not quite as falsely charming and charismatic as Jim, being a much more straightforward character, and he is shown feeling remorse for his actions even though he does not understand why he has offended – in contrast to Moriarty, who understands exactly why he offends, but does not care. The latter two facets, however, apply to both. For the lifestyle, Sherlock is a "consulting detective", adapting his profession from *A Study in Scarlet*; to mirror this Jim accepts the mantle of a "consulting criminal" (McGuigan "The Great Game" 01:23:13), a villain for hire – a refinement of the original arch-criminal role seen most clearly in *The Valley of Fear*. Antisocially, both are similar in their lack of respect towards the law; Sherlock, however, differs in that he is "on the side of angels" (Haynes 01:16:04). But where Sherlock is notoriously chaste, Jim flirts wildly with everyone (including Sherlock), flamboyantly metrosexual to Sherlock's insistent asexual – under the heading "promiscuous sexual encounters", this is another of Hare's signs of psychopathy (Lilienfeld et al.).

The sum of the two characters' psyches, then, is that while Sherlock may claim to be a high-

functioning sociopath, he is likely not. It has been pointed out by psychologists that "no actual psychopath – or sociopath (...) – would ever admit to his psychopathy" (Konnokova). Notably, Moriarty never admits to any form of mental illness besides commenting he is "changeable" (McGuigan "The Great Game" 01:27:55), because he is a *true* psychopath/sociopath, unable to form meaningful personal relationships and, unlike Sherlock, surrounding himself with disposable henchmen and accomplices rather than indisposable friends.

However, as part of his manic nature, Jim Moriarty also appropriates a trait that both the original Holmes and the 2010 Sherlock share. Like his opponent, Moriarty is driven by the need for a new challenge, an element that becomes obvious in "The Great Game" and continues to shape the character's action for the rest of his life. Like Sherlock, who takes cases to alleviate his boredom, Jim tortures him to alleviate his. The plot of that episode deals with Jim staging crimes to "play" with Sherlock, strapping bombs to innocent citizens who are forced to inform him of the cases; if Sherlock fails to solve them, the bombs explode. This criminal hedonism continues into "The Reichenbach Fall" (Haynes). In an obvious appropriation of the 1939 film, Moriarty breaks into the Tower of London, sits among the Crown Jewels and submits to a trial (which he wins by manipulating the jurors). Later, during their final confrontation, even Sherlock has lost the shine of a worthy opponent: "Nah", Moriarty tells him. "You're ordinary" (Haynes 01:16:00). This points to another aspect of the literary Moriarty being dropped: that of the avenger. Moriarty is, from beginning to end, an arch-criminal alone. He remains so even to the end, scheming and forming plans within plans; though he seemingly kills himself, the most recent episode (Hurran 01:28:08) hints that he may be returning from the dead.

In comparison to Granada's Moriarty, *Sherlock's* version heavy-handedly rather than subtly appropriates the traits of supervillains such as those faced by James Bond. It appears, however, that one recent legend of popular culture in particular has been appropriated; Batman's nemesis, the Joker, as portrayed by the late Heath Ledger in an Academy Award-winning role in *The Dark Knight* (Nolan). It is hard not to see traces of Ledger in Jim Moriarty's homicidal cruelty, the penchant for hidden bombs that he displays in "The Great Game", and the simple fact of his aforementioned sociopathy. Moreover, *The Dark Knight* featured a Batman (portrayed by Christian Bale) whose psyche was investigated to a greater degree than the Caped Crusaders played by Michael Keaton (Burton *Batman*; Burton *Batman Returns*), Val Kilmer (Schumacher *Batman Forever*) and George Clooney (Schumacher *Batman & Robin*). It might be argued that some of Bale's Batman is appropriated by Cumberbatch's Sherlock, a much more anti-heroic figure than

earlier Holmeses, who wears a long, black coat that may signal an appropriation of the Caped Crusader's iconic silhouette. Notably, Ledger's Joker performs something of the same narrative function as Jim Moriarty. Once the status quo has been established by the first episode of each franchise (Nolan *Batman Begins*; McGuigan "A Study in Pink"), that episode ends with a cryptic mention of a dangerous, new antagonist (the Joker and Moriarty). Later, this character completely upends the status quo by doing substantial damage to the protagonist's reputation, before finally being defeated in a one-on-one combat that is fought with words more than fists. Interestingly, *The Dark Knight* and "The Reichenbach Fall" both end with protagonist and antagonist undergoing a physical fall, but the protagonists suffering a metaphorical one as well. The last scenes of the Joker and Moriarty are eerily similar; while both are at the edge of triumph, they face death not only without fear, but with relish. However, *The Dark Knight* spares the Joker and attributes his defeat to the fundamentally good nature of his victims, while Jim Moriarty commits suicide in order to assure a defeat for Sherlock. Meanwhile, Batman becomes a fugitive and suffers a wound that still plagues him almost a decade later (Nolan *The Dark Knight Rises*); Sherlock fakes his death and goes underground for two years.

With Moriarty dead, the dynamics of *Sherlock* changed. The title character returned to life in "The Empty Hearse" (Lovering), the most postmodern episode yet. Here, characters speculate on how Sherlock might have survived his fall – the theories, all shown as imagination spots, are the most prominent ones devised by online fans. One of those theories is particularly interesting, even if it played largely for comic relief; it shows Jim and Sherlock collaborating to fool John, ending with the two of them leaning in for a passionate kiss (00:29:16-00:29:50). A peculiar trend of modern Internet fandoms is *shipping* (Hellekson and Busse 84), shorthand for "relationshiping", imagining and championing romantic relationships between characters who may or not have one in the text itself, regardless of the characters' gender or morality. The series had already teasingly alluded to the long-standing tradition of shipping Holmes and Watson; after Scott's Moriarty became a breakout character and shipping favourite, this scene was the showrunners' way of recognising it.

The third series takes its cue from the first, hinting at a shadowy new arch-enemy who has filled the late Moriarty's footprints. In the series finale, *His Last Vow* (Hurrant), the identity of this new antagonist is revealed. Charles Augustus Magnussen is an adaptation of Charles Augustus Milverton, a Doyle villain notably described by Holmes as the man who most repulses him ("Charles Augustus Milverton" 963). When the blackmailer is murdered by a victim, the Great Detective flatly states that his "sympathies are with the criminals" (976).

Milverton's transition to Magnussen is the result of two additional appropriations. The first is of a real-life figure. Magnussen – a foreign media magnate with UK interests and controversial access to the highest levels of government – seemingly takes his cue from Australian billionaire Rupert Murdoch. Notably, Murdoch was the owner of *News of the World*, the British tabloid that was forced to shut down in 2011 after the uncovering of a surveillance scheme directed against celebrities, royals and even the next of kin to murder victims (Chandrasekhar, Trotman and Wardrop). Like Murdoch, then, Magnussen presents a very real Otherness to the British public: an outsider with a far too intimate grasp of British affairs, both public and private. Though the filmmakers protested otherwise, many reviewers saw Murdoch in the villainous newspaper tycoon Elliot Carver (Jonathan Pryce), James Bond's enemy in *Tomorrow Never Dies* (Spottiswoode); like Carver, Magnussen is also larger-than-life and generally repulsive.

Magnussen's second appropriation is of none other than the hypotextual Professor Moriarty himself. It can, in fact, be argued that Magnussen is a closer adaptation of Doyle's Professor than Jim Moriarty is. While Andrew Scott's terrorist was a drastic adaptational innovation, Magnussen remains the respected figure of society who is secretly, rather than openly, a master criminal. Unlike Jim Moriarty, it is Magnussen who is compared to an animal in a sight-related simile, though a dead-eyed shark (Hurran 00:19:49) rather than a reptile or spider. The most obvious signifier is the nickname Holmes bestows upon him, "the Napoleon of Blackmail" (00:22:07), but when examining Doyle's list of Moriarty's differences and similarities to Holmes, Magnussen fits many of them. Like the hypotextual Professor Moriarty, Magnussen is older than Holmes, highly educated, and though controversial, a respected public figure. Most notably, perhaps, is the fact that Magnussen has matched Sherlock in utilizing the mental technique of a "mind palace", an adaptation of the mental attic described in *A Study in Scarlet* (see 2.2). Magnussen's mastery of the concept is an obvious appropriation of the line that Moriarty "has a brain of the first order", just like Sherlock Holmes himself. Finally, there is Magnussen's fate. In a confrontation with Sherlock, the Great Detective kills him (Hurran 01:21:45). It happens on the steps of his house rather than at a waterfall in Switzerland, but such a cold-blooded murder causes Sherlock himself to fall as well, although metaphorically rather than physically like he did in the previous series finale. With his brother now a proven murderer, Mycroft sends him off on a suicide mission to die in Her Majesty's service – even if that mission lasts for only a couple of minutes before being aborted, due to Moriarty's aforementioned return; England once again needs Sherlock Holmes (01:28:14).

In addition, Magnussen's casting is interesting when considering the character's similarity to Bond villains. He is portrayed by Lars Mikkelsen, brother of Mads Mikkelsen, who starred as the evil Le Chiffre in 2005's *Casino Royale* (Campbell) opposite Daniel Craig. For his own part, Lars Mikkelsen played politician Troels Hartmann in *The Killing* (Sveistrup); thus, seeing him in a morally ambiguous position of power was not an entirely new experience for UK viewers. Moreover, *The Killing* is an example of Nordic noir, in the same way as *The Girl With The Dragon Tattoo* (Larsson) and *Headhunters* (Nesbø); grim, realistic, psychological crime-thrillers featuring imperfect protagonists and powerful antagonists. At its darkest, *Sherlock* certainly channels these roots; Sherlock's psyche is not unlike that of the Aspergers-suffering Saga Norén (Sofia Helin) in *The Bridge* (Rosenfeld). It does, however, have a quirkiness and perhaps Hollywood-like tone that these Scandinavian crime-thrillers lack. Moriarty is too cheerfully insane to fully fit the mould of a Nordic noir character; Mikkelsen's Magnussen, however, would not be out of place in either Larsson or Nesbø, and the connotations of his casting reflect this.

Sherlock's Holmes, for all his faults, remains an English symbol (now an English *sex* symbol as well, just like Bond), a testament to the success of the spirit of the law and for personal liberty (this last one emphasised and problematised), a triumph for over the criminal trinity of the idiot, the fanatic, and the egotistically brilliant. Opposed to this, the two Moriarty analogues demonstrate separate forms of Otherness. Where Jim Moriarty represents the modern menace of terrorism, Magnussen's appropriation represents the opposite evil of runaway electronic surveillance, both conducted by private interests (as symbolised by Magnussen) and national governments (as symbolized by Mycroft, who is forced to protect the antagonist). Ultimately, both are defeated, but not without cost, a hopeful but realistic mirror of the current situation where both threats are extremely topical.

Of these two Moriarties, however, it is Scott's version who seems to have become almost iconic, second only in prominence to Cumberbatch's Sherlock himself. Where earlier adaptations had presented a dour, but occasionally vicious Victorian criminal, Jim Moriarty swayed audiences with his youth and roaring insanity. This shows, too, when considering the difference between Jim Moriarty and Charles Augustus Magnussen. While certainly memorable, the latter – who is, as mentioned, the closest adaptation of the hypotextual character – seems to lack some of the sheer maniacal impact that Scott had. It is probably not a coincidence that the third series, for its cliffhanger, resurrected Moriarty from the dead and had him ask the entire world, "did you miss me?". In their postmodern way, the showrunners asked their audience a question they already knew

the answer to: Moriarty was indeed missed.

The Moriarty of the modern era, then, has gone from being extremely close to Doyle's hypotextual version to diverging into two different characters entirely. However, they all invoke a specific form of Otherness, being enemies not only of Holmes, but of Holmes's audience. In this way, Porter, Scott and Mikkelsen all continue the tradition set by their predecessors. However, their proximity to current events, be it the landgrabs of Putin's Russia or the acts of terrorism and illegal surveillance that appear on our news channels and Facebook feeds, lends them a particularly chilling kind of recognition. Opposing them, as always, are the values of peace, democracy and justice; the values of Sherlock Holmes.

5.0 – CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Whether an actual professor, a self-declared one or no academic at all, every Moriarty to threaten a Holmes owes his existence to that first sinister figure who stalked through the pages of *The Strand* magazine in 1893. By killing the Great Detective, he cemented his role in pop culture history – and by representing such a thorough opposite to everything Holmes stood for, he became one of the first true supervillains.

As has been seen, while Moriarty in some way always seems to return to Doyle's short story, the symbolism of his character has changed with the times. As the British Empire has become a United Kingdom, and new enemies have emerged to threaten it, he has been a stand-in for enemies Doyle had no chance of imagining. The first adaptation presented in this thesis, the 1899 play, thus presents Moriarty as a penny-dreadful crime boss, certainly sinister, but ultimately incompetent and powerless against the force of British law (as represented by one Mr. Sherlock Holmes). When times change, so does the Professor. In 1939, with Hitler's Germany looming on the horizon, a Moriarty with Germanic and Italian tendencies suddenly lunges for the Crown Jewels, the very symbol of the nation. These higher stakes are matched in 1985, but now taken to an international level, as a Bond villain-esque, KGB-like Professor goes after the Mona Lisa and hunts Holmes across Europe. And finally, reinventing himself for the twenty-first century, the Moriarties of 2012 represent the two polar opposites of freedom and democracy, with insane terrorism on one side and ruthless electronic surveillance on the other.

The adaptation history of the character, then, is one of changing Otherness in the face of a changing world. Unless the text in question is a parody of the character, Sherlock Holmes himself is always brilliant, but is sometimes a clean-cut hero and sometimes an infuriating anti-hero. As he represents Britain's Self, he is an admission that the country is not without its flaws, but that it will always seek to do the right thing, and that it will always be a force to be reckoned with. Moriarty, on the other hand, is evil, and he is never redeemed; as an Other, he seems to represent the forces that Britain cannot make peace with, those that oppose order and justice while championing greed and corruption.

This thesis, for reasons of space, has been unable to analyse more than a fraction of the Moriarties produced by writers and actors over the last 122 years. This is its main flaw. The list of Holmes adaptations on screen literally fills an entire book. In addition, there are plays, novels, short stories,

audio dramas, and a host of other reworkings. In most of them, it seems, a villainous professor (or a suitably chilling analogue) rears his reptilian, oscillating head. There are a multitude of ways in which adaptations have played with the character; he has been an innocent man, an artificial intelligence, a Great Detective and a vampire. There are, quite simply, too many Moriarties for a single master's thesis to encompass.

Not all of these variant antagonists are in the past. As mentioned, Andrew Scott's character may be returning to haunt Benedict Cumberbatch's Sherlock once again. In 2013, *Elementary* (Doherty) made Jamie Moriarty the alter ego of Irene Adler (Natalie Dormer), creating a shining example of Otherness by having Moriarty be a woman to Sherlock's man. It remains to be seen which other versions of the character will appear, but it can look as though Andrew Scott has made it acceptable for future characters to drop the Professor title entirely; the sacred trinity of academic, arch-criminal and avenger is seemingly more open to experimentation. We might see a generation of younger antagonists, more insane, more unpredictable, but just as brilliant – in fact, characters who appropriate earlier Holmeses just as much as earlier Moriarties.

To watch the careers of these future Napoleons of Crime will be, as a Great Detective once said, of extraordinary interest.

WORKS CITED

- Aldershot Military Museum website. "General Sir Daniel Lysons KCB." 2015. Web. 28.04.2015.
- Attlee, Clement, and Neville Chamberlain. "Prime Minister's Statement, HC Deb 03 October 1938 Vol 339 CC40-162." 1938. Web. 28.04.2015.
- Barnes, Alan, and Steven Moffat. *Sherlock Holmes on Screen: The Complete Film and TV History*. Titan, 2011. Print.
- Boghardt, Thomas. "The Cambridge Five." International Spy Museum, Washington D.C. No date. Web. 28.04.2015.
- Brummet, Barry. *Techniques of Close Reading*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc, 2010. E-book.
- Cartmell, Deborah, and Imelda Whelehan, eds. "Introduction – Literature on screen: a synoptic view." *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Print.
- . Voighs-Virchow, Eckard. "Heritage and Literature on Screen: Heimat and Heritage." Cartmell, Deborah, and Imelda Whelehan, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Print.
- Chandrasekhar, Indu, Andy Trotman, and Murray Wardrop. "Phone Hacking: Timeline of the Scandal." 2012. Web. 30.04.2015.
- Cohen, Clarence. *Benedict Cumberbatch 224 Success Facts - Everything You Need to Know About Benedict Cumberbatch*. Emereo Publishing, 2014. E-book.
- Croker, John Wilson. *The Croker Papers: The Correspondence and Diaries of the Late Right Honourable John Wilson Croker, LL.D., F.R.S., Secretary to the Admiralty from 1809 to 1830*. 1885. Ed. Jennings, Louis J. Vol. 2. Web. 30.04.2015.
- . *The Croker Papers: The Correspondence and Diaries of the Late Right Honourable John Wilson Croker, LL.D., F.R.S., Secretary to the Admiralty from 1809 to 1830*. 1885. Ed. Jennings, Louis J. Vol. 3. Web. 30.04.2015.
- Doyle, Arthur Conan. *Memories and Adventures*. Ed. Choat, Colin. 2014. *Arthur Conan Doyle's Autobiography*. Web. 30.04.2015.
- Frie, Roger. *Subjectivity and Intersubjectivity in Modern Philosophy and Psychoanalysis: A Study of Sartre, Binswanger, Lacan, and Habermas*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1997. E-book.
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997 (1982). Print.

- Hawthorn, Jeremy. *Studying the Novel*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010. Print.
- Hellekson, Karen, and Kristina Busse, eds. *Fan Fiction and Fan Communities in the Age of the Internet*. 2006. E-book.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.
- Inglis, Ruth A. "An Objective Approach to the Relationship between Fiction and Society." *American Sociological Review* 3.4 (1938). Web. 30.04.2015.
- Konnokova, Maria. "Stop Calling Sherlock a Sociopath! Thanks, a Psychologist." 2012. Web. 04.30.2015.
- Lavanga, Claudio. "Mona Lisa Researchers Work to Find Woman Behind Famous Painting." *NBC News* 04.30.2014. Web. 30.04.2015.
- Leitch, Thomas M. *Film Adaptation and Its Discontents: From Gone with the Wind to the Passion of the Christ*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007. Print.
- Lilienfeld, Scott O., et al. "Psychopathic Personality: Bridging the Gap between Scientific Evidence and Public Policy." 2011. Web. 30.04.2015.
- Loew, Brenda, ed. *Playbills to Photoplays*. Xlibris Corporation, 2010. E-book.
- McCaw, Neil. *Adapting Detective Fiction: Crime, Englishness and the TV Detectives*. London: Continuum, 2011. E-book.
- Merriam-Webster. "Arch-Enemy." Web. 27.04.2015.
- . "Canon." Web. 28.04.2015.
- . "Nemesis." Web. 27.04.2015.
- Mumford, Gwilym. "Sherlock Returns to the BBC: 'He's Definitely Devilish'." *The Guardian*. Web. 28.04.2015.
- Noonan, Kevin. "Lost 'Sherlock Holmes' Film Discovered after Almost a Century." *Variety* 2014. Web. 28.04.2015.
- Oxford Dictionaries. "Nemesis." Web. 27.04.2015.
- Panek, Leroy. *An Introduction to the Detective Story*. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1987. E-book.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books, 2003. E-book.
- Sanders, Julie. *Adaptation and Appropriation*. London: Routledge, 2007. Print.
- Tibell, Gunnar. "Linnaeus' Thoughts on Reptiles." Uppsala University 2012. Web. 27.04.2015.
- Tower of London website. "A Building History." No date. Web. 28.04.2015.
- Wandrup, Fredrik. *James Bond: Mannen Som Erobrete Det Tyvende Århundret*. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag ASA, 1999. Print.

WORKS OF FICTION CITED FEATURING HOLMES AND/OR MORIARTY

PRINTED TEXTS CITED

- Corey, Daniel, and Anthony Diecidue. *Moriarty: Deluxe HC*. Berkely: Image Comics, 2013. Print.
- Doyle, Arthur Conan. "The Bruce-Partington Plans." *The Complete Stories of Sherlock Holmes*. Ware: Wordsworth Library Collection, 2008. Print.
- . "Charles Augustus Milverton." *The Complete Stories of Sherlock Holmes*. Ware: Wordsworth Library Collection, 2008. Print.
- . "The Engineer's Thumb." *The Complete Stories of Sherlock Holmes*. Ware: Wordsworth Library Collection, 2008. Print.
- . "The Final Problem." *The Complete Stories of Sherlock Holmes*. Ware: Wordsworth Library Collection, 2008. Print.
- . "The Five Orange Pips." *The Complete Stories of Sherlock Holmes*. Ware: Wordsworth Library Collection, 2008. Print.
- . "The Greek Interpreter." *The Complete Stories of Sherlock Holmes*. Ware: Wordsworth Library Collection, 2008. Print.
- . "The Hound of the Baskervilles." *The Complete Stories of Sherlock Holmes*. Ware: Wordsworth Library Collection, 2008. Print.
- . "The Naval Treaty." *The Complete Stories of Sherlock Holmes*. Ware: Wordsworth Library Collection, 2008. Print.
- . "The Red-Headed League." *The Complete Stories of Sherlock Holmes*. Ware: Wordsworth Library Collection, 2008. Print.
- . "A Study in Scarlet." *The Complete Stories of Sherlock Holmes*. Ware: Wordsworth Library Collection, 2008. Print.
- . "The Valley of Fear." *The Complete Stories of Sherlock Holmes*. Ware: Wordsworth Library Collection, 2008. Print.
- Doyle, Arthur Conan, and William Gillette. "Act I." *Sherlock Holmes. A Drama in Four Acts*. 1897-1898. Web. 30.04.2015.
- . "Act II." *Sherlock Holmes. A Drama in Four Acts*. 1897-1898. Web. 30.04.2015.
- . "Act III." *Sherlock Holmes. A Drama in Four Acts*. 1897-1898. Web. 30.04.2015.
- . "Act IV." *Sherlock Holmes. A Drama in Four Acts*. 1897-1898. Web. 30.04.2015.
- Newman, Kim. *Professor Moriarty: The Hound of the D'urbervilles*. Titan Books, 2011. E-book.
- Moore, Alan, and Kevin O'Neill. *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen*. Oslo: Schibsted, 2004.

Print.

FILMS AND TV EPISODES CITED

- "A Study in Pink." *Sherlock*. Dir. Paul McGuigan. Prod. Mark Gattis and Steven Moffat. Perf. Benedict Cumberbatch, Martin Freeman, Mark Gatiss. BBC, 25.07.2010. TV episode.
- . "The Great Game." *Sherlock*. Dir. Paul McGuigan. Prod. Mark Gattis and Steven Moffat. Perf. Benedict Cumberbatch, Martin Freeman, Andrew Scott. BBC, 08.08.2010. TV episode.
- . "The Reichenbach Fall." *Sherlock*. Dir. Toby Haynes. Prod. Mark Gattis and Steven Moffat. Perf. Benedict Cumberbatch, Martin Freeman, Andrew Scott. BBC, 15.01.2012. TV episode.
- . "The Empty Hearse." *Sherlock*. Dir. Jeremy Lovering. Prod. Mark Gattis and Steven Moffat. Perf. Benedict Cumberbatch, Martin Freeman, Andrew Scott. BBC, 24.12.2013. TV episode.
- . "His Last Vow." *Sherlock*. Dir. Nick Hurran. Prod. Mark Gattis and Steven Moffat. Perf. Benedict Cumberbatch, Martin Freeman, Lars Mikkelsen, Andrew Scott. BBC, 12.01.2014. TV episode.
- The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*. Dir. Alfred Werker. Prod. Gene Markey. Perf. Basil Rathbone, Nigel Bruce, George Zucco. Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corporation, 1939. Film.
- Elementary*. Prod. Robert Doherty. Perf. Natalie Dormer. CBS Television, Timberman/Beverly Productions, Hill of Beans Productions, 2012. TV series.
- "Elementary, Dear Data." *Star Trek: The Next Generation*. Dir. Rob Bowman. Prod. Gene Roddenberry. CBS, 05.12.1988. TV episode.
- . "Ship in a Bottle." *Star Trek: The Next Generation*. Dir. Alexander Singer. Prod. Gene Roddenberry. CBS, 24.01.1993. TV episode.
- "The Empty House." *The Return of Sherlock Holmes*. Dir. Howard Baker. Dir. John Bruce. Prod. Michael Cox. Perf. Jeremy Brett, Eric Porter. Granada Television, 07.09.1986. TV episode.
- The Great Mouse Detective*. Dir. Ron Clements, Burny Mattinson, Dave Michener, John Musker. Walt Disney Pictures, 1986. Film.
- "The Red-Headed League." *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*. Dir. John Bruce. Prod. Michael Cox. Perf. Jeremy Brett, Eric Porter. Granada Television, 09.22.1985. TV episode.
- . "The Final Problem." *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*. Dir. Alan Grint. Prod. Michael Cox. Perf. Jeremy Brett, Eric Porter. Granada Television, 09.29.1985. TV episode.
- The Seven Per-Cent Solution*. Dir. Herbert Ross. Universal Pictures, 1976. Film.
- Sherlock Holmes*. Dir. Guy Ritchie. Perf. Robert Downey, Jr. Warner Bros., 2009. Film.
- Sherlock Holmes: A Game of Shadows*. Dir. Guy Ritchie. Perf. Robert Downey, Jr., Jared Harris.

Warner Bros., 2011. Film.

Sherlock Holmes and the Secret Weapon. Dir. Roy William Neill. Perf. Basil Rathbone, Nigel Bruce. Universal Pictures Company Inc, 1942. Film.

Sherlock Holmes Baffled. Cin. Arthur Marvin. American Mutoscope and Biograph Company, 1900. Silent film.

Sherlock Holmes i Livsfare. Dir. Viggo Larsen. Perf. Gustav Lund. Nordisk Films Kompagni, 1908. Silent film.

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's the Hound of the Baskervilles. Dir. Sidney Lanfield. Prod. Gene Markey. Perf. Basil Rathbone, Nigel Bruce. Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corporation, 1939. Film.

WORKS OF OTHER FICTION CITED

PRINTED TEXTS CITED

Dickens, Charles. *A Christmas Carol*. Ed. Hutchison, Patricia. Costa Mesa, CA: Saddleback Publishing, 2013. Print.

---. *Oliver Twist*. Ed. Tillotson, Kathleen. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.

Larsson, Stieg. *Menn Som Hater Kvinner*. Oslo: Gyldendal, 2006. Print.

Nesbø, Jo. *Hodejegerne*. Oslo: Bokklubben, 2011. Print.

FILMS AND TV EPISODES CITED

Batman. Dir. Tim Burton. Perf. Michael Keaton. Warner Bros., 1989. Film.

Batman & Robin. Dir. Joel Schumacher. Perf. George Clooney. Warner Bros., 1997. Film.

Batman Begins. Dir. Christopher Nolan. Perf. Christian Bale. Warner Bros., 2005. Film.

Batman Forever. Dir. Joel Schumacher. Perf. Val Kilmer. Warner Bros., 1995. Film.

Batman Returns. Dir. Tim Burton. Perf. Michael Keaton. Warner Bros., 1992. Film.

Broen. Prod. Hans Rosenfeld. STV/DR, 2011-2013. Perf. Sofia Helin. TV series.

Casino Royale. Dir. Martin Campbell. Perf. Daniel Craig, Mads Mikkelsen. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer and Columbia Pictures, 2006. Film.

The Dark Knight. Perf. Christian Bale, Heath Ledger. Dir. Christopher Nolan. Warner Bros., 2008. Film.

The Dark Knight Rises. Perf. Christian Bale. Dir. Christopher Nolan. Warner Bros., 2012. Film.

Dr. No. Dir. Terence Young. United Artists, 1962. Film.

Forbrydelsen. Prod. Søren Sveistrud. Perf. Lars Mikkelsen. DR, 2007. TV series.

Octopussy. Dir. John Glen. MGM/UA Entertainment Company, 1983. Film.

Threads. Dir. Mick Jackson. BBC, 1984. Film.

Thunderball. Dir. Terence Young. United Artists, 1965. Film.

Tomorrow Never Dies. Dir. Roger Spottiswoode. Perf. Pierce Brosnan, Jonathan Pryce. United Artists, 1997. Film.

APPENDIX: RELEVANCE FOR THE TEACHER PROFESSION

In an educational setting, this thesis could be used as a departure point for teaching and making students interested in adaptation. Most children will have heard of Sherlock Holmes, and those old enough to have watched *Sherlock* will certainly have been impressed by Jim Moriarty. And what about other popular characters? Batman was originally a homicidal vigilante who gunned down his enemies; Donald Duck could be downright sadistic; Sherlock Holmes did cocaine. As such, the illustration of how much Moriarty has changed could be applied to other such iconic figures of pop culture – figures the students know and can claim an amount of ownership to – and show not only how they and their behaviors towards each other have changed, but from which original sources they take their cues. Batman, after all, is a modern Hercules, representing our dreams of fighting bad guys; Donald Duck a modern anti-hero ala Shakespeare, representing our flaws; Sherlock Holmes a modern Leonardo da Vinci, representing our brilliance. Such interpretations can be debated, of course, but this is the whole point. As such a debate is going on, so is learning.