

# ◆ The Medical Bulletin ◆

The official newsletter/journal of Doctor Watson's Neglected Patients, a Scion Society of The Baker Street Irregulars

Series 2, Issue 18

Summer 2002

## FROM THE CHIEF SURGEON'S BLACK BAG:

I hope you enjoy this issue of the Bulletin. We owe thanks to Ron Lies for much of it. His "Jack the Ripper" article is an outgrowth of his talk last spring, one of the most delightful and enjoyable talks I've experienced in my seven years as a Patient.

Ron also retrieved Bernie Kelly's article from the Bulletin's archives for reprint. This collection of old Bulletins and Litmus Papers (from the short-lived splinter group, Saint Bartholomew's Chemical Lab) are truly a treasure trove of articles, stories, quizzes, etc. We plan to reprint more in future issues. I hope you look forward to them as I do.

Ron has been laboring on finishing a complete collection of the Bulletin, a project nearly completed by my predecessor, Dennis Hogarth.

Ron also plans an occasional column of Sherlockian oddities from the Canon. It should be a lot of fun!

To bring things up to date, I'll begin with a glance at our Fall 2001 events. We had two Seminars. On October 20,

Bill Dorn gave an excellent talk on Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's life.

Bill's lectures always have a good turnout and this was no exception.

On November 17, Joanne and Fred Bantin gave us a wonderful presentation on Sherlock Holmes radio shows. Fred included numerous audio clips from various shows, which featured different actors portraying Holmes and Watson.

Our Guy Fawkes celebration was held on Saturday, November 3, at the V.F.W. Hall. We had one of our largest gatherings for a delicious potluck supper. The evening's focus was The Hound Of The Baskervilles. We viewed the Basil Rathbone/Nigel Bruce film; then discussed it and the novel.

In December, several of us helped The Radio Historic Association of Colorado celebrate Christmas. We performed in a re-creation of the radio play, "The Christmas Bride." It was a fun evening.

Our 28<sup>th</sup> Annual Banquet was held Saturday, January 19<sup>th</sup>, 2002 at the



Sheraton Four Points Hotel. Everything went splendidly. Everyone had a wonderful time. We've already booked the Sheraton for next year, and have been promised the Ballroom. Please plan to attend.

We had an excellent guest speaker. Steve Jackson is the author of No Stone Unturned, the Story of Necrosearch, Intl. This is a forensic science investigative group. Patients Jack Swanburg and Tom Griffin are members of Necrosearch; Jack is one of the Founders. The book details a number of criminal cases that Necrosearch has been involved in solving. Some cases are still ongoing, and Steve was unable to discuss them. I highly recommend that you read No Stone Unturned if you want information on practical use of Sherlock Holmes techniques.

I must mention that I am in possession of a black eyeglass case, which was left in the banquet room. It has no name on it, but it is from Lenscrafters. Please contact me to claim it.

In our Winter Season this year, we've begun to again study the original stories. On March 9, Bill Dorn led a most enthusiastic discussion of A Study

In Scarlet. This gathering was highlighted by the return of several long unseen familiar faces and new faces as well. Welcome, or welcome back, as the case may be.

On April 20, Ron Lies and Larry Feldman led a discussion of The Sign Of Four.

Our Spring Tea was Sunday, May 19<sup>th</sup>, at the home of John and Priscilla Licht. All those in attendance had a wonderful time. A game of croquet, delicious food and conversation with wonderfully interesting people made the afternoon a success!



A brief note on our Fall 2002 schedule: we plan to discuss and study more of the stories. I've been prevailed upon to lead a discussion of The Musgrave Ritual, and Ron Lies has volunteered to conduct another gathering. We're making plans for a fun-filled Guy Fawkes event.

In January 2002, I had the opportunity to view and examine John

Stephenson's Sherlock Holmes collection. I considered myself a collector until I saw John's holdings. It is truly magnificent and John is a gracious host and guide. He has a wonderful, extensive library of books, videos and audiotapes, highlighted with statuettes, figurines, stuffed animals, cups, mugs, paintings, prints, etc. I was desperately trying to take everything in, and then John ushered me into his backroom work area. The shelves there hold hundreds of notebooks, each on a different topic, containing an incredible variety of items. John and Judy, thank you again for a truly memorable afternoon!

Traditionally, I've devoted this next portion of my column to discuss pertinent books I've acquired or noticed. I've another armload for your perusal this time.

I obtained the first book listed via the Internet and Amazon.com. The Conan Doyle Stories is a 1200-page collection of 76 of Doyle's non-Sherlock Holmes stories. An entertaining mix they are: sport, military, sea and pirate, mystery, horror, medical, adventure and ancient history. Included are Doyle's four stories of Captain Sharkey, the pirate. The 76 stories are

by no means all of his non-Holmes stories. The volume is out of print now; but I found many reasonably priced listings to choose from.

Sherlock Holmes In America, compiled by Bill Blackbeard, is a delightful book to read or just to thumb through. It is a collection of cartoons, comic strips, poems, pastiches (comic and serious), spoofs, magazine illustrations, movie and play reviews and essays. Many of the pieces would be virtually impossible to find elsewhere. The book includes all of Frederick Dorr Steele Holmes illustrations for Collier's Magazine. His cover illustrations are beautifully reproduced in full color. Among other essayists are Christopher Morley and Vincent Starrett. John Stephenson recommended this book to me and I recommend it to you. I found a copy at the public library. The book is out of print, but I've found listings on Amazon.com for used copies in good condition.

My next two selections are recently published pastiches. Sherlock Holmes and The Giant Rat of Sumatra was written by Alan Vannemann, and is an Otto Penzler book published by Carroll and Graf. The story veers off in a totally different direction from Richard

L. Boyer's similarly titled pastiche. Vannemann's book is a fast-moving, sometimes slightly far-fetched yarn, but a fun read.

Night Watch by Stephen Kendrick is a more brooding, atmospheric novel. It involves Holmes and Watson with G. K. Chesterton's Father Brown, in an investigation of a murder at a religious conference in a London church. Kendrick is also the author of Holy Clues, The Gospel According to Sherlock Holmes.

My final recommendation is The Patient's Eyes by David Pirie. Rather than a Holmes and Watson pastiche, it pairs a young Arthur Conan Doyle with Dr. Joseph Bell as investigators. The book is in some ways a follow up to PBS's "Mystery—Murder Rooms" episode.

I look forward to seeing you all at the upcoming events and board meetings. Everyone is always welcome at the meetings. You'll get a chance to see the planning that goes into our events. Two of our newest members have been enthusiastic attendees, Fred Daniels and Jerry McInerney. It's grand to see you there, fellows. Your input is invaluable.

We welcome any and all volunteer help at any time. And we're always on the lookout for new board members. So just let any of us know of your interest. Until next issue, I'm off to the scene of the crime!



#### **Medical Board members and Officers**

Chief Surgeon: Mark Langston 303-758-4091

Staff Surgeon: Denis Masel 303-778-7440

Bursar: Geraldine Malmberg 303-699-8504

Transcriber: Linda Rex 303-433-8866

Interns: Priscilla E. Licht 303-321-6269

Audrey Duman 303-940-9290

Stan Moskel 303-355-8991

Archivist: Charlene Schnelker 303-722-5336

### ***UPCOMING ACTIVITIES!!!***

#### ***Mark your calendars!***

**September 21 and October 5, 2002 at LoDo**

***Tattered Cover at 10am. Intriguing book discussions. Be sure to attend !***

**November 2, 2002 Guy Fawkes Night**

**January 18, 2003 Banquet**

## GHASTLY MURDERS !



A History of Sherlock Holmes and  
Jack The Ripper

by Ronald E. Lies

### **Acknowledgments**

I need to thank many Sherlockians who helped me in writing this article.

My thanks to John Stephenson, who generously allowed me the use of his wonderfully vast Sherlockian library and collection. He was always helpful and generous in giving me access for study time. I was able to find many almost impossible to find articles and journals. He is a good friend and valuable Sherlockian asset to Dr. Watson's as well as the rest of the Sherlockian world.

I also need to thank the charming, beautiful keeper of The Charles Ford Hanson Memorial collection, Charlene Schnelker, for Dr. Watson's Neglected Patient's society here in Denver. Her unflinching good-natured response to my requests for items from the collection is warmly appreciated.

Thanks also to Larry Feldman for loaning books and valuable advice.

Thanks are also due to Bill Dorn for his advice and patiently answering many questions on how to write this paper.

I need to thank Adrian Nebbett for letting me use information from his select bibliography, published on the Internet on the Sherlockian Net site, and his sharing of information about the Ripper. He read my paper and gave me the highest complement in saying that I rekindled his interest in the subject. Check out his excellent site, schoolandholmes, on Canonical characters in literature.

Finally if anyone knows of any other articles or stories combining Holmes and the Ripper please contact me. I am always interested in getting the most complete bibliography I can.

In the words of Sherlockian Chris Redmond, "Any connection between a literary character and a historical event does have to be speculative of course! Lots have been written suggesting there was a Holmes-Ripper connection, but it's all very speculative, since the original stories don't mention The Ripper. To a normal person that would be proof that it never happened, but Sherlock Holmes fans tend not to be normal people!"<sup>†</sup>

The Canon abounds in mysteries—not just in the 60-recorded cases solved by the Master. The some 85 or so unpublished tales with such tantalizing titles such as *The Giant Rat of Sumatra* and *The Affair of the Vatican Cameos* continue to torment the reader with their hidden enjoyment that we will never share. To me the most perplexing mystery of all is the question of why Jack The Ripper, certainly the most notorious scoundrel of the century was not mentioned in the Canon. Here was a phantom who killed with impunity, vanished without a trace, terrorized

millions, and whose activities inspired a committee of vigilance to patrol the streets, along with special police patrols and newspaper reporters following all the other patrols. Whitechapel streets must have been a crowded place; yet Jack struck and escaped with out being caught. He humiliated the official police, and brought two letters of concern from the Queen of the British Empire herself. This must have touched some cord in Sherlock Holmes. Is the lack of mention of the case due to Holmes having investigated and failed as so many others had? This hardly seems likely, since Dr. James Watson chronicles several other instances in which Holmes failed, and yet no record of The Ripper or is there a hidden mention we have not deduced? Was Holmes merely disinterested? This also seems unlikely, since such a monstrous and seemingly insolvable series of murders must have certainly attracted the attention and piqued the professional curiosity of the great detective, as well as offered an unprecedented opportunity to tweak the nose of the official police. To pass up the chance would have been singularly out of character for one who constantly sought relief from boredom and inactivity. Could it be that Holmes did successfully investigate and chose to suppress the evidence, as he did in the case of *The Abbey Grange* and others? The timing of the first book publication of *A Study in Scarlet* was perfect. In 1888 the citizens of England, with the Ripper loose, were aware of the horror of murder, as they had never been before. Conan Doyle's story of mystery and terror, the blood red word Rache on the wall, the staring face on the floor, the pursuit of a mysterious killer, was ideally calculated to appeal to the public taste. If the public could not find justice through detection from Scotland Yard in real life, they would find it in books, and

in Holmes' they did. Yet Holmes' huge popularity was still three years off.

This paper is to show the connection between Holmes and Jack The Ripper, not to solve the mystery of whom The Ripper was but what The Sherlockian world has done with these two characters, by our standards both real at least in our imaginations. What is there about the characters Holmes and Jack The Ripper that continues to draw us to them? Holmes was and is the world's first and greatest consulting detective. Jack The Ripper was not the world's first serial killer but he was the first to be brought into the public eye by the printed media at the time. The fear that was created by the supposed Ripper letters and The Ripper name that the newspapers used took the public's fear



They resulted in putting Jack into the realm of international notoriety for all time. Since Holmes and The Ripper were both in the Victorian era how could they not have come together? Jack The Ripper brought the terrifying fear and evil that destroys that sense of order that we find so pleasing in that peaceful Victorian world that only existed in our minds. We bring them together to have Holmes triumph over the Ripper. It proves to us that old adage that right will prevail, something that does not happen often enough in our present day world.

## A Few Facts in the Case/ Real Life vs. Story connections:

In 1888, five prostitutes were brutally murdered within a tiny area of the east end of London.



Murders were not that unusual amongst the population, but these five have fueled the imagination of the world. They occurred from August 31, 1888, to November 9, 1888. The number of murders attributed to Jack varies in real life from four to 13 and in fiction from the beginning of time to Star Trek and beyond. The most widely accepted number of murders today is approximately five. Though they are referred to as the Whitechapel murders and while all occurred in London, only three occurred in what was the parish of Whitechapel. The other two were in the parish of Spitalfields.

Sir Charles Warren, the Police Commissioner for metropolitan London, even brought in bloodhounds to help in the case.<sup>ii</sup> They were supposed to help in solving the murder of one of the victims. A case in the countryside had been solved using the dogs and Sir Charles was looking for anything to help catch the killer. However, this was the city and there was no creosote to follow, as in *THE SIGN OF FOUR*. Tests run by the police showed the dogs could not

follow trails through crowded streets and they had been shipped back to their owner in the country. Before the results of the tests were known, Sir Charles issued orders that at the next murder site, entry to the crime scene was to be held up until the dogs arrived. Sir Charles resigned his office on November 8. On November 9, the day the last murder, entry into the murder site was held up while the dogs that were not there were being sent for on the orders of the Police Commissioner who had just resigned. Could there be a better time to ask for help from the brothers Holmes?

An imagined connection of Holmes and Jack the Ripper could come from two actual eyewitness statements from the murders. Witness Elizabeth Long testified that on the morning of the murder of Annie Chapman, she saw a figure talking to the victim at about 5:30 a.m. She overheard him say to her, will you? She described his appearance as dark complexion, brown deerstalker hat, possibly a dark overcoat, aged over 40, somewhat taller than Chapman, a foreigner of "shabby genteel."<sup>iii</sup>

Another imagined connection comes from what Police Constable William Smith saw at about 12:30 a.m. on the morning of the murder of Elizabeth Stride. He testified he saw a figure with the victim. He described him as aged 28, clean-shaven and respectable appearance, 5 foot 7 inches, hard deerstalker hat, and dark clothes, carrying a newspaper parcel 18 x 7 inches.<sup>iv</sup> There have been ideas put forward that the parcel contained a knife, which was later, turned over to Scotland Yard and is in the famous Black Museum at New Scotland Yard. However there is no record of a weapon ever found at any of the murder sites.

Even one of the Scotland Yard investigators on the case was thinking of Holmes. Sir Robert Anderson, Assistant Commissioner in the Metropolitan Police CID and in charge of the murder investigations from 8 October 1888, was in no doubt as to the murderer's identity. Though he never names a suspect, he gives us an idea of the killers profile in his autobiography. In his autobiography he wrote:

One did not need to be a Sherlock Holmes to discover that the criminal was a sexual maniac of a virulent type; that he was living in the immediate vicinity of the scenes of the murders; and that, if he was not living absolutely alone, his people knew of his guilt, and refused to give him up to justice.<sup>v</sup>

***Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Sir Joseph Bell***



Sir Arthur Conan Doyle explained how Holmes might have solved the case. In an interview with an American journalist from the Portsmouth Evening News July 4, 1894, an article was entitled "Jack The Ripper; How Holmes would have tracked him."

He says: I am not in the least degree either a sharp or an observant man myself. I try to get inside the skin of a sharp man and see how things would strike him. I remember going to the Scotland Yard Museum and looking at the letter which was

received by the police and which was reported to have come from the Ripper. Of course it may have been a hoax, but there are reasons to think it genuine, and in any case it was well to find out who wrote it. It was written in red ink in a clerky hand. I tried to think how Holmes might have deduced the writer of that letter. The most obvious point is that someone who had been in America wrote the letter. It began "Dear Boss" and contained the phrase "Fix it up," and several others, which are not usual with the Britishers. Then we have the quality of the paper and the handwriting, which indicate that the letters were not written by a toiler. It was good paper, and a round, easy, hand. He was therefore, a man accustomed to the use of a pen. Having determined that much, we cannot avoid the inference that there must be somewhere letters which this man had written over his own name, or documents or accounts that could be readily traced to him. Oddly enough, the police did not, as far as I know, think of that and so they failed to accomplish anything. Holmes' plan would have been to reproduce the letters in facsimile and on each plate indicate briefly the peculiarities of the



handwriting. Then publish these facsimiles in the leading newspaper of Great Britain and America, and in connection with them offer a reward to anyone who could show a letter or any specimen of the same handwriting. Such a course would have enlisted millions of people as detectives in the case." In fact this was one of the methods that Sir Arthur used in the real life Edalji case but with out the sort of success Holmes might have expected.

Adrian Conan Doyle wrote Of His father Conan Doyle's own theory of who the Ripper was:

More then thirty years has passed; it is difficult to recall his views in detail on the Ripper case. However, I do remember that he considered it likely that the man had a rough knowledge of surgery and probably clothed himself as a woman to avoid undue attention by the police and to approach his victims without arousing suspicion on their part.

Dr. Joseph Bell, accepted as the model for Holmes, claimed to have solved the Crime. He revealed, in a magazine article, He and a friend with an analytical turn of mind both investigated the mystery. They sealed their conclusions in envelopes which they gave to each other and they both had the same name which was turned over to the police.

and soon afterwards, the crimes stopped - or so Bell claimed.<sup>vi</sup>

### **Canonical background details for pastiches**

According to whichever theory of chronological dating you wish to go by, Holmes was in London at the time. He was involved in *The Sign Of Four*, *The Greek Interpreter*, *The Noble Bachelor* and *The Hound of The Baskervilles*. Which ever you go with, Holmes would have been in London at the time and could not have missed being aware of this series of murders and the furor it was causing.

To quote Sherlockian Dayna Nuhn McCausland, Holmes's involvement or not in the Ripper case seems to fall into five categories:

1. Holmes was Jack the Ripper. (Some circumstantial evidence such as Holmes being in London at the time of the killings, for example: but we know what the Master thought about circumstantial evidence.) Quoting from "*The Boscombe Valley Mystery*, Circumstantial evidence is a very tricky thing; it may seem to point very straight to one thing, but if you shift your own point of view a little, you may find it pointing in an equally uncompromising manner to something entirely different."
2. Holmes solved the case but couldn't or wouldn't reveal this knowledge. (Possibly.)
3. Holmes was too busy elsewhere to get involved. (Maybe, but I doubt it.)
4. Watson was Jack the Ripper. (Surely this is grasping.)

5. Moriarty was involved somehow.<sup>vii</sup>

The Tales usually start out with a lost Watson manuscript turning up anywhere from a chicken coop in Iowa to an inheritance from a departed relative. This tale may or may not be written by Dr. Watson but it always contains the conclusion to the solution to the case cannot be revealed for one reason or another. Six of the Canonical suspects I know of are:

1. Twin brother of Dr. Watson.<sup>9</sup>
2. Sherlock Holmes himself.<sup>10</sup>
3. Inspector Athelney Jones.<sup>11</sup>
4. Dr. Watson.<sup>12</sup>
5. Professor Moriarty.<sup>13</sup>
6. Frankland from *THE HOUND OF THE BASKERVILLES*.<sup>14</sup>

I am sure, given time and imagination, more will be revealed as the Ripper.

### **Books on the Subject**

The earliest book I found was released in 1957. Edgar Smith published "The Suppressed Adventure of the Worst Man in London" in *BAKER STREET AND BEYOND TOGETHER WITH SOME TRIFLING MONOGRAPHS*. He takes us through the newspaper accounts of the murders and then offers several possible speculations, such as that the Ripper was one of Moriarty's henchmen and Moriarty became so disgusted he did away with him, or that Holmes figured out that the murderer was a sailor who killed when his ship was in port, a theory that proved useful less than a year later in "*The Five Orange Pips*." Holmes tracked him down and took matters into his own hands so that he could truthfully say that "the air in London was sweeter for his presence" from the story "*The Final Problem*."

Charles Fisher in his 1959 article, "A Challenge From Baker Street," which appeared in the book, *LEAVES FROM THE COPPER BEECHES*, took an original approach in which he presented a case for the villain being Bruce Harker from the story "*The Six Napoleons*." Harker was a minion of Moriarty, and Holmes was successful in putting a stop to the murders for two years. When they start again in 1891, Holmes again steps in and interferes with Moriarty on several occasions with his intervention. This, of course, leads to the final confrontation. At least here the chronology is correct, although it requires acceptance as Ripper victims several women who had already been eliminated in 1888. Fisher also provides an explanation for the reference to the unpublished case, "*The Problem of the Grosvenor Square Furniture Van*" mentioned in the tale of "*The Noble Bachelor*." Harker uses the van to kidnap and remove the two bloodhounds, which Sir Charles Warren had borrowed to track down the Ripper (Harker) and were mistakenly believed to have gotten lost during a trial run in London. The trial run never happened in real life. The furniture van would effectively hold the dogs and muffle their barking. (Not historically accurate but an interesting idea, I think.)

Three years later in 1962 William S. Baring Gould published his biography entitled *SHERLOCK HOLMES OF BAKER STREET*; and he did not neglect the Ripper either. In his chapter entitled Jack the Harlot Killer he has Inspector Athelney Jones brought an urgent request from Sir Melville Macnaughten asking for Holmes's assistance in the Ripper case. Dressed as a streetwalker, Holmes sets a trap for Jack and entices him to strike, but it is

Watson who saves Holmes from the Ripper and also saves the day. It seems that Dr. Watson deduced the identity of the Ripper, who turned out to be Scotland Yard Inspector Athelney Jones, follows him, and prevents him from killing Holmes. Naturally, Scotland Yard could not let it be known that one of their own was the fiend. (Again, it is an interesting theory but the story disregards the true historical facts to provide an identity to the Ripper and a Sherlockian connection.)

After the movie *A Study in Terror* was released in 1966, the writing team of Ellery Queen had a story ghost written that changed the ending from the movie, had a different killer, and added in a subplot involving Elery aiding a descendant of the supposed killer to clear her ancestor's name. The book was published as *A STUDY IN TERROR* in the United States. The story was released in Great Britain as *SHERLOCK HOLMES VERSUS JACK THE RIPPER*. (I think the book did not play fair with the readers as to allowing them to solve the mystery as with the historical facts.)

One Sherlockian scholar and devout Ripperologist of note, Michael Harrison has come up with his own suspect as to the identity of the Ripper. His book is *CLARENCE: WAS HE JACK THE RIPPER?* Mr. Harrison is given credit for being the first in discounting one of the so called royal conspiracy theories that the Ripper was Prince Edward, The Duke of Clarence, Grandson of Queen Victoria and heir to the throne after his father. Prince Edward could not have been the Ripper by tracing his movements on the nights of the murders. Mr. Harrison claims that there were 10 Ripper murders and names as his suspect J.K. Stephens, the duke's

tutor thus adding a new version to the royal conspiracy. The royal conspiracy theory has many versions. The basic idea is that The Royal Family was involved in the ripper killings and for one reason or another and covered up the identity of the killer to protect the throne of England. In his book *THE WORLD OF SHERLOCK HOLMES*, published in 1973. In chapter 5 *The Ripper and the Crown*, Mr. Harrison mentions:

"There is one small piece of evidence not only that a Ripper murder occurred before 1887 but that Holmes knew about it. There is no more record in the Holmes-Watson file than the brief mention, in "*The Adventure Of The Norwood Builder*", of the case of Bert Stevens, the terrible murderer. Now we know that Watson, not only in the interests of tact, to say nothing of the avoidance of expensive libel, but mostly because of his professional training had conditioned him to discretion, always made some alteration, great or small, in the names of the dramatis personae, in the locations of the adventures, and in even the dates involved. But Bert Stevens is so reminiscent of Jim Stephen- especially when to both may be applied the dreadful title of the Terrible Murderer- that it is difficult to resist the conclusion that Watson is referring to the man whom I have identified as one of the most dedicated and savage woman mutilators in history."



A tale that brings together Holmes as a minor character, The Ripper and Professor Moriarty is **THE RETURN OF MORIARTY**. Published in 1974. The Ripper case plays a small role in the book but in the professor's memories of the autumn of 1888 reveal that the professor unmasked and disposed of the Ripper. The story does stay true to historical facts of the case and even names one of the real suspects as the Ripper.

A second book in 1974 was **THE BOOK OF CHANGES** by R.H.Dillard. A surrealistic tale that has a Sherlockian detective's life is changed by his discovery of Holmes's involvement in the Ripper affair. (Ron's note, I tried but could not make sense of this piece).

Another story that unfortunately identifies Holmes as the Ripper is a terrible attempt by Michael Dibden in his book **THE LAST SHERLOCK HOLMES STORY** published in 1978. This tale proposes that Holmes is not only the Ripper but is Professor Moriarty also. No more needs to be said.

This next book brings in a strong candidate for the most outrageous treatment of Holmes and the Ripper. The book is **AN EAST WIND COMING** by Arthur Byson Cover in 1979. This story takes our immortal Consulting Detective and the Good Doctor ten million years in the future, where they try to stop Jack The Ripper and his antimatter knife. Eventually the Ripper is

subdued but not before the reader is forced to trudge through some of the most unreadable pornographic prose ever foisted upon Sherlockians.

In 1981 there was a book entitled **Crime Wave: World's Winning Crime Stories**, 1981, introduced by Desmond Bagley. There is a short story, **The Case of Baker Street Dozen** by Arthur Douglas, in which Holmes investigates the Ripper murders. I have not read it but would be interested in doing so if any one has a copy.

1981 also brings forward the book, **The Pandora Plague** by Lee A Matthias. Dr Watson takes Harry Houdini on a tour of the Ripper murder sites.

1982 brings the book, **DRACULA'S DIARY** by Michael Geare and Michael Corby. Dracula encounters Holmes and Watson during their Ripper investigations.

In 1984 we have two books published. The First is **THE MYCROFT MEMORANDA** by Ray Walsh. His brother Mycroft and the British Government brings Holmes into the case. This tale involves a twin brother of Dr. Watson as the Ripper. When Watson is injured and not able to assist Holmes. Lord John Ruxton from the Doyle's wonderful tale of adventure **The Lost World** is brought in to aid Holmes. The story does not follow through on its premise.

Another disappointment published in 1984, is the second effort of Robert Bloch that does combine Holmes and the Ripper. His first short story did not involve Holmes but is worth mentioning and is an excellent story entitled **YOURS TRULY JACK THE RIPPER**. It

was first published in July 1943 in the pulp magazine *Wield Tales* and since made into a number of television productions. The second effort, Bloch's book *NIGHT OF THE RIPPER*, brings in all the usual suspects with Holmes and Watson but almost every one living at that time. Oscar Wilde, The Elephant Man, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and George Shaw are all brought into the case. Sir Arthur solves the case by coming up with a deadly duo as the killer. (She strangles He stabs). The story is a bad one and seems to try to make up for it by not playing fair with the reader with clues and brings in unnecessary sadism examples from around the world into each chapter.

Inspector Lestrade is in his own story with Jack entitled *THE SUPREME ADVENTURE OF INSPECTOR LESTRADE* by M. J. Trow, (in 1985.) This was the first of a series about The Inspector. The author is quoted as saying he wrote the story because he was annoyed by the way Sir Arthur Conan Doyle treated Lestrade. I take offense at the way he treats Holmes. In these stories Lestrade's first name is Sholto (shades of SIGN.) Lestrade inadvertently solves the Ripper case while working on another. The Ripper turns out to be a different suspect then I have ever heard of being mentioned. Mr. Trow has since written a good nonfiction book on Jack The Ripper in 1997 entitled *THE MANY FACES OF JACK THE RIPPER*.

In 1988, M.J.Trow's second book *LESTRADE AND THE RIPPER* came out in Great Britain. In this tale Holmes and Watson have a parallel investigation in conflict with Lestrade. The tale brings quite a few of the real suspects and theories. Lestrade investigates the

possible return of The Ripper but fails to solve the case.

Also in 1988 was the book *DRUID'S BLOOD BY* Esther M, Friesner. Set in an alternate England, one of Holmes's contacts becomes a victim of the Ripper.

In 1990 Holmes is offered the case of the Ripper but turns it down in *GOOD NIGHT IRENE* by Carole Nelson Douglas, The Irene Adler series. A new novel in the series, *CHAPEL NOIR* by Ms. Douglas has Adler and Holmes facing the Ripper in Paris.

The next book combining Holmes and Jack The Ripper was published in 1992. The title is *THE WHITECHAPEL HORRORS* by Edward B Hanna. I have not read the book but I do know the tale involves Edward {Eddy} The Duke of Clarence, Lord Randolph Churchill and The Prince of Wales, Heir to the Throne of England as the three chief suspects. Which one is it? The story has it that on the surface Holmes and Watson do not know who the Ripper is. However, the story ends with the idea that Watson suspects that Holmes knows who it is and will not tell who it is. In Holmes's words from the story itself "There are some things it is best *not* to know, old fellow, some things it is best *not* to question".

Next in 1992, is *Anno Dracula* by Kim Newman. In an alternate time, the vampire population has increased. Dracula rules London and Holmes have been dispatched to a prison camp. It is up to Lestrade to solve the Ripper murders, and Mycroft and the Dioceses Club to destroy Dracula.

Another science fiction novel entitled *A Night in The Lonesome October* by Roger Zelazny, illustrations by Gahan Wilson, published in August 1993 has a different twist. The Ripper is the hero forced to do murder to prevent worse happening in the world. Holmes is not named but the description of The Great Detective and his companion leaves little doubt as to whom they are, however, The Great Detective plays a minor role, Abandon all touch with reality in reading this tale, The tale is narrated by The Ripper's dog Snuff. It is an entertaining tale for those with a taste for fantasy.

Holmes's sister takes on the Ripper case in *The STRANGE ADVENTURES of CHARLOTTE HOLMES* by Hillary Bailey, published in 1994.

1996 brought a book, *SUPPING with PANTHERS* by Tom Holland. A villain inspired by a reading of *A Study in Scarlet*, and a hero- a student of Dr. Joseph Bell's- who becomes more closely involved with the Ripper than he would like.

In 1997 we have the book *BLOODGUILTY* by Raymond Thor where we have Holmes and the Ripper and a virus infecting the world.

Released in 1999 there is a book titled *SHERLOCK HOLMES AND THE APOCLYPSE MURDERS* or alternate title *SHERLOCK HOLMES AND THE COPYCAT MURDERS* by Barry Day. The story has the Ripper returning to London from France where he was exiled by Holmes and Mycroft 7 years earlier because He was too high ranking a person to be put on trial.

There is a collection of tales titled *DARK AND STORMY NIGHTS* by Bradley H.

Sinor published in May of 2001. There is a tale titled *The Adventure of the Other Detective* is a fantasy tale, which Watson, and later Holmes, find himself transported to another dimension in which he died at Maiwand and Moriarty and Murray become the 221b detectives. Again this occurs after the Ripper (the Duke of Clarence this time) has been locked away and there is a plot afoot to set him free.

### ***John Lennon.***

John Lennon from the Beatles has even joined in the game. Mr. Lennon published a book of prose in 1965 entitled *A SPANIARD IN THE WORKS*, There is a story titled, "The Singular Experience of Miss Ann Duffield". There are three characters named Shamrock Wombs, My dear Whopper, and Jack The Nipple.



---

### **Articles in books on Holmes and The Ripper:**

The Problem of Sherlock Holmes & Jack The Ripper by P L Anness in the book The Life and Times of Sherlock Holmes by Philip Weller in 1992.

A brief article in The Baker Street Companion by Paul Lipari in 1992

A very brief article in The Sherlock Holmes Encyclopedia by Matthew Bunson in 1994:

### **Sherlockian periodical /Magazine pastiches**

The most ludicrous foreign story I heard of is a story of German-Spanish origin entitled "Jack El Destripador" reprinted in many publications. In the story there are 38 murders and Holmes as a result of a bet ends up solving the crimes by disguising himself as a woman wearing a steel corset to catch the killer, who turns out to be another doctor, no not Watson.

I found a wonderful article written by a distinguished Sherlockian and Ripper Scholar from Saint Louis, Joseph J. Eckrich. He has written many good articles on Both Holmes and Jack the Ripper and I recommend them highly. The following is from his article entitled "In Whitechapel with Holmes."<sup>15</sup>

---

One of the earliest articles {combining Holmes and Jack The Ripper appeared in {The Baker Street Journal} 1949, Volume 4, Number 1, Old Series. In the article "Another Bohemian Scandal", Author Page Heldenbrand stated, "That the matter was ultimately appealed to Sherlock Holmes is a foregone conclusion. In view of the sensation caused by the Ripper's activities, the utter despair of Scotland Yard and the renown enjoyed by Holmes in 1888, we can be absolutely certain that he took a hand in attempting to discourage wayward Jack's cutting up." That, in a nutshell, is the reasoning of those Sherlockians who accept Holmes's involvement in the investigation. Heldenbrand goes on to claim that the Mrs. Turner mentioned in "*The Scandal in Bohemia*" was Mrs. Hudson's cousin substituting in her absence, who a short time later became a victim of the Ripper. Dr. Watson makes no mention of Holmes's involvement because all of the victims were prostitutes and tying Martha Turner to Baker Street would involve scandal, Thus silence was dictated, particularly since Holmes failed.

The next attempt to match Holmes and Jack The Ripper appeared in the publication The Illustrious Client's Case Book published in 1953. Gordon Neitzke, in his story "Sherlock Holmes and Jack the Ripper", decides Holmes must have solved the case, since the murders suddenly stopped, but then let Jack go free. Since he would not let a stranger go free, it must have been Dr. Watson and he builds a case based on Watson's medical knowledge, his physical description, his readiness to break the law "*Charles Augustus Milverton*", and his "strong natural turn" for making

---

masks "*Charles Augustus Milverton*". Watson goes into a sanatorium for a cure which is covered up by his phony marriage to Mary Morstan, so that, at the time of "*The Blanched Solider*" Holmes is able to say, "The good Watson had at that moment deserted me for a wife, the only selfish action which I can recall in our association." "When a doctor goes wrong, he is the first of criminals" from the story "*The Speckled Band*" takes on new meaning in Fleming Christensen's article, "Who's Afraid Big Bad Jack?" in The Baker Street Journal Volume 15 Number 4, 12/1965. DR Watson is again the Ripper, and Christensen creates his own chronology to prove it. Christensen was only 17 years old at the time and so can be excused an argument that makes absolutely no sense, which is more than Joseph Eckrich can say for The Baker Street Journal for printing this unmitigated bleat. Watson is available on the appropriate nights and turns to murdering prostitutes because of disappointment in his own marriage. Mary Morstan finds out about it and, when she thinks he is about to strike again, she sends him out of town with Holmes. Finally she lets Watson know that she is aware of his deeds by calling him Jack in front of Kate Whitney, from the story "*The Man With The Twisted Lip*". If Mary had called him Jack, A variation of his own name he might think it was one of her whims and might not understand, but James made it as clear as mud. {Have you followed that?} This might be an answer to the question as to why Mary called John James but does it make sense? Finally, Mary died because she pined away for the thought that her husband was a mass-murderer.

Much has been made of the fact that Holmes had few reported cases during

---

1888 and most of them were very short, leaving time for him to alternately investigate or commit the crimes and the same holds true of Watson. However, Bruce Dettman, in his article "Who Wasn't Jack The Ripper" in The Baker Street Journal, volume 17; number 4 12/1/67, tries to bring some sanity to the discussion by trying to prove that none of the Canonical figures was a villain and argues that we should drop that line of investigation.

In mentioning and refuting the Christensen's article, He drew forth another article from Christensen in the Baker Street Journal, Volume 18; Number 2 dated 6-1968. The article entitled "Who Wasn't Turner". Some people don't know when to quit. Christensen took issue with Dettman's objections to his earlier essay, not so much because Dettman was wrong, but because "he might have questioned many other points of a more dubious quality". Some argument. It should also be noted that such attention was paid to Dettman's argument that in the same issue {BSJ 12-1967} Bruce Kennedy argued for Moriarty as the Ripper in his article "Jack in the Abyss" That was what led to the lengthy battle with Moriarty culminating at the final showdown at Reichenbach



Another variation in the June 1968 issue of the BSJ, was the article "Holmes and the Ripper" by Edward S. Lauterbach. Told in verse form, it is the story of how



---

Holmes and Watson lay in wait and killed the Ripper only to find that the Ripper was Moriarty who had also escaped from Reichenbach (never mind that the killings stopped three years before "The Adventure of The Final Problem".) It seems that Moriarty was a broken man after the fall, his mind filled with hate, which turned toward his Scottish whore mother who had mistreated him as a child and he took it out on Whitechapel prostitutes.



In an article which was originally appeared in THE LISTENER {December 16, 1965 Issue} and was reprinted in the Baker Street Journal {volume 16, Number 3 dated 9-1966}, L. W. Bailey, in "The Case of the Unmentioned Case", identifies Holmes as the Ripper. We are told in the story *The Reigate Squires* or is it *The Reigate squire*? Or is it *The Reigate Puzzle*? (This one adventure has three titles depending on which edition you pick up), that Holmes had a breakdown in 1887. And he obviously didn't allow sufficient time to recover before plunging into more work. In 1888 it manifested itself in a madness, which found an outlet in violent crime. And wasn't a man wearing a deerstalker seen prior to several of the murders? Although he made a most cunning criminal, even Holmes could not elude

---

detection forever, particularly when he dressed as himself, but what was Scotland Yard to do? They needed Holmes to solve their crimes. So they let him go but watched him so that he committed no more crimes until February 1891. The confrontation with Moriarty a few months later provided the final answer and Holmes spent the next three years in Switzerland, admitted anonymously to a clinic for a prolonged course of treatment during which he was finally cured and allowed and allowed to return to London.

I found an article published in The Baker Street Journal Volume 18, Number 3, new series, September 1968. Entitled Mr. Holmes Please Take The Stand by Jack Leavitt. It takes Mr. Holmes on trial and has him admit that He the ripper while on the stand testifying about the Calhoun case in the story "*The Five Orange Pips*".

Humor hasn't been totally absent. "The Adventure of the Grinder's Whistle" by Howard Waldrop in the magazine Chacal, Spring 1977 has Holmes solve one of the deaths by showing Lestrade how a runaway steam-powered piece of farm machinery accidentally ran over the woman in the street: all this to use the pun Jack the Reaper.

There was a one issue only magazine published in December 1977 entitled The World of Sherlock Holmes. The lead story was an unpublished Watson tale that was a takeoff of a mad killer along the lines of the Ripper called "the Mad Midwife".

The tale not only involves Holmes, Watson and Inspector Gregson but also but George Bernard Shaw, Oscar Wilde, Florence Nightingale and William Booth, the Founder of the Salvation Army. The

---

killer turns out to be a male Police Sergeant disguised as a woman when committing the crimes and then changing back to his police uniform to investigate the crimes.

The Baker Street Journal published an issue in June of 1978 entitled the Ninetieth anniversary Jack The Ripper Memorial Issue. In which the Editors comments and the first five stories are devoted to Holmes and The Ripper. The theories mentioned there in include the ideas that Jack was: 1, In the Editors comments, they bring up the idea that Holmes deduced that Jack was a maniac and could only be caught by stumbling across him when he was at work. 2, In an article entitled "I Am A Doctor Now Ha, Ha" by R.A. Faguet, The Baring-Gould theory mentioned earlier was a ruse and the Ripper is Dr. Watson. 3, The Author Andrew S. Hannah in his article "The Most Tragic Case: Sherlock Holmes and Jack The Ripper", brings up the idea that Holmes captured the Ripper who was Professor Moriarty's younger brother mentioned in the canon as a station master in the west of England. Holmes secretly turned him over to The Professor, which gave Holmes a hold over the Professor and explains why Moriarty did not try to kill Holmes earlier than The Final Problem. With his brothers death Moriarty was free to battle with Holmes in their final, climatic struggle.

4, this story titled "Mr. Sleuth- Holmes or Moriarty?" brings in the 1913 novel The Lodger by Marie Lowndes which has a killer named Mr. Sleuth. The author of this article Harold Niver takes the thought that this killer that wears an Inverness cape like Holmes and a top hat like The Professor as well as other physical descriptions and speculates

---

that the novel is real. The next article, "The Curious Incident of The Whitechapel Murders" by J. David Kiser brings forward the idea that the ripper killings occurred as the same time as the Canon cases and Watson by not mentioning the ripper is trying to conceal the fact that the killer might be Holmes. The last article is a recipe by the authors, Julia Carlson Rosenblatt and Frederic H. Sonnenschmidt, of a cookbook that takes its recipes from the Canon cases. Their idea are recipes entitled "The Elizabeth Stride Memorial Kidney Recipes", based the fact that part of a kidney was removed from this victim and possibly mailed by the real killer to the head of one of Whitechapel Vigilance committee. The recipes were misnamed, as the victim that lost a kidney was Katherine Eddowes not Liz Stride. This article is a little too weird for me.

We at Doctor Watson's in Denver had our own scholar who was published in our publication "The Medical Bulletin". The piece was entitled "Was Sherlock Holmes Wrong In The Jack The Ripper Case" and was written by the late Bernard Kelly. The article first appeared in the volume 5, number 4, December 1979 issue. It was republished in THE BEST OF THE PATIENTS 10TH YEAR ANNIVERSARY issue released in 1985. The article discusses the movie MURDER BY DEGREE and Holmes's solution from that movie. Mister Kelly discusses the crimes, suspects and his own conclusion as to who the killer was. He also made a comparison map of down town Denver and surroundings, drawn to about the same scale as a map of London's EAST End, which shows the sites of the murders. This gives those of us who are familiar with the Denver area an idea of how far apart

---

the murders were. In my opinion it is an article well worth reading and shows just how much we miss Bernie's wit and writings.

In 1980 Mad Magazine published a parody titled Shamus Holmes: The Return of the Ripper. It was included in The Mad Book Of Mysteries by Lou Silverstone and Jack Rickard.

An interesting item appeared in an article in the June 1984 issue of the Baker Street Journal. In a chronological look at the story "The Resident Patient", the author, Richard S. Warner dates the story as being in late 1888 because the story states that Dr. Trevelyn carries his medical instruments in a wicker basket instead of the usual medical bag. The author feels he does this because of the notoriety that has arisen around the bag as a possible identification of the Ripper as a doctor.

A parody in 1985 is Jack the Ripper, which was published in the collection; I'm Sorry I'll Read That Again by Graeme Garden and Bill Oddie. In 1988 the Canadian Holmes publication put out a centenary supplement with a number of articles on various aspects of the Ripper case as they might touch on Holmes. Dayna McCausland had a good article, titled "Who was Jack? Where was Sherlock?" She argued that Holmes never solved the Ripper case not because he wasn't there, and certainly not because he was personally involved, but merely because he couldn't. Holmes's specialty is explaining crimes that are committed for rational reasons, she said, a random killer, a psychopathic killer, offers him nothing to get a hold of. An interesting observation,

---

I think. Her idea presupposes that a random psychopath committed the Ripper killings and there was no hidden motive for choosing the victims that he killed. She lists some assets and deductions about Holmes and the Ripper that I feel are worth listing here:

- Holmes knew about "life criminals": "That fellow will rise from crime to crime until he does something very bad, and ends on the gallows." Quoted from "A Case of Identity".
- Holmes probably invented scene of crime interpretation.
- He had qualities of instinct, imagination and intuition.
- He understood human nature and had formed theories people's behavior.
- He was good at surveillance, had a network of contacts, and was good at setting traps.
- He had knowledge of London, including the Whitechapel area.
- His study of cryptography and footprints would probably be useful.

Add to these considerations some obvious deductions about Jack the Ripper:

- Male Caucasian, about medium height, between 30 and 40 years old, with dark hair and probably a probably a moustache (disguise?). Probably not from the lower class.
- Had studied human anatomy, though he need not have been a doctor.
- Was intelligent, with a detailed knowledge of the Whitechapel area.



Having great faith in Holmes's abilities, I'm sure he could have added to that meager description. But would that knowledge and information be enough to solve the case? How do you find one man in thousands, even if you are the world's greatest detective? It could easily prove to be an insurmountable task.

Perhaps the main proof for the theory that Holmes couldn't solve the case is that we still don't know who Jack the Ripper was. We do know, however, that Holmes laid the foundation for modern police work, quoting from the case "A Study in Scarlet", "*No man lives or has ever lived who has brought the same amount of study and natural talent to the detection of crime.*"

As we know, Holmes could look at any seemingly meaningless event and discover the hidden motive behind it if there was one to be found. So had there been a conspiracy Holmes would have found it. The next story "Holmes's secret case against the Ripper" Charles Meyer not only involves Holmes, Moriarty and Moran but also the mysterious Porlok from The tale "The Valley of Fear". Porlok turns out to be a real victim of the ripper, Mary Jane Kelly. The story offers an explanation for the real life brutality of Kelly's death as well as the fact that Kelly's death being in doors as verses the others out doors. So that Moriarty would have the privacy and the time to punish his mistress for betraying him as well as set an example for others in his

---

organization as to their fate if they would betray him.

Two other articles deal with Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's reasons for not publishing A Holmes and Ripper tale. Quoting from the Article "Why it never was the 61<sup>st</sup> adventure" by Barbara Alder; "Evan had Doyle written of an encounter between Holmes and the Ripper, and had been able to get it into print, He might have had a great deal of trouble with the ending. Not in deducing the murderer --- there were any number of suspects, from sailors to doctors to doctors to members of the royal family. The problem would have been in avoiding a libel suit once the killer was named. Now, a century later, it is possible to bandy about names with impunity. However, it was a great deal riskier in 1888. One overly zealous newspaper named a Polish immigrant as the Ripper, and became rather nervous when he proved to have a solid alibi; Remarkably it got off with only 50 pounds in libel costs to settle the case out of court. Perhaps, however, Saucy Jack, {another name for the Ripper} did influence at least one of the adventures of Holmes. In 1893, when Sir Arthur Conan Doyle wrote the Cardboard Box, the story was considered not "healthful" enough for family reading, and was dropped from the book publication of THE MEMOIRS OF SHERLOCK HOLMES. Along with the sexual infidelity the tale discussed the gruesome box sent to Susan Cushing containing two severed human ears. Perhaps Doyle was remembering a letter, which was received by the Central News Agency in London on September 25<sup>th</sup>, 1888. The letter was thought to have come from the Ripper. It read thus:

Dear Boss,

I keep on hearing on hearing the police have caught me, but they won't fix me just yet. I have laughed when they look so clever and talk about being on the right track. . . . I am down on whores and I shant quit ripping them till I do get buckled. Grand work the last job was. I gave the lady no time to squeal. How can they catch me now? I love my work and want to start again. . . . I saved some of the proper red stuff in a ginger beer bottle over the last job to write with but it went thick like glue and I can't use it. Red ink is fit enough I hope ha ha. The next job I shall clip the lady's ear off and send it to the police officers just for jolly wouldn't you.



The other article "Didn't author's eye fall on the case?" by Phillip K Wilson of Wichita Kansas {My home town} One of the coroners who held the inquests put forward the idea that the slayings were not preformed in a meaningless manner, but rather were done by "someone with considerable anatomical skill and knowledge". Although later downplayed, this observation initially provided the supportive, yet circumstantial, evidence used in naming several physicians as murder suspects. As a physician, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle must have carefully scrutinized the case reports when members of his own profession were accused of murder. There was at the time of the Ripper murders a theory that

the last thing a murder victim saw was fixed on the retina of the victim's eye. In the murder of Mary Jane Kelly, which occurred in side in a room, the victim was the most savagely mutilated. A report published in the *Illustrated Police News* at the time of the Kelly murder stated there were pictures taken the room, the victim, and specifically the victim's eyes. Though it is clear that Conan Doyle's interest in photography and future plans for ophthalmology were founded by 1888, though a letter to one of his sisters about his plans to study that subject further, it remains puzzling to me and other Sherlockians that Conan Doyle did not take a more active role in unraveling the Ripper case. Perhaps he was aware of the experience L. Forbes Winslow, a fellow British doctor, medical theorist and medical detective, who after announcing his views on the Ripper investigation, was scoffed at and denounced as a nuisance by Scotland Yard. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle may not have pursued an investigation into the case for similar reasons. But there seems to be enough evidence that the details and foibles of the Ripper investigation did not completely escape his notice and arouse some interest.

The other articles consist of a review of the two Ripper films, *A STUDY IN TERROR* (1960) and *MURDER BY DEGREE* (1979) by Dayna Nuhn McCausland. She felt that a study in Terror took too many licenses with the facts. *Murder by Degree* was a more accurate portrayal of the facts and a good presentation of a theory that seemed to, at that time to be close to the truth. The theory has been since shown to have too many holes to be believed. There is also an entertaining piece entitled "Mockbeth" By Watson and is written by Robert f. Fleissner,

---

which combines Holmes, Watson, Inspector Gregson and Shakespeare's Three witches from Macbeth. Who with their "bubble, bubble, toil and trouble" create their brand of witchcraft for Holmes and Watson. There is also well done but now dated bibliography of Ripper books by the noted Sherlockian and Ripper expert Joseph J. Eckrich from St. Louis. To end the issue, the editors brought up the Canadian candidate for the Ripper, Dr. Thomas Cream who supposed to have said as he was being hung I am Jack the--- but did not finish as the trap door opened out from under him and he was sent on his way. He was hung on November 15, 1892 after being arrested for murdering prostitutes. His weapon was the poison strychnine: his weakness was his ego, which lead him to drop larger and larger hints to his identity until he was arrested in June of 1892. Unfortunately there is a good reason why Dr. Cream could not be the ripper. The Ripper murders at generally believed to have occurred in 1888. Dr. Cream was serving a prison term in Joliet Illinois from 1888 until July 1891 for the murder of his lover's husband and did not arrive in England until October 1891, So much for Dr. Cream.

The Baker Street Miscellanea published an issue in autumn 1988 for the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Jack The Ripper murders with 4 articles on the subject. The first article was titled "A Scarlet Study" by Kevin I. Jones in which he did not try to identify a Canonical character as the Ripper, but merely attempted to demonstrate that Holmes investigated and solved the crimes. He maintained that the stories "The Scandal in Bohemia and The Man with the Twisted lip" were totally fictitious and actually

---

covers Holmes's investigation of the Ripper murders. In Scandal, it is the Prince of Wales who comes disguised to consult Holmes about the fate of his son, Albert Victor Edward, the cause of the murders. He then gives a rehash of the Stephen Knight conspiracy with Dr. Gull, Physician to the Queen, as the chief among a group of Freemason murderers. Along the way, Montague James Druitt, a real life potential Ripper, is identified as a scapegoat and murdered. The story "The Man with the Twisted Lip" is actually an investigation of Druitt's death and the name "James" is a slip of Watson's pen which refers to Druitt's middle name. Mary Jane, the sloppy maid of the Watson's from the story "A Scandal in Bohemia" is really the real life victim of the Ripper, Mary Jeanette Kelly, to whom Watson gives temporary refuge at the request of Holmes. Mary Watson dismissed her and she was sent to meet her fate at the hands of the ripper. Holmes knew that Gull was the ripper but did not make it public because to do so would have endangered his and Watson's lives and caused a major political crisis. WHEW! If you got all this theory could you please explain it to me?

Another tale in the issue is by Lenny Picker entitled "Jack the Ripper Unmasked [Again]". He begins by stating, "By my best scientific estimate, at latest count only twelve of the hundreds of men, women, and children who are mentioned in the Canon have not yet been identified with that most infamous of serial murderers, Jack the Ripper. With the publication of this essay, the ranks of the unsuspected will narrow to eleven." The Author then goes on to identify The Character Frankland the crank from the story THE HOUND OF THE BASKERVILLES as the Ripper

---

but offers no proof. The rest of the issues stories are interesting and one of them brings in, as a strong candidate for the most outrageous treatment is the book AN EAST WIND COMING by Arthur Byson Cover in 1979.

Quoting from Paul Herbert's article, Sherlock Holmes's Ripping & Yarns, One story takes our immortal Consulting Detective and the Good Doctor ten million years in the future, where they try to stop Jack The Ripper and his antimatter knife. Eventually the Ripper is subdued but not before the reader is forced to trudge through some of the most unreadable and pornographic prose ever foisted upon Sherlockians. Another tale that takes place in a different time period is the short story "Sherlock Holmes Meet Jack the Ripper or pardon me, but your knife is in My Throat" by Howard Diehl from the Journal, THE THREE PIPE PROBLEM, Issue #2 October 1971. Two friends, one a present-day enthusiast of Holmes, the other an admirer of Solar Pons, go back to 1888 in a time machine to see how Holmes handles the Ripper investigation. They later return to the 1970s convinced that Holmes has failed, until one of those ubiquitous long-lost letters surfaces among the papers of a Watson descendant, in particular missive Holmes informing Watson that he knows the killer's name but will never divulge it because of political implications.

The next connection is an article that appeared in the journal "WHEELWRIGHTTINGS" in September of 1988 published by the society The Midwest Scion of the Four located in St. Louis Missouri. The article entitled "John Clayton's Secret" brings up The

---

Stephen Knight theory again and proves that John Clayton from the story "A Study in Scarlet" was one of the conspirators, the coach driver of the killers.

The publication "THE WHEELWRIGHTINGS" in September 1989 had an article by Charles E, Neblok with the title "Whatever happened to Jack the Ripper". Mr. Neblock names Sir Arthur Conan Doyle as the Ripper. *I am relating Mr. Neblock's outrageous theory, not because I give any credence to it but because I admire the way he put his case together, even when based on so called facts that can and should be disputed.*

Mr. Neblock states, before we attempt to answer the question of whether or not Holmes actively investigated the Ripper murders, we must determine if he had time available to conduct inquiries during this period. Using Baring-Gould's chronology for the year 1888, he found Holmes engaged in three cases, Then there appears a long hiatus from recorded cases until the case *The Copper Beeches* starts on April 5, 1889. "This period of time encompasses the final ripper killing and the subsequent disappearance of Springheel Jack. Holmes may have very well found the killer and ended his depredations during this time. If successful, why was the result of the investigation suppressed? A clue may exist in *The Thor Bridge Mystery* in which Watson tells us: "Apart from those unfathomed cases, there are some which would mean consternation in many exalted quarters if it were thought possible it might find its way into print."

---

This could lead one to believe that the theory that the Duke of Clarence was the Ripper and Holmes found out and was covering for the Royal Family, however, this theory, is disproved by the evidence of Duke Eddy's social calendar, which placed him in plain sight of hundreds of witnesses, when the Ripper murders were committed. What have we left then, in the way of explanation for the apparently inexplicable behavior of Holmes in not solving and revealing who the Ripper was? Clearly, We must follow Holmes's own dictum: Having eliminated the impossible we must accept what is left, however improbable. (Ron's note, This is not an exact quote by Mr. Neblock, I have found 5 versions, if interested Where please contact me). The known indisputable facts are:

1. The Ripper displayed at least some medical knowledge and a degree of surgical skill. He was possibly an unsuccessful and embittered medical practitioner.
2. The Killer possessed considerable talent and intelligence, but was mentally unstable-likely a sexual psychopath, possibly with inherited tendencies.
3. The killer possessed an utter contempt for the intelligence of the police in general and the Metropolitan Force (Scotland Yard) in particular.
4. Several students of Ripperology have suggested that the Ripper was in fact a social reformer, so affected by the wretched condition of the very poor in Victorian London that he was willing to go to any lengths, even brutal murder, to bring their plight to the attention of the public.

5. The killer must have been intimately familiar with the byways of the East End, as evidenced by his ability to accurately pick spots in which his crimes could be committed without interruption and from which he could so quickly disappear.
6. Dr. Joseph Bell claimed that he and his friend, possessed of an equally analytic turn of mind, investigated the killings and independently arrived at a single name. Hence, the killer was someone known to Bell.

It is now reasonable to ask if any member of Holmes's coterie and whom he might wish to shield fits the facts presented. The conclusion, like the Ripper's knife, leaps out of the darkness, sharp and glittering. A single individual stands out, filling the pattern like a glove:

1. He was a failed medico, unsuccessful in the field, frequently changing practices.
2. He had a high order of intelligence and came from a talented but mentally unstable family of artists. His father was an alcoholic, manic-depressive who spent his last days in an asylum. One of his foremost biographers noted that he equated sex and death in his mind. We reminded that art in the blood takes strange forms.
3. His writings proclaim his contempt for the regular police.
4. He was interested in social reform and justice for the



---

individual and spent much of his life attempting to single-handedly right judicial injustices.

5. He prided himself on as intimate a knowledge of the byways of London as Holmes himself.
6. He greatly admired, and was a former student of, Dr. Joseph Bell.

Who better fits the pattern, and whose guilt is Holmes more likely to conceal than—the Literary Agent himself? We can visualize the final confrontation between Holmes and the Ripper, but can only wonder at what explanations and assurances were given that Holmes to believe once again into the concealing mists of Whitechapel to be seen no more. Still, when the yellow tendrils of fog swirl round the Lambeth stairs and creep into the city, the heart skips a beat and the throat closes as the vision of Red Jack emerges to once again terrorize the pitiable drabs of London, and assault the conscience of the nation.”

In 1996, The publication *The Sherlock Holmes Review*, Volume V, Number One There is an article titled “The truth about Sherlock Holmes & Jack the Ripper”. The author is Steven T. Doyle, BSI. He connects a real life unfortunate resident of Whitechapel and Holmes with a family tie and further connects the theory with a historical reference that I enjoyed reading.

“Oswald Puckridge, a resident of the Whitechapel district, a chemist was reported to be mentally ill and was admitted to an asylum on January 6,

---

1888 and discharged as relieved but not cured on August 4, less than a month before the Ripper murders began. There is evidence that Holmes was involved in clearing Oswald Puckridge off the police list of suspects. Oswald Puckridge was born to John and Philadelphia Puckridge on June 13 1838 at Burpham, near Arundel, in Sussex. Oswald’s mother’s name was Holmes. Can there be any doubt that Holmes was some how related to the Holmes family in Sussex and thus to Oswald Puckridge? (Ron’s note: Many Sherlockian scholars accept the birthplace of Holmes as Sussex.) This could incidentally explain Holmes reticence in discussing his family. What then is the evidence that Holmes was active in exonerating Puckridge? Eyewitness accounts relating to the murder of Annie Chapman, the second victim, the second victim, place a man described as wearing a “brown deerstalker hat” in the company of the victim sometime prior to the murder being committed. Was this the Ripper? Or was this Holmes on the case? [Ron’s note: There was another sighting of a man wearing a deerstalker, refer to page 3 of this paper]

I believe it was Holmes. In all subsequent reports of potential Ripper sightings, eyewitnesses reported the suspect as wearing a black peaked cap like a Greek sailor’s. It fits with the facts early in the case, when his unfortunate relative Oswald Puckridge was under suspicion; Holmes undertook some action to clear Puckridge’s name. So, Puckridge is suspected, Holmes investigates, a man in a deerstalker is spotted, Puckridge quickly passes from suspicion, and the Deerstalker wearing man is seen no more. Finally, is there any further evidence to support the theory that Oswald

---

Puckridge is related to Holmes? Lets remember that Oswald Puckridge was admitted to Hoxton House Lunatic Asylum on January 6, 1888. Does this date ring a bell? The very next day, January 7, 1888, is, according to William S Baring-Gould, The date of the beginning of the Adventure, THE VALLEY OF FEAR.

Based upon Holmes rather cranky disposition that morning, it has been deduced that Holmes was suffering a January 6 birthday party. Now we can say with confidence that it was not a birthday party hangover Holmes was suffering from. Rather, it was depression over the knowledge that one of his few relatives had been committed to the lunatic asylum the previous day. Perhaps Holmes himself was in attendance, and found it upsetting enough to ruin his night's sleep. Thus we understand when he asks Watson the next night at Birlstone Manor, "I say Watson, would you be afraid to sleep in the same room as a lunatic, a man with the softening of the brain, an idiot whose mind has lost its grip?" Obviously poor Puckridge was on the Great Detective's mind. This is the only Holmes/Jack the Ripper theory, based on true, documented, evidence that explains Holmes role in the case, what the motivations were, and which fits with the Canon. It would force us to reconsider January 6<sup>th</sup> as the birthday of Holmes". I think this theory is inventive but lacks proof.

In 2000 is Bloodline by Jill Jones. A series of Ripper-like murders begins after a Sherlockian conference on Holmes and Watson.



The first E mail paper on Holmes and the Ripper I received is titled A Scandal in Whitechapel or The Adventure of The Three Kings, being an investigation into the connections between A Scandal in Bohemia and the Jack the Ripper case. This theory, Written in 2000 by Sherlockian Andrian Nebbett. He has done massive research into the case and the Holmes connection. The paper is to be published in The Baker Street Journal at a later date. The theory proposed is about the identity of the visitor to 221b. and is quite intriguing. Mr. Nebbett is currently teaching in Malaysia, proof that Holmes is worldwide.

### ***Movies/Plays/Television/Radio***

In 1966 there came a movie entitled A STUDY IN TERROR. It pitted Holmes against Jack The Ripper. Quoting from an article in FILMFAX Magazine an article entitled "Jack The Ripper, His Life and Crimes in Popular Entertainment" by Gary Coville and Patrick Lucanio, "The movie was the first to use the actual names of the victims although glamour and provocative sexuality replaced the actual plain desperate situations of the victims." It does not stay true to the historical facts. The story and screenplay were edited by Donald and Derek Fork, but many sources at the time asserted that their script was adapted from an original treatment entitled Fog-which was the films production title -written by Adrian Conan Doyle, one of the sons of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. This claim may be true since the movie was partially financed by Doyle estate through its film division, Sir Nigel Films Ltd. Moreover

---

the script is abundant with Canonical touches such as Holmes declaration that he is a "consulting detective" and his use of Baritsu, an oriental art of self defense, both of which appeared first in the original stories. The ending has Holmes keeping the secret of Jack The Ripper as privileged information shared only by himself and Dr. Watson to prevent another scandal. Capitalizing on both the James Bond film's popularity and the Batman television craze Columbia films denigrated the films dignity as well as John Neville's fine performance as Holmes by describing the character in its promotional material as "James Bond in a cape; Batman with brains and The worlds first secret agent." The movie also had a soundtrack that sounds like it came from the Batman television series. The film does not follow historical accuracy but it deserved better from its producers.

Robert Bloch's third effort involves The Ripper but not Holmes unless you consider Mr. Spock from The original 1960 Star Trek television series as a Sherlock Holmes in the future. Mr. Bloch wrote the episode was entitled Wolf in the Fold which was shown on December 22, 1967. Although this episode does not mention Holmes, one Sherlockian has used it to combine all the elements in his treatment of our subject. Brian Garnet wrote a tale entitled Return of the Wolf. The story has the evil spirit in the original episode Rejack, the hunger that does not die, that has had many names such as Jack and has followed the advance of civilization throughout history and out into space combined with Mr. Spock. Captain Kirk and the Enterprise ship and crew with Holmes and Dr. Watson in Victorian England and back out into space. The Ripper may continue to

---

plague civilization but hopefully there will always be an England as well as a Holmes or a Spock, following in the footsteps of the Master to stop him. The story was published in a journal called the Holmesian Federation and combines Star Trek and Holmes. I have a copy of the story but not the date it was published. (If any one reading this has any information on this group I would appreciate hearing from you)

Holmes turned down investigating the Ripper in the movie *The PRIVATE LIFE of SHERLOCK HOLMES*, released in 1970 but the scene was cut from the version released In the theaters. Sherlockians Michael and Mollie Hardwick wrote the screen play adapted to a paperback edition.

"The Whitechapel Murders; A Tale of Sheerluck Holmes and Dr. Witsend" was another 1977 light-hearted piece, appearing in the *Morecambe and Wise Special*, was A British television special starring the two British comedy stars. A steady diet of puns is the main fare in this short parody that makes use of the Ripper speculations involving the Duke of Clarence.

*The end...or is it??*



<sup>viii</sup> A private communication with noted Sherlockian scholar and friend, Chris Redmond.  
<sup>viii</sup> Philip Sugdon *The Complete History of Jack the Ripper* (Carroll&Graf 1994) pp 292-296.

- 
- <sup>viii</sup> Maxim Jakubowski and Nathan Bond Editors  
The Mammoth Book of Jack the Ripper  
(Carroll&Graf New York 1999) pp 61-2.
- <sup>viii</sup> Donald Rumbelow Jack The Ripper the  
Complete Casebook (Contemporary Books  
Chicago 1988) page79
- <sup>viii</sup> Jakubowski, page 96
- <sup>viii</sup> Rumbelow, pp 239-40. From Tit bits Magazine  
article October 24, 1911
- <sup>viii</sup> Dayna Nuhn McCausland, Canadian Holmes,  
page 7.
- <sup>9</sup> Ray Walsh, The Mycroft Memoranda
- <sup>10</sup> Michael Dibden The Last Sherlock Holmes  
Story [published in 1978 in Great Britain and  
The United States in 1979.]
- <sup>11</sup> William S. Baring-Gould, Sherlock Holmes Of  
Baker Street Chapter 15
- <sup>12</sup> The Baker Street Journal, Volume 15, number  
4, December 1965, article entitled. "Who's Afraid  
of Big Bad Jack" by Flemming Christensen
- <sup>13</sup> The Canadian Holmes, The magazine of the  
Bootmakers of Toronto, volume 12 Number 1,  
Micaelmas (autumn) 1988. Article entitled  
Holmes's Secret Case against the Ripper by  
Charles Meyer. This one involves not only the  
Professor as the brains behind the Ripper but  
also Colonel Moran and the mysterious Porlok of  
*THE VALLEY OF FEAR*.
- <sup>14</sup> Baker Street Miscellanea, no.55 autumn 1988,  
Article entitled "Jack the Ripper Unmasked  
(Again)" by Lenny Picker. Almost The whole  
issue is devoted to The Ripper.