

Manning the Empire:
The Pedagogical Function of Sherlock Holmes and Phileas Fogg
in the Late Victorian Period

by

Naomi Eberly

A capstone project submitted in partial fulfillment
of graduating from the Academic Honors Program
at Ashland University
May 2014

Faculty Mentor: Dr. Sharleen Mondal, Assistant Professor of English
Additional Reader: Dr. Daniel Lehman, Trustee's Distinguished Professor of English

Abstract

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes stories have captured and retained readers' attention since the late 1880s, with no shortage of film, stage, and television adaptations to prove Holmes' enduring popularity. Though not as well remembered today, Phileas Fogg from Jules Verne's *Around the World in Eighty Days* (1873) was also wildly popular; his fictional circumnavigation spawned a spectacular stage production and several films, and inspired others to make similar trips. I argue that these texts ought to be considered together, despite differences in author nationality, because of their enormous popularity at nearly the same time in British imperial history. The large audience of these texts made them capable of serving a pedagogical function, teaching their readers about the British Empire in the late Victorian period. Taking a historicist approach, I use close reading to unpack the links between the literary texts and their social and historical context. An intersectional approach to race, class, and gender enables an understanding of how Victorian masculinity was instructed, through these characters, in the era of high imperialism. I examine three significant elements of the texts that show how Victorian values were reinforced by Holmes and Fogg: how the men demonstrate their colonial "mastery" through detection and travel, how women are seen as a means of negotiating the crisis of colonial otherness, and the role that the sidekick characters play in supporting colonial masculinity.

Acknowledgments

I am indebted to Dr. Sharleen Mondal for guiding me through this process. I cannot imagine undertaking this project without her constructive feedback; wealth of information and always one more helpful book; and sense of humor that allowed us to talk about *Sherlock*, Spock, and *Spartacus*.

I would also like to thank Dr. Dan Lehman for being my second reader and my faculty mentor once I declared an English major. In fact, the English department as a whole has been supportive and I'm proud to call myself an English major. I am grateful for Kathryn Venditti's librarian expertise that gave me the tools necessary for finding sources, as well as the library staff for encouraging me throughout the project. Additionally, I would like to thank my fellow Honors students and English majors who inspired me to keep being nerdy about the things I love.

I would be remiss if I forgot to thank my family for supporting me throughout my college career. Now they probably know more about Sherlock Holmes than they ever cared to know. Finally, I would like to thank the Lord for all of the small things that came together and eventually led to this project.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Colonial “Mastery” through Detection and Travel	12
Self-Fashioning: Preserving the Imperial Self within the Diluted English Community..	14
Self-Fashioning: Controlling the Emotions for “Superior Englishness”	17
Pedagogy of “Superior” Englishmen	23
Relationship to “the other” or Realigning with Countrymen	30
Chapter 2: Women as a Means of Negotiating the Crisis of Colonial Otherness	38
Marriage at Home: <i>The Sign of Four</i>	42
Marriage Abroad: <i>Around the World in Eighty Days</i>	47
Chapter 3: “Sidekick” Figures and their Role in Establishing Colonial Masculinity	59
Inclusion: Informing the Reader about the Main Character and Setting	61
Gaining the Reader’s Trust through Sociability, Relatability, and Comic Relief	67
Differences in Nationalities and Narrative	72
Sidekick’s Pedagogical Function for Preserving the Imperial Message	78
Works Cited	83
Author’s Biography	87

Introduction

In 1893, renowned British author Sir Arthur Conan Doyle killed his beloved Sherlock Holmes in the short story “The Final Problem.” Two years earlier, Doyle wrote his mother, saying “I think of slaying Holmes in the sixth [story] and winding him up for good and all. . . He takes my mind from better things” (Stashower 126). His mother managed to convince him not to kill Holmes in 1891, but soon Doyle wanted to work on his serious historical fiction, so he sent Holmes to his grave. The public did not agree with him and 20,000 people cancelled their subscriptions to the *Strand* magazine, where the Sherlock Holmes stories appeared (Miller 158). Despite his resolution to never return to the world’s only consulting detective, the pocketbook began to call and Doyle released *The Hound of the Baskervilles* (1902) as a story set before Holmes’ fatal fall at Reichenbach with his arch nemesis, Professor James Moriarty. It was not until ten years after the fall, in 1903, that Doyle brought his consulting detective back from the dead, having him miraculously survive the fall and live to continue solving crimes in London. Readers rejoiced and Doyle continued to write Sherlock Holmes stories until a few years before his own death.

Holmes is cited by *The Guinness Book of World Records* as the most portrayed literary character in film and television (Guinness World Records News). Since his first appearance in *A Study in Scarlet* (1887), Holmes has appeared in all sorts of media, from the silent 1900 short film *Sherlock Holmes Baffled* to the recent television shows *Sherlock* (BBC, 2010) and *Elementary* (CBS, 2012), Holmes has never ceased to draw an audience. His enduring popularity proves that his character is worth examination. His original stories are the source of hundreds of adaptations that have captivated generations and their message to original readers is worth investigation. The mysteries in detective fiction pique readers’ interest, and Holmes’

powers of observation are fascinating to try to figure out. The curiosity his cases inspire in readers aligns them with the great detective. Something about a strange Victorian gentleman who goes on adventures and can solve crimes that no one else can transcends time.

Although not as famous as Holmes, another fictional Victorian gentleman who captivated—and still captivates—readers is Jules Verne’s Phileas Fogg from *Around the World in Eighty Days* (1873). Fogg is not a detective, but his adventures take him over the entire world. Despite Fogg’s obscurity today, *Around the World in Eighty Days* was one of Verne’s most popular stories, was extremely popular in France and it spawned a spectacular stage production¹ and inspired people to make similar journeys to try to beat Fogg’s time². There have been several attempts to bring Fogg’s story to life on screen, including one as recent as 2004. The fact that both Fogg and Holmes have maintained popularity for over a century raises the question of what entices readers about these figures. In their original Victorian context, both Fogg and Holmes shared a distinct element despite the separate genres of detective and travel fiction in which they emerged: they display a recurring motif of colonial masculinity defined by the imperial context of late Victorian Britain. This motif, and their role in shaping it, merit further analysis.

Central Argument

At the heart of the early Sherlock Holmes stories and *Around the World in Eighty Days*, colonial masculinity drives the main characters and provides the basis for their alleged supremacy as Englishmen. Colonial masculinity is the construction of the status of men within an imperial context. As Philippa Levine notes in her introduction to *Gender and Empire*, “The

¹ I.O. Evans’ *Jules Verne and His Work* comments on the novel’s popularity, as well as the extravagant stage production (70-71).

² The most famous of these being Nellie Bly’s 1889 trip, which she completed in 72 days and stopped to see Verne in France! For more information, I recommend Matthew Goodman’s *Nellie Bly and Elizabeth Bisland’s History-making Race around the World*.

Empire was, in many ways, a deeply masculine space” (1). Colonial masculinity became the social norm of what Englishmen expected themselves to do while working within the British Empire. In the late-Victorian period, a racial hierarchy set Englishmen as superior to other races they encountered, but especially above those they colonized. Martyn Cornick simply defines the hierarchy as, “Below the ‘white race’ come the ‘yellow’ and the ‘red’, with the ‘race noire’ at the base. These notions of racial superiority underlay colonial ideology, the ‘white races’ believing that they not only had the right but a ‘mission’ to carry civilisation out to the ‘inferior’ races” (139). These racist characterizations assumed that white Europeans alone had the capability of improving the world. Additionally, during this time the Empire was rapidly changing; threatened by class conflict at home as well as colonial resistance and uprisings abroad, Englishmen struggled to maintain their position over those who were colonized. This uncertain time pronounced an emphasis on teaching colonial masculinity to inspire Englishmen to continue their dominance. The pedagogy of colonial masculinity, present in novels of the time, makes it worth studying Holmes and Fogg together, because the stories reflect the increasing anxiety, as well as the drive to protect the Empire.

Methodology

The centrality of colonialism in late-Victorian fiction is the subject of study by many Victorian scholars. Edward Said’s foundational text, *Orientalism*, provides a basis about the Eurocentric views of “the Orient” and how Europeans advocated a continued Western involvement and dominance in the East. Said defines Orientalism as “a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” (3). Colonial masculinity forms the basis for preaching the necessity of Western involvement in colonized countries, such as India. Because masculinity clearly implies gender, Philippa Levine’s *Gender and Empire*

illuminates how gender adds a central and constitutive layer to colonial texts. Levine argues that in imperial contexts “women became an index and a measure less of themselves than of men and of societies” (7). As markers of civilization or depravity, women reinforced colonial masculinity because Englishmen defined their own culture, as well as the cultures they colonized, by the status of the women. The work of Said and Levine lays the theoretical groundwork for my examination of Holmes’ and Fogg’s imperial texts.

Building on the scholarly work on the topic of colonial masculinity, I use a historicist approach to understand the context the original texts worked within. Historicism involves researching the social atmosphere and culture to see how they affected the texts, and also how the texts in turn influenced their social and historical context. Tim Edensor argues that texts do not live in a vacuum, but rather a “cultural matrix” where “national identity is grounded in the everyday, in the mundane details of social interaction, habits, routines and practical knowledge” (Edensor 17). Pairing the historical context surrounding the text with close reading is valuable as it shows how particular texts existed within the broader context of the time period. Historicism and close reading complement each other because the precise words used to advocate colonial masculinity can be dissected to find deeper meaning. For instance, in Chapter 1, Phileas Fogg engages in a duel with an American while aboard a train (Verne 119). While it serves the purpose of adding tension and drama to Fogg’s time in the United States, it also symbolizes the strained Anglo-American relations during the late-Victorian period. So soon after the American Civil War, the United States wanted to define itself as separate from countries that previously had claims in it. Additionally, the fact that the duel takes place on a train, which is a symbol of an imperial power, shows the struggle between two men, but also two countries. Without the

historical context, this vignette has little meaning; however, when paired with the cultural common knowledge of the time, the themes of colonial masculinity become clear.

In addition to historicism, I rely on intersectionality, an approach coined by Kimberle Crenshaw which considers “the various ways in which race and gender interact” (1244). Intersectionality allows the consideration of the multiple dimensions of power and identity in the world that the characters, as well as their readers, lived in. The way that race and gender intersect in these texts illuminates what the Englishmen think of themselves, and how the women in the stories reinforce the colonial masculinity that surrounds them. For instance, intersectionality makes it possible to examine the nuances of how English and colonized women reinforced colonial masculinity, though in vastly different ways. Again, I employ close reading to complement this approach to reveal the hierarchy that Englishmen put in place culturally also denoted that women be inferior to the men. In Chapter 2, when Watson first meets Morstan, he thinks, “in an experience of women which extends over many nations and three continents, I have never looked upon a face which gave a clearer promise of a refined and sensitive nature” (Doyle 131). Watson is judging Morstan not only on her appearance, but also her race and class, before pronouncing her desirable. Morstan defines Watson’s hierarchy which reinforces his colonial masculinity.

By taking a historicist and intersectional approach in my close readings, I can connect the themes within the texts to the broader context of the British Empire during the late-Victorian period. This methodology illuminates the theme of colonial masculinity and how the Empire constructed its role and instructed its people. According to Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities*, simple means of communication, such as newspapers and novels construct the idea of national identity (24-25). If novels historically have this sort of power to connect readers,

then the lessons from the novels ought to be identified and examined. The characters, specifically the sidekicks mentioned in Chapter 3, who tell the stories are also instructing the readers about colonial masculinity. Combining a historicist and intersectional approach illuminates the pedagogical function of the sidekicks as they navigate their colonial and gendered world. By pairing these methods, the pedagogical function of the texts can be gleaned and the precise function of the words in furthering the Empire become clear.

Overview of the Texts

Sherlock Holmes first appears in 1887, with Dr. John Watson narrating the world's first glimpse of the unusual detective in *A Study in Scarlet*. Living in London after serving in Afghanistan, Watson meets Sherlock Holmes and the two become roommates. Holmes explains his job as the "world's only consulting detective," and takes Watson along on a case the police cannot figure out. Watson carefully describes the scene and evidence surrounding the man who is found murdered in an abandoned house, with a woman's wedding ring nearby. Holmes advertises the lost ring in hopes of drawing the criminal in, but is tricked. The detectives from Scotland Yard arrive with information about the murdered man's colleague also being found dead, with a pillbox found nearby. The box contains two pills, one of which is harmless while the other is poisonous. Holmes is told that his taxi has arrived and he immediately announces that the cabdriver is the murderer, an American named Mr. Jefferson Hope. The second part of the story is a flashback to the story of Hope's sweetheart, Lucy Ferrier, who died a tragic death at the hands of a fanatic group of Mormons. Hope devotes his life to avenging her death and tracked down each of the men who had a hand in Lucy's unwilling marriage and subsequent death. Finding the final two men in London, Hope became a cabdriver to fund his stay while he planned their murders. The pill cases contained two pills, so Hope played a sort of Russian

roulette with his victims in order to give them a chance. Content that he finished his mission, Hope peacefully dies of an aortic aneurysm before his trial. The story ends with Holmes explaining his train of thought to Watson, and Watson asks to publish an account of the case.

Sherlock Holmes next appears in *The Sign of Four* in 1890. It begins with Holmes shooting up with cocaine to relieve the boredom that consumes him when he is not working. After reiterating his skills to Watson, a woman arrives with a new case. Miss Morstan received a letter telling her to meet with a mysterious person to discuss what happened to her father and why she receives a pearl in the mail each year. Thaddeus Sholto, the son of Morstan's father's friend, discloses that Captain Morstan and Major Sholto attempted to divide a treasure they brought back from India, but Morstan died and Sholto hid the treasure. Sholto's sons disagreed how to divide up the treasure, so Thaddeus decided that Mary Morstan deserved at least a part of it because her father was involved. However, when they go to confront Thaddeus's brother Bartholomew he has been murdered. Holmes deduces that two men were involved, one being Jonathan Small and the other being a small person skilled at shooting darts. Holmes tracks down their whereabouts and after a thrilling boat chase on the Thames, Small is captured and his Andaman assistant, Tonga, is killed. Small explains his history in India and that he was part of the "Sign of Four" who found the treasure during the Indian Uprising of 1857. Having been tricked by Morstan and Sholto, he vows revenge and returns to England to retrieve the treasure. Much of it was thrown overboard during the chase, so Miss Morstan does not receive the treasure. Watson falls in love with her and by the end of the story they are engaged, at which Holmes scoffs before returning to his bottle of cocaine.

Jules Verne's 1873 travel novel, *Around the World in Eighty Days*, begins by describing Mr. Phileas Fogg's systematic life that rarely changes. At Fogg's Reform club, the gentlemen

discuss a recent bank robbery and talk about how the thief could escape anywhere in the world. Fogg argues that the world is actually shrinking, citing a newspaper article that claims a circumnavigation could take as few as eighty days. To prove this reported fact, Fogg accepts a wager to complete the trip in the allotted amount of time and sets off on his journey that very evening with his newly hired manservant, Passepartout. Concerned only with the time consumed in his journey, not the sights, Fogg prefers to ignore his surroundings, leaving the exploration to Passepartout. These actions attract the attention of a detective who believes Fogg is the bank robber the Reform gentlemen discussed, and the detective follows Fogg around the globe in hopes of obtaining a warrant and arresting him. While in India, Fogg and Passepartout rescue Aouda, an Indian woman forced into committing sati³, and she continues on their journey because her family cannot be contacted. The novel continues with many other episodes, notable ones including a duel with an American, Native Americans attacking their train, and missing their scheduled ships several times. Each event results in either a gain or loss of time. When the crew arrives back in England, the detective arrests Fogg and the delay seemingly causes Fogg to lose his bet. Dejected, he returns home to his old lifestyle nearly penniless because he spent everything during the trip, except the money he wagered. It is not until Aouda proposes to him and he sends Passepartout for someone to marry them that he learns he has not lost the wager after all, because he gained a day when he crossed the International Date Line. Fogg arrives at the Reform club exactly eighty days after first accepting the bet. Once again wealthy, Fogg marries Aouda and the novel concludes with him thankful for taking the trip and meeting Aouda.

³ Sati is the Hindu practice of a widow placing herself on her husband's funeral pyre.

Chapter Summaries

The first chapter of my analysis revolves around how Holmes and Fogg demonstrate their colonial “mastery” through detection and travel, respectively. Both men live outside of traditional societal roles, but because of this they have the power to master their environment. The texts serve a pedagogical function, teaching readers how to navigate within Empire while best preserving their colonial masculinity. First, I explore how Holmes and Fogg set themselves apart from their “diluted” English community. Second, I argue that this distance is due in part to how strictly Holmes and Fogg regulate feminine emotions that could threaten English rationality. Third, I show how the “superiority” of their performance of English masculinity enables them to retain a position of social dominance over various foreign others. Through this recurring narrative, the texts suggest that colonial masculinity protects them from foreign threats. Finally, I examine how Holmes and Fogg realign themselves with their countrymen when confronted with a foreign other, but still remain superior. These points build on one another to show that the colonial “mastery” the two men exhibit is carefully fashioned in order to protect the imperial self from the dangers associated with crime and foreign others.

The second chapter takes an intersectional approach to race and gender in regards to Mary Morstan and Aouda. I argue that despite their seeming marginality, the women actually play a central role in the construction of English masculinity—and thus, in the texts overall—because they “marked civilization and progress” (Wilson 21). In addition to gender, the women also have places within the Victorian racial hierarchy that assumes English superiority, then Europeans, then colonized people, with distinctions made in each rank. Outlining the Victorian racial hierarchies that assume English superiority over cultural others, it is apparent that the two women are vastly different, and cannot easily be compared together. Instead, I start with

Morstan's status as an English woman living in England. Two approaches towards women, to either control or ignore them, as illustrated by Holmes, who vows to never marry, and Watson, who proposes to Morstan by the end of *The Sign of Four*. I read both approaches as different ways to uphold colonial masculinity and keep femininity in check. Then, I examine Aouda's unique position as an Anglicized Indian woman whom Fogg saves from sati. By the end of the story, she marries Fogg, and her interracial marriage could threaten the ostensible purity of the English race. Though Aouda could be read as defying the rules of the hierarchy because of this marriage and because she saves Fogg's wager, she actually plays a subservient role and reinforces colonial notions of a need to "improve" the colonies. Fogg marries her out of duty and completes the colonial narrative of an Englishman needing to save the Indian women. Aouda and Morstan fit into the Victorian racial hierarchy a bit differently, but the men who surround them see them as markers of culture.

My third and final chapter focuses on the role of the sidekick in furthering the message of colonial masculinity. Using Ron Buchanan's generic view of the importance of sidekicks⁴ to help readers relate to the main character, I argue that Dr. John Watson and Monsieur Jean Passepartout not only assist Holmes and Fogg, but function within a highly masculine archetype and act as Orientalist reporters who can comment on the cultures they see and perpetuate the idea that England must continue to control its colonies. Furthermore, the sidekicks are the entire reason that the pedagogical function of the main characters, as outlined in Chapter 1, is actually reported. Holmes and Fogg do not narrate their stories, so the burden falls to the sidekicks to intrigue the readers and also relay the lessons of colonial masculinity that the main characters practice.

⁴ "'Side by Side': The Role of the Sidekick."

Each of the chapters works to explore the power dynamics at work when Sherlock Holmes and *Around the World in Eighty Days* first appeared. Returning to these texts provides a rich understanding of late-Victorian culture and what people were taught during this crisis in imperialism. The specificity of this point in time, where the globe rapidly changed and members of the British Empire questioned their roles at home and abroad, makes it important to realize that these characters were attempting to define their readers' world. If modern readers fail to notice the colonial masculinity performed by Holmes and Fogg much of the richness of their original power in Victorian culture beyond simply being fictional characters is lost. Holmes and Fogg were meant to inspire British citizens and reaffirm their past successes; these stories strove to prove that England could maintain its dominance and suggested models of emotional restraint. The texts offer a rich subtext that is enhanced by studying how race, gender, class, and imperialism intersect to create a complex world that Britain could still master.

Chapter 1: Colonial “Mastery” through Detection and Travel

“Oh, I don’t know that. The world is big enough.”

“It was once,” said Phileas Fogg, in a low tone.

—Jules Verne’s *Around the World in Eighty Days* (1873)

Caroline Reitz’s *Detecting the Nation* traces the origins of the detective figure in British literature during the Victorian period (1837-1901). The occupation emerged in the turbulent landscape of the ever-expanding British Empire and soon became a new breed of character. Reitz explores the early detective writings inspired by thuggee accounts in India, the mid-nineteenth century view that police and detectives must function as a barrier to protect the English homeland, and the late-Victorian distinction between detective fiction and spy narratives which she argues differs only in the setting. In the final chapter, she juxtaposes two law-enforcing figures, Arthur Conan Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes with Rudyard Kipling’s Kim, to prove that while Holmes is a detective and Kim is a spy they both have the same function—to find a balance between England at home and abroad. Reitz argues that because of these two characters “detective fiction makes imperialism central to what it means to be English rather than casts it from the garden” (68). Defining Englishness is not solely limited to detective fiction; I argue that in addition to the detective who stays at home, those who travel abroad have the ability to establish England’s role in the world. I have chosen to compare the early depictions of Sherlock Holmes with one of his contemporaries, Jules Verne’s Phileas Fogg, to illustrate that these characters served a pedagogical function, teaching readers by example how to navigate the British world in regards to home and empire. Both characters are role models who emotionally set themselves apart from those they interact with as they conduct their business, teaching readers that rationality is of the utmost importance when protecting their British masculinity from potential threats.

In 1873, Phileas Fogg made his only appearance in *Around the World in Eighty Days*. Part of Jules Verne's "Voyages Extraordinaires" series, this story rivalled *Twenty-Thousand Leagues under the Sea*, spawned a stage production, and inspired people to race around the world. In this novel, Fogg seems to conquer the world and even time in a quest to prove English superiority. Sherlock Holmes first appeared in *A Study in Scarlet* in 1887. Three years later, another novel entitled *The Sign of Four* followed and by the next year, his short stories vaulted the detective into his firm place in literary history and he continues to baffle readers who wish they had his eye for detail. I will only be looking at Holmes' first two stories because both rely most centrally on the role of the detective in maintaining the empire both at home and abroad.

In addition to being wildly popular with readers, both characters are eccentric gentlemen who live in London, distanced from society. Holmes is the world's "only consulting detective" (Doyle 17) and Fogg is a quiet Englishman who makes a bet that he can circumnavigate the globe in eighty days. While a detective and a globe-trotter may seem quite different, both of these characters have the ability to master their situations and environment, at home and abroad. The men serve a pedagogical function, teaching the readers about the differences between the English and those from other countries. Further, they illustrate the difference between proper Englishness and a sullied Englishness; because there is such a difference, the texts guide the reader toward the notion that English masculinity must be preserved. Sherlock Holmes ensures the safety of England and Phileas Fogg serves as proof that with English rationality, the world can easily be conquered. In order to maintain English superiority, the characters fashion themselves differently from other Englishmen in both action and emotion. I will explore how they construct their identities in regards to their peers, why they are considered superior to other Englishmen, and how that allows them to protect their homeland from foreign intruders.

Self-Fashioning: Preserving the Imperial Self within the Diluted English Community

Before Holmes and Fogg can protect the empire, they must first define how they fit into English society. Both characters believe that their abilities give them a particular advantage over their peers to perform in the most rational manner possible. Holmes and Fogg need to master their environment at home before they can even think about the whole of the English Empire. From nearly the beginning of his acquaintance with Dr. John Watson, Sherlock Holmes makes it a point to make himself as different from his fellow Englishmen as possible. He does not stop with remaining outside normal social boundaries; rather, he creates his own liminal space away from the norms. He tells Watson in *A Study in Scarlet*:

Well, I have a trade of my own. I suppose I'm the only one in the world. I'm a consulting detective, if you can understand what that is. Here in London we have lots of government detectives and lots of private ones. When these fellows are at fault, they come to me, and I manage to put them on the right scent. (Doyle 17)

Holmes begins by setting himself apart from everyone in the entire world, the only one who can do his job. As the only specialist in his area of expertise, Holmes can be responsible for everything from private to international problems. Instead of spending his time helping in international affairs, he tends to stay home at his base in London, the heart of the British Empire, where other significant problems may arise. As is typical with urban areas, there is a substantial amount of crime and many detectives to combat it. The fact that Holmes mentions there being “lots” of government and private detectives who need his help suggests that the Empire is vulnerable, even with the systems put in place. Holmes sees the detectives of his city as incapable of finding what he finds. As Holmes condescendingly explains his job to Watson, he sounds like a mentor to the inferior minds of the common detectives. Instead of being colleagues

who work with another detective, the London detectives are reduced to being like dogs that chase after scents and hope that they have chosen the correct one. Because they cannot protect their country, they rely on Sherlock Holmes to protect England. Thus, Holmes declares his status that no one else has any chance of attaining.

With his role in society firmly established, Holmes is confident that no one can detect what he can and does not want to give up his superior place in society. Just as baffled as the reader, Watson repeatedly tries to get Holmes to explain his methodology throughout the series. In *A Study in Scarlet*, Holmes refuses to fully enlighten his colleague, and thus the reader, claiming, “a conjurer gets no credit when once he has explained his trick; and if I show you much of my method of working, you will come to the conclusion that I am a very ordinary man after all” (Doyle 33). By this point in the story, it is clear that the reader will never be able to deduce like the “only consulting detective” can. However, Holmes prefers his powers to remain mysterious. He would rather people wonder at his reasoning and just take his word as truth without question. He likens himself to a conjurer, someone the average viewer cannot keep up with. Rather than wishing to humanize himself, Holmes wants to keep distance between himself and his fellow ordinary Englishmen.

Sherlock Holmes differentiates himself from other Englishmen in regard to his work, and Phileas Fogg defines his place in English society in such a way that he maintains a distance from his peers. When first introduced to Phileas Fogg, the reader is presented with a statement of his oddity, as well as a laundry list of what he is not. The narrator notes, “Certainly an Englishman, it was more doubtful whether Phileas Fogg was a Londoner. . . He belonged, in fact, to none of the numerous societies which swarm in the English capital . . . Phileas Fogg was a member of the Reform, and that was all” (Verne 1). The rather long list, which I have excluded here,

emphasizes that it is necessary for an English gentleman to have connections. Indeed, gentlemen were expected, amongst other things, to belong to groups and have access to many other gentlemen (Waters 5). Fogg, however, wants nothing to do with his fellow Britons. He has chosen a single group and has hidden every detail of his life from others. Fogg's facade makes him forfeit a personal existence and makes the reader see him as a British "everyman" who embodies the ideal standard for a gentleman. Karen Waters attempted to define what was expected of a gentleman and found that it is a difficult word full of contradictions and impossible standards (21). Originally men of noble ancestry and wealth were considered gentlemen, but as the class hierarchies shifted, the term encompassed men who act in a chivalrous manner (18). By assuming that gentlemen were superior, the hierarchy reinforced the notion that superiority was natural and that English gentlemen were the best possible people for leading civilized lives. Waters defines commonly held Victorian views about British superiority, saying that, "Nineteenth-century British imperialist ideology involved two basic premises: the first was that non-Western culture is inferior to Western culture; the second was that non-Western people are racially different from Europeans and that this difference is hereditary (45). Because Fogg has taken on the gentleman persona, he has sacrificed the spontaneity of life. Though his inclusion in the club and his lack of a job to sustain himself show he is obviously an English gentleman, he stands outside of humanity. He does not connect with others, beyond hiring a manservant and playing whist as quietly as possible at the Reform Club.

Fogg's reputation for his quiet life precedes him, which attracts the Frenchman Passepartout who seems to have an innate reverence for the theoretical, proper English way of life. The previous ten houses he has served have all been subject to Englishmen who were "invariably whimsical and irregular, constantly running about the country, or on the look-out for

adventure” (Verne 5). Passepartout cannot respect their inconsistency, nor their unruly decisions. Fogg’s exactitude is well known, so Passepartout enlists to take care of the Saville Road mansion. After he is hired, he familiarizes himself with the house and finally declares, “This is just what I wanted! Ah, we shall get on together, Mr. Fogg and I! What a domestic and regular gentleman! A real machine; well, I don’t mind serving a machine” (Verne 6). Since Passepartout has been in the households of many English gentlemen, his statements contrasting the other wide gentlemen with Fogg are quite useful. Fogg’s routine is a stark contrast to how everyone else of his stature lives; even in the intimacy of the home, he is exact and aloof from what his peers do in private. He does not have the whimsy or sudden bursts of inspiration to travel because he is at home in London, with his routine that has been calculated down to the precise number of steps he takes from the club to his front door each evening. Even his most inward actions are regulated and set him apart from the rest of England.

Self-Fashioning: Controlling the Emotions for “Superior Englishness”

In addition to their outward lifestyles that even those not close to them can see, Holmes and Fogg are masters over their emotions, which gives them the edge over their fellow Englishmen as well as the ability to navigate the Empire properly. Both men can win the game against the foreign other because their lack of emotions makes them superior; their successes make them serve a pedagogical function, teaching their readers how to interact within imperial England. The attitude that emotions were feminine and potentially dangerous to rational minds became popular in the mid-Victorian period, due to many scientific discoveries which caused the English to question long-held beliefs, and persisted through the rest of the century (Christ, Robson 986). These men would want to make sure their own feelings could not interfere with their work. Holmes’ disdain for romance is highlighted in *The Sign of Four*. Holmes’ first

novel, *A Study in Scarlet* is recorded by Watson, who then publishes the work. That crime involved a man extracting revenge on some ex-Mormons who had mistreated a girl the man loved. Curious to know what Holmes thinks of the narrative, Watson asks Holmes' opinion. Adverse to emotion, Holmes is not impressed with Watson's version of the story because he believes the romantic elements have sullied his work. Holmes remarks, "Detection is, or ought to be, an exact science and should be treated in the same cold and unemotional manner. You have attempted to tinge it with romanticism" (Doyle 125). Though Watson protests that the story did contain romantic elements, Holmes believes that only the facts ought to have been reported. While Watson seems concerned about what makes a story readable and likable, Holmes does not want readers to feel any sort of connection to him or his clients. Holmes' sensitivity to this story of his work shows that he considers his work an extension of himself that he does not like being tampered with. Indeed, in *A Study in Scarlet*, Watson finds Holmes' publication, which contains the "Science of Deduction and Analysis" (Doyle 16), which Holmes says is paramount in his work. If his own invented branch of science is meant to be cold and without emotion, his value of it implies that Holmes also strives for an unemotional life. Lacking excessive emotion does not mean he coolly addresses his cases. Indeed, when Watson is first describing his flatmate he notes that "Nothing could exceed his energy when the working fit was upon him; but now and again a reaction would seize him, and for days on end he would lie upon the sofa in the sitting-room, hardly uttering a word or moving a muscle from morning to night" (Doyle 11). Despite Holmes' bursts of inspiration and days of sitting on the couch, he tries to make sure that the emotions that can sidetrack other men do not interfere with his scientific way of categorizing life. Watson does not see more emotion from Holmes during his working periods, only more

action, because tainting himself with romanticism could nearly topple his ability to rationally approach his cases.

While it may be easy for Holmes to claim his lack of emotions while lounging in 221B Baker Street, the real measure of how he handles his emotions is tested while on cases. During *The Sign of Four*, Holmes is pursuing an English soldier with an Andaman native ally in order to track down a treasure that belongs to a client. The Andaman's weapon of choice is poison darts, which Holmes refers to as "hellish" (Doyle 171). The dart is a foreign device that can harm English superiority and represents the danger that colonies present to the Empire. Watson is a victim of such contamination that is possible from the other. Cultural otherness is part of Orientalism, which is defined in Edward Said's 1978 foundational text *Orientalism*. The simplest definition he provides for Orientalism is "a way of coming to terms with the Orient that is based in European Western experience" (Said 1). By setting cultures from the Orient against those of the Occident, Europeans defined themselves as the opposite of what they saw in foreign countries. Said describes the Orientalist's perception of those of the Orient as "linked thus to elements in Western society (delinquents, the insane, women, the poor) having in common an identity best described as lamentably alien" (207). Said also notes the common "motif of the Orient as insinuating danger" (57). With such drastic differences commonly believed, it becomes important for the characters to keep the members of both cultures distinct. Though Watson seems to be an average Englishman, he is tainted in a way that does not permit him to continue to protect his country as he previously could in Afghanistan. Originally an assistant surgeon, he served there before being wounded in "the shoulder by a Jezail bullet, which shattered the bone and grazed the subclavian artery" (Doyle 3). Rather than staying at home, Watson went out into foreign lands and was invaded by a "foreign other." Not only did the

bullet enter into his body, it destroyed an internal piece of him. With such injuries, he is disabled and more susceptible to further harm; Holmes, on the other hand, is safe from such intrusions of the foreign because he is sure to rationally approach his situations in London and not be surprised by potential foreign dangers.

During the climactic chase on the Thames, a poison dart nearly hits Holmes and Watson. Watson recalls, “Holmes smiled at it and shrugged his shoulders in his easy fashion, but I confess that it turned me sick to think of the horrible death that passed so close to us that night” (Doyle 205-206). This level of detachment is somewhat unnerving; most people would get ruffled in the face of death, but Holmes sees it in a cold, logical manner. He even smiles as if to mock the primitive weapon and assert his authority over it. Watson, portrayed in a more human way, focuses on what could have happened, while Holmes focuses on the fact that it did not happen and smiles as if to mock that the dart did not hit its intended target. By detaching himself emotionally, he is able to keep his cool in all sorts of danger and to react with a reasonable measure. Holmes easily brushes off this emotionally charged instance so he can continue plying his trade, while Watson is clearly shaken and nearly unable to function. Holmes continues to assert his English superiority over others because he is detached from emotions that could make him vulnerable to foreign intrusion.

Phileas Fogg’s detachment from emotion also prepares him for what he prepares to do in the name of English honor. His never-varying day-to-day actions are noted meticulously after his introduction, but his reactions to his fellow clubmen during a game of whist clearly illustrate his alienation from them. After producing evidence that a trip around the world could be managed in eighty days, one of his usual whist partners quite passionately begins discussing its probability with Fogg:

“Yes, in eighty days!” exclaimed Stuart, who in his excitement made a false deal. “But that doesn’t take into account bad weather, contrary winds, shipwrecks, railway accidents, and so on.”

“All included,” returned Phileas Fogg, continuing to play despite the discussion. (Verne 10)

Since Mr. Stuart belongs to the club, the reader can assume he is like many other Englishmen. He has dialogue with Fogg, so he is on the same social level, but he seems to be a mouthpiece for Englishmen who lack the proper emotional restraint, discussing concerns of the Empire with Fogg. Stuart represents the Englishmen who allow doubts to get in the way of their ability to control England’s imperial possessions. All of the concerns he mentions are easy to fixate on, but Fogg is unfazed and continues to play. In Stuart’s discussion of such stunningly new ideas he loses track of the game. The narrator notes his “excitement” as the source of his poor playing at this point, while Fogg calmly is able to keep his mind on the game and how best to win it. Eventually, Stuart’s errors add up and Fogg benefits from Stuart’s emotional blundering. Unlike others who could be distracted by an exciting discussion, Fogg distances himself from being excited and focuses on the task at hand. This card game, played for money, serves as a metaphor for his trip which is taken on a wager. No matter how daunting the challenges are, Fogg will handle them coolly and continue as if nothing were different or extraordinary in his settings. His rational approach to the card game foreshadows his rational approach to the imperial land he passes through on his journey.

Fogg’s coolness during the game translates to his steady reactions during the trip. Repeatedly, the narrator and Passepartout emphasize that Fogg’s circumnavigation is not for sight-seeing, like worldwide trips generally are. As Fogg makes his journey around the world,

he constantly thinks of it as a mathematical voyage to be completed. On one occasion, the narrator states, “Meanwhile Phileas Fogg moved about above them in the most majestic and unconscious indifference. He was passing methodically in his orbit around the world, regardless of the lesser stars which gravitated around him” (Verne 64). In this space-like portrayal of Fogg and his traveling companions, he is separated from all others. Indeed, he is above them, and his lack of emotions gives them the impression of majesty. There is a natural order and he belongs to the most elite section of it. He does not look down to see what is happening to his French servant or his Indian rescuee. Being neither British nor gentlemen, they rely on Fogg during the trip for everything, while he moves in his orbit without regard for their small worries. Instead of fellow passengers or even travelling companions, Passepartout and Aouda are dependent on Fogg and are seen as objects that must be arranged according to his path. As the Englishman in charge, he asserts his imperial mastery over their very lives.

While some readers might believe that, unlike Holmes, Fogg’s icy outlook defrosts during his journey, even in his most intense moments he remains calm and controlled. For instance, at the beginning of the novel, when a travelling companion is concerned for Passepartout being able to continue with Fogg because of violating a local Indian law, Fogg replies, “I don’t see how this affair could have delayed his master” (Verne 34). But, when Passepartout helps save their train in the United States from a Native American attack, Fogg asks the conductor to form a rescue committee and understands that his actions will delay his journey and cost him some of his crucial connections. This sounds like a sacrifice for a man who has done so much for Fogg until the text is consulted. Rather than filled with gratitude, Fogg thinks, “It is my duty” (Verne 122). Passepartout saved the train and the passengers, so they all owe him a safe return. Nowhere in this passage does Fogg fear losing a friend; Passepartout has

proven faithful, so Fogg calculates that he ought to care for him. Fogg maintains his English superiority and makes that his reason for rescuing his servant. It would be disgraceful to abandon someone who just saved his life, not saddening to lose a colleague. Fogg is still quite unconnected to his emotions and defers to his proper English values to remain above his surroundings.

Pedagogy of “Superior” Englishmen

So far, I have illustrated the unusually strict control that Holmes and Fogg have over themselves, to preserve themselves for the protection of their country. Because their lives are so perfectly ordered, they can serve as role models for the readers on what is deemed superior in the English. The seemingly boring traits that set these men apart from their peers are extraordinary and necessary for the preservation of the Empire. The authors juxtapose their heroes with other Englishmen to fully illustrate how Holmes and Fogg are superior to their fellow Englishmen. Doyle contrasts Sherlock Holmes with many different people, such as other detectives, Dr. Watson, and his criminals. Being the world’s only consulting detective places him next to the local law enforcement at Scotland Yard, which allows the reader to see a contrast to how these two keep Britain safe. Inspectors Tobias Gregson and G. Lestrade are officers who call on Holmes for help in unusual cases. Watson records Holmes’ thoughts about his professional associates: “Gregson is the smartest of the Scotland Yarders,” my friend remarked; “he and Lestrade are the pick of a bad lot. They are both quick and energetic, but conventional—shockingly so” (Doyle 22). The public detectives must rely on Holmes to point out the unconventional clues that solve their most interesting cases. The way that Holmes notes that Gregson has an edge over his fellow detectives also shows that Holmes considers all of the public detectives and policemen beneath him. Their reliance on convention that Holmes finds so

shocking gives them a narrow-minded view of the case and oftentimes leads them to erroneous decisions. This suggests that even if there is an obvious explanation that requires some imagination, these detectives will ignore it to follow protocol. Even though Gregson has distinction over his colleagues, he still relies on Holmes to point him in the right direction. Holmes disdains the idea of being chained to convention and distances himself from the detectives. Because these crimes often contain foreign elements, whether it be the perpetrator or a weapon used, the detectives' conventional way of thinking limits them to what they already know and the solution evades them. These men who are in charge of maintaining order in England cannot solve basic crimes, so Holmes alone has the powers to look beyond the usual and protect the British Empire.

While police and detectives were often seen as inferior to gentlemen, Doyle makes sure that Holmes' primary foil for proper Englishness is his friend Watson. Since Holmes' unusual habits and thinking methods alienate him from the reader, Watson is an average man the reader can relate to. In *The Sign of Four*, the detective is approached by Mary Morstan, a client who needs some friends to settle some business about her late father. She was instructed to meet a man and was advised to bring friends to protect her. Mary elects to call on the great detective, who accepts the case. They take a cab on the way to their rendezvous and the weather is downright depressing. Watson makes the following observation:

There was, to my mind, something eerie and ghostlike in the endless procession of faces which flitted across these narrow bars of light—sad faces and glad, haggard and merry. Like all humankind, they flitted from the gloom into the light and so back into the gloom once more. I am not subject to impressions, but the dull, heavy evening, with the strange business upon which we were engaged,

combined to make me nervous and depressed. . . Holmes alone could rise superior to petty influences. (Doyle 138-139)

Watson observes life as he sees it in general. He does not have the power to deduce why some men are happy while others are downhearted; he does not possess the gift that Holmes has for noticing crucial details, but can observe enough to know what is going on. When he claims that atmosphere usually does not affect him, he seems to be holding himself somewhat equal with Holmes, who is nearly never affected as well. However, the gloom of this particular evening is too much for the common Englishman. Only Holmes can work on a strange case in depressing weather without paying a bit of attention to outside influences such as weather. Holmes is able to detach himself from inconsequential forces to focus; Watson, on the other hand, is more open to the world. This openness makes Watson vulnerable to outside influence and unable to properly protect his country.

Watson's vulnerability is illustrated by the multiple times he is invaded by outside influences. In addition to the weather and the Jezail bullet, during his recovery abroad he contracts typhoid fever, which he calls, "that curse of our Indian possessions" (Doyle 4). By referring to the disease as an Indian curse, he defines it as something that belongs to a cultural "other." In Said's theory of Orientalism, he defines the perceived differences between Western and Oriental cultures as complete opposites, which ought never to mix. Watson's typhoid fever is not a scientific disease caused by bacteria or viruses, but rather a plague that a colonized country possesses, almost as a warning for the English and any other intruder to stay away. By being open to the colonial world, Watson's body is fully invaded by a colonial outsider, which damages him. Watson is forced to return home and live as a British citizen who needs to be protected from foreign influences. For protecting the Empire, the British Empire needs someone

who can close himself off from outside influences, not someone vulnerable to the imperial dangers. Contrary to Watson, Sherlock Holmes has no impairments that could keep him from protecting his nation; he regulates everything from his emotions to the “seven-per-cent solution” of cocaine (Doyle 124) he uses to distract his mind when he does not have clients. His strict regulations make him a superior Englishman able to combat the imperial contamination without falling prey to its dangers.

If Watson lives on as a cautionary tale of what to avoid in the colonies, Jonathan Small serves as a reminder that abandoning English values leads to destruction. Small served in the British army in India, and, like Watson, he was injured during his stay. After losing his leg to a crocodile, he worked as an overseer on an indigo plantation in India. In the course of his term, the 1857 Indian Uprising breaks forth and the English viewed this as a mutiny where they had to defend themselves from their previously subservient colonists. In Shafquat Towheed’s introduction to *The Sign of Four*, he explains the significance of this event in imperial history. Being the first major rift between Britain and colonized India, it was a popular subject in literature, with fictional and real accounts published for years after it occurred. Towheed examines documentation of the event alongside the novel because “[b]y the time Doyle came to write Johnathan Small’s narrative, the Indian “Mutiny,” and the mythologising of its events and participants . . . already loomed large in the imaginative consciousness of British readers” (22). The uprising stirred debates about proper interaction with colonized nations and offered exotic entertainment for English readers, making Small’s account one more Englishman affected by the uprising. Small remembers the 1857 Indian Mutiny, as a frightening time, “Wherever the English could collect in little bands they held just the ground that their guns commanded. Everywhere else they were helpless fugitives” (Doyle 216). Small’s report paints the English as

victims cruelly harassed by the colonized people they previously lived next to. Rather than being benevolent, respected rulers, the revolt reduces them to “fugitives” in a foreign land. Colonizing a foreign country is dangerous business, which requires the colonizer to maintain the upper-hand. Unfortunately, Small has been damaged during his stay, which makes him more vulnerable than his fellow Englishmen in India during this uprising. Small is ambushed by several “Sikhs” who claim to know of a great Indian treasure, and is compelled to join them in order to acquire it. The four men find the treasure and hide it, agreeing to split it evenly later. In the meantime, Small and his associates are convicted of murder from the night they dealt with the treasure and are sentenced to service for life. Small, now stationed in the Andamans, takes another soldier, Captain Morstan, into his confidence in order to retrieve the treasure.

The soldier, Captain Mary Morstan’s father, hesitates at first, and balks at Small’s insistence that his fellow treasure-finders consent to the retrieval plan. Morstan exclaims, “Nonsense! ... What have three black fellows to do with our agreement?” to which Small replies, “Black or blue, they are in with me, and we all go together” (Doyle 230). The group gives their blessings, but they are double-crossed by Morstan, which leads to Small’s quest to regain the treasure. While the modern reader may appreciate Small’s color-blind approach to his colleagues, during Victorian times social distinctions between class and race were highly important. Small choosing to align himself with Indians leads to his quest for treasure, and ultimately his downfall and quest for revenge. His acceptance of the Indians in pursuit of treasure has corrupted him and driven him to intense measures that border on barbaric. By siding with Indians in this instance, as well as his Indian wound, Small’s Englishness is corrupted, which makes him a poor protector of English masculinity while abroad. Even when he returns to England, he brings a native Andaman and a foreign crime onto English soil. Small

opened himself to the foreign, which then invaded him and works towards further encroaching on the safety of England.

If Small is a cautionary tale of not accepting the foreign while traveling abroad, Fogg seems to be a role model for maintaining English masculinity without fault at home, as well as abroad. When Fogg is first introduced at the Reform Club, he is described as utterly unconnected to his fellow Englishmen. His daily habits are described at length:

He lived alone in his house in Saville Row, whither none penetrated. A single domestic sufficed to serve him. He breakfasted and dined at the club, at hours mathematically fixed, in the same room, at the same table, never taking his meals with other members, much less bringing a guest with him; and went home at exactly midnight, only to retire at once to bed. (Verne 2)

Fogg's home is kept with pristine order that cannot be sullied because he allows no one in; there is no possibility of contamination from the outside in his personal life. Even the club, which is more in the public sphere, Fogg is guarded from the outside world and his fellow club members. His home and the club serve as metaphors for England and the Empire. His home is a private area, needing minimal contact with the outside world in the form of a solitary servant, successful because he does not depend on the outside to support himself. Since Fogg's home is a fortress of Englishness that is rarely breached, this suggests that England's empire ought to be organized similarly. If England does not depend on its colonies, just as Fogg does not depend on many servants, it is protected from breaches of foreignness and there is no danger of contamination. Other than playing whist, Fogg maintains minimal contact with all his fellow Englishmen. By doing so, Fogg is detached from others who might have been "contaminated" in the same way as Watson or Small have been.

Just as he preserves his home in England, Fogg retains invulnerability while abroad on his trip, preferring to stay on the trains and ignore the sights that Passepartout eagerly soaks in. In fact, Fogg continues to interact with passengers on the boats or trains only if they play whist. One man, Sir Francis Cromarty, traverses India with Fogg. Sir Francis is an Englishman who had a great military career in India and now resides there almost full time. There is a bond between the men because of their background and shared pastime, but Fogg seems to want to keep his distance from his partner. Being open to accepting foreign ideas, Sir Francis serves as a contrast to Fogg, who astutely clings to British ideals. Sir Francis

made India his home, only paying brief visits to England at rare intervals; and was almost as familiar as a native with the customs, history, and character of India and its people. But Phileas Fogg, who was not travelling, but only describing a circumference, took no pains to inquire these subjects; he was a solid body, traversing an orbit around the terrestrial globe, according to the laws of rational mechanics. (Verne 32-33)

Sir Francis is somewhat like Watson, in that he has allowed a foreign element to enter his system; he is able to keep it fairly well under control unlike Jonathan Small. However, for Fogg such contamination is undesirable. Underneath Sir Francis's acceptance of the foreign lies some mistrust that he has "gone native" (Stoler 182). John McBratney writes about racial matters within the Empire and Rudyard Kipling's works, discussing how race was perceived by Englishmen at home, in *Imperial Subjects, Imperial Space*. One chapter is devoted to how the English viewed relationships between Indians and British men. Sir Francis' position, making India more his home than England, would have made British readers somewhat leery of him because of his potential "cultural mingling," which could lead to "cultural mixing" with Indians

rather than fellow British colonizers in India (McBratney 64). While one could argue that Sir Francis' knowledge could help Fogg in the long run (which it does), Fogg does not see the importance of knowing local customs when he is planning on using British transportation to quickly cross over India. His path is the "circumference" of the world, which means Fogg stays free from contamination that could result from getting involved with local business. His journey is set, like the laws of science, and the vastness of the English Empire allows him to rationally transverse the globe with minimal contact with foreign others. Fogg's view that the world is so neatly ordered subtly reinforces the Victorian belief that imperialism was the natural order of life, with some countries made to rule over less developed or rational ones. Fogg maintains superiority over the only Englishman who has a chance at being seen as his equal on his trip, thereby keeping English values of purity foremost over the value of an English friendship.

Relationship to "the other" or Realigning with Countrymen

After Fogg and Holmes so precisely define themselves against their peers, their worth as proper Englishmen is fully explored when they are confronted with foreign others and maintain that English masculinity reigns supreme. Though Fogg and Holmes staunchly set themselves apart from their fellow Englishmen, they realign with them to protect England when a foreign object threatens to intrude. Holmes, as a city detective who rarely leaves London, comes into contact with foreign influences at every turn; in cases like these, he temporarily aligns himself with an Englishman of inferior clout to combat them. After capturing Jonathan Small, his criminal in *The Sign of Four*, Small tells his backstory. The tale involves an Indian mutiny, hidden treasure, an alliance with Indians, treachery among Englishmen who desired the treasure and eventually murder. Watson is one of three people listening to Small's testimony, Holmes being one and Inspector Athelney Jones being the other. During the tale, Watson notes that,

“Sherlock Holmes and Jones sat with their hands upon their knees, deeply interested in the story but with the same disgust written upon their faces” (Doyle 223). During the entire case, Holmes distanced himself from Inspector Athelney Jones, who insults Holmes’ methods for detection. It is in this moment that Holmes, almost subconsciously, takes the same stance as Jones does towards the gruesome murder necessary for gaining the treasure. The horror of the crime surpasses Holmes’ threshold for proper behavior. Holmes steadily works towards keeping England safe from intruders such as Small’s accomplice, an Andaman named Tonga, and even Americans bent on revenge.

Small’s downfall is a tragedy because he once protected colonial imperialism, but some of Holmes’ other enemies are purely foreign. One such character used to define Holmes’ superior Englishness is Jefferson Hope, the murderer from *A Study in Scarlet*. As an American reader, it is easy to forget that the United States is also a foreign country in regard to England. Hope, a man from the United States seeking revenge for wrongs by a group of Mormons, enters England to administer his own justice. Hope fell in love with a woman in Utah who was forced to marry a man of Mormon faith. After the group killed her father and forced her to marry, she died of a broken heart. Hope vowed revenge on the men who destroyed his love and spent decades tracking them down. The trail ended in England, with Hope offering his victims a sort of Russian roulette and reminding them why he was pursuing them. Because Hope takes it upon himself to be the law to people who previously had no laws, he has broken the laws and drawn the attention of Scotland Yard and Sherlock Holmes. His lawless pursuit of justice threatens the sanctity of society, which requires Holmes to restore order. When he is trapped, he attempts to fight his way out. Watson notes his “savage face” and that during the fight “[h]e was dragged back into the room, and then commenced a terrific conflict. So powerful and fierce was

he that the four of us were shaken off again and again” (Doyle 62). Hope’s description places him on the same level as *The Sign of Four*’s Tonga. He is a beast who needs controlled by the superior English society. Even though those involved in his capture are not all as “pure” as Sherlock Holmes, the detectives and Watson have enough English imperial masculinity to bring Hope down.

In order to find Hope, Holmes uses elements of modernity to regain order. Though the Baker Street Irregulars, young homeless children in London who work for Holmes, may or may not be a legal way to acquire information, Holmes does rely on information like newspapers to learn about who he is combating, as well as to draw them in. In order to draw Hope to Baker Street, Holmes first tries using the local newspapers. Holmes understands that a ring found at the scene of the crime has sentimental value to the criminal, so using Watson’s name, Holmes places an advertisement in “every paper. . . immediately after the affair” (Doyle 39). Though he sometimes criticizes the press for manipulating stories or reporting false facts, he understands that the establishment connects all of England. This connection was explored by Benedict Anderson in *Imagined Communities*, where he argues that society is constructed by information and ideas such as newspapers and novels (24-25). Specifically newspapers are bound by time and are consumed soon after being written, but quickly become obsolete; people become connected by the information they ingest and they feel connected to fellow readers when they see that others are reading the paper they just read (Anderson 35-36). Holmes relies on the fact that newspapers were such an integral part of English life that his advertisement must be seen by the man he is hunting. In fact, it is seen, but Hope is able to outwit Holmes by sending a decoy. As much as Holmes may set himself apart from other Englishmen, he upholds English values and returns to his fellow Britons to defend the homeland.

Like Holmes, Fogg usually asserts his superiority over his fellow Englishmen in London. Though he stays away from others, he still values his heritage as an Englishman. As Benedict Anderson reminds us, newspapers construct the ideas of English connectedness and are important pillars to society. Nearly three hours of Fogg's day are spent examining the newspapers; he is given an "uncut Times, which he proceed[s] to cut with a skill which betray[s] familiarity with this delicate operation" (Verne 7). By recording the Empire's history, Fogg defines what it means to be English. By devoting time and energy to organizing and saving the stories of England, Fogg is reinforcing the values of the time and making sure they are preserved. Though Fogg is generally not one to make headlines by participating in English history, he feels it is important to absorb the stories and bind them in books for further reference.

Once Fogg makes his journey throughout the world, he continues to remain aloof from others, but he more openly aligns himself with his homeland. In a heated moment during an election in San Francisco, Fogg exchanges words with a hot-headed American named Colonel Proctor and they promise to meet again to duel later. One of Fogg's travelling companions notes that "It was clear that Mr. Fogg was one of those Englishmen who, while they do not tolerate dueling at home, fight abroad when their honour is attacked" (Verne 101). Fighting at home is seen as a uncivil and a violation of the laws that govern England. Abroad, however, is ostensibly a savage world that sometimes requires violence to restore order. Separating similar actions based on location is common, with Reitz noting that even in scholarly studies strikingly similar issues in texts are not considered together because, "they write from and about fundamentally different places" (66). Within *Around the World in Eighty Days*, it is clear that the different places call for different rules. Fogg clearly values what others think about his culture and is ready to face death to defend it. Proctor's hostile reaction to Fogg shows that Proctor, a product

of the American Empire, is the product of an imperial power that is not quite finished, which requires Fogg to assert his superiority over him. When these two characters clash, they represent the clash between two Empires, striving for control of the world.

The need to prove English superiority arises later on the train, when the men realize they are both on board. While the conductor refuses to stop the train for the duel, he suggests “as you have not had time to fight here, why not fight as we go along” (Verne 119)? Trains are symbols of imperial progress, with England building railways across India and the First Transcontinental Railroad spanning the United States in the mid-nineteenth century. These quicker methods of transportation were deemed necessary for imperial improvement and bringing civilization to those who previously could not access the empire, though using them to plunder the country’s resources was another advantage. In Ian Kerr’s *Engines of Change: The Railroads That Made India*, he notes that railroads were “developed primarily as a colonial project designed to support British interests and objectives in South Asia,” namely economics and moving troops to maintain order (86). An Empire cannot successfully rule without transportation for goods and their people. The United States was a former British colony that declared independence approximately one hundred years before and was growing into its own sort of Empire, sprawling across the continent. Fogg’s journey takes place a decade after the Civil War, which was a tumultuous time in United States history that led to a desire to define the country as distinct from England. Anglophobia “allowed Americans to define themselves against Britain and British policy, in the process articulating a more positive vision of American nationality and branding those unsympathetic with their vision as unpatriotic” (Tuffnell 79). The struggle between Fogg and Proctor can be seen as a metaphor for the struggle between the growing United States and the established British Empire. Both countries are progressing through the world and neither

wants to be inferior to the other. It was not until the turn of the century that relations between the two countries began to heal. With such blatant American disdain for England, it seems natural that England did not care for the United States at this time. Fogg's willingness to fight shows that he believes England is superior to any other country that might try to contaminate it or pull it down to their level.

The duel can be read as a civilized way to settle their dispute, but it is quickly halted by an attack by a tribe of Native Americans, which provides a foil to the two imperial powers. The narrator describes the attack as a savage act:

The Sioux had at the same time invaded the cars, skipping like enraged monkeys over the roofs, thrusting open the doors, and fighting hand to hand with the passengers. Penetrating the baggage-car, they pillaged it, throwing the trunks out of the train. The cries and shots were constant. (Verne 120)

The ruckus of the attack shows that this narrative disregards the historical fact of extreme violence against the Native Americans and chooses to portray them much like other colonized people. The Native Americans are not depicted as people who are forced to deal with the ever-expanding Americans who keep invading their hunting grounds; they are simply creatures who attack progress because they are backwards. Being compared to monkeys demotes them to sub-human beings who do not understand anything but primitive violence. Their hand-to-hand combat is decades behind the guns being used by the Englishman and American for the duel. While guns allow some distance between assailants, the Native Americans must invade the imperial personal space in order to successfully attack. Fogg and Proctor halt their own sort of killing to engage in another. The men are temporarily aligned as defenders of society, but Proctor "was one of the most seriously hurt; he had fought bravely, and a ball had entered his

groin” (Verne 121). Proctor fell victim to a cultural other, much like Watson did while fighting in Afghanistan. Indeed, the site of his injury clearly suggests his masculinity is damaged from the attack, while Fogg, “who had been in the thickest of the fight, had not received a scratch” (Verne 121). The text gives no insight as to how Fogg’s participation was different from Proctor’s, only that they both bravely fought and survived and that Fogg’s lack of wounds is admirable. Fogg has proved his superior Englishness and has remained pure despite being bombarded with foreign elements. He is able to protect his English masculinity and emerges unscathed.

Comparing Holmes and Fogg, two characters who triumph over every obstacle, shows that interactions with threatening or colonial others was quite important to the British during this time of high-imperialism. Holmes and Fogg are examples of extraordinarily popular characters who defined their time period and allowed readers to learn how English masculinity was constructed and taught to be upheld in the late Victorian era. As Tim Edensor writes in the preface to his book, *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life*, culture “is constantly in a process of becoming, of emerging out of the dynamism of popular culture and everyday life whereby people make and remake connections between the local and the national, between the national and the global, between the everyday and the extraordinary” (vii). Thousands of readers learned about how Holmes and Fogg find success in whatever they attempt, and the characters’ detached attitude within imperial life they lead makes the reader view English life differently. If the Empire is threatened, self-control is recommended by these characters to give an Englishman a superior view of the situation. By cultivating rationality, controlling emotions, and protecting the self, the characters show that pure Englishness can prevail over all threats. The texts offer many warnings, in the forms of colonized people and people who have gotten too close to them,

of what could happen if rigid control is ignored. The enormous popularity of these texts when they were first published proves that these works became part of the cultural landscape. As novels, these texts emphasize their lessons without sounding like textbooks and the material is absorbed, before becoming apparent throughout everyday lives. The construction of English masculinity was the basis for their colonial dominance. Because these characters have survived, and especially because of the continued interest in Sherlock Holmes, learning about the historical context they were born in adds a new layer of appreciation to the texts.

Chapter 2: Women as a Means of Negotiating the Crisis of Colonial Otherness

“Women are never to be entirely trusted—not the best of them.”

—Sherlock Holmes in Arthur Conan Doyle’s *The Sign of Four* (1890)

“But love is an emotional thing, and whatever is emotional is opposed to that true cold reason which I place above all things.”

—Sherlock Holmes in Arthur Conan Doyle’s *The Sign of Four* (1890)

As perceptive as Holmes can be, his dismissive view of women is not one readers should adopt as they analyze his stories because women play a central role in late imperial fiction; just because they are marginalized by Holmes and appear, on the surface, to be minor in the text does not mean that they are. In Philippa Levine’s *Gender and Empire*, she argues that gender is important to consider when examining imperial texts, given that in imperial contexts “women became an index and a measure less of themselves than of men and of societies” (7).

Throughout Britain’s expansion of Empire, the English struggled to define themselves and those they colonized. The first few chapters of *Gender and Empire* focus on the general views held by the Empire in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Kathleen Wilson contends that nation was constructed by “customs, descent, and ‘blood’ (17), making women and their reproductive capacities important for defining Empire. Englishmen in the eighteenth century came to a general consensus that “women marked civilization and progress” (Wilson 21). They believed that Englishmen were the only men who knew how to treat women properly and judged their colonized people by how they treated women. English women were only a part of the gender hierarchy and how nineteenth century Englishmen viewed colonized women was vastly different from their perception of Englishwomen. As Catherine Hall explains, “in particular colonial discourses, the Indian woman was constructed as a degraded victim of her barbaric society” (51) who needed help from the British Empire.

This historical context in regards to the intersection between race and gender is crucial for understanding imperial literature from this period. In this chapter I am aligning myself with Levine and the other scholars who contributed to *Gender and Empire*, expanding how gender's role in Empire is important. By focusing solely on Englishmen, a complete portrait of the Empire is impossible. Levine notes:

The focus on a group of pioneer men taming wild terrain into productivity and profitability put the spotlight on physically courageous and industrious men, posing an ideal white male figure. That emphasis celebrated a very particular vision of white maleness as physical, responsible, productive, and hard-working. These were qualities denied to women and to the colonized. (7)

This ranking of skills became a hierarchy that separated everyone in the British Empire into different degrees of usefulness. Women do not feature heavily in the Sherlock Holmes stories or *Around the World in Eighty Days*; nevertheless, they formed the basis of the performance of English masculinity. How Holmes and Fogg interact with the women reflects how Englishmen viewed gender within Empire, and suggests that the audience read the women as indices of colonialism. As Levine's introduction explains, regardless of where in the Empire they lived, women were considered inferior to the "ideal white male figure." Countering the more overtly patriarchal Victorian view of women, in his 1869 publication *The Subjection of Women*, John Stuart Mill argued for the emancipation of women. While many Victorians thought women were weak and full of emotions that could wreak havoc on reason, Mill believed "what is now called the nature of women is an eminently artificial thing—the result of forced repression in some directions, unnatural stimulation in others" (1065-1066). Though Mill's ideas had started to gain

traction by the late nineteenth century, Englishmen continued to see women as potential threats to masculine reason throughout the Victorian era.

Under the Victorian social and racial hierarchy, not just English women, but Indian women, too, were subject to different expectations by Englishmen. In “Contentious Traditions,” Lata Mani explores the debates between colonial officials around funeral act of sati in India. Sati was the practice of a widow burning herself on her husband’s funeral pyre. Mani argues that because the British saw sati solely as a cultural (not political or historical) practice, “this notion of culture effectively erases the agency of those involved in such practices” (151-152). Thus, Indian women became not the subject or object, but “the ground of discourse on *sati*” (152). Beyond sati, British and Indian men saw Indian women as indices for their culture rather than rational human beings. In *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*, Gayatri Spivak includes a list of this racial hierarchy, with the most elite groups being first the colonizer and then the Indians in power; Indians who live in the cities are third on the list, with unrepresented Indians being last (79). Based on where in society a colonized person fell, the English saw them at different levels of proximity to the supposed superior Englishness, with the elite classes coming as close as possible to it. Within this hierarchy, each section can also be divided into two sub-hierarchies with men ranking above women. Due to these nineteenth century views, Indian women suffered twice because of their gender and race. While Englishmen considered Englishwomen to be property, the women still maintained control of the private sphere; Indian women had no such place to control because British men saw them as fundamentally incapable of any sort of control, perceiving them as either passive or hypersexual.

I find Levine’s view of gender in *Empire*, Mani’s discourse on sati and the status of Indian women, and Spivak’s hierarchy of races illuminating on viewing gender in *Empire*;

building on their work, I show how the early Sherlock Holmes stories and *Around the World in Eighty Days* reinforce the gender and racial hierarchies of the late-Victorian era. The portrayals of Mary Morstan and Aouda, two vastly different women, in regards to the similar Englishmen show the complicated hierarchy that ruled the late Victorian era. Both Sherlock Holmes and Phileas Fogg maintain superhuman non-attachments to women. As protectors of Empire, these characters are careful about foreign or feminine imperfections that may stain their pure English lives. Because Holmes chooses to forever ignore women and Fogg marries the woman he saves, both seem to be trying to secure England's purity from foreign influences, albeit in different ways. In Chapter 1, I have already discussed their pedagogical functions in regard to the self, but their actions regarding women also teach the reader how to navigate the amorous possibilities of Empire. While both authors portray women as posing a threat to rationality, the texts also suggest that the reader can neutralize the threat by following Holmes' or Fogg's example. In order to protect English masculinity and the Empire, these texts suggest women need to be dismissed or contained.

My first section will focus on women in *The Sign of Four*, primarily Mary Morstan and her relationship to both Sherlock Holmes and John Watson. Holmes keeps his distance from women, while Watson quickly falls in love with Miss Morstan. As I have already established that Watson and Holmes represent two different types of English masculinity, their attitudes towards women represent differing views on English femininity at home. Holmes' view of Mary serves as an extreme view of keeping himself pure to continue protecting the Empire. My second section is devoted to the interesting position Aouda inhabits as an Indian woman in regard to England in *Around the World in Eighty Days*. Aouda's role of needing to be saved by Fogg reinforces popular imperialistic views that England has a duty to improve their colonies.

Though Fogg eventually marries her, which Holmes would find unthinkable, Fogg, too, is neutralizing what he sees as a potential threat to the British Empire.

Marriage at Home: The Sign of Four

Within the context of the British Empire, women at home were expected to fit neatly into a gendered and classed society, separate from the foreign elements that could be potentially dangerous or tainted. As mentioned in my previous chapter, Holmes despises that Watson includes the romantic elements of *A Study in Scarlet*, specifically the fact that the entire case is built around a man's revenge against men who killed the woman he loved (Doyle 125). Holmes believes that feelings interfere with his work and are unnecessary for everyday life; his work is of the utmost importance and allows him to protect the Empire. Watson, on the other hand, is open to experiences such as romance that Holmes abstains from. After Holmes chastises Watson for his acceptance of romance and proceeds to remind him about his methods of deduction, a lady client arrives with a case. Watson devotes a fairly large paragraph to describing her when she enters the room, noting her calm manner and lovely appearance. Though Morstan is not stunningly gorgeous, Watson muses, "in an experience of women which extends over many nations and three continents, I have never looked upon a face which gave a clearer promise of a refined and sensitive nature" (Doyle 131). Obviously, this narrative will include the romance that Holmes hated in his previous published case. The fact that Watson mentions other countries within the Empire makes it clear that there is a hierarchy that Morstan fits into. In this observation, Watson is reporting what he believes to be a fact of nature that Miss Morstan is superior to women of other non-English places. According to the hierarchy Spivak outlines, Morstan's "refined and sensitive nature" would also place her above women within England who are from less-desirable socioeconomic classes. Miss Morstan has the correct Englishness and

Watson praises her manner and is attentive to her actions as she explains her problem to Holmes. In Watson's eyes, Morstan seems to be an excellent match judging by his past experiences.

How Watson's and Holmes' two widely different approaches to Miss Morstan showcase their contrasting views of women. Beyond her favorable first impression, Watson remains attentive to her and sees her as an ideal partner. While Holmes is investigating some evidence in a garden, Watson notes that though they had only been acquainted for one day "now in an hour of trouble our hands instinctively sought for each other. . . it seemed the most natural thing that I should go out to her" (Doyle 153). Watson reaffirms the cultural hierarchy that men are superior to women by noting that Morstan naturally needed his protection. Though Morstan is frightened, she does not panic or distract Holmes. Instead, she quietly turns to Watson and remains stoic throughout the case. It is not until she is out of sight of Holmes that she allows her reserve to crumble. While riding home in a cab, "she turned faint and then burst into a passion of weeping—so sorely had she been tried by the adventures of the night" (Doyle 167). Watson remains reserved, citing chivalry for not comforting her more while she is in a demoted state of emotion. She is weak, not up to the task of helping solve the case she is involved in. This case, which is tightly connected to her life, has many connections to India which makes her vulnerable. She was born in India because her father was serving there, and lived there for a few years before being sent to a boarding school in England. The treasure he came into contact with was also Indian and now is the source of her seeking Holmes' guidance. The resurgence of Indian elements from the case disrupts her quiet life in London, and there is an underlying threat from an Indian otherness. Watson considers himself trained in how to interact with women in the Empire, as evident when he compares Morstan to women around the world, and sees it as his

duty to take care of the more delicate side of the British Empire. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Watson's wounds from the Afghan wars make him a sullied Englishman unlike Holmes, but he still has more power than English women to protect the Empire. Watson, in addition to being the romantic, is embracing a patriarchal and orientalist view of women that assumes Englishwomen need to be protected from foreign elements.

While Watson, the wounded hero and man of Empire, immediately notices Miss Morstan and falls in love with her, Holmes remains cold and calculating and in this manner follows his own approach to protecting and preserving the Empire. As Watson exclaims about her beauty, Holmes says he did not observe it. He and Watson have this conversation:

“You really are an automaton—a calculating machine,” [Watson] cried. “There is something positively inhuman in you at times.”

[Holmes] smiled gently.

“It is of the utmost importance,” he cried, “not to allow your judgment to be biased by personal qualities. A client is to me a mere unit, a factor in a problem. The emotional qualities are antagonistic to clear reasoning. I assure you that the most winning woman I ever knew was hanged for poisoning three little children for their insurance-money, and the most repellent man of my acquaintance is a philanthropist.” (Doyle 135)

Holmes prizes his ability to solve crimes to protect London from outside evils. In *Detecting the Nation*, Caroline Reitz argues that Victorians associated the rising crime rates with the growth of the Empire, making crime a foreign element even if it was based in England. She notes, “As imperial expansion begot crime, the reasoning went, crime threatened the security and indeed the very character of Empire” (xiv). Miss Morstan's connections to India tie her to this foreign

crime, which poses a threat to the British Empire. Holmes recognizes this threat and does not contradict Watson's critique of his strict rationality, because he understands that he is mechanical in his pursuit of detection. Holmes cannot afford to appreciate Miss Morstan or any other woman because appearances can be deceptive. If he involves himself with fancifully admiring a client, he fears he will be blinded to solving the crime accurately. When he mentions the most "winning woman" he knew, he shows that England has already contains foreign crime in its daily fabric. Holmes wants his view of the world to be unclouded by emotions, just as he wants Watson's narratives to be. He does not even acknowledge that Morstan is in fact a Miss; she is simply a client with a problem. He factors her actions into his analysis, but leaves beauty out of the matter. Though he allows her to be a "model client" (Doyle 134), able to produce the information she has and answering his questions completely, he does not see any further need to dwell on her. Holmes sees danger in shallow relationships and seeks to secure himself from any and all risks that could affect his ability to protect the Empire; while Watson feels that mingling with romantic notions is harmless, Holmes believes it threatens imperial rationality.

Despite working with Morstan during the case, Holmes' feelings are unchanged towards women; the gender hierarchy in England is too rigid for Miss Morstan to make any significant changes. When Watson announces their engagement, Holmes does not wish to congratulate him, but offers a compliment in her favor: "[s]he is one of the most charming young ladies I ever met and might have been most useful in such work as we have been doing. She had a decided genius that way" (Doyle 235). Holmes appreciates how she managed to fit within his equation, but other than seeing her as a potential assistant, he cannot see any use for her. Though Holmes notes her charm, it seems as if he simply wants to compliment her for Watson's sake. During the case, she was a marginal piece of the puzzle that Holmes was trying to solve. Miss Morstan did

not disrupt his crime-solving, so her inoffensiveness makes her “charming.” When he notes that she could be useful, it is unlikely that Holmes had plans of using her like Wiggins, the boy who heads up Holmes’ network of homeless children, in future crimes. Morstan is a woman, soon to be married, who must take her place within the home. In the domestic sphere, she will not have the power to enter into the public sphere as an autonomous agent, as she did when soliciting Holmes’ help. Her emotions will stay in her home, away from Holmes, and Watson will take care of any needs that arise. As Holmes sees it, there is no danger in complimenting her because when she becomes Mrs. Watson, not only will she no longer have the same degree of agency, but also, he will no longer interact with her.

For Holmes, emotional involvement hinders the logic he relies on to protect the Empire. Though he suggests that she could have been a colleague, he can never see her as an equal. Holmes continues, “love is an emotional thing, and whatever is emotional is opposed to that true cold reason which I place above all things. I should never marry myself, lest I bias my judgment” (Doyle 235). Holmes hates feminine-attributed emotion, and considers it a detriment to his Science of Deduction. He wants to protect himself from any “bias” that could cloud his investigations. Holmes is set on ignoring women to maintain his masculine reason and to continue solving England’s crimes. Watson does not have such an extreme view of love in the context of Empire, but throughout the case he tried to help keep Morstan’s emotions under control. By marrying her, he is both helping to continue expanding the Empire and moving Morstan into the home where she will be less likely to interfere with external affairs. Throughout the case, Holmes largely ignored Miss Morstan, while Watson kept her under control, providing two examples of how to deal with Englishwomen within the Empire.

The danger of femininity is not limited solely to Morstan, and Holmes eschews any contact with foreign others who may taint his English rationality and harm his ability to continue as protector of the Empire. The Andaman character, Tonga, serves as an example of this racial characterization. As Edward Said mentions in *Orientalism*, “The Oriental was linked thus to elements in Western society (delinquents, the insane, women, the poor)” (207). During the final chase, Watson describes Tonga as “a little black man--the smallest I had ever seen . . . His small eyes glowed and burned with a sombre light, and his thick lips were writhed back from his teeth, which grinned and chattered at us with half animal fury” (Doyle 204). Tonga’s physical smallness aligns him more with feminine and other “degenerate” traits than the dominating stature of Holmes and other Englishmen. Additionally, Tonga’s emotions are uncontrollable and written on his face. Tonga is a beast who belongs to the very bottom of the hierarchy. Tonga is associated with undesirable traits and cannot be allowed to roam London. When Holmes successfully avoids Tonga’s dart, Holmes proves his dominance over Tonga’s feeble, yet potent weapon. Holmes’ ability to avoid contact with Tonga, and the fact that he and Watson shoot Tonga when he lashes out with his final dart, shows that his English masculinity and cool head enable him to take down a foreign threat that embodies not only a feminized body but also animalistic savagery and uncontrollable emotion. Tonga poses a direct threat to Holmes during the chaos of the chase, but Holmes is prepared because he has already resolved to maintain his level head by ignoring emotions.

Marriage Abroad: Around the World in Eighty Days

During the late Victorian period, Englishmen attempted to categorize the world into a simple hierarchy that placed England as superior to any other nation, just as Spivak denotes in “Can the Subaltern Speak?” (67). Women at home, as discussed with Miss Morstan, were

subject to different ideals than the colonized women that Englishmen encountered. *Around the World in Eighty Days* offers a lesson in how colonized women were to be attended to. Women throughout the Empire were seen as defining markers of culture; when the British men colonized India, they saw women as the measure of whether a people was civilized or not. In *Around the World in Eighty Days*, Aouda is an Indian woman who eventually marries Fogg. This acceptance of a foreign other seems to be contrary to the construction of colonial masculinity, accepted by Holmes, which stipulated separation from colonized others, so I will be looking at what about her makes her desirable and less of a threat to the Empire Fogg defends mathematically. Like Holmes, Phileas Fogg initially lives “outside of every social relation” (Verne 5) with no one to slow down his precise life. However, unlike Holmes, Fogg does not shun the idea of marriage. In his extremely private life, which involves him either quietly at home or at the Reform Club, women never enter the equation. It is not until his trip around the world that Fogg is confronted with a funeral sati which places a woman directly in his path.

Englishmen saw themselves as saviors of Indian women, which is illustrated by Fogg’s reaction to sati. Sati is the Hindu practice that a widow is burned on her husband’s funeral pyre upon his death, and became quite political as England strove to define it. While many women were forced to practice sati, others chose to. England tried to define it as a barbarity that needed to be wiped out. During Victorian times, colonial ideology dictated that Indian women, especially widows, were “victims who must be saved by the civilizing power of the colonial state” (Hall 54). The practice of sati is a highly debated one in which women had very little to say. Fogg’s first question in the entire text comes in India when their group stumbles upon a procession. Sir Francis explains that sati is a practice of a voluntary sacrifice of a widow burning herself on her husband’s funeral pyre. While Passepartout is shocked by the practice, Fogg

calmly asks, “Is it possible. . . that these barbarous customs still exist in India, and that the English have been unable to put a stop to them” (Verne 42)? Fogg joins many Englishmen who believed sati was an evil practice put in place by cruel Indian men who did not know how to treat their women (Hall 55). By English standards, this ritual is not a civilized way to handle religion or grief. In fact, sati was outlawed in 1829⁵. Gayatri Spivak, in *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*, writes that “The abolition of this rite by the British has been generally understood as a case of ‘White men saving brown women from brown men’” (287). Up to this point in the narrative, Fogg has not questioned anything he encountered. He is so certain about what he knows, that when confronted with a foreign practice that England cannot control, he is puzzled. As a whole-hearted believer in his country, Fogg reacts as an imperial analyst checking in on a territory. When Fogg is momentarily baffled by “these barbarous customs,” he is reinforcing the notion that England has a responsibility to India to improve it. Fogg sees it as England’s duty to protect all of its imperial subjects from harm.

The woman about to commit sati, named Aouda, has a unique status within Indian culture which makes her an ideal partner for Fogg. In *Gender and Empire*, Wilson notes that nation was defined by “customs, descent, and ‘blood’ (17). By this definition, Aouda should be seen as a foreigner; however, when Fogg’s Indian guide relates her past and her appearances, the lines of the hierarchy begin to blur. Aouda is “a celebrated beauty of the Parsee race, and the daughter of a wealthy Bombay merchant. She received a thoroughly English education in that city, and from her manners and intelligence, would be thought an European” (Verne 44). Unlike many of the other colonized characters in the novel, Aouda is described quite favorably with a distant connection to Europe as “young, and as fair as a European” (Verne 41). Indeed, she is part of a higher caste in her culture which brings her closer up the hierarchy. Her education is English,

⁵ Lata Mani in *Contentious Traditions* (119).

which makes her desirable and shows her ability to work within colonial rule without opposing it. Aouda's education takes place several decades after Thomas Macaulay's 1835 "Minute on Education," but his ideas continued to hold sway throughout the century, though after the 1857 Uprising, some English people doubted the extent to which Indians could in fact be "civilized." Burton Stein cites Macaulay's argument that:

We [the British] must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern, —a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect. To that class we may leave it to refine the vernacular dialects of the country, to enrich those dialects with terms of science borrowed from the Western nomenclature, and to render them by degrees fit vehicles for conveying knowledge to the great mass of the population. (Stein 254)

Macaulay advocated educating Indians with English literature to create a buffer group that could facilitate colonial rule. This group would think like the English, but otherwise remain Indian to go between the colonial rulers and the Indian people. Aouda's English education has prepared her to serve an English ruler, both more broadly and in terms of Fogg as a future husband. Her education makes her desirable because she understands how to work within the power dynamics between colonized India and Fogg's supposed superior English masculinity.

As the debate on education raged on, academic debate sought to map out racial, and in turn linguistic, origins of different peoples. As Hindi language scholar Michael Shapiro explains, Victorian scholars found that "Hindi belongs to the Indo-Aryan family of languages," and is "related to such European languages as English" (Shapiro 1). This connection in language proves a common ancestor links the races that were previously seen as separate. On one hand,

this proof justifies the colonial takeover of Indians in order to help them meet their true potential. This notion of pulling India into European progress can be attributed to John and James Stuart Mills' view of colonial improvement as one that required a stronger power to pull the "backwards" colony into the future, though fundamental differences prevented the colony from becoming a power equal to the colonizer. For John Mill, the "Hindu civilization . . . epitomizes this condition of being stalled in the past. But various aspects of Hindu civilization had prepared it for progressive transformation" (Mehta 94). If Indian cultures are related to European ones, they belong to the hierarchies that govern English life. This evidence could support why Aouda is eligible to marry a European. If somewhere in her lineage she is connected to Europeans, under the logic Mehta describes Aouda has the potential to improve herself and be worthy of her European upbringing. Though it is important to remember that Aouda's English education makes her one step closer to European, her nationality makes it impossible for her to achieve the ideal construction of a pure Englishwoman.

Despite suggestion of an emotional connection between Fogg and Aouda, Fogg maintains his emotionless state to protect the Empire. Confronted with Aouda's sati, Fogg suggests, "Suppose we save this woman. . . I have yet twelve hours to spare; I can devote them to that" (Verne 43). Ever coolly rational, Fogg is not motivated out of romantic love, but of duty. Upon rereading, it is somewhat chilling to wonder what Fogg would have done if he had not had the time. While he does think it part of his English duty to improve the lives of women in Indian society, he cites time as his reason for saving her. After the thrilling escape, with Passepartout disguising himself as Aouda's dead husband and rising off the funeral pyre, Aouda's next moves must be decided. Sir Francis, Fogg's temporary traveling companion who has made his home in

India, argues that Aouda's safety is jeopardized if she remains in India, and eventually Fogg agrees to let her continue on their journey. The narrator tells the reader:

The phlegmatic gentleman listened to her, apparently at least, with coldness, neither his voice nor his manner betraying the slightest emotion; but he seemed to be always on the watch that nothing should be wanting to Aouda's comfort. . . He treated her with the strictest politeness, but with the precision of an automaton, the movements of which had been arranged for this purpose. (Verne 57)

After saving Aouda's life, Fogg continues to protect her by seeing to her comfort while traveling. Fogg's "phlegmatic" attention to her is calculated to see that she is attended to, but no emotion or attachment seems likely to form because of his coldness. Fogg emotionally maintains his distance from Aouda so as not to compromise his prized English rationality. With the word "but," the narrator tries to give the reader a sense of emotion working inside of Fogg that is contrary to his cold exterior; the narrator attempts to suggest that Fogg shows his love by his actions, but it might simply be wishful thinking. Defined as a machine who dutifully cares for Aouda, Fogg's icy exterior remains intact. As pointed out in William Butcher's introduction to *Around the World in Eighty Days*, the narrator tells incorrect information or even withholds it from the reader. Butcher claims:

Verne's narrator thus has the outward form of the nineteenth-century's omniscient and ubiquitous narrator, but is in fact less reliable than the twentieth-century bystander-narrator: a combination that very much undercuts the veracity and authority of his own position, and throws considerable doubt on his role as a whole. (xxiv)

Relying on the narrator to tell us about Fogg's internal state is not the soundest way to learn what Fogg is feeling. Love involves emotions which can be irrational and Fogg is unlikely to abandon the rationality that strictly governs his existence. Even if he is falling in love, he reverts to his mechanical state to protect himself from Aouda's potential feminine threat. The threat is emphasized when Aouda's eyes are compared to beautiful, foreign lakes, which "Fogg did not seem at all inclined to throw himself into" (Verne 58). Aouda is an index of what men could do when confronted with a woman. Allure is an inherent life-threatening quality that could potentially cause the death of rationality. Fogg continues to hold his rationality above human interaction so he can continue to successfully navigate the Empire.

Aouda's Orientalist portrayal as passive, and a victim requiring an Englishman's assistance proves that the reader should value Fogg's rationality. English education emphasized rationality, which Aouda attempts to emulate in Fogg's presence. As Fogg, Passepartout, and Aouda are leaving India, a policeman takes them into custody for Passepartout's previous entrance into a temple without removing his shoes and everyone but Fogg begins to worry. Because she does not know why they are arrested, Aouda fears Fogg will be punished for saving her from her unwilling sati, and "with an emotion she tried to conceal" tries to convince Fogg to leave her behind and continue his journey (Verne 53). Fogg "contented himself with saying that it was impossible. It was quite unlikely that he should be arrested for preventing a suttee. . . There was some mistake" (53). Aouda has traveled with Fogg enough to know that he prefers cold, rational behavior in both himself and others and tries to tone down the emotion she feels in this instance. Additionally she begs him to leave her behind so he can continue his journey. Though this selfless attitude initially appears considerate that she is thinking about her savior's own need to complete his wager in a timely manner, it seems Aouda holds Fogg's club bet in

higher regard than her own life. The men have already established that Aouda is not safe while she is in India, but she is willing to let Fogg continue his cold, imperial journey, while she as a colonized woman fends for herself out of sight. Aouda's emotional response makes her irrational because she cannot suspend her emotions enough to see what Fogg sees, namely the illogical idea that her sati is the cause of their arrest. Fogg, with his English rationality, calmly dismisses the idea as "impossible" that they are being held for halting a sati. Fogg attributes their arrest to a "mistake" that could quickly be corrected quickly enough for them to make their boat's departure time, and by staying calm he saves Aouda again from the potential danger of colonized men. Because Fogg is assessing the situation without emotion, he can logically figure out that Aouda's sati is unlikely the reason they were stopped. His calmness in an uncertain situation gives him superior reasoning to Aouda's muffled panic.

When Aouda learns how to fit into Fogg's world without disrupting the hierarchy, it means Fogg can travel with her. Just as Macaulay wished in his "Minute on Education" to create a buffer between the English colonizer and the colonized Indian, Aouda is already receptive to English ideas and figures out where to live within them. On their passage to Hong Kong, their ship encounters a typhoon which serves not only as a dramatic moment in a fantastic journey, but also as a moment that ties Fogg and Aouda together. The storm is awful, "but Aouda, with her eyes fastened upon her protector, whose coolness amazed her, showed herself worthy of him, and bravely weathered the storm. As for Phileas Fogg, it seemed just as if the typhoon were a part of his programme" (Verne 81). As they press on, "Aouda was exhausted, but did not utter a complaint. More than once Mr. Fogg rushed to protect her from the violence of the waves" (Verne 82). Aouda is impressed by Fogg's rational approach to the storm and adopts his outlook on the storm. By suppressing any weakness she might have, whether it be fatigue or fear, her

rationality is proven to be enough like Fogg's to make her subservient to him. Because Aouda does not complain, she silently reinforces that she will not disrupt Fogg's rationality. Her silence enables Fogg's display of his colonial masculinity. Fogg's physical state is not discussed here, but the fact that he acts like the storm is a planned event shows that he is still ready for anything that may threaten his trip and English rationality. Aouda grows tired from the storm, but remains worthy of Fogg because she does not get in the way. She is deemed worthy because she can shut down the threatening emotions that could potentially harm Fogg's rationality. Fogg, the man whose very steps are regulated, "rushes" to keep Aouda safe from the raging storm. Still feeling it his duty to protect Aouda, a colonial body under the care of an English one, Fogg momentarily abandons his calculated movements to defend her against the elements.

By diminishing her own individuality, Aouda fits in with Fogg's English rationality, and feels compelled to protect it, representing and solidifying the importance of such strict rationality in a colonial context. After proving herself capable of restraining herself, Aouda further reinforces valuing English rationality by trying to protect Fogg from abandoning his goal and a potential emotional outburst. Originally, Fogg was going to escort Aouda to a family member in Hong Kong, but his absence means Aouda, a single woman in a foreign city, cannot stay there alone. Feeling responsible for her, Fogg decides to let her continue on his circumnavigation. While in the United States, Fogg nearly gets in a fight with an American named Colonel Proctor who insults him. The two agree to fight when they meet again; because of his wager, Fogg says he will return to America later so they can duel. However, the Colonel boards the same train as Fogg and Aouda realizes that the men could fight sooner than Fogg had originally planned. As she processes this:

Her heart sank within her when she recognised the man whom Mr. Fogg desired, sooner or later, to call to account for his conduct. Chance alone, it was clear, had brought Colonel Proctor on this train; but there he was, and it was necessary, at all hazards, that Phileas Fogg should not perceive his adversary. (Verne 111)

Aouda manages to hide her turbulent emotions from Fogg, but the threat of Proctor feels much too dangerous for her liking. Fogg would be inclined to get their fight out of the way, protecting his honor as an Englishman ought to, even if it could hinder or end his journey. Aouda recognizes that Fogg's quest for protecting his honor might clash with his rationality and wants to keep the information from him. She waits until Fogg sleeps to explain the situation to Passepartout; if Fogg "Should . . . perceive Colonel Proctor, we could not prevent a collision which might have terrible results" (111). A confrontation could delay Fogg, making it impossible to complete his journey on time and Aouda wants to keep the trip running smoothly until his return to England. Fogg's first encounter with Proctor is emotionally charged: "'Yankee!' exclaimed Mr. Fogg, darting a contemptuous look at the ruffian" (Verne 100). This presents a sharp contrast to his emotionless decision to save Aouda from her sati. Fogg exhibited more emotion confronting Proctor than nearly any other character, so Aouda fears that Proctor poses a threat to Fogg's cool rationality and wants to protect it at all costs.

Despite the novel's emphasis on Aouda's Englishness, its depiction of Aouda fulfills Mehta's description of how colonized people could be brought up near the status of England; because of the potential Aouda possesses to fit into Fogg's hierarchy, she can be acquired through marriage. Though Aouda does not succeed in keeping the men apart, the duel does not delay them. An attack by a tribe of Native Americans, which involved Passepartout saving the train but being taken hostage, and Fogg dutifully rescuing him, causes Fogg and company to

miss their ship from New York. They make up time and seem to have won the wager when they are arrested in England and detained well past the end time set for the bet. Quietly, Fogg returns to No. 7 Saville Road, defeated by the time he so deftly controlled for years. Aouda recognizes his solitude and asks how she contributed to the journey and what will happen to him now.

When he says he had to take care of her, she asks him, “not content with rescuing me from a terrible death, you thought yourself bound to secure my comfort in a foreign land” (144)? He affirms this statement and offers to continue to care for her with what little he has left. She is an index to Fogg’s construction of masculinity, which means he feels responsible to rescue and secure her. Aouda recognizes the colonial power dynamic between the two of them, with him acting as her savior. Fogg still feels it his duty to care for the woman he brought to England after his travels. When Aouda pities his lonely life, she asks, “do you wish at once a kinswoman and friend? Will you have me for your wife” (144)? Fogg’s countenance changes briefly before simply accepting her proposal. What Aouda is asking of Fogg, that she become his wife, also positions her, under the law of coverture⁶, as one of his possessions. Fogg’s lack of feeling in accepting this proposal is sorely obvious, more like a business transaction than an engagement. Aouda acknowledged her debt to Fogg and by marrying him she erases her ledger. Fogg saved her, and though he considers Aouda’s proposal something that saves him, he has acquired a wife as well as showed mastery over a colonized people, which reinforces English mastery over the Indian race. Aouda does not have many options available to her after returning to England, so finding a home is the only action she could possibly take. Though her proposal could be read as

⁶ The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines coverture as “The condition or position of a woman during her married life, when she is by law under the authority and protection of her husband.”

a norm-bending action⁷, she has no choice other than becoming a possession for Fogg. Her proposal also leads a series of events that shows that Fogg did not lose the bet after all. Aouda's acceptance and encouragement of Fogg's rationality allowed him to not only win the game, but take home a prize in the form of an Indian wife. Aouda's subservience to Fogg places her squarely within the racial hierarchy Gayatri Spivak outlines. She complements Fogg's quest and serves to illustrate that Indians can function in the English hierarchy, but that ultimately English masculinity is the superior position.

Aouda and Mary Morstan advocate the idea that women ought to be either controlled via marriage or ignored altogether in order for Englishmen to successfully perform their masculinity. Morstan works within the English sphere, ignored by Holmes and controlled by Watson's eventual marriage. Aouda's unique status as an Anglicized Indian woman makes her doubly reinforce English rationality by both supporting it and learning how to live within it. These women do not steal the show from the male protagonists and live in the background, defining the men in the colonial context. Nevertheless, Morstan and Aouda play a vital role in defining the colonial masculinity that the men around them construct and live by.

⁷ Aouda's proposal to Fogg is unique because traditionally men are expected to propose to women. I acknowledge that this can be read against the grain to show Aouda's power in a male-dominated world, but choose to focus on the fact that she does not have many other options to choose from.

Chapter 3: “Sidekick” Figures and their Role in Establishing Colonial Masculinity

“I should prefer having a partner to being alone.”

—Dr. Watson in Arthur Conan Doyle’s *A Study in Scarlet* (1890)

Little does Dr. Watson realize when he makes this statement that the partner he will share 221B Baker Street with will become his lifelong friend and colleague. Forever linked to Sherlock Holmes, Watson acts as a sidekick to his many detective adventures. Sidekicks are a fairly recent addition to the literary world, with the word itself being coined in the United States in the early 1900’s (“Side-kick”). In *“Side by Side”: The Role of the Sidekick*, Ron Buchanan traces the history of the sidekick, associating the character with the development of the novel and citing Don Quixote’s Sancho Panza as one of the first literary sidekicks (16). Buchanan notes that the sidekick is “crucial to the story’s development, being present to assist the central character and to act as a surrogate for the audience” (15). He continues to outline different duos throughout literary and television history to show different types of sidekicks, namely to accompany the main character either as a companion or subservient helper (16). Buchanan’s examples span the centuries, but he only cites two notable female duos, presenting an overwhelmingly male view of sidekicks. By applying this masculine role to characters from the Sherlock Holmes stories and *Around the World in Eighty Days*, the reader sees how the sidekicks further the main characters’ colonial masculinity. These stories feature sidekicks who provide essential help to the main character as well as the readers who could not relate to the main characters without the help of the sidekicks. Dr. John Watson fulfills a companion role for Sherlock Holmes, while Monsieur Jean Passepartout performs an obedient servant role to Phileas Fogg.

As sidekicks who illuminate what is happening for the reader, Watson and Passepartout are invaluable as definers of culture during the late-Victorian period. As they report on what

they see, they also comment on foreign cultures, taking an Orientalist view. In *Orientalism*, Edward Said defines Orientalism several times, and the most fitting definition for this study claims that by:

Taking the late eighteenth century as a very roughly defined starting point Orientalism can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient--dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient. (3)

As I will show, Watson describes foreign distinctions fitting within the detective narratives and Passepartout freely gives his opinions on cultures he sees while travelling with Fogg. Their recording of their thoughts places them squarely within the imperial desire to control the Orient. Their comments perpetuate the perceived superiority of the English in regards to colonized India and other nations. What Watson and Passepartout comment on or laugh at fits into the larger goals of Western cultures who wished to control the Orient. The sidekicks feel entitled to observe “Oriental” elements and pass it on to readers, teaching the audience place within Empire.

Buchanan’s article addresses sidekicks generally, providing a basis for my reading of Dr. Watson and Passepartout. Beyond the usual sidekick roles, these characters also perform a more subtle role as they observe, comment on, and therefore dominate foreign others, as articulated by Said’s definition of Orientalists. I argue that further than simply helping with the plot or narrative, these sidekicks also serve an Orientalist pedagogical function. Without these characters, the lessons taught by Sherlock Holmes and Phileas Fogg would either not have been recorded or extremely dull. Because the sidekick is someone the reader can relate to, this makes

the lesson more credible and perhaps more obtainable than if the reader only had Holmes' or Fogg's example to follow. Dr. Watson and Jean Passepartout cement my overarching thesis: that these three works serve a pedagogical function in regards to colonial masculinity. In Chapter 1, I argue that Holmes and Fogg illustrate a "superior" English rationality that allows them to succeed when faced with colonial objects. Now, I am adding the importance of the sidekick in conveying the lessons about emotional detachment and self-definition that Holmes and Fogg illustrate, but never document. The sidekick characters are vital to the message of colonial masculinity conveyed to late-Victorian readers.

The importance of the sidekicks in *A Study in Scarlet*, *The Sign of Four*, and *Around the World in Eighty Days* can be divided into four main sections. First, the sidekicks inform the reader about the main character because both Holmes and Fogg would unlikely surrender this information themselves. Second, the sidekicks gain the reader's trust through being sociable or relatable, and providing much of the comic relief. Third, I explore the differences between the narratives constructed by sidekick figures and how the authors used them to perpetuate narrative tropes of their time. Fourth, the sidekicks preserve the imperial message that the main characters are teaching. By recording the adventures, Watson and Passepartout serve a pedagogical function, teaching readers how to navigate Empire while protecting their allegedly superior colonial masculinity.

Inclusion: Informing the Reader about the Main Character and Setting

Sherlock Holmes is enormously popular and rightly stars in every story written about him, but looking at the beginning of *A Study in Scarlet*, the reader finds that the stories begin with Dr. John Watson. Before introducing the world's most famous detective, the reader learns about the history of the army doctor who simply wants to split rent with someone so he can

remain in London. Though a mutual friend warns Watson about Holmes' eccentricities, Watson immediately decides Holmes will be a decent roommate and within the next few days the men move into 221B Baker Street. It is through Watson's eyes that the reader learns about Holmes. Watson cites his poor health and lack of friends as the reason for describing Holmes so thoroughly. He writes, "Under these circumstances, I eagerly hailed the little mystery which hung around my companion, and spent much of my time in endeavouring to unravel it" (12). Holmes' daily habits, appearance, and knowledge are carefully catalogued by Watson who is attempting to learn about Holmes. Humorously enough, Watson does not initially know about Holmes' job as "the world's only consulting detective," and sees his new roommate as a mystery to figure out. As Watson endeavors to learn all he can about Holmes, the reader also has questions about the man who knows all about the different types of dirt in London by sight but fails to understand the solar system. Watson's interest in Holmes sparks the reader's interest in him.

Making an odd character like Holmes relatable to the reader, Watson serves an important role in portraying Holmes as a brilliant, yet flawed character that readers cannot dismiss. Watson carefully documents Holmes' appearance for the reader as follows: "In height he was rather over six feet, and so excessively lean that he seemed to be considerably taller. His eyes were sharp and piercing, save during those intervals of torpor to which I have alluded; and his thin, hawk-like nose gave his whole expression an air of alertness and decision" (Doyle 11). Holmes' appearance is rather striking and intimidating, but Watson's description portrays Holmes as clever and perceptive. By comparing Holmes to a hawk, a bird known for its intelligence, Watson draws the attention away from Holmes' physical features and uses them to focus on Holmes' mental assets. This description cleverly draws the reader into wanting to know

more about the strange looking man who is potentially brilliant. However, though Watson praises Holmes, he does not put him on an untouchable pedestal. Watson lists Holmes' knowledge about various subjects and finds that the information Holmes retains varies widely; Holmes knows nothing about literature, but knows about every crime committed in England. Watson looks up to Holmes and consistently praises his deductions, but Watson does not idolize Holmes nor make him appear perfect to the outside world. The honesty Watson displays for the reader makes him trustworthy and because he thinks well of Holmes, the readers do as well.

Watson does not limit his powers of observation to Holmes alone; he also describes the murder scenes with a remarkable attention to detail that gives the reader access to what the great detective is working with. From the very first murder investigation he attends, Watson painstakingly tells the reader what he sees:

It was a large square room, looking all the larger from the absence of all furniture. A vulgar flaring paper adorned the walls, but it was blotched in places with mildew, and here and there great strips had become detached and hung down, exposing the yellow plaster beneath. Opposite the door was a showy fireplace, surmounted by a mantelpiece of imitation white marble. On one corner of this was stuck the stump of a red wax candle. (Doyle 25)

Holmes is busy examining footprints and other pieces of the scene, but Watson takes a moment to consider the reader's needs entering into the story. He notes not only the shape, but aesthetic deficiencies of the room. It is unlikely that Holmes would stop his train of thought in order to make the same gestures for the readers. Indeed, Holmes usually only surrenders information when Watson asks for an explanation.

Just as Holmes remains silent, Phileas Fogg is even more difficult to coax information from which makes his sidekick character necessary as well. As the sidekick and narrator, Watson is the sole relayer of information for Holmes; Phileas Fogg has an unidentified third person narrator as well as his sidekick, Passepartout, who is responsible for much of the personal descriptions of Fogg. The narrator gives an overview of how Fogg is perceived by other people, but Passepartout provides physical details. Fogg quickly hires Passepartout, then leaves to spend the day at the Reform Club, as usual, leaving Passepartout to acquaint himself with his new position. Passepartout, like Watson learning about his new roommate, closely studies his new master. Noticing what the narrator withheld from the reader, Passepartout describes Fogg:

He appeared to be a man about forty years of age, with fine, handsome features, and a tall, well-shaped figure; his hair and whiskers were light, his forehead compact and unwrinkled, his face rather pale, his teeth magnificent. His countenance possessed in the highest degree what physiognomists call “repose in action,” a quality of those who act rather than talk. (4)

The readers get a glimpse of Fogg, who Passepartout paints favorably in his first encounter. There seem to be no faults with the main character; Passepartout cites physiognomy, the pseudo-science that appearance was an indication of character and morality, which was still considered credible in the late Victorian period. If Fogg looks like a good person, he is a good person, according to Passepartout. The servant also immediately notes Fogg’s taciturn nature, which apparently can be read in his face. As Passepartout describes Fogg, he foreshadows Fogg’s silence, yet willingness to take action to prove a point. Within a few pages, Fogg makes the bet that he can circumnavigate the world in eighty days to demonstrate that the trip is possible, rather

than to continue arguing with his fellow club members. Passepartout's summary of Fogg gives the reader a view of Fogg and also subtly proclaims Fogg's credibility.

Throughout the novel, Passepartout keeps tabs on his master and continues to suggest that the reader see Fogg as a human, rather than a cold machine, making the reader trust Fogg's actions. When Fogg decides to save Aouda from committing sati on her late husband's funeral pyre, Passepartout wholeheartedly supports Fogg. Fogg's "idea charmed him; he perceived a heart, a soul, under that icy exterior. He began to love Phileas Fogg" (43). Fogg's decision to save Aouda is one of the most impossibly low-key, matter-of-fact commitments towards a rescue mission. Fogg shows no grief or fear in this section, but Passepartout believes that Fogg is acting more human by stopping to care for someone. As outlined in Chapter 2, I read Fogg's rescue as an act of duty as an Englishman to help an Indian woman being mistreated by her culture rather than a loving human instinct. Nothing about the passage sounds like Fogg's "icy exterior" is melting, but because Passepartout mentions it, the statement appears more credible to readers since someone close to Fogg observes it. Passepartout often comments on his perceived state of Fogg's emotions, which suggests that Fogg is defrosting, despite a lack of evidence from Fogg himself! Passepartout makes the distant Fogg accessible to the readers by believing that Fogg has an emotional life beneath his strictly rational appearance.

Fogg rarely looks at the places he is passing through, which makes for a rather boring travel novel; the burden falls to Passepartout to record the sights for the reader. In addition to making Fogg look good, the narrator gives Passepartout the role of making the journey look attractive as well. After taking care of their passports in Aden (located on the coast of present-day Yemen):

Mr. Fogg returned on board to resume his former habits; while Passepartout, according to custom, sauntered about among the mixed population of Somalis, Banyans, Parsees, Jews, Arabs, and Europeans who comprise the twenty-five thousand inhabitants of Aden. He gazed with wonder upon the fortifications which make this place the Gibraltar of the Indian Ocean. (28)

Fogg has no interest in this trip other than the time it takes to complete it. Sight-seeing is not important to his mission, so he sees no reason to engage in it. Passepartout, whose very name translates to “a person who may go anywhere” or “master key,” is ready to explore each place they stop (“Passepartout”). He describes the scenery and people just vividly enough for the reader to imagine being on a similar trip, experiencing the same sights. Passepartout acts as a tour guide, unafraid to dive into local culture and report it back to people sitting comfortably in their own homes. As a guide, Passepartout is knowledgeable about his surroundings. As he meanders through the crowds, he is able to recognize and distinguish the different types of people within the crowd like an expert. His Orientalist expertise makes him credible and able to comment on the different peoples he sees. Passepartout “gazed with wonder,” which shows that his emotions are engaged with what he sees. By not reigning in his emotions when experiencing a new place, the readers share his wonder. Passepartout’s emotional openness makes the novel more engaging and exciting, maintaining reader interest despite Fogg’s lack of attention to the world he passes through. As sidekicks, Passepartout and Watson both construct the setting and the main characters by providing the details the readers want to know if they are to continue reading about the adventures of Holmes and Fogg.

Gaining the Reader's Trust through Sociability, Relatability and Comic Relief

The fact that Holmes and Fogg are the coldest characters in these texts, but also serve as the protagonists, makes it of the utmost importance that the sidekick make them relatable to the general public. Both men are antisocial oddballs who most people would distrust or avoid in real life; Watson and Passepartout are charged with the task of gaining the reader's trust to make them receptive to Holmes and Fogg's lessons about the superiority of an emotionless, rational masculinity in Empire, which is outlined in Chapter 1. Watson functions more as a sociable and relatable character for the reader. His "delicacy" which keeps him from questioning Holmes (Doyle 15) is starkly contrasted with Holmes' "bumptious style of conversation" (29). Watson knows how to interact in social situations while Holmes largely disregards them. In *The Sign of Four*, while listening to how Holmes' client, Miss Morstan's father died, Watson notices that:

Miss Morstan had turned deadly white, and for a moment I feared that she was about to faint. She rallied, however, on drinking a glass of water which I quietly poured out for her . . . Sherlock Holmes leaned back in his chair with an abstracted expression and the lids drawn low over his glittering eyes. (148)

Watson splits his time between paying attention to the story and gauging how it affects those who are listening to the story. The death of a family member is a personal matter, which Watson understands and attends to. Holmes is so intent on the story he does not notice that someone in the room has strong emotions tied to the case he is working on. To him, emotions are unnecessary and would hinder his process. While Holmes' focus is somewhat obnoxious, Watson describes his eyes as "glittering," which makes Holmes more relatable. Rather than repulsing the reader by Holmes' lack of empathy, Watson's description interests the reader in his Holmes' mental processes. His mental facilities are highlighted, effectively making him the hero

of the story, while Watson narrates himself as a sidekick who quietly helps in the background. Even as a sidekick, Watson's sympathy for Mary makes him relatable to readers and they trust him because he cares about the feelings of others.

In addition to caring for other minor characters, Watson expresses concern with Holmes' health like a good friend; this care for Holmes makes the reader care for Holmes as well. *The Sign of Four* is notorious for the depiction of Holmes as a user of cocaine and the story begins and ends with Holmes shooting up. Holmes claims it stimulates his brain during the periods he does not have cases. Watson objects to his friend's habit and asks him to quit. He urges:

Count the cost! Your brain may, as you say, be roused and excited, but it is a pathological and morbid process which involves increased tissue-change and may at least leave a permanent weakness. . . Remember that I speak not only as one comrade to another but as a medical man to one whose constitution he is to some extent answerable. (124)

According to Christopher Keep and Don Randall, the perception of cocaine was changing at the time Doyle wrote *The Sign of Four*. They note that in the 1880s "Conan Doyle, himself a practicing physician at the time, is also known to have experimented with the drug" (209). It was not until the 1890s, around the time Holmes' use became known, that the medical community began to see the addictiveness of the substance. As a doctor, Watson fears it poses a threat to Holmes' mind. While Watson can explain away Holmes' quirks and bad habits, he does not try to find a positive element in Holmes' drug use. He allows that Holmes' brain may be "roused and excited," but believes that in the long run it will pose a larger threat to his friend's mind. The "permanent weakness" that Watson suggests may plague Holmes parallels Watson's own injury that prevents him from being the hero of Empire that Holmes can be. Watson wishes

to preserve his friend's power of observation so he can continue to protect England in a way that no one else can. Speaking not only as his companion, Watson calls in the highest authority he has in order to make Holmes listen to him. Watson demonstrates to readers Holmes' importance as the protector of the British Empire.

Preserving his homeland with unusual skills that no one else possesses, Holmes' differences and idiosyncrasies that enable him to carry out his imperial work would quickly annoy readers if Watson was not there to filter them and portray Holmes' positive crime-fighting skills. In fact, Watson also has a sense of humor that appears from time to time in his narratives. At the end of *The Sign of Four*, when Watson announces his engagement to Miss Morstan, Holmes "gave a most dismal groan. 'I feared as much,' said he. 'I really cannot congratulate you'" (Doyle 235). Initially somewhat hurt by this candid talk, after Holmes explains that he refuses to let emotions into his own life, Watson laughs. Holmes' antisocial attitude is portrayed as an endearing quirk rather than plain rudeness. His groan is reminiscent of young boys who declare they will never get married. Rather than complying with the social custom of wishing his friend well in marriage, Holmes dismisses it and continues to prize reason over basic human interactions. Watson does not stay offended at Holmes' comment, so the reader also forgives him.

Just as Watson's caring gains reader trust by being relatable and somewhat humorous, Passepartout takes on the sidekick role and serves primarily as comic relief throughout *Around the World in Eighty Days*. The most immediately extreme instances involve his athletic physical humor, which provide a sort of slapstick comedy. While riding the elephant through an Indian jungle, Passepartout does not get to sit upon its back. Rather he "bounced from the elephant's neck to his rump, and vaulted like a clown on a spring-board; yet he laughed in the midst of his

bouncing” (Verne 39). Passepartout used to be a gymnastics professor, but it is difficult to picture exactly how he is able to perform this athletic feat without touching the people riding on the elephant’s back. The fact that he finds it humorous himself makes it seem like this glimpse of Passepartout is included for a bit of humor. Because of his athletic background Passepartout can take on many roles, including one as a long-nosed acrobatic clown later in the story, and emerge smiling. He is a clown and he revels in that role. Other than people who are frightened by clowns, people who can make others laugh are generally well liked. Passepartout’s physical humor endears him to the audience and helps them enjoy the trip alongside the unmoving Fogg.

Perhaps Passepartout’s most important function is his commentary on the cultures he meets because they reinforce the idea of British superiority. Fully assuming Said’s definition of Orientalism as a way for Westerners to comment on non-Western cultures and thus reify the notion of Western superiority, Passepartout always has something to say about the cultures he encounters. While witnessing Aouda’s sati procession this conversation takes place:

Sir Francis, recognising the statue, whispered, “The goddess Kali; the goddess of love and death.”

“Of death, perhaps,” muttered back Passepartout, “but of love--that ugly old hag? Never!”

The Parsee [their guide] made a motion to keep silence. (41)

Though Sir Francis has absorbed information about local culture, he is somewhat inaccurate in his simplified explanation of who Kali is. More correctly, the *Oxford English Dictionary* describes Kali as the goddess of time and death (“Kali”). Passepartout’s comment on part of the Hindu religion is written to make the audience laugh about something foreign. By laughing at a goddess, he is demoting her in the eyes of Europeans who read the novel. Referring to Kali’s

lack of beauty, he is describing her as a degenerate feminine form incapable of invoking love. If love is supposedly a universal emotion, Passepartout's remark could be read as a critique on a depraved, backwards culture where basic emotions are warped. As these Europeans comment on Indian culture, it is interesting that their guide does not do anything more than silence them. Partially his "motion to keep silence" comes from wanting the group to remain hidden from the sati procession, but it is interesting that he does not correct or rebuke either man. The guide is not Hindu, but he is forced to listen to two Europeans mercilessly critique an Indian religion. Passepartout and Sir Francis do not consider the connection their guide may have to the religion they are commenting on. Their supposedly superior ability to comment on religion shows a disregard for the colonized Indians, and is not appreciated by the local people. His remark reinforces a hierarchy of culture of Christianity against depraved Hinduism, and the perception of Indians as a backwards people whose goddess of love looks frightening.

Sometimes Passepartout does not have a good punchline for something he encounters, so he just laughs at it, as if to point out its inferiority, reinforcing the notion that Western cultures are superior to Eastern ones. While in Hong Kong, Passepartout notes that the city seems like "Bombay, Calcutta, and Singapore, since, like them, it betrayed everywhere the evidence of English supremacy" (68). This juxtaposition of cultures denotes Passepartout's value of England. The Asiatic cities they visit seem to him to have been improved by England's presence within them. The progress of cities seems to indebt them to the imperial influence of Great Britain. In Uday Mehta's *Liberalism and Empire*, he describes James and John Stuart Mill's views of India throughout the nineteenth century and to explain their perspective, uses an analogy of an empire as "an engine that tows societies stalled in their past into contemporary time and history" (82). Passepartout's belief that the Asian cities are improved by their

connection with “English supremacy,” reflects the Mills’ argument. Rather than finding the beauty in existing structures, Passepartout praises the influence and control England maintains abroad. A while later, Passepartout learns that only the elderly people over the age of eighty are “permitted to wear yellow, which is the Imperial colour. Passepartout, without exactly knowing why, thought this very funny” (69). Though he cannot quite explain why, when Passepartout laughs at the significance of a color to Imperial China he seems to be mocking the ability for an Asian country to produce an Empire capable of competing with England’s Empire. By focusing on the old men, Passepartout seems to also be critiquing the China’s lack of powerful male leadership. The emperor is linked to the elderly, which suggests a lack of virile male rulers⁸. If China is an effeminate country, it needs England’s masculine presence in order to move forward. Passepartout’s laughter reinforces the colonial masculinity that Fogg embodies throughout the text. Working at a deeper level than simply making the audience laugh, Passepartout’s laughter works to undermine the legitimacy of an Asiatic country to rule itself without help from England. As a non-threatening character created to make readers laugh, Passepartout provides the reader with entertainment on a journey that, if Fogg had been the sole guide, could have been rather dull. Passepartout and Watson are the reason readers decide to tolerate the eccentric English gentlemen who lack the ability to relate with other humans.

Differences in Nationalities and Narrative

Although different in nationality and narrative type, Watson and Passepartout both work to support the English rationality and masculinity of the main character. Watson lives in a British detective novel that was written for a British audience. The detecting duo is the same

⁸ In *Colonial Desire*, Robert Young reinforces this notion of Eastern civilizations, citing Swiss-American polygenist Henry Hotze’s notion that races were all connected, but culture was the measure of civilization: “The Chinese civilization . . . is not a mere child, or even an adult not yet arrived at maturity; it is rather a decrepit old man” (48).

nationality as many of their readers, which makes the characters relatable. Despite differences in skills Watson and Holmes are fairly equal within the British hierarchy, which places English men as the most superior class and gender in the Empire (Spivak, “Can...” 79). This equality is evident in the way they immediately inhabit the Baker Street lodging without even getting to know each other first. Holmes reveals that he has skills that make him different from Watson intellectually, but otherwise they are both fairly rational Englishmen. In *A Study in Scarlet*, after Holmes receives a letter from Scotland Yard’s Lestrade he tells Watson, “Come on! . . . Get your hat” (Doyle 22). Having only just learned about his friend’s job working with the police on interesting crimes, Watson is puzzled that Holmes wants him along, but Holmes assures him that he wants Watson at his side. Later when Holmes is trying to lure their criminal in to Baker Street he uses Watson’s name in the advertisement without asking to do so. Holmes justifies this saying, “Excuse me for using your name. . . If I used my own, some of these dunderheads would recognize it, and want to meddle in the affair” (39-40). Holmes’ use of Watson, who is not a “dunderhead,” shows that he values Watson as a man equal to him and useful in certain instances⁹. When Holmes uses others to further a case, like Wiggins and the other children who act as his eyes and ears on the streets, he keeps his distance from them and almost seems to wash his hands of their presence once they leave. Their working relationship fits into Buchanan’s view of a companion sidekick who “presents a near-equal posture as a participant in the plot but still plays a less important role in the ultimate resolution (16). As mentioned in Chapter 1, Watson’s experiences in Afghanistan have damaged him from being the ideal master of colonial masculinity, but as a sidekick he can assist Holmes in the protection of the British Empire.

⁹ Though I do not elaborate on it here, I recognize the significant and compelling scholarship on homosocial desire between Holmes and Watson. Their relationship merits a closer look at other compelling arguments that this paper was unable to cover. In Barbara J. Black’s article, “The Pleasure of Your Company in Late-Victorian Clubland,” she associates Holmes with Englishmen who belonged to clubs, which scholars have defined as homosocial, masculine territory.

Within his role, supporting Holmes' colonial masculinity, Watson also works to inform the reader of the case details, to record the imperial message. In the nineteenth century, detective memoirs and detective fiction became popular in England. Authors thought of more bizarre or difficult plots to confuse readers, while others withheld evidence for the reader so the ending was a complete surprise. In Russell Miller's *The Adventures of Arthur Conan Doyle*, he notes that:

Doyle was to eschew such techniques and sought, with Sherlock Holmes, to create a new and unique hero figure, a scientific detective who would succeed as a result of his exceptional skills, which the reader could admire, if not always understand until the denouement. (110)

By including every detail Holmes sees, the reader is given an equal playing field with the great detective. Dr. Watson filled the gap that Doyle saw in his genre and gave readers the chance to become like the great detective by recording every visible detail about the evidence, setting, and the victim. However, for all of Watson's diligence in reporting the reader is usually still surprised by the ending that Holmes easily deduces. The fact that the reader has access to the same information Holmes does makes it seem all the more remarkable that he solves the cases. In *A Study in Scarlet*, the reader sees a ring that Holmes believes simplifies his case. It is not until the end of the story that Holmes explains to Watson the importance of that piece of evidence in figuring out the motive for the murders:

Robbery had not been the object of the murder, for nothing was taken. Was it politics, then, or was it a woman? That was the question which confronted me. I was inclined from the first to the latter supposition. . . It must have been a private wrong, and not a political one, which called for such a methodical revenge. . .

When the ring was found, however, it settled the question. Clearly the murderer had used it to remind his victim of some dead or absent woman. (Doyle 117)

The reader, like Watson and the police on the case, thought of the ring as an accident or trivial piece that did not matter to the case. Only Holmes is able to see the potential of the ring and produce a logical train of thought that accurately explains the situation. The murderer, Mr. Jefferson Hope, was avenging the death of his sweetheart many years before in the United States and used her ring to remind her murderers of the pain she suffered. Holmes understood what pieces of evidence were critical to the case and that others, such as the word “Rache” written on the wall were intended to be used as red herrings. The reader is as guilty as Watson, who Holmes chastises in “A Scandal in Bohemia,” “You see, but you do not observe” (Doyle 241). Watson allows the reader to see what he can see, but Holmes’ observation and specialized knowledge is required to fully crack the case. Watson reports information for the reader and tries to make sense of the case, but only Holmes—the emotionless protector of Empire—has the ability to solve the crime. Thus, Watson’s recording illustrates the necessity of Holmes’ skills in combating crime.

Just as Watson assists Holmes’ colonial narrative, Passepartout supports Phileas Fogg; unlike Watson, however, Passepartout is relegated to a subservient role because of his French nationality. Fogg’s story is written by a semi-omniscient narrator who tends to favor Fogg’s servant, Passepartout. Buchanan notes the “subservient role to the master,” present in some sidekick relationships (16), but does not elaborate much on this form of companion because the friendly dynamic of a relationship like that of Holmes and Watson make it a more popular choice. Verne chose to make Fogg’s sidekick a French valet who is not privy to Fogg’s secrets. He can observe, but never know for sure what his master is thinking. In addition to being paid

for a service, Passepartout is further unequal to his master because of his nationality. Verne wrote for a French audience, so it makes sense for his sidekick to be a Frenchman since part of the sidekick's job is to relate to the audience so the main character can also be accessed. Martyn Cornick analyzes how British people were depicted in French fiction in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Tensions between the two colonial powers lead to a distrust, but English colonies were more prosperous than the French ones. Cornick notes, "The industriousness and dynamism of the British were ascribed to their 'Anglo-Saxon' racial origins, and Verne echoed fears about the perceived inferiority of the 'Latin race'" (142). Simply put, Verne modeled Fogg on the views of the time that proclaimed British superiority over the French. Fogg wins because that is what Englishmen do; Passepartout is there to support him. Within the Victorian hierarchy, the English consistently considered Europeans as superior to other races and cultures. Within this distinction, England prided itself on its superior accomplishments despite the mixed Anglo-Saxon background of many English people. As Robert Young cites in *Colonial Desire*, Herbert Spencer "held up Britain, 'peopled by different divisions of the Aryan race', as an example of a society that had progressed through racial amalgamation" (17). Each country has its own personal makeup of ancient races, but many English believed England the superior example, even among other European countries. Passepartout is stereotyped as an overly emotional Frenchman who cannot hide his feelings, which is a sharp contrast to the stony Englishman Fogg. While going to catch the train to begin his journey around the world, Fogg sees a poor woman with a baby begging outside the station. With no sympathy,

Mr. Fogg took out the twenty guineas he had just won at whist, and handed them to the beggar, saying, "Here, my good woman. I'm glad that I met you;" and passed on.

Passepartout had a moist sensation about the eyes; his master's action touched his susceptible heart. (Verne 13)

Fogg, though charitable in this instance, keeps his emotional distance from the poor woman while giving her his winnings from Reform club game of whist where he made his imperial wager. He won the money by retaining his cold, emotionless reason that other players failed to replicate. Struck by the charity of his master's action, Passepartout immediately tears up. His heart is referred to as being vulnerable to emotions, as if he has a weakness for the feminine emotions that Fogg removes from himself in order to be successful in the Empire. Passepartout is unable to actually help the woman because he does not have money; his pity cannot help the woman, so Passepartout must simply watch while Fogg assists her. Fogg has money, owing to his "superior" English masculinity, which gives him a responsibility to care for the Empire. In contrast, Passepartout's emotions do not help him in imperial ventures and he must simply support the unemotional Fogg.

Despite Passepartout's inability to conform to Fogg's model of emotionless colonial masculinity, Passepartout provides valuable assistance throughout the trip to help Fogg reach his goals. Though his emotions are sometimes beyond his control, he stands by Fogg with such loyalty that the reader also supports him. In one instance, Passepartout begins to suspect the detective who is following Fogg in order to arrest him for suspected involvement with a bank robbery of being a spy from the Reform Club, sent to make sure Fogg completes what he said he would do. Passepartout proudly thinks, 'He's a spy sent to keep us in view! That isn't quite the

thing, either, to be spying Mr. Fogg, who is so honourable a man! Ah, gentlemen of the Reform, this shall cost you dear” (Verne 61). Passepartout’s loyalty against what he perceives as Englishmen who cannot take on the feat that Fogg can, makes him an ally against degenerates within Fogg’s own “superior” culture. As a French servant, Passepartout recognizes he will never be Fogg’s cultural equal, but comments on the difference between Fogg and the more emotional or less stable Englishman he associates with at the club. If the Reform gentlemen stoop to spying on Fogg, Passepartout sees it as his duty to help Fogg attain the goal he set at the club. The journey is not Passepartout’s, but he recognizes it as an imperial quest he can aide.

While not assisting Fogg, Passepartout is assisting the reader through the travel narrative, acting like the tourist the readers wish they could be, which endears him to his audience even more and serves to inspire readers to similar lives of adventure. Fogg is content to stay within his travel vessels and hardly ventures into his destinations; Passepartout, on the other hand loves exploring new places. In “The Lure of Empire: Why Frenchmen Entered the Colonial Service,” William Cohen examined why some men decided to leave their homeland for imperial ventures. Citing freedom, gaining status, and a desire to control, he also includes literature as serving to inspire readers of life in the Empire. He found that “Jules Verne stimulated curiosity in the young about far-off places” in his novels (113). Thus, the fantastic adventures Verne’s characters encounter serve a pedagogical function to the readers. Cohen’s study proves that what readers consume manifests itself in their daily lives and choices. Readers soak in the narratives and make decisions, like whether to travel abroad and find adventure, based on what they read. The influence of literary characters that advocate a life of imperial adventure in the colonies cannot be overlooked, and Passepartout and Watson contribute to national longings to colonize.

Sidekick's Pedagogical Function for Preserving the Imperial Message

The final, and most important, function of the sidekicks is that they preserve the message that Holmes and Fogg teach about colonial masculinity. Both sidekicks were constructed to best help the protagonist reach their goals as well as provide a way to convey the lessons Holmes and Fogg exemplify. The fact that both sidekicks are not perfect is crucial to audience acceptance. Buchanan argues that sidekicks are absolutely necessary with such brilliant central characters. Characters like Holmes

promote high ideals for which all human beings should strive, and they illustrate the “rewards” of following these ideals--justice, truth, success, admiration. But, few persons embody the dominant traits these hero(ine)s typify . . . The sidekick becomes a lesser model of the hero(ine), one which we can emulate more readily while still hoping we might attain the ideal. (24-25)

The accessibility of the sidekicks allows a bond that is not possible with the superhuman Holmes and Fogg. Their lessons on how to properly react to colonial threats, as mentioned in Chapter 1, would be lost if the audience did not care about the teachers. Watson, the biographer of nearly all the Sherlock Holmes stories, save two narrated by Holmes himself and two narrated in the third person, is who readers everywhere can thank for recording Holmes' prowess at solving crimes. In *A Study in Scarlet*, the reader learns that Holmes wrote about his technique, but it is not widely known. It is not until Watson asks to publish an account of the case that Holmes' powers are illuminated to the public and eagerly devoured by readers. Watson so admired Holmes' trains of thought that he exclaims, “Your merits should be publicly recognized. You should publish an account of the case. If you won't, I will for you” (Doyle 119). Holmes tells Watson to do whatever he chooses and then changes the subject, not concerned with telling his

own story. Watson feels that what Holmes has to teach is so important that it must be recorded and made available for other people to learn from. He recognizes the lessons and cultural impact they may have and urgently requests that the information be shared. Holmes does not care about actually teaching the lesson that his life sets up, so it becomes Watson's job to tell the story. Watson connects Holmes' internal logic and individual action with a social message. Holmes teaches by example, while Watson teaches by recording.

Similarly to Watson's account of Holmes' successes, Passepartout's commentary informs the reader of the lessons Fogg teaches throughout the journey. The burden of many descriptions falls on the narrator, but that does not make Passepartout any less useful. In the novel, he is invaluable to Fogg's journey because he makes sure to keep Fogg on schedule. When they learn that the railroad through India does not, in fact go all the way through India, it is Passepartout who find an elephant to convey them. Granted, Fogg hired Passepartout to assist him, so Passepartout is only doing his job and the actual procurement of the elephant fall on Fogg and his suitcase of money. Later in the United States, Passepartout saves his train from an attack by Native Americans in a way Fogg would not have been able to do. Realizing that the cars need to be detached from the engine, Passepartout:

succeeded in slipping under the car; and while the struggle continued and the balls whizzed across each other over his head, he made use of his old acrobatic experience, and with amazing agility worked his way under the cars . . . creeping from one car to another with marvellous skill, and thus gaining the forward end of the train. (Verne 121)

Passepartout successfully separates the out of control engine from the rest of the train that contained the passengers, and the Sioux are chased off by soldiers from a nearby fort. Without

his acrobatic skills, there is a possibility that no one, including Fogg, would have survived the attack. His quick thinking saved his fellow travelers from dying at the hands of a cultural other. His act is protective of the train as a symbol of Empire as well as protective of Fogg, who is the symbol of absolute British masculinity. Fogg owes Passepartout his life, but the debt is quickly repaid when he in turn rescues Passepartout and others the Sioux kidnapped.

Passepartout is often the hero for a moment, only to have Fogg finish the act or improve upon it. The trip is clearly Fogg's imperial journey and Passepartout is an asset who cannot quite complete what is expected of him. Fogg's model of colonial masculinity is impossible to attain, but Passepartout acts as an example of how working with inferior, emotion-ridden experiences can also be useful in imperial circumstances.

Passepartout gives the story closure, not by agreeing to tell the story like Watson, but rather by giving the novel its happy ending. When Fogg dejectedly returns home after believing his wager lost, he is willing to return to his quiet life and forever view his trip as a failure. It is not until Aouda proposes to him and he sends Passepartout to arrange the ceremony for the next day that his error about the International Date Line is discovered. Passepartout hurriedly explains, "You have made a mistake of one day! We arrived twenty-four hours ahead of time; but there are only ten minutes left!" (Verne 148). Practically dragging the confused Fogg out of his house and sending him to the Reform club, Passepartout ensures that Fogg reaches his destination precisely eighty days after his wager. Fogg owes his win to Aouda and Passepartout for leading to this discovery, but the win would not have happened if he had not taken the wager in the first place. Passepartout brings closure to the story that celebrates his master's strict manner. Fogg's precision down to the final minute of his arrival at the club is all the gentlemen witness. They assume that Fogg's voyage must have been similarly methodical, when in fact it

relied on many advances and setbacks that happened to even out. Passepartout is at the heart of many of the setbacks, but manages to pull through when it is of the utmost importance. Without Passepartout, Fogg's reputation would be in shambles and the strict rationality he lives by would be shaken because they had failed him. Passepartout's role in reinforcing Fogg's colonial masculinity preserves Fogg's imperial message and makes it exciting enough to inspire readers.

Watson and Passepartout observe their world and report it, either by writing or freely mentioning it in the narrative, from an Orientalist viewpoint. They are close to the reader because of their warm personalities that are lacking from their extraordinary colleagues. Buchanan notes that "All too often, the hero(ine) is a cold, distant, aloof personality with idiosyncrasies that distance the individual from the audience" (20). This foundation of trust makes the readers support the imperialistic ventures of Holmes and Fogg. The cold rationality of the main characters is appreciated when filtered through the eyes of the sidekicks. Without Watson, Holmes' stories may never have been told; without Passepartout, Fogg's circumnavigation would have been one of the most boring travel stories ever written. The interest that the sidekicks gain and maintain makes them vital in presenting Holmes' and Fogg's lessons of colonial masculinity to the public. Without the sidekicks, who would care about the heroes?

Works Cited

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. New York: Verso, 1991. Print.
- Black, Barbara J. "The Pleasure of Your Company in Late-Victorian Clubland." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 32.4 (2010): n. pag. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 23 Aug. 2012.
- Buchanan, Ron. "'Side by Side': The Role of the Sidekick." *Studies in Popular Culture* 26.1 (2003): 15-26. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 Apr. 2014.
- Butcher, William. "Introduction." Introduction. *Around the World in Eighty Days*. By Jules Verne. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. Vii-Xli. Print. Oxford World's Classics.
- Christ, Carol T., Catherine Robson, Stephen Greenblatt, and M. H. Abrams, eds. *The Victorian Age*. 8th ed. Vol. E. New York, NY: W.W. Norton &, 2006. Print. The Norton Anthology of English Literature.
- Cohen, William B. "The Lure of Empire: Why Frenchmen Entered the Colonial Service." *Journal of Contemporary History* 4.1 (1969): 103-116.
- Cornick, Martyn. "Representations Of Britain And British Colonialism In French Adventure Fiction, 1870-1914." *French Cultural Studies* 17.2 (2006): 137-154. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 28 Oct. 2013.
- "Coverture." Def. 9a. *OED Online*. 2007. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Web. 22 Apr. 2014.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43.6 (1991): 1241-299. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Apr. 2014.
- Doyle, Arthur Conan. "A Scandal in Bohemia." *Sherlock Holmes: The Complete Novels and Stories*. New York: Bantam, 1986. 239-263. Print.

- . "The Sign of Four." *Sherlock Holmes: The Complete Novels and Stories*. New York: Bantam, 1986. 123-236. Print.
- . "A Study in Scarlet." *Sherlock Holmes: The Complete Novels and Stories*. New York: Bantam, 1986. 3-120. Print.
- Edensor, Tim. *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life*. Oxford: Berg, 2002. Web. 15 Apr. 2014.
- Evans, I. O. *Jules Verne and His Work*. London: Arco Publications, 1965. Print.
- Goodman, Matthew. *Eighty Days: Nellie Bly and Elizabeth Bisland's History-making Race around the World*. New York: Ballantine, 2013. Print.
- Guinness World Records News. "Sherlock Holmes Awarded Title for Most Portrayed Literary Human Character in Film & TV." *Guinness World Records*. N.p., 14 May 2012. Web. 21 Apr. 2014.
- Hall, Catherine. "Of Gender and Empire: Reflections on the Nineteenth Century." *Gender and Empire*. By Philippa Levine. New York: Oxford UP, Incorporated, 2007. 46-76. Print. Oxford History of the British Empire.
- "Kali." Def. 1. *OED Online*. 2007. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Web. 10 Apr. 2014.
- Keep, Christopher, and Don Randall. "Addiction, Empire, and Narrative in Arthur Conan Doyle's The Sign of the Four." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 32.2 (1999): 207-21. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 18 Mar. 2014.
- Kerr, Ian J. *Engines of Change: The Railroads That Made India*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2007. Print.
- Levine, Philippa. "Introduction: Why Gender and Empire?" *Gender and Empire*. New York: Oxford UP, Incorporated, 2007. 1-13. Print. Oxford History of the British Empire.

- Mani, Lata. "Contentious Traditions: The Debate on Sati in Colonial India." *Cultural Critique*. 7 (1987): 119-156. Web. 22 Mar. 2014.
- McBratney, John. *Imperial Subjects, Imperial Space: Rudyard Kipling's Fiction of the Native-born*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2002. Print.
- Mehta, Uday Singh. "Progress, Civilization, and Consent." *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought*. Chicago: U of Chicago, 1999. 77-114. Print.
- Mill, John S. "The Subjection of Women." 1869. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt and M. H. Abrams. 8th ed. Vol. E. New York: W.W. Norton, 2006. 1060-070. Print. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*.
- Miller, Russell. *The Adventures of Arthur Conan Doyle: A Biography*. New York: Thomas Dunne, 2008. Print.
- "Passepartout." Def. 1. *OED Online*. 2007. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Web. 10 Apr. 2014.
- Reitz, Caroline. *Detecting the Nation: Fictions of Detection & Imperial Venture*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2004..
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1979. Print.
- Shapiro, Michael C. *A Primer of Modern Standard Hindi*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1994. Print.
- "Side-kick." Def. 1. *OED Online*. 2007. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Web. 10 Apr. 2014.
- Spivak, Gayatri C. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1988) *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*. Ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman. Columbia University Press: New York, 1994. 66-111. Print.

- . "History." *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*.
Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1999. 198-311. Print.
- Stashower, Daniel. *Teller of Tales: The Life of Arthur Conan Doyle*. New York: Holt, 1999.
Print.
- Stein, Burton. "The Education Debate." *A History of India*. Ed. David Arnold. 2nd ed.
Chichester, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. 254-57. Print.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the
Colonial Order of Things*. Durham: Duke UP, 1995. Print.
- Towheed, Shafquat. Introduction. *The Sign of Four*. By Arthur Conan Doyle. Peterborough,
Ont.: Broadview, 2010. 9-38. Print.
- Tuffnell, Stephen. "'Uncle Sam Is to Be Sacrificed': Anglophobia in Late Nineteenth-Century
Politics and Culture." *American Nineteenth Century History* 12.1 (2011): 77-99.
Academic Search Complete. Web. 15 Apr. 2014.
- Verne, Jules. *Around the World in 80 Days*. [United States]: Tribeca, 2012. Print.
- Waters, Karen Volland. *The Perfect Gentleman: Masculine Control in Victorian Men's Fiction,
1870-1901*. New York: P. Lang, 1997. Print.
- Wilson, Kathleen. "Empire, Gender, and Modernity in the Eighteenth Century." *Gender and
Empire*. By Philippa Levine. New York: Oxford UP, Incorporated, 2007. 14-45. Print.
Oxford History of the British Empire.
- Young, Robert. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race*. London: Routledge,
1995. Print.

Author Biography:

Naomi Eberly was born in Wooster, Ohio. She grew up on her family's farm and graduated from Northwestern High School in 2010. At Ashland University, Naomi is majoring in English with a minor in History. In addition to being a member of the Honors Program, she is a member of the English honorary society Sigma Tau Delta, and works at the campus library several hours a week.

Upon graduation, Naomi plans to work at a library before pursuing a master's degree in library science or English literature.