

**THE UNIVERSITY OF DANANG
UNIVERSITY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDIES**

-----***-----



TRẦN THỊ KIM ÁNH

**AN INVESTIGATION INTO EXPRESSION OF
ARGUMENT IN SHERLOCK HOLMES
STORIES**

**Major: ENGLISH LINGUISTICS
Code: 822.02.01**

**MASTER THESIS IN
LINGUISTICS AND CULTURAL STUDIES OF
FOREIGN COUNTRIES
(A SUMMARY)**

Da Nang, 2019

This thesis has been completed at University of Foreign Language Studies, The University of Da Nang

SUPERVISOR: NGŨ THIÊN HÙNG, Ph.D

Examiner 1: Trần Bá Tiến, Ph.D

Examiner 2: Nguyễn Thị Thu Hương, Ph.D

The thesis was orally defended at the Examining Committee

Time: 06 Jan, 2020

Venue: University of Foreign Language Studies

-The University of Da Nang

This thesis is available for the purpose of reference at:

- *Library of University of Foreign Language Studies, The University of Da Nang.*
- *The Center for Learning Information Resource and Communication, The University of Da Nang.*

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. RATIONALE

As humans, we have the ability to process thought both logical and illogical. We are the only animal that interprets information with conscious thought, formulating meaning, ideas, concepts, models and theories to explain, predict, control, and sift through information to discern relevance. We also have the mental capacity to negate, contradict, deceive, misconceive, distort, stereotype, form prejudices and narrow-minded perceptions. Moreover, the world that is changing rapidly and every person, organizer and investigator need to understand and develop is critical thinking.

Critical thinking is the analysis of an issue or situation and the facts, data or evidence related to it. Ideally, critical thinking is to be done objectively—meaning without influence from personal feelings, opinions or biases—and it focuses solely on factual information.

Thinking critically is related to objectively analyze and evaluate complex subjects and situations which can be identified as argument in persuading people by speaker’s knowledge and ability.

When it comes to using our thinking, we all want to learn how to think like Sherlock Holmes. This isn’t just a way of solving a crime. It’s a way of critical thinking. One of the most important ways to facilitate critical thinking is argument.

“How on earth did you know that I have been in Afghanistan?” This is a question that Dr. Watson asked in astonishment when Mr. Sherlock Holmes perceived in the first

meeting. After living time in the same house, Dr. Watson was penetrated by Sherlock Holmes's logical answer "Nothing of the sort. I knew you came from Afghanistan. From long habit the train of thoughts ran so swiftly through my mind that I arrived at the conclusion without being conscious of intermediate steps. There were such steps, however. The train of reasoning ran, 'Here is a gentleman of a medical type, but with the air of a military man. Clearly an army doctor, then. He has just come from the tropics, for his face is dark, and that is not the natural tint of his skin, for his wrists are fair. He has undergone hardship and sickness, as his haggard face says clearly. His left arm has been injured. He holds it in a stiff and unnatural manner. Where in the tropics could an English army doctor have seen much hardship and got his arm wounded? Clearly in Afghanistan. The whole train of thought did not occupy a second. I then remarked that you came from Afghanistan, and you were astonished.'" That is an excellent answer! That is just a petty argument in a complex argument chain in *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* by critical thinking.

Dr. Watson's query was cleared by Mr. Sherlock Holmes's logical argument. And our query "How can argument be used in *Sherlock Holmes*?" and "How his argument can be linguistically realized?" These questions should be answered for a better understanding of the argument expression used in *Sherlock Holmes*.

So far, little has been written about language features in *Sherlock Holmes* concerning the argument aspect in their discourse. Logistically, the information, in fact, is narrowed in the scope of that available information until the premise is the only logical conclusion remaining; there is a suspect in mind based on previously available

information that is not necessarily related to the case, and then the evidence is sought out to prove the guilt of that suspect. It's been proven over time to be a useful tool in crime-solving and law enforcement. This is the kind of logic, in fact, many of the police in the Sherlock Holmes stories (and our modern world) use, but it sure doesn't seem like the Sherlock method. That is one of extraordinary feature in Sherlock Holmes that is the language in argument. Accordingly, it is should take into consideration the argument expression in language aspects in the discourse.

For the aforementioned reasons, I decided to conduct a study entitled: **“An investigation into expression of argument in Sherlock Holmes stories”**. Through the research, it is hoped that language learners will able to comprehend and apply the patterns of argument in using language effectively in persuading others in real life.

1.2. AIMS AND OBJECTIVE

1.2.1. Aims

This study aims to examine the language used for argument patterns in Sherlock Holmes to provide language learners with practical knowledge in using language effectively with persuasive arguments and decision making.

1.2.2. Objectives

To achieve the aim of the study, the following objectives are intended

1. To examine the argument patterns used in Sherlock Holmes
2. To examine the linguistic aspects of argument used in Sherlock Holmes in term of syntactic and pragmatic features

1.3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

To fulfill the objectives mentioned above the study seeks the information for the following questions

1. What are the argument patterns identified in Sherlock Holmes stories?
2. What are the syntactic features of arguments in Sherlock Holmes?
3. What are the pragmatic features of arguments in Sherlock Holmes?

1.4. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

In the scope of this study I focused on examination of the argument patterns used in Sherlock Holmes with specialized words and structures that signal premise and conclusion, the syntactic features of argument in Sherlock Holmes like interrogative, declarative and imperative in premises and conclusions, and the pragmatic aspects of argument such as illocutionary force and implicatures of argument.

Though, this study may fall within the scope of discourse analysis in stylistics that was not dealt with. The reason for this delimitation is due to the data of this study was focally collected from Mr. Watson's storytelling, and the time limitation is one of the objective reasons, which is the limitation of the study.

1.5. JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

The findings of this study are expected to facilitate better understanding of the language in argument patterns. It is presumed that getting insight into how argument patterns used in Sherlock Holmes with specialized words and structures will help to enhance the learner's ability in identifying strong and weak arguments as well

as producing valid and cogent arguments used by the characters in stories. Additionally, the findings are supposed to be a useful source of language learners in applying argument with benefits in persuading others in real life.

1.6. ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY

This study consists of 5 main chapters as follows:

- **Chapter one** includes the rationale, the aims and objectives, the research questions, the significance and scope of the study and organization of the study.

- **Chapter two** consists of two parts. The first one is a review of previous study related to the thesis and the second is theoretical background related to issues to be investigated in the study

- **Chapter three** describes research methodology and procedures of collecting and analyzing data

- **Chapter four** deals with studying the argument values and linguistic aspects of argument patterns used in Sherlock Holmes

- **Chapter five** gives a summary and the findings and conclusion drawn from the study as well as proposes the implications for language learners in persuading others in real life. Finally, some suggestions for further research are put forward.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Theories of argument have been studied, developed and contributed much by many linguistic researchers: Mei and Allison (2005), Andrews (2007), Durkin (2008), Olga, Chrysanne & Allen (2015).

Regarding to Sherlock Holmes's reasoning, there are some studies: Uchii (1988), Didierjean & Gobet (2010), Redgate (2018).

Available literature reveals that a lot of pieces of research have been done on critical thinking aspects of Sherlock Holmes. However, the existing studies have not mentioned aspects of language used for argument patterns. Motivated by the scanty working in this area and the need to fill the existing vacuum in the literature, the study, therefore, sets out to analyze how the argument values and the linguistic aspects of argument patterns used in Sherlock Holmes with specialized words and structures that signal premise and conclusion.

2.2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.2.1 Definition of critical thinking

2.2.2. Concepts of the argument

2.2.3. Sentence types.

2.2.4. Speech act Theory

2.3. SUMMARY

In summary, this chapter has reviewed the previous studies relating to this study. It has presented a literature review of the theory of the argument in definition, conclusion and premise

indicators, and argument patterns: chain and modus ponens which has been built by Bassham, Irwin, Nardone&Wallace (2011). Also, it has showed in views of syntactic theory in declarative, interrogative, imperative and subjunctive of Aarts (2001); the theory speech act by Searle (1975). All these theories serve as background of the study and the foundation for analysis in the following chapters.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODS

3.1. RESEARCH METHOD

As guided by the research questions that have been stated in chapter One, the study adopted a descriptive method with the combination of both qualitative and quantitative manner of collecting and analyzing data. Quantitative approach is vital for a descriptive study, finding different kinds and linguistic features of argument patterns concerning premises and conclusions in Sherlock Holmes stories. The qualitative technique including descriptive analysis in seeking and identifying argument patterns concerning premises and conclusions in Sherlock Holmes stories is a crucial part in this process, which greatly supports the explaining and exemplifying argument patterns. These methods were used to generate a concrete description of the patterns of argument.

3.2. DATA COLLECTION

3.2.1 Sampling of the study

3.2.2. Population of the study

3.3. DATA ANALYSIS

The data were analyzed to produce both quantitative and qualitative information in relation to these facets in a research of argument patterns.

The study sought the qualitative information regarding these aspects in the research questions:

- Examining argument patterns in Sherlock Holmes stories in finding the kinds of premises and conclusion and how they are combined to shape the arguments.

- Analyzing the syntactic features of argument in Sherlock Holmes into declaratives, imperatives, interrogatives and subjunctives of premises and conclusion, also the pragmatic features in terms of illocutionary force and implicatures of argument.

3.4. CODING

3.5. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. THE PATTERNS OF ARGUMENT USED IN SHERLOCK HOLMES

This section shows how the argument pattern is established and how the patterns of argument used in Sherlock Holmes are. There are 3 kinds of arguments used in Sherlock Holmes stories: arguments with independent; dependent premises and mixed of independent and dependent premises.

4.1.1. Arguments with dependent premises used in Sherlock Holmes

In arguments, the premises have other premises that support or give more evidences to make clear the main premises are sub-premises. Therefore, we have the pattern in arguments with dependent premises, which can be verified in some examples below.

a. Dependent premises type 1 (DPT1):

As analyzing, we can produce the argument pattern as below:

$$\boxed{\text{DPT1: } P_1 + P_2 + P_3 + \dots P_n \rightarrow C}$$

In that, P_1, P_2, P_3, P_n are considered as each premise which support together to lead to C - meaning conclusion of argument by arrow.

b. Dependent premises type 2 (DPT2):

From that analysis, the argument pattern of dependent premises (DPT2) is presented as below.

$$\boxed{\text{DPT2: } P_1 \rightarrow P_2 \rightarrow P_3 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow P_n \rightarrow C}$$

To understand this argument pattern, let's me explain that P1, P2, P3, Pn are known as the premises of argument in which P1 is offered as a reason for P2, P2 is offered as a reason for P3, and continuously for Pn and then for C that means a conclusion of argument. The relationship of each premise and conclusion is by adding arrows to indicate the support.

c. Dependent premises type 3 (DPT3):

As analysis, the argument pattern of dependent premises (DPT3) is showed as below.

$$\text{DPT3: } P1 \rightarrow P2 + P3 \rightarrow P4 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow Pn \rightarrow C$$

In this argument pattern, P1, P2, P3, P4, Pn are known as the premises of argument in which P1 is offered as a reason for P2, P2 work conjointly with P3 to support P4, and continuously for Pn and then support C that means a conclusion of argument. The relationship of each premise and conclusion is by adding arrows to indicate the support and put the plus sign (+) to show the supporting combination.

In these diagrams, we can see most of premises are dependent. According to the theory of Bassham, Irwin, Nardone&Wallace (2011) about hypothetical syllogism in argument, the pattern of argument in arguments with dependent premises is as modus argument.

4.1.2. Arguments with independent premises used in Sherlock Holmes

As we know that arguments are composed of one or more premises and a conclusion, the premises that support independently the conclusion are independent premises. As analysis, the argument pattern of independent premises (IDP) is showed as below.

$$\text{IDP: } P_1, P_2, P_3 \dots P_n \rightarrow C$$

As we have known that, in this argument pattern, P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4, P_n are considered as the premises of argument in which P_1, P_2, P_3, P_n work independently to build C that means a conclusion of argument. The relationship of each premise is created by comma and which of premise and conclusion is by adding arrows.

In these diagrams, we can see some premises are independent. According to the theory of Bassham, Irwin, Nardone&Wallace (2011) about hypothetical syllogism in argument, the pattern of argument in Arguments with independent premises is as chain argument.

4.1.3. Arguments with mixed of dependent and independent premises used in Sherlock Holmes

In arguments, sometime, the premises have other premises that support or give more evidences to make clear the main premises; the premises sometime support independently the conclusion. Therefore, we have the pattern in arguments with mixed of dependent and independent premises (MODP&IDP) is showed as below.

$$\text{MODP\&IDP: } (P_1+P_2 \rightarrow P_3), P_4, (P_5 \rightarrow P_6), \dots P_n \rightarrow C$$

In this argument pattern, P1, P2, P3, P4, Pn are considered as the premises of argument in which P1, P2 work together to build P3 by putting a plus sign between P1 and P2, adding arrows for supporting of P2 for P3 and P5 for P6 due to linked work; and comma is separated the independent premises P4, (P1+P2→P3), (P5→P6), Pn, which support to lead to C- conclusion of argument by arrow signal.

As analysis above, the researcher showed the patterns of argument used in Sherlock Holmes in 3 kinds: arguments with independent; dependent premises and mixed of independent and dependent premises. The table below presents the number of types of argument patterns as well percentages in each type of arguments.

Table 4.1 Types of argument patterns used in Sherlock Holmes stories

No	Types of argument patterns		Number (N)	Percentage (%)
1	Dependent premises	DPT1	8	10%
		DPT2	14	17.5%
		DPT3	38	47.5%
2	Independent premises		5	6.3%
3	Mixed of dependent and independent premises		15	18.7%
	Total		80	100%

The table shows that the argument pattern in dependent premises is produced mostly with 75% in which the percentage of dependent type 3 is the most with 47.5%. While, 6.3% is the percentage of independent premise of argument pattern which is smallest one in total. That means that the dependent premises of argument pattern were used mostly in Sherlock Holmes stories.

4.1.4. Summary

This section showed how the argument pattern is established and how the patterns of argument used in Sherlock Holmes are, which illustrated that there are 3 kinds of arguments used in Sherlock Holmes stories: arguments with independent; dependent premises and mixed of independent and dependent premises, in which the pattern of argument in arguments with independent premises as chain argument and the pattern of argument in arguments with dependent premises as modus argument.

In conclusion, as the analysis above, we can realize that the patterns of argument in Sherlock Holmes could be based on the argument patterns in critical thinking.

4.2. THE SYNTACTIC FEATURES OF PREMISES AND CONCLUSION OF ARGUMENT IN SHERLOCK HOLMES

4.2.1. Syntactic form of premises of argument

4.2.1.1. Premises in form of declarative sentence

- a. Premise in form of Simple declarative sentence***
- b. Premise in form of Complex declarative sentence***
- c. Premise in form of Compound declarative sentence***
- a. Premise in form of Elliptical declarative sentence***

4.2.1.2. Premise in form of interrogative sentence**4.2.1.3. Premise in form of imperative sentence****4.2.1.4. Premise in form of subjunctive sentence****4.2.2. Syntactic form of conclusion of argument****4.2.2.1. Conclusions in form of declarative sentence**

In terms of declarative sentence, instances of the conclusions of arguments used in Sherlock Holmes stories were found to have the syntactic realization of four sub- categories: simple, complex compound and elliptical sentences.

b. Conclusions in form of Simple declarative sentence**c. Conclusions in form of Complex declarative sentence****d. Conclusions in form of Compound declarative sentence****d. Conclusions in form of Elliptical declarative sentence****4.2.2.2. Conclusions in form of interrogative sentence**

As analysis above, the writer presented the findings of the syntactic patterns in types of sentences namely declarative, interrogative, imperative and subjunctive ones of the arguments. The table below shows the numbers of types of sentences used in the conclusions and premises of arguments in Sherlock Holmes in the numbers and the percentages.

Table 4.2 Types of sentences used in conclusions and premises of arguments

No	Types of sentences	Arguments			
		Conclusions		Premises	
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage

		(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
1	Declarative	77	38.5%	95	47.5%
2	Interrogative	3	1.5%	15	7.5%
3	Subjunctive	0	0%	8	4%
4	Imperative	0	0%	2	1%
	Total	80	40%	120	60%

The table 4.2 shows that there are two types of sentences as declarative and interrogative ones which are used in conclusion of arguments, but 4 types of sentences are applied in premises. Moreover, the declarative sentence is conducted most in premise and conclusion of argument with 47.5% and 38.5% respectively. In contrast, 0% and 1% are the percentage of imperative sentences which are less used in conclusion and premise of argument responsively.

As analysis above, the researcher showed the findings of the syntactic patterns in types of sentences namely declarative, interrogative, imperative and subjunctive ones of the arguments. Clearly, most of the conclusions are in the declarative sentence while 4 types of sentences are used in the premises which are summarized as formulas below.

Context 1: P1 [simple declarative sentence] **C1** [simple declarative sentence] **C2** [simple declarative sentence] P2 [compound declarative sentence] **C3** [simple declarative sentence]

P3 [simple declarative sentence] P4 [simple declarative sentence]
 P4a [simple declarative sentence] P5 [interrogative sentence] **C5**
[simple declarative sentence] C [complex declarative sentence]

Context 2: C [complex declarative sentence]

P1 [simple declarative sentence] P2 [simple declarative sentence]
 sentence] **C1 [simple declarative sentence]**

P3 [simple declarative sentence] P4 [complex declarative sentence]
 sentence] **C2 [complex declarative sentence]**

Context 3: C [compound declarative sentence] C1 [simple declarative sentence] C2 [simple declarative sentence] C3 [simple declarative sentence] C4 [simple declarative sentence] C5 [complex declarative sentence] C6 [compound declarative sentence]

P5a [complex declarative sentence] P5b [complex subjunctive sentence], P5 [complex declarative sentence] P5c [complex declarative sentence]

P1 [simple declarative sentence] P1a [simple declarative sentence], P1b [simple declarative sentence] P1c [complex declarative sentence] P1d [simple declarative sentence]

P2a [Subjunctive sentence], P2 [complex declarative sentence] P3 [compound declarative sentence]

P6 [simple declarative sentence] P6a [subjunctive sentence]
 P4 [compound declarative sentence] P4a [compound declarative sentence] P4b [complex declarative sentence]

4.2.3. Argument Indicator signaling premises and conclusions

In identifying premises and conclusions, we are often helped by indicator words. Indicator words are words or phrases that provide clues that premises or conclusions are being put forward. Premise indicators indicate that premises are being offered, and conclusion indicators indicate that conclusions are being offered.

4.2.4. Summary

In aspect of syntactic features, the 4 types of sentences namely declarative, interrogative, imperative and subjunctive ones of the arguments were used in arguments in Sherlock Holmes stories. However, the declarative sentence kind was used mostly in both conclusion and premises of arguments. Besides, the conclusion and premises of argument can be realized by the signal of conclusion and premise indicators and by analyzing the meaning of words in case of indicator absence.

4.3. THE PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF ARGUMENT IN SHERLOCK HOLMES

This section explores direct and indirect illocutionary force of speech acts in arguments for the purpose of giving the opinion, information, asking questions that require answers to get information in Sherlock Holmes stories.

4.3.1. Direct Illocutionary Act signaling premises and conclusion of argument in Sherlock Holmes stories

In arguments of Sherlock Holmes stories, there are 2 types of illocutionary force that were mostly used to show the opinion, ask information. They are representative and directive.

4.3.2. Indirect Illocutionary Act signaling premises and conclusion of argument in Sherlock Holmes stories

This category of speech act is characterized by the fact that the successful performance of any of them does not match the propositional content with the reality and vice versa.

2 types of illocutionary force: representative and directive that were mostly used to show the opinion, ask information in arguments of Sherlock Holmes stories.

As analysis above, the researcher showed the types of speech acts as direct and indirect ones in arguments. The table below presents the number of types of illocutionary force as representative and directive ones as well as the numbers and percentages of speech acts in each type in arguments.

Table 4.7 Types of speech acts used in arguments in illocutionary force types

No	Speech acts	Types of illocutionary force			
		Number (N)		Percentage (%)	
		Representative	Directive	Representative	Directive
1	Direct	166	8	87.3%	4.2%
2	Indirect	15	1	7.9%	0.6%
	Total	190		100%	

The table shows that the types of illocutionary force: representative and directive are in the direct and indirect of speech act. The percentage of the representative force is the most in the direct of speech act with 87.3% and 7.9% that is in the indirect speech act. In contrast, 4.2% and 0.6% are minor in the percentage of directive illocutionary force in the direct and indirect speech acts.

4.3.3. Implicatures of arguments in Sherlock Holmes stories

4.3.4. Summary

After analyzing, direct and indirect illocutionary acts were used more frequently in premises and conclusions of arguments in Sherlock Homes stories to express the purposes of speaker in which sometime show or explain information, sometime emphasize or make an impression in surprising information. Also, what Holmes intends to communicate was characteristically far richer than what he directly expresses; the message conveys and understand through not only linguistic meaning but also word or sentence order in implicatures of arguments in Sherlock Holmes stories.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

With the results of data analysis I would like to make some final remarks and implications about the argument values in references to their syntactic and pragmatic features.

5.1. CONCLUSIONS

With the purpose to examine the linguistic aspects of arguments used in Sherlock Holmes in term of syntactic and pragmatic features, the argument patterns used in Sherlock Holmes as well, I have come to following conclusion:

Syntactically, argument in language of Sherlock Holmes can be treated in using variety linguistic structures. They can be declarative, interrogative, imperative and subjunctive sentences. Besides the major sentences are declarative sentences in simple, compound and complex clauses in structures S +V + Relative clause or Noun clause, the study found some instances of minor sentences in imperative sentences. Moreover, in identifying premises and conclusions, we are often helped by indicator words which are words or phrases that provide clues that premises or conclusions are being put forward. Premise or conclusion indicators indicate that premises or conclusion are being offered. We can identify the argument without the premise or conclusion indicators by using analyzing in linguistic.

Pragmatically, in terms of speech acts, argument values are explored with representative and directive meaning of illocutionary force. Most instances of speech acts were those of representative with the function to impart the information to readers. The directive

was used in stories with the purpose of finding the information and then giving evidences. Also, in aspect of implicatures, Sherlock Holmes - speaker meaning reveals that an aspect of what is meant in a speaker's utterance without being part of what is said. What he intends to communicate is characteristically far richer than what he directly expresses; linguistic meaning radically underdetermines the message conveyed and understood.

Argumentatively, this study clarified clearly the argument patterns used in Sherlock Holmes with specialized words and structures that signal premise and conclusion in aspect of syntactic and pragmatic features. Also, it showed that getting insight into how argument patterns used in Sherlock Holmes like dependent; independent premises and mixed dependent and independent premise as modus ponens and chain argument patterns.

5.2. IMPLICATIONS OF STUDY

Theoretically, the study has attempted to provide general background knowledge of the argument based on the viewpoints of Bassham, Irwin, Nardone&Wallace.

Practically, argument will be of great benefits not only for teaching and learning English but also for those who are interested in the field. For learning, it is really necessary for language learners to enrich their ability in comprehending and using language in critical thinking, also language argument to order to enhance their communication effects. For teaching, this thesis will help teachers have knowledge of syntactic and pragmatic features of argument. Teachers can explore more sentences in distinguish and comprehend language in critical thinking by their language argument.

In mastering argument used in Sherlock Holmes, it is hoped that language learners will be more aware of comprehending and applying the patterns of argument in using language effectively in persuading others in real life.

5.3. LIMITATION OF STUDY AND SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study has just addressed the issue within the scope of syntactic and pragmatic features on argument used in Sherlock Holmes to find out the argument patterns that used in Sherlock Holmes stories but has not stressed on semantics feature to find out how the language meaning is used due to the time limitation.

Ambition and passion for further research are great, due to the limitation of time as well as materials, there are some other aspects awaiting investigation. Therefore, from the personal experience as doing the research, I strongly suggest further studies as follows:

- An investigation into politeness strategy in Sherlock Holmes stories
- An appraisal analysis of languages used in Sherlock Holmes stories