(No) More Family:
Reading Family and Serial Murder in Patricia Cornwell's Gault-Trilogy

Acta Electronica Universitatis Tamperensis 17

MAARIT PIIPPONEN

(No) More Family: Reading Family and Serial Murder in Patricia Cornwell's Gault-Trilogy

University of Tampere
Tampere 2000

ACADEMIC DISSERTATION

University of Tampere,
Department of Philology I,
English Philology

Electronic dissertation
Acta Electronica Universitatis Tamperensis 17
ISBN 951-44-4756-5
ISSN 1456-954X
http://acta.uta.fi

MAARIT PIIPPONEN

(No) More Family: Reading Family and Serial Murder in Patricia Cornwell's Gault-Trilogy

■

ACADEMIC DISSERTATION

To be publicly defended, by due permission of
the Faculty of Humanities, at the University of Tampere,
for public discussion in the Lecture Theatre B 332
of the Pyynikki Building, Pyynikintie 2, Tampere
on 24 March 2000 at 13 o'clock.

University of Tampere
Tampere 2000

Maarit Piipponen. “(No) More Family: Reading Family and Serial Murder in Patricia Cornwell’s Gault-Trilogy.” Tohtorinväitöskirja: Englantilainen filologia, Tampereen yliopisto. 265 s.

Tarkastelen väitöskirjassani perheen ja sarjamurhan yhteenkietoutumista amerikkalaisen rikoskirjailijan Patricia Cornwellin kolmessa Kay Scarpetta-romaanissa: Cruel and Unusual (1993), The Body Farm (1994), ja From Potter’s Field (1995). Kutsun näitä romaaneja työssäni Gault-trilogiaksi, koska kaikissa esiintyy sarjamurhaaja Temple Brooks Gault: sarja alkaa Gaultin astumisella Scarpetan maailmaan, ja liikkuu kopiomurhan kautta Gaultin kuolemaan trilogian viimeisessä osassa.

Väitän työssäni, että sarjamurhaajan - Gaultin - hahmon kautta romaanit rakentavat kuvaa normaaliudesta, epänormaaliudesta, terveydestä, sairaudesta, saastumisesta ja perheestä. Kuten johdantoluvusta käy ilmi, termi perhe ei tarkoita työssäni pelkästään biologista perhettä vaan sillä viitataan myös rikoksia ratkovaan professionaaliseen perheeseen, ja lisäksi kansallisvaltioon, ihmiskuntaan ja ’inhimilliseen’. Työ jakautuu laajahkon johdannon ja loppusanojen lisäksi kolmeen asialukuun. Johdantoluku valottaa perhekäsitteen lisäksi myös Cornwellin asemaa tämän päivän amerikkalaisten naisrikoskirjailijoiden joukossa. Väitänkin, että toisin kuin monet muut naisrikoskirjailijat, Cornwell ei ole romaaneissaan kiinnostunut ns. tavallisista rikoksista (esim. mustasukkaisuusmurhista, murhista rahallisen hyödyn tai koston takia, sosiaalisista ongelmista, jne) vaan hänen romaaninsa käsittelevät nimenomaan kauhistuttavia rikoksia ja psykopatologisia rikollishahmoja, kuten sarjamurhaajia. Tällaisten aiheiden takia Cornwellin romaanit ovat mielestäni atmosfääriltään sukua kauhukirjallisuuden ja goottilaisen romaanin hirviöille, vaikka romaanit strukturaalisesti kuuluvat rikosromaanin lajiin. Populaarikulttuurin puolella sarjamurhaa käsittelevät romaanit ja elokuvat voidaan itse asiassa karkeasti jakaa kauhuun ja rikoskirjallisuuteen ja rikoselokuviin. Kauhu-genren sarjamurhaaja on aivan erilainen hahmo kuin rikoskirjallisuuden ja syitä hahmon erilaisuuteen on etsittävä eri aikakausista, lajien eri perinteistä ja konventioista. Siinä missä kauhun sarjamurhaaja on usein varsin anonyymi tappajahahmo eikä poliisilla ole suurta merkitystä sarjamurhaajajahdissa, niin rikoskirjallisuudessa poliisilla ja etsivillä on keskeinen rooli.

Luku 2 tarkastelee sarjamurha-asiantuntijuuden muodostumista trilogiassa ja Scarpetta-sarjassa. Sarjaa on usein kiitelty sen ’feministisyydestä’, mutta tarkempi luenta osoittaa, että sarjaa voitaisiin lähinnä kutsua liberaali-feministiseksi. Tällainen feminismi on itse asiassa varsin valkoista, keskiluokkaista ja heteroseksuaalista, kuten myös analyysini osoittaa. Sarjamurhaajan hahmo trilogiassa horjuttaa juuri tuollaisen feminismin arvoja: näennäisesti se hyväksyy esim. seksuaalisen tai etnisen toiseuden, mutta viime kädessä tuomitsee ne itselleen vieraina, ’toisina’, ja sairaina. Luku tarkastelee myös sitä, kuinka oikeuslääkäri lukee rikollisen hahmoa, kuolemaa ja kuolleita asiantuntijana. Erityisen tarkastelun kohteena on murha perheessä, koska sarjamurhaaja tappaa sisarensa trilogian viimeisessä romaanissa.

Luku 3 analysoi sukupuolta ja sukupuolista identiteettiä trilogiassa. Sarjamurhaajan hahmo

nähdään romaaneissa nimenomaan uhkana siksi, koska hän rikkoo heteroseksuaalisen sukupuolijärjestelmän binaarilogiikan. Sarjamurhaaja esiintyy useissa ’toiseuden’ hahmoissa eikä hänellä näytä olevan stabiilia sukupuolta ja sukupuolista identiteettiä. Hän mm. näyttää naiselta ja homoseksuaalilta mieheltä. Naismainen mies yhdistetään trilogiassa systemaattisesti homoseksuaalisuuteen, ja homoseksuaalinen mies on taas aina HIV-viruksen kantaja. Täten romaanit tuomitsevat ’poikkeavan’ miehen, ja koska hänet esitetään sarjamurhan kontekstissa, niin poikkeavuus rakentuu entistä suuremmaksi uhaksi. Samaten romaanien päähenkilö, oikeuslääkäri, kuvataan poikkeavaksi naiseksi, ’maskuliiniseksi’ naiseksi: juuri tämän oman poikkeavuutensa takia hän pystyy lukemaan rikollista. Naisten maskuliinisuus puolestaan yhdistetään romaaneissa aina lesbolaisuuteen. Sarjamurha ei siis ole trilogian ainoa rikos vaan myös sukupuolinen poikkeavuus kuvataan rikokseksi ja sairaudeksi - rikokseksi ydinperhettä kohtaan.

Luku 4 tutkii sarjamurhan, perheen ja (kommunikaatio)teknologian välisiä yhteyksiä trilogiassa. Sarjamurhaaja kuvataan nimenomaan viruksena, joka saastuttaa ihmiset, talot ja teknologian. Hänet siis liitetään teknologiaan ja siihen mitä teknologia edustaa, ei-inhimillistä, kuollutta, toistettavuutta. Kuitenkin juuri teknologian avulla trilogiassa on mahdollista jäljittää ja saada sarjamurhaaja kiinni. Kuvaavaa sarjamurhatrilogialle onkin teknologian aiheuttama inhimillisen saastuminen: ihmisiä kuvataan konevertauskuvin ja ihmistoimintoja verrataan koneellisiin toimintoihin. Trilogiassa sarjamurhaaja saastuttaa juuri sen teknologian, jonka avulla hänet yritetään saada kiinni: CAIN-tietokoneen ja arkiston. CAINin avulla hän myös yrittää lukea itse sarjamurhaa eri tavalla kuin varsinaiset asiantuntijat, ts. hän alkaa lukea rikosta uudella tavalla. Viime kädessä teknologia, kirjoitus, ja lukeminen myös implisiittisesti liitetään representaatioon ja väkivallan representaatioihin: rikostapausten arkistointi, väkivallallasta kirjoittaminen ja lukeminen ovat vahingollisia, koska ne saastuttavat ihmismielen. Representaatio koetaan romaaneissa lisäksi toistona, uhkana ’läsnäololle’ ja identiteetille.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing a thesis can be a very solitary business; it should not, however, be too solitary. I wish to express my gratitude to a number of people who have commented on the various parts or drafts of my thesis during the past years. This thesis has two different 'homes': the Department of English, University of Tampere, and the Finnish Graduate School for North American Studies. I would thus like to thank my supervisors Professor Ralf Norrman and Dr. David Robertson at the Department of English, and Professor Olli Vehviläinen, Professor Markku Henriksson, and Dr. Michael Coleman of the Graduate School. I would also like to express my thanks to the other student members of the school as well as to the visiting scholars for their comments.

In particular, I would like to thank the following persons, who have in various ways encouraged me and/or critically read the various drafts or parts of the thesis: Antony Easthope, Tina Parke-Sutherland, Heta Pyrhönen, and Nicholas Royle. During the last couple of years, Arja Kulmala and Kaija Marjamäki patiently listened to my thoughts on serial killers and Cornwell over cups of coffee and glasses of wine; sometimes we had the pleasure of being accompanied by Tiina Ohinmaa. Satu Manninen and Asko Kauppinen provided me with bed & breakfast, and much more, during my visits in Edinburgh; now we all know that one slice of the chocolate cake is just not enough. Riitta Laitinen and Tuija Modinos always encouraged me and, in their own ways, pushed me towards gender studies. Mikko Tuhkanen kindly read my chapters despite the geographical distance between us: indeed, electric communication knows no boundaries.

For financial support and travel grants, I am grateful to the University of Tampere, H. Weijola Foundation, the Department of English Philology, Suomalainen Konkordialiitto, and Oskar Öflunds Stiftelse.

I also wish to thank the examiners appointed by the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Tampere for their valuable comments on my work: Associate Professor Judith Halberstam (University of California, San Diego) and Dr. Sally R. Munt (University of Brighton, UK). I believe that, had I been able to receive their comments at an earlier stage, this study would have been much better.

Finally, I want to express my gratitude to my parents Lilja and Paavo Piipponen for their encouragement and financial support during my years of study -- studies that sometimes must have seemed to have no end. My love and warmest thanks go to Arto Schroderus, who never failed to support me: without him I would not have finished this thesis. Arto, being a person who never reads detective fiction, nevertheless read a number of serial murder novels and shared his thoughts with me. If, at times, I was no longer able to see the things before me properly, he helped me to regain my vision.

Maarit Piipponen
Tampere
February 6, 2000

There is a general movement to close things off, to get back where we belong, a desire to detect and bind orificial openings, the still festering wounds or cuts from which uncontrollable utterances might be stopped. One of the dreams shared by the body politic, the academy, and forces of the body police consists in shutting down the flow, and anyone who approaches the immense toxic waste sites should be properly vested, wearing plastic gloves, keeping rather clear and clean. The latency period of the archival, viral, and historical underground seems to be linkable to the structures maintaining a secretly cycling poison, the hidden terrorisms that have taken up residence in the rhetoric of bloodlines and bacillary negotiations, all requiring applications of hyperdetection and a new examination of the shit we keep on walking into.

- Avital Ronell, 'The Worst Neighborhoods of the Real'

1. In the Name of the Family

A Filthy Business

> When people ask about the reason for the growing number of signature crimes, people have to look at the collapse of the traditional family in America and judge for themselves the very far-reaching consequences it's having on all of us.[1]

'I can't read sad, scary, or violent books.' Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, these words come from the mouth of detective writer Patricia Cornwell, who has made a fortune out of writing sad, scary, and violent books.[2] Indeed, Cornwell is presently one of the most well-known American detective writers who has made writing about bodily violence and cruel crimes into a multi-million dollar business. Her first novel featuring medical examiner Kay Scarpetta, Postmortem (published in 1990), won the Edgar, John Creasy, Anthony and MacAvity awards as well as the Prix du Roman d'Aventure -- all in one year. Postmortem also introduced a topic which was to become a pervasive one in Cornwell's later work: serial murder.

During the last couple of decades, there have been changes in detective fiction as regards its central character, the detective, and its forms and themes. Issues of class, gender, and ethnicity have become important in society as a whole and in the academia (due to the emergence of feminism and cultural studies, for example). These issues have had an impact on popular culture and popular fiction as well -- their contents and their characters. The solitary detective figure (without a family or close friends) that we often find in fictions written by male authors is frequently rewritten when the detective and the author, too, are female. Awareness of gender and sexuality in general, the position of the female detective within masculine hierarchies, organizations, and genres, friendships between women, as well

[1] Robert D. Keppel, with William J. Birnes, Signature Killers (London: Arrow, 1998), p. 370.

[2] Patricia Cornwell, 'Kay Scarpetta Would Get Tough on Young,' in Richmond Times-Dispatch, September 13, 1998, at wysiwyg://155/http://gateway-va.com/rtd/special/opedcols/cornwell13.shtml.

as negotiating and renegotiating family, motherhood and parenting are common issues in contemporary detective fiction by women. Cornwell's serial character Kay Scarpetta resembles many of her fellow sisters in the field of contemporary crime: she is independent, divorced, white, heterosexual, a childless middle-aged woman. Besides Cornwell, novels by such American authors as Linda Barnes, Sue Grafton, Karen Kijewski, Marcia Muller, and Sara Paretsky come easily to mind here: all feature independent female detectives/investigators. However, even though these characters are independent and live alone -- having usually neither a husband nor children -- they do not exist alone. They have affairs with men (with varying success) and have friends (professional and otherwise) in the place of the biological family. Indeed, as Kathleen Gregory Klein has noted on the changes in the detective genre and the appearance of what she calls the 'newest women detectives' at the end of 1980s: 'their authors do not define these women as loners without family or friends.'[3] Or, as noticed by Urszula Clark and Sonia Zyngier on recent detective fiction by women featuring 'independent, self-sufficient professionals of First World countries': 'Here, hierarchy and traditional patriarchal family structures are undermined. Instead, connection and intimacy are established with neighbours or friends who become substitutes for parents, sisters, brothers. Filial duty implodes.'[4]

All the above writers, then, and many others, deal with ideas of friendship, motherhood, parenthood, and 'adopted' families in various ways in their fiction. In lesbian detective fiction, these questions are perhaps even more relevant, especially if the heroine is rejected by her biological family because of her sexual identity -- a lesbian community can then function as a substitute family (the same can of course be said of detective novels with gay detectives, as in the work of Mark Richard Zubro). Sue Grafton's serial heroine Kinsey Millhone was brought up by her aunt after her parents died in an accident, and she 'adopts' her old landlord as a kind of father-figure; Kijewski's heroine Kat Colorado refers to her 'adopted' grandmother; and Barnes' sleuth Carlotta Carlyle has a 'little sister,' whom she

[3] Kathleen Gregory Klein, The Woman Detective: Gender & Genre (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1995; orig. publ. 1988), p. 232.

[4] Urszula Clark and Sonia Zyngier, 'Women Beware Women: Detective Fiction and Critical Discourse Stylistics,' in Language and Literature, 7, No. 2 (1998), p. 145.

helps and guides. The family based on biology and genetic kinship is thus replaced with, and extended by, adopted families. These adopted families then provide the heroines with feelings of belonging, satisfaction, and fulfilment, and sometimes, of distress and anger, depending on their position in any given plot. As biological families are replaced with families these heroines choose for themselves, the boundaries, as well as the definitions, of the family are being questioned in these popular fictions. What these alternative family structures suggest to the reader is that it is not necessarily ancestry and genes which make up a family, but the things which people willingly share and do together. As Kay Scarpetta notes on her sister Dorothy in The Body Farm, 'It made no sense to me that she was my sister, for I failed to find anything in common between us except our mother and memories of once living in the same house.'[5]

The present study is a study on distress and anger in the family in Cornwell's novels, for whatever form the family (biological or professional) takes in her novels, one thing remains constant: family is a filthy, dangerous, business. Whether Scarpetta deals with her biological family (her mother, her sister Dorothy, and her niece Lucy), or with her professional, 'techno-family' (Pete Marino from the Richmond police, and later, Benton Wesley from the FBI, and her niece Lucy, the computer whizz kid),[6] family seldom brings joy to her life. This, I think, is one feature which distinguishes Cornwell's work from the work of many other female detective writers: the Scarpetta series is preoccupied with the 'dark side' of family, with the distress and anger caused by both biological and substitute families and family relations. Specifically, this study examines family and serial murder in three novels by Cornwell, Cruel and Unusual (1993), The Body Farm (1994), and From Potter's Field (1995). In these novels ideas on family come, little by little, to a crisis, and the 'dark side' of family is contextualized within the thematics of psychopathology and serial murder. These novels form what we could loosely call the 'Gault-trilogy,' because they all feature serial killer Temple Brooks Gault.

---

[5] Patricia Cornwell, The Body Farm (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1994), p. 285; hereafter abbreviated as BF in the text.

[6] Like Scarpetta, Lucy belongs to both 'families.' She starts to help Scarpetta in the third novel, Cruel and Unusual; a point examined later on.

Whereas Gault's presence is more or less of secondary importance in the first two novels, in From Potter's Field it dominates the novel. In Cruel and Unusual the central mystery is how a dead man (a convicted and executed criminal) can continue to kill; towards the end of the novel Scarpetta learns that Gault has tampered with the AFIS (Automated Fingerprint Identification System) and changed its fingerprint files. In The Body Farm, Gault is still on the loose, and Scarpetta's team investigates a murder of a little girl. Because of the familiar modus operandi, this murder is at first attributed to Gault, but the real murderer is the girl's own mother, who suffers from Munchhausen syndrome by proxy. Finally, in From Potter's Field, the investigation focuses on the murder of a 'homeless' woman; eventually we find out that the murdered woman is actually Gault's twin-sister Jayne and that she was murdered by Gault. The latter two novels deal specifically with murder within the family -- with a mother murdering her child and with a brother murdering his sister. Therefore, as Cruel and Unusual serves as an introduction to Gault, I shall concentrate more on The Body Farm and especially on From Potter's Field in this study. When necessary, I shall also refer to the other novels in the series; Scarpetta is, after all, a serial character.

On the whole, as a detective writer, Cornwell does not write about 'ordinary' or classic crimes and murders; that is, about murders committed because of greed, jealousy, or revenge, for example (inasmuch as there is anything ordinary or normal about killing for revenge). Moreover, unlike many other female, feminist and/or lesbian detective writers today, she does not explicitly deal with social problems, child abuse, incest, sexism or racism in her work. The Cornwellian landscape is, above all, inhabited by fanatic and psychopathologically dangerous individuals or groups -- by serial killers (again and again), political fanatics or cults, people suffering from Munchhausen syndrome by proxy or by people spreading deadly viruses, and so forth. In this respect, her work is closer to such American detective and thriller writers as Thomas Harris, James Patterson, and Jonathan Kellerman. Like Cornwell, these writers paint the picture of evil monstrosity in contemporary American society.

Little by little Cornwell is turning her serial character into a mythic Superwoman, who confronts enemies of equally mythic proportions. Rarely have I come across such self-aggrandizement in detective

novels (at least by women) as in the work of Cornwell: consider, for instance, these words of Scarpetta in the ninth Scarpetta novel, Point of Origin: 'In recent years I had worked the World Trade Center and Oklahoma City bombings and the crash of TWA Flight 800. I had helped with the identifications of the Branch Davidians at Waco and reviewed the disfigurement and death caused by the Unabomber.'[7] These 'events' are the great traumatic events of the U.S. society in the 1990s. What the preoccupation with psychopathological characters and the framing of the Scarpetta series within, for example, the Oklahoma bombing and the Unabomber inevitably imply, is that the American society is being destroyed from within and, consequently, drastic measures are needed to save the nation and humanity. If destruction comes from within, we need those -- the experts -- who can distinguish for us the 'normal' from the 'psychopathological' and 'deviant.'

Indeed, all these psychopathic killers, violent deaths, horribly mutilated bodies and autopsies appear in the name of justice and humanity, argues Cornwell herself:

> Everything Scarpetta does is about living. She wants to prevent further death, to give peace of mind to the families, justice for the dead. She does everything for the living. She is driven by her humanity, by her outrage over people who have taken power over others. It's not about death, but about death coming to the aid of the living.[8]

But, we might ask, what kind of 'humanity' in Scarpetta is Cornwell envisaging, and how is humanity presented in her novels? I shall argue in the present study that Scarpetta's 'humanity' (as both 'kindness, benevolence' and 'the human race' as defined by New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary) and ideas about humanity function in Cornwell's work -- and in an exemplary fashion in the Gault-trilogy through the figure of the serial killer -- as ideas which limit, classify, categorize, stigmatize, and regulate. In other words, I shall show that through the figure of the serial killer, the trilogy fundamentally produces and patrols the limits and borders of the 'family' and 'human': the biological or the professional family,

---

[7] Patricia Cornwell, Point of Origin (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1998), p. 4; hereafter abbreviated as PO.

[8] 'Verbal Evidence,' an interview with Patricia Cornwell, in The Third Degree: Crime Writers in Conversation, ed. Paul Duncan (Harpenden, Herts: No Exit Press, 1997), p. 21.

the humankind or the national family, the human as opposed to other species (animals as opposed to the species and family of 'Man'), or the human as opposed to technology and the machinic (the animate vs the inanimate). These are opposed to the inhuman, the deviant, the abnormal, and the monstrous, which Gault stands for. In effect, the concept of the 'family' in this study will signify not only the biological or professional family but also what is included in the 'normal,' the 'human,' the 'nation,' and the 'species.' Being a family member is thus a question of boundaries, of practices and discourses of inclusion and exclusion: who belongs and does not belong to 'our family' and to the category of the human. Therefore, while serial murder in the trilogy is regarded as a crime against the society's laws, the serial murderer is constructed as a figure through whom fears of otherness (sexual, ethnic, machinic) are expressed. Noticeably, Scarpetta calls Gault a 'virus' in From Potter's Field. The virus is one of the most powerful metaphors -- and more than a metaphor -- of the 1980s and 1990s. Viral imagery is currently employed not only to express but also to produce various sexual, political, religious, technological, and racial phobias. Rhetorically speaking, viral imagery is a 'language' that everybody can easily understand -- the language of disease and cure (I shall return to viruses in the next chapter).

Writing a thesis about a serial character is not without its problems, especially when the series continues to be written. It is difficult to remain within the novels chosen for examination, and who knows what the future will hold for Kay Scarpetta and her team? Even though I concentrate on the trilogy here (and even there the emphasis that the novels receive varies), a reader of this thesis will notice how some of the matters under discussion break the boundary of the trilogy. In other words, some aspects that I examine in this study are typical of the series as it is (for example, Scarpetta's relation to the dead) and not just of the trilogy -- particularly so since all the novels in the Scarpetta series so far, from Postmortem to Black Notice, deal with hideous, violent, crimes. To some extent, then, this study also serves as an introduction to the Scarpetta series.

The thesis has three main chapters besides the introductory chapter and the conclusion. The rest of this introductory chapter will serve as a more general introduction and context to reading family, serial murder, monstrosity, and contamination in the Gault-trilogy. The following chapters will offer

more detailed analyses of these issues in the trilogy itself. In Chapter 2, 'Reading Experts,' I shall analyze the ways in which the investigative subject (a female first-person narrator) and her team are portrayed, and the specificity of the threat that Gault presents to Scarpetta's white middle class values. I shall further argue how the ability to read serial murder(er) and the dead in the trilogy is intimately connected to being contaminated by knowledge and reading strategies -- in itself a typical feature in serial murder novels. In Chapter 3, 'Kay and Gay, or, "*The man in the family gets the big tits!*"' I shall argue that serial murder is linked to 'deviant' gender and sexual identity within the family, and that behind the acceptance of non-heterosexuality, the trilogy actually nurses a negative attitude towards that non-heterosexuality. In other words, the narrator -- indeed, our sanitary expert -- regards non-heterosexuality and 'improper' gender as deviant, abnormal, and as contagious copies and diseases. Then, in Chapter 4, 'Cain and CAIN: Flesh and Letter,' I shall examine the role of technology in the hunt for Gault and serial killers. The threats and promises posed by technology in the trilogy signify how the position of technology is that of the Derridean pharmakon,[9] a remedy and poison at the same time -- not unlike the position of the narrator herself. That is, on the one hand, in the fight against psychopathological criminals, technology is given the role of rationality and efficiency; but, on the other hand, technology can be abused and taken over by criminals. Further, technology points to a frightening prosthetic relation between humans and machines: I shall claim that the human (agency) is prosthetically extended as well as cancelled by the machinic in the trilogy. The machinic also threatens the human because it suggests reproducibility and lifelessness -- in other words, copies of the human. Finally, Chapter 5, '(No) More Serial Murder Experts,' functions as a short conclusion to the study.

As for the methodology and theoretical framework used in the study, I consider this project an interdisciplinary one. Despite the fact that the study focuses on the work of a popular detective writer, I intend to move beyond genre theory, towards cultural studies. Criticism on detective fiction has so far dealt very little (amazingly little) with serial murder novels. Therefore I think it is necessary to

[9] On the pharmakon, see Jacques Derrida, Dissemination, trans. Barbara Johnson (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981).

contextualize the trilogy not only within contemporary detective fiction and its criticism but also within a larger framework: gender studies, studies on monstrosity and technology as well as studies on other genres (like horror and the Gothic) and 'real' serial murder -- within those fields which have analyzed serial killer figures. The figure of the serial killer, after all, covers many fields and discourses. Critics of horror and the Gothic, for example, have analyzed the figure of the psychopath and the serial killer -- particularly the serial killer on screen -- in ways that critics of detective fiction have failed to. Considering this, I wonder whether it is because the serial killer is an 'alien' figure in detective fiction: s/he is a figure who does not seem to have a rational, easily explainable, motive for the crimes, which could be rationally solved by the detective (Hercule Poirot would probably have to stretch his little gray cells hard to catch Gault). The serial killer's motives -- or, motivelessness -- and crimes appear to belong to other genres, where irrationality, inhuman beasts, 'beasts within,' and monsters reign. It might thus be possible to think of the figure of the serial killer as a figure who traverses generic boundaries -- a figure who changes through time, place, and genre.

> 'If you would visit your mother once in a blue moon, we could eat together. Normal meals. We could be a family.'[10]
>
> The infamous 'family values' debate of the 1992 U.S. presidential election will be remembered as the discursive moment in which conservatives lost their hold on the imaginary place called 'home.' In what Jameson calls the homeopathy of postmodernism -- the resistance through indulgence -- family values dissolved at the touch. As soon as conservatives actually described the family they had in mind, its very visibility ruined its power as an ideological imaginary: there really is *no place* like 'home.' Discursive power operates from the imaginary, and identity registers its moment of failure.[11]

In his book Past, Present, and Personal: The Family and the Life Course in American History (1986), John Demos points to three crucial aspects in the analysis of family and family history: demography, structure, and affect. That is, what are the 'quantitative boundaries of family life' -- what is the demography of the family?[12] Where do we draw the boundaries of family membership? The structural points would encompass the 'division of power, the demarcation of roles and responsibilities' within the family (p. 7): consider, for instance, gender, child-rearing, and age in the family. Finally, affect would refer to 'emotional experience' within the family (p. 17). During the last couple of decades these questions have perhaps become more crucial and problematic than ever before. In the United States, for example, the 1980s witnessed a clash between the family-values rhetoric of the New Right movement of the Reagan-era and those unhappy with such conservative, fundamentalist, anti-feminist, anti-gay, anti-abortionist -- and often covertly racist -- politics. In Families We Choose: Lesbians, Gays, Kinship, in fact, Kath Weston refers to the 1980s as the period when 'the overt politicization of kinship' took place in the United States. She writes that 'Also debated during this decade were new reproductive technologies; surrogate motherhood; open adoptions; abortion rights; the increase in numbers of teenage

---

[10] Cornwell, The Body Farm, p. 375.

[11] Judith Halberstam and Ira Livingston, 'Introduction,' in Posthuman Bodies, eds. Judith Halberstam and Ira Livingston (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995), pp. 12-13.

[12] John Demos, Past, Present, and Personal: The Family and the Life Course in American History (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 6.

mothers, working mothers, and single (mostly female and poor) parents; a rising divorce rate; and "blended families" that brought remarried spouses together with children from previous marriages.'[13]

The 1980s and 1990s could also be described as decades of 'familial abuse' in popular culture and in society in general. The forms that this familial abuse -- or, by and large, the threats to the so-called nuclear family -- takes have often been envisaged in terms of psychology (traumatic events and memories), biomedical technologies, and sexuality. Popular culture and mass media have spread the word of various diseases of and in the family: about Munchhausen syndrome by proxy, incest, and satanic abuse approved by parents and discovered through psychotherapy (i.e., 'recovered memories').[14] In the 1990s American cult-series 'X-Files' even the most bizarre cases of alien abduction always seem to involve family and family secrets. At the same time, with the advances in biomedical sciences and biotechnology, questions and debates about biological reproduction and new reproductive technologies have become central. We already have Dolly the cloned sheep; cloning humans is just around the corner.[15] These new reproductive technologies affect the very status and boundaries of what we have traditionally understood as family, since, for example, it is now possible to 'rent a womb' or possible for a dead man to 'have' children (through frozen sperm).[16]

Moreover, much of feminist scholarship on the family during the last couple of decades has

---

[13] Kath Weston, Families We Choose: Lesbians, Gays, Kinship (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), pp. 1-2.

[14] On 'traumatic events,' memory, and the role of psychoanalysis and its 'founding myth,' see Mikkel Borch-Jacobsen's Remembering Anna O.: A Century of Mystification, trans. Kirby Olson with Xavier Callahan and the author (New York and London: Routledge, 1996).

[15] On January 23, I read in The Sunday Times that 'Scientists have made the world's first synthetic DNA - the molecules that form the blueprint for life. The breakthrough means that the first artificial organisms could be "born" within two years and raises the prospect of humans redesigning whole species, including themselves.' See Roger Dobson and Jonathan Leake, 'First artificial DNA can create new forms of life,' The Sunday Times, January 23, 2000 (http://www.sunday-times.co.uk/).

[16] In Stanley Pottinger's novel The Fourth Procedure (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1995), there is a series of bizarre murders of men. At first these murders are attributed to a serial killer, but eventually another explanation is found (this novel exemplifies how serial murder can be used as a 'red herring' in detective fiction and thrillers). A group of pro-abortion women experiment on transferring a uterus and a fetus into men who have been involved with bombing abortion clinics. The women finally succeed in the case of Chief Justice Abner Titus, who is anti-abortionist, but who now finds himself 'pregnant' against his will -- and desires an abortion.

stressed more than Demos above the family's role as the vehicle of sexual education. For example, in 'The Family in Contemporary Feminist Thought: A Critical Review,' Jane Flax refers to the work of Kate Millett, among others, when she argues that 'the family is the primary territory of sexual politics,' and that 'Within the family, persons are "conditioned" to either a masculine or a feminine personality in early childhood.'[17] That is, the family is a site in which children should become properly gendered into heterosexuality (and Sigmund Freud, through Oedipus, told us much about (im)proper gender-identification and dark family romances). In this context, note what Roddey Reid argues on the various narratives of threat which started to emerge in the nineteenth century and continue today -- narratives of things gone wrong within the family:

> Now, if there were many potential enemies standing on the borders of the domestic family, just as many if not more emerged treacherously from within: from the latter half of the nineteenth century and down to the present, psychiatrists, experts of all kinds, and the media have constructed narratives of middle-class households also 'endangered' by wayward hysterical mothers and daughters, effeminate sons, unmarriable cousins, sexual 'perverts,' emancipated women, and maniacal or impotent fathers.[18]

Further, the idea of the family has of late been questioned on the basis of sexual identity, because during the last two decades, there have been more and more debates worldwide as to whether same-sex couples should have the same legal rights as heterosexual couples to marry and have children. The (American) family is, indeed, in a crisis: who belongs to, and which people form, the family in an age when 'biological truths' are losing their status?

As I shall show in this study, the Gault-trilogy deals with threats to the white middle class (American) life, middle class family and values. Closely read, Scarpetta considers Gault an enemy to the capitalist national body and family -- a threat to the family: it is through the figure of the serial killer that the image of normality and family is drawn. However, while Cornwell's novels embrace a certain

---

[17] Jane Flax, 'The Family in Contemporary Feminist Thought: A Critical Review,' in The Family in Political Thought, ed. Jean Bethke Elshtain (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1982), p. 226.

[18] Roddy Reid, '"Death of the Family," or, Keeping Human Beings Human,' in Posthuman Bodies, p. 190.

kind of family structure, the ideal nuclear family, where everybody (father, mother, child) has their proper place and where everybody is properly educated into heterosexuality, the novels simultaneously break up that ideal structure by offering different kind of families and by continuously suggesting the nuclear family's (or perhaps, eventually, any family's) dysfunctionality and destructiveness. The nuclear family that is longed for in the novels never seems to have existed in the first place: there is nostalgia for something that did not or does not exist, but this phantasmatic something -- a norm and ideal -- is offered and upheld to the novels' readers as something desirable. 'Thus,' writes Reid in '"The Death of the Family,"' 'in constant surveillance of ourselves and others -- "who's next?" -- we stoke our desires of "family" with tales of its disruption or decline in hope that someday we will nonetheless "get it right" in our daily lives' (p. 191). It is the loss of the imagined family unity -- in the series, through the death of Scarpetta's father -- that makes the family ideal possible. Paradoxically, too, the Scarpetta figure seems to long for a traditional family structure (the nuclear family),[19] but she herself would actually not be an ideal figure as a career woman in such a family. Yes, 'there really is *no place* like "home."' It may be that such a contradictory positioning of the family (maintaining and undermining the nuclear family) in the novels would eventually open a way for a critique of the nuclear family.

Family and home appear in contemporary serial killer novels in many forms and in many ways. To begin with, if we contextualize the Gault-trilogy within these detective novels in general, we can perceive how the trilogy partakes in a common theme therein -- and in true-crime books, pop-psychological and pop-criminological books.[20] That is, what we time and again find in such novels and 'expert' accounts is that the reasons for the murderous deeds are to be found in the breakdown of the

[19] The nuclear family, as defined by Judith Stacey in In the Name of the Family: Rethinking Family Values in the Postmodern Age (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996), is 'inhabited by a male breadwinner, his full-time homemaker wife, and their dependent children' (p. 6). Note that Stacey herself considers such a nuclear family one that 'many today mistake for an ancient, essential, and now-endangered institution' (ibid.).

[20] It needs to be noted that besides Cornwell's novels, I shall specifically refer to other detective novels when I discuss serial murder. Thus I shall not examine, for example, Bret Easton Ellis' American Psycho (London: Picador, 1992; orig. publ. 1991) or the work of Dennis Cooper: their novels do not deal with crime and its detection. Therefore, when I use the term 'serial murder novel' in this study, I specifically refer to the kind of novel that Cornwell and Harris are famous for.

family structure and in childhood traumas. Mark Seltzer notes in his recent book Serial Killers: Death and Life in America's Wound Culture (1998) that 'recourse to the trauma of child abuse or sexual abuse as explanation ... has become virtually automatic in the literature (factual or fictional) on serial killing.'[21] Moreover, as regards childhood and family, a typical pattern found in serial murder novels is that the blame for the (male) killer's actions is put on mothers and women. This is also what we encounter in the Gault-trilogy. These mother-figures do not mother properly (whatever that is taken to mean) and their children become improperly gendered and confused about sex and sexual identity because of bad mothering, or the mothers abuse their children in various ways, or they are dead, absent or mentally unstable.

Take into account here, for instance, Thomas Harris' two influential novels published in the 1980s, which are very much concerned with family issues, parenthood, and improper gender-identification. Harris' novels opened the way for numerous imitators, as did the films based on the novels, 'Manhunter' (directed by Michael Mann in 1986) and 'The Silence of the Lambs' (by Jonathan Demme in 1991). The novel Red Dragon (1981), where Harris first dealt with serial murder, relates the story of the hunt for and the capture of a mass-murdering serial killer, Francis Dolarhyde, who was abandoned by his mother and raised by his grandmother.[22] Harris' next best-seller, The Silence of the Lambs (1988), has as central characters two 'orphans,' FBI trainee Clarice Starling and serial killer Jame Gumb, aka Buffalo Bill. Whereas in Red Dragon Dolarhyde wipes out whole families, Gumb 'only' murders daughters. Gumb kidnaps and skins big girls because, to quote the infamous serial killer in the novel, Hannibal Lecter, '"He wants a vest with tits on it."'[23] Or, more specifically, Gumb wants to be Mommy. As regards the novel's heroine, Clarice -- in the world that Clarice sees around her, men

---

[21] Mark Seltzer, Serial Killers: Death and Life in America's Wound Culture (New York and London: Routledge, 1998), p. 256. Seltzer's book is one of the few studies which tries to analyze serial murder (both real and fictional) in a wide cultural framework.

[22] Thomas Harris, Red Dragon (London: The Bodley Head, 1982); orig. publ. 1981.

[23] Thomas Harris, The Silence of the Lambs (New York: St. Martin's Paperbacks, 1989; orig. publ. 1988), p. 152.

are mostly strong and women weak, and women, like her own mother, cannot keep families together and they fall prey to such monsters as Buffalo Bill.[24] Harris' latest novel Hannibal (1999), the sequel to the Silence of the Lambs, focuses on the character of Lecter, and it we learn that Lecter, too, is an orphan: when he was six years old, his parents were killed in the Second World War and his younger sister was eaten by a 'mixed bag of deserters.'[25] No wonder then that in Hannibal Lecter studies the history of his family and believes, 'from fragmentary family records,' that he descends from Machiavelli (p. 136). It seems that in Harris' novels orphans have two career options only, those of the detective and the serial killer.

Consider too, for example, T. Jefferson Parker's novel Summer of Fear (1994). The killer in Parker's novel is called the 'Midnight Eye,' and he is painstakingly meticulous as regards the parents in the non-white families he targets:

> Both bodies -- smallish darkskinned bodies -- were opened and emptied like drawers. Their contents were everywhere, strewn around the floor, hurled against the walls, piled on the bed, strung from the blades of the ceiling fan, flung onto the lamp shades, the blinds, the television screen, the dresser, hung from the top fronds of a palm that stood by the window, splattered against that same window and drying now from red to black in the golden summer sunlight of morning.[26]

The parents become part of, and merge with, their surroundings as their inner body parts are emptied

---

[24] Clarice's relation to the mother of one of the kidnapped girls, Catherine, is ambiguous for reasons of class and education. Senator Martin, 'that Vanderbilt bitch' as Clarice calls her once (p. 290), suspects Clarice of a theft, and when Clarice succeeds in finding the Senator's daughter, this daughter welcomes her with these words: '"You fucking bitch don't leave me down here, my mother will tear your goddamn shit brains out -- "' (p. 344). This is opposed to Clarice's thoughts about Catherine earlier on: there is a passage in the novel when she feels she must sympathize with Catherine. It is as if Clarice were able to relate to Catherine only through dead fathers:

> She wondered if Catherine tried to please her father when she was little. She wondered what Catherine was doing when they came and told her that her father was dead, of a heart attack at forty-five. Starling was positive Catherine missed him. Missing your father, the common wound, made Starling feel close to this young woman. Starling found it essential to like Catherine Martin because it helped her to bear down. (p. 208)

[25] Thomas Harris, Hannibal (New York: Delacorte Press, 1999), p. 255. See also my review of Hannibal,'Hämmentävä sarjamurhaaja Hannibal,' in Helsingin Sanomat, December 11, 1999.

[26] T. Jefferson Parker, Summer of Fear (New York: St. Martin's Paperbacks, 1994), p. 68.

out: this is, literally, the broken family. If in some cases the serial killer wipes out whole families, the mother, father, and children, then in other cases the killer targets only mothers and children -- as in Derek Van Arman's Just Killing Time (1993), where there is one killer stalking single-parent families, and a pair of killers sexually abusing and killing young women.[27] Sometimes the killers renounce their biological families and family names and replace them with new ones when they move, as it were, from the biological family to the 'serial killer family.' In some novels this replacement is articulated very clearly: for example, the killer called 'Midnight Eye' in Summer of Fear remarks to the investigating reporter that '"And I have only one name -- the Midnight Eye. Ing is a person who used to be and is no more"' (p. 344). Ing moves from one family to another, and there is a shift from anonymity to the mythological and the historical. In A.J. Holt's Watch Me (1996), there is a serial killer 'family' the members of which boast about their murders and communicate with each other through the Internet.[28] FBI-agent Jay Fletcher starts to track down and kill the members of this family: she is both outside the family (invading the family uninvited and murdering its members) but soon inside it, because she starts to send messages to the other members through the Internet. Acting like a real member, informing others about her victims, Fletcher begins to destroy the serial killer family from within.[29] Watch Me thus employs, too, a typical motif found in contemporary serial murder novels; the motif of the detective's dangerous identification with the serial killer.

As regards pop-criminological and pop-psychological accounts of serial killers, the passage that I quoted from Robert Keppel's Signature Killers at the beginning of this chapter expresses a typical argument. Keppel links serial murder to the breakdown of the family as he concludes that 'When people ask about the reason for the growing number of signature crimes, people have to look at the collapse of

---

[27] Derek Van Arman, Just Killing Time (New York: Onyx, 1993).

[28] A.J. Holt, Watch Me (London: Headline Feature, 1996).

[29] Should we here consider the Manson Family -- Charles Manson and his followers who were named the 'Family'. They were not serial killers but, nevertheless, mass-murdered a number of persons. As Colin Wilson and Damon Wilson write in The Plague of Murder: The Rise and Rise of Serial Killers in the Modern Age (London: Robinson, 1995): 'Charles Manson, who was sentenced to death in April 1971, may or may not have actually killed anyone, but his followers -- known as "the Family" -- killed at least nine people, possibly more' (p. 298).

the traditional family in America and judge for themselves the very far-reaching consequences it's having on all of us.' Or note what another writer, Joel Norris, writes in his book Serial Killers: The Growing Menace (1990): 'The current knowledge of experts in the fields of neurology, internal medicine, psychology, and criminal justice shows that the disease of serial murder is generational. It is passed on through child abuse, negative parenting, and genetic damage.'[30] Yet another book, Nigel Hawthorne's Sex Killers (1994), frames the murders committed by Jeffrey Dahmer within the breakdown of the Dahmer family: 'Dahmer began his murderous career at eighteen. At that time, his parents were going through an acrimonious divorce. Dahmer's father had already left and his mother was away on a vacation. Dahmer was alone in the house and feeling very neglected.'[31] Furthermore, Ann Rule's book about Ted Bundy, The Stranger Beside Me (1980), states that Bundy's 'very birth stamped him as different.'[32] Bundy was an illegitimate child, who grew up believing that his mother was his sister and his grandparents were his parents.

Cornwell's trilogy is no exception as the family becomes an origin of distress and crime on a number of levels. In fact, the story of how Gault's crimes have their origin within the Gault family is doubled in the story of Scarpetta's investigation into his crimes. Both the Gault family and the Scarpetta family become 'sites of crime' in a number of ways. In the Scarpetta family, the 'original' crime in question is the death of the father and, therefore, the breakdown of the family structure. Indeed, if mothers are everywhere in Cornwell's novels, fathers are either dead or absent. As regards the characters, Scarpetta's father is dead, and so is her niece's, Lucy's, alcoholic father; another member of Scarpetta's professional family, Pete Marino, is divorced and does not communicate with his only child; and in The Body Farm, Denesa Steiner's husband is dead and thus unable to prevent the murder of his

[30] Joel Norris, Serial Killers: The Growing Menace (London: Arrow, 1990), p. 325.

[31] Nigel Hawthorne, Sex Killers (London: Boxtree, 1994), p. 152.

[32] Ann Rule, The Stranger Beside Me (London: Warner Books, 1994; orig. publ. 1980), p. 7). Rule's book, by the way, is dedicated to her parents 'for their unfailing love and support, and because they always believed...' (ellipsis in the original).

daughter.[33] The death of the father is, in fact, connected to Scarpetta's choice of career, and this motif of identification with the father-figure is what we find earlier on in Harris' The Silence of the Lambs.[34] When in From Potter's Field Richmond's Chief of police, Paul Tucker, asks Scarpetta about her motives for becoming a medical examiner, she simply answers, '"I don't know why."'[35] Nevertheless, in an earlier novel, Body of Evidence (1991), Scarpetta reveals the following to the reader who thus becomes privy to her motives:

> I was only vaguely aware of what I was doing. The career I had embarked upon would forever return me to the scene of the terrible crime of my father's death. I would take death apart and put it back together again a thousand times. I would master its codes and take it to court. I would understand the nuts and bolts of it. But none of it brought my father back to life, and the child inside me never stopped grieving.[36]

There is a wound in Scarpetta's life, and this wound is clearly the death of her father. The passage provides an 'explanation' for Scarpetta's motives for becoming a medical examiner, but it also draws the reader's attention to how Scarpetta strangely describes the death of the father as a 'crime' -- a crime

---

[33] We find the same scenario in Cornwell's first novel which does not belong to the Scarpetta series, Hornet's Nest (London: Little, Brown and Company, 1997): Andy Brazil's mother is an alcoholic (unable to take care of her son) and his father is an absent figure.

[34] Jane Caputi argues that there is a specific 'lesson' for the female readers of the Silence of the Lambs as regards such father-figures. She writes in 'American Psychos: The Serial Killer in Contemporary Fiction,' Journal of American Culture, 16, No. 4 (Winter 1993), that

> *The Silence of the Lambs* is dedicated by Harris to 'the memory of my father' and, despite the strong female presence, it is the patriarch who rules this text. He appears variously in Starling's fondly remembered father (a slain night watchman), Jack Crawford, her boss at the FBI, and Dr. Hannibal Lecter, the infamous multiple murderer and cannibal whom she must petition to aid her in her current search for Jame Gumb, a killer who kidnaps, kills and skins large young women so that he may sew up a 'girl suit' for himself to wear. Lecter, as befitting his name, then becomes her teacher, as well as her therapist, psychic lover and father figure. (pp. 102-103)

Specifically, according to Caputi, the lesson of the novel for its female readers is that they 'once again have been given to understand that their only hope of salvation lies in being dutiful daughters, bonding with and paying homage to abusive father figures' (p. 103).

[35] Patricia Cornwell, From Potter's Field (New York: Scribner, 1995), p. 26; hereafter abbreviated as FPF in the text.

[36] Patricia Cornwell, Body of Evidence (London: Warner Books, 1992; orig. publ. 1991), p. 162; hereafter abbreviated in the text as BE.

which destroys the unity and structure of the Scarpetta family (I shall return to this in Chapter 3).

The fact that the death of the father is centrally linked to Scarpetta's choice of career, makes the Scarpetta family, too, a site of crime and illness. The career as a forensic pathologist provides Scarpetta, then, with a perspective of health and illness: as part of medico-judicial discourses, forensic medicine is, after all, a discourse which produces the normal and healthy as well as their opposites. The Scarpetta family is constructed as a site where ideas and ideals of family and family-life are tested, and where family members survey each other('s bodies) for signs of improper behaviour, illness and deviation. In the Scarpetta family, the family members do not hug each other out of love but because they look for signs of addiction -- addictions like smoking: '"You hugged me because you wanted to see if I smell like cigarettes."'[37] Or the family members look for signs of sexual or gender deviation as when Dorothy worries over Lucy in Cruel and Unusual: '"I worry that she's going to start looking masculine."'[38] That is, Lucy exercises too much, and also, as Scarpetta's mother remarks, she '"live[s] inside her brain all the time"' (p. 83). According to Scarpetta's mother, reading science books destroyed Scarpetta's marriage; hence, exercising, reading, and science are not appropriate for young or married women.

Such practices of familial surveillance signify to the reader how exactly one is accepted into the family, or how, and on what basis, one deviates too much from the familial norms and roles. No wonder, then, that in Scarpetta series the body is seen as something needing to be constantly controlled and kept within the limits and numbers of normality: practices of weight-watching, exercising, and dieting are central, not to mention abstinence from drinking and smoking. This is a kind of policing of the body and a denial of 'unhealthy' pleasures, and the lesson to the novels' readers is that, ideally, 'healthy' bodies produce 'healthy' minds and people worthy of citizenship.[39] The control of the body can therefore, I

---

[37] Lucy's words to Scarpetta in From Potter's Field, p. 151. In this novel, Scarpetta's mother, who has always smoked too much, is hospitalized and, as Dorothy tells Scarpetta, '"a machine breathes for her"' (p. 110).

[38] Patricia Cornwell, Cruel and Unusual (London: Warner Books, 1994; orig. publ. 1993), p. 82; hereafter abbreviated as CU in the text.

[39] Sometimes, however, the surface of 'health' can be deceptive, as in the case of Lucy and her sexual identity. In From Potter's Field, Scarpetta describes Lucy as 'athletic and superbly fit' (p. 152). However, beneath this surface of health Lucy is 'sick': she is lesbian (I shall return to this in Chapter 3). Typically, then, the Scarpetta

think, be translated into a control of the social body and nation. Surveillance works on the level of the national family. Thus, if the members of the Scarpetta family survey each other, so do the members of the national family -- some more (expertly) than others -- when they look for, as well as define, signs of illness, deviation, and unhealthy habits in the national body. 'In familial discourse,' writes Reid, 'the production of "family" as desirable norm has always required freaks and outcasts that name the norm indirectly by virtue of their departure from it' (p. 191). In effect, the Scarpetta family (emblematic of the national family/body) epitomizes questions of othering, namely questions of sex, gender, gender identification, sexuality, ethnicity, class, and technology. Family is that which is 'indirectly' defined through the figure of Gault.

Questions of othering relate to criminal acts especially in the Gault-trilogy. By contextualizing serial murder within sexual deviance, for example, that sexual deviance -- non-heterosexuality -- becomes deemed as criminal. This is the kind of 'mapping together' that Philip Jenkins analyzes in his book Using Murder: The Social Construction of Serial Homicide (1994). Jenkins writes that 'Also significant ... is the concept of stigmatizing one form of behaviour by linking it ("mapping together") with another phenomenon that is perceived as far more dangerous.'[40] Jenkins continues that serial murder 'represents an "ultimate evil," and any behaviour that can plausibly be linked to it will be regarded as a much greater menace than might otherwise be the case' (ibid.). In other words, by linking serial murder to improper gender and sexuality in the Gault-trilogy, those two become considered even more deviant and dangerous -- and in need of control and policing. Serial murder may thus (be used to) strengthen conservative attitudes towards those seen to deviate from the traditional/familial/national norms. Indeed, as Jenkins argues, 'From a conservative stance, the central theme is that any given society has so departed from traditional norms as to produce individuals as bizarre and threatening as the celebrated serial killers' (p. 17).

---

figure reveals, and points to, a sick, dirty, world beneath the surface of health and normality.

[40] Philip Jenkins, Using Murder: The Social Construction of Serial Homicide (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994), p. 7.

The Scarpetta family -- and, consequently, the national family -- is thus in multiple ways a site of illness, deviation, and crime; a site to be purified. In addition, for Scarpetta her family produces feelings of guilt and inadequacy: she is not there for her family, but has left Miami (her mother and sister there) in order to make a career for herself. In this scenario, her family endlessly reminds her of her position within the family structure and of her duties and roles as a 'proper' woman, daughter, sister, and aunt: of duties and roles which she often finds impossible to fulfil or come to terms with. Unlike many male detective figures, Scarpetta is, as it were, always already guilty in her relationships with her family members: guilty of not caring enough, not loving enough, not visiting often enough -- like in From Potter's Field when the murder investigation prevents Scarpetta from visiting her family during Christmas:

> We walked without talking for many blocks, and I thought about my family in Miami. I probably would call them again before the end of the day, and my reward would be more complaints. They were unhappy with me because I had not done what they wanted, and whenever that was the case, I furiously wanted to quit them as if they were a bad job or a vice. In truth, I worried most about Lucy, whom I had always loved as if she were my daughter. Mother I could not please, and Dorothy I did not like. (p. 85)

Accordingly, when Scarpetta cannot properly fulfil her role as a daughter and sister, her family becomes something she hopes she could 'quit' like a 'bad job or a vice,' a blemish, a fault, a bad habit -- no more family. If the family is, like in the above quotation, regarded as a vice, a bad habit, then it strangely takes on the meaning of addiction: the family is an addiction, something which one can only hope to quit, like smoking or drinking.

> And even once you get inside the Norman Bates house...it wasn't a dark back alley, it wasn't all you'd have seen before. It was kind of bringing murder home.[41]
>
> As optimistic as we should be about the future, we are nevertheless more fearful than ever. We're afraid we'll get shot on the freeways, afraid that the child sitting next to ours in the school cafeteria is carrying a gun, and afraid to drive down to the ATM because we don't know who's lurking in the shadow just beyond the circle of the halogen lamp. We live in fear; yet it's a fear that is partly of our own making.[42]
>
> 'So I will tell you why I avoided that specialty. I cannot spend so much time with monsters. It is bad enough for people like you [Scarpetta] who take care of their victims. But I think to sit in the same room with the Gaults of the world would poison my soul.'[43]

Ours is, indeed, the time for the expert on the body and the time of the body: we dissect it, mutilate it, control it, exercise it, obsess with it, locate it in history, sexualize it, medicalize it, technologize it. With the help of new (bio)technologies nothing about our bodies remains secret: we can see beyond the skin into our bodies, into our organs, cells, and genes (just think about the Human Genome Project). Yet the same body has become an alien body: it can be penetrated, impregnated with alien objects (à la 'X-Files'), and endlessly worked over by body-building and plastic surgery, for example.

As a main character, a medical examiner is a fitting choice in an age of serial killers, mass murderers, contagious viruses, and an immense interest in the body; an interest fuelled by, among others, the rise of feminism and, later, cultural studies. Indeed, such a character cannot but investigate crimes committed by serial killers and other psychopathologically dangerous persons or groups: how else to justify such a main character in narrative terms? In other words, in terms of storytelling medical examiners need multiple crimes and multiple bodies. Moreover, the contextualization of the investigation of crime in the Scarpetta series within forensic medicine, effectively gives rise to the

---

[41] The words of Joseph Stefano, scriptwriter for Alfred Hitchcock's 'Psycho,' in 'Clive Barker's A to Z of Horror,' Part 1. Dir. Stephen White. A BBC/A&E Network Co-Production, 1995.

[42] Keppel, Signature Killers, p. 375.

[43] Cornwell, From Potter's Field, p. 262.

contextualization of the body, crime and criminals within the rhetoric of health and illness, within norms and deviations from those norms. I shall now move on to examine serial murder regarded as a particular kind of disease, as evil monstrosity. In order to do that, I shall examine views on real serial murder, as well as monstrosity and studies on other genres (like horror and the Gothic). As I suggested earlier on, if serial killers are monsters, they take us beyond the genre and boundary of detective fiction, beyond 'ordinary' crimes with 'rational' motives. By and large, serial killers (and texts about them) spread (the culture of) fear and terror -- the fear that violence and disease lurk behind the world's surface of normality, and that anybody around us could be a killer.

What we have learned from numerous novels, films, and true-crime books is that serial murder is one of the most difficult crimes to solve. It is surrounded by speculation and hesitation, and researchers cannot quite agree with one another as regards its origin, occurrence, and even exact definition. The origin of 'modern' serial murder is usually traced back to Jack the Ripper, the killer who terrorized the Whitechapel area of London in 1888 and whose identity -- despite the efforts of ripperologists -- remains unknown. Even though Jack the Ripper was not the first serial killer in the world, his 'contribution' lies in that, as Philip Sugden has noticed, 'More important for our own day, perhaps, the Ripper heralded the rise of the modern sexual serial killer. He was not the earliest such offender. But he was the first of international repute and the one that first burned the problem of the random killer into police and popular consciousness.'[44] The fact that the Ripper's identity was never resolved, gave way to numerous theories and imitators. Many of these theories at the time of the murders clearly expressed fears of ethnic otherness and fears of the new medical professions: the Ripper, it was suggested, was an East European Jew, a Russian, or a mad doctor.

Even though we are now familiar with the term serial murder and even though we are used to calling Jack the Ripper a serial killer, the term was actually 'invented' as late as the mid-1970s. Before this term, such terms as 'mass murder' or 'stranger-killings' were commonly used. It was FBI-agent Robert K. Ressler who coined the term 'serial killer.' At this time, Ted Bundy murdered young women

[44] Philip Sugden, The Complete History of Jack the Ripper (London: Robinson, 1994), p. 2.

around the United States, David Berkowitz, aka Son of Sam, shot couples in New York, and John Wayne Gacy buried young men in the crawl space under his house; Ressler taught in Quantico and lectured in seminars around the world. One important factor for the naming event was popular culture: as Ressler writes in Whoever Fights Monsters (1993),

> Now that I look back on that naming event, I think that what was also in my mind were the serial adventures we used to see on Saturday at the movies.... Each week, you'd be lured back to see another episode, because at the end of each one there was a cliff-hanger. In dramatic terms, this wasn't a satisfactory ending, because it increased, not lessened the tension. The same dissatisfaction occurs in the minds of serial killers.[45]

Even though many critics acknowledge Ressler's part in the naming event, there is some controversy as to who it was that invented the term. In her foreword to Keppel's Signature Killers, true-crime writer Ann Rule asserts that the term 'came from Pierce Brooks' in the early 1980s (p. xiii). Colin Wilson, on his part, informs us in A Plague of Murder that 'crime writer John Brophy had used the term "serial murderer" in his book *The Meaning of Murder* in 1966' (p. 390).

What researchers nowadays more or less agree upon is that serial murder differs from other forms of multicide such as mass murder, so that -- to quote Jane Caputi's The Age of Sex Crime (1987) -- mass murder 'refers to a single crime in which a number of persons are killed ... while a *serial murder* refers to a number of killings by a single person over a period of months or even years.'[46] This distinction is important as the two phenomena are at times mistaken for being identical with each other in popular media discussions of the topic.

When it comes to both the exact nature of serial murder and who can be defined as a serial killer on what basis, the hesitation we find mostly focuses on the questions of motivation, victim-selection, and even on the number of victims needed. Some critics, Eric Hickey, for instance, consider the

---

[45] Robert K. Ressler and Tom Shachtman, Whoever Fights Monsters (London: Pocket Books, 1993), p. 46.

[46] Jane Caputi, The Age of Sex Crime (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1987), p. 1; emphasis in the original. See also 'Multiple Murder: A Review' by David M. Gresswell and Clive R. Hollin on the definitions of the various forms of homicide, in The British Journal of Criminology, 34, No. 1 (Winter 1994), pp. 1-14.

definition presented by Ronald M. Holmes and James De Burger in their Serial Murder (1988) insufficient as it mainly stresses stranger-to-stranger relations and 'intrinsic' motivation (to do with psyche).[47] Although Holmes and De Burger discuss 'extrinsic' motivation (e.g. passion, personal gain, jealousy), the emphasis seems to lie on intrinsic motivation and stranger-to-stranger relations. Hickey, on the other hand, would seem to regard intrinsic and extrinsic motives as equals. According to Hickey's definition, many women -- for example, those who practice euthanasia in nursing-homes -- could also be considered serial killers since he writes that,

> In essence, serial murders should include any offenders, male or female, who kill over time. This includes murderers, who, on a repeated basis, may kill within the confines of their own home; for example, a woman may poison several husbands, children, or elderly people in order to collect insurance. In addition, serial murderers are also those men and women who may be mobile and operate within the confines of a city or state or even travel through several states as they seek out victims. Consequently, some victims will have a personal relationship with their killers and others will not, while some victims are killed for pleasure and some merely for gain.[48]

This could be seen as a response to the often repeated claim that there are very few female serial killers compared to the male ones (at least ones that we know of): the numbers may actually depend on how serial murder is initially defined. Nevertheless, it is precisely the Ripper-style murders -- and, specifically, murders committed by men -- that have become the topic for popular fictions, films, and true-crime books during the past couple of decades.

Even though the attention devoted to serial murder in novels, films, true-crime books, and newspapers is enormous, the actual occurrence appears to be small. Jenkins notes that even though serial murder is perceived as a 'massive threat to social values,' it actually 'involves minuscule numbers of people, either as victims or perpetrators, and the likelihood of becoming a victim of this activity is extremely low' (p. 19). Jenkins himself claims that on the American scene, serial murder victims

---

[47] Ronald M. Holmes and James De Burger, Serial Murder (Newbury Park, CA and London: Sage, 1988), see pp. 18-19.

[48] Eric Hickey, 'The Etiology of Victimization in Serial Murder: An Historical and Demographic Analysis,' in Serial Murder: An Elusive Phenomenon, ed. Steven A. Egger (New York: Prager, 1990), p. 55.

comprise about one percent of all the homicide victims (p. 29).[49] As for the estimate of active serial killers each year, it ranges from about 30 to several hundreds -- depending, again, on what one uses as a source.[50] Judging from the huge number of fictional killers, who have terrorized Americans for the past twenty years, at least half of the population should be dead by now.

The present study will focus on serial murder defined as murders committed by 'anonymous' strangers lacking 'apparent' motive; I shall show, however, how anonymity and motivelessness turn out to be a question of family and normality in the Gault- trilogy. Defined as a 'motiveless' crime, or lacking a clear motive, serial murder poses problems because, as is often claimed, it cannot be 'understood' so to speak. What we find again and again both in studies on real serial murder and in fiction, is that serial murder rejects understanding and reason. As Holmes and De Burger typically put it in Serial Murder,

> Homicidal crimes of passion, though reprehensible, can at least be understood and dealt with rationally ... Even in felony homicides and 'classical' murder, it is possible in a grim sort of fashion to make sense of the homicide in terms of the pattern of relations between the killer and the victim. But this cannot be said of serial killing, where an innocent person is slain, sometimes after inhuman torture and degradation, by a stranger. (pp. 24-25)

In a similar fashion, Harold Vetter asserts that 'Serial murderers also pose a problem of

---

[49] See Chapter 2, 'The Reality of Serial Murder' in Jenkins' book on the various figures on serial murder. Jenkins divides the American experience with serial murder into three periods: 'a time of quite intense activity before about 1940; a time of relative tranquility in the mid century; and finally a "murder wave" that began in roughly the mid-1960s and continues unabated today' (p. 33).

[50] See Steven A. Egger, 'Serial Murder: A Synthesis of Literature and Research,' in Serial Murder: An Elusive Phenomenon, pp. 9-10. See also Kenna Kiger's essay in the same book, 'The Darker Figure of Crime: The Serial Murder Enigma,' in which she notices the following:

> The sources of data that have been used to arrive at these various estimates vary at the least with reference to sample bias and size, data collection procedures, and the definition of serial murder. Many samples involve only known or apprehended serial offenders, an obvious selection bias. In addition, their claims of a victim count may be suspect and unreliable. Other studies have relied on a secondary analysis of newspaper indices and other periodicals, searching for stories involving serial homicides. Newspaper stories are problematic sources of data because they are obviously dependent upon editorial decisions and because they may sensationalize (not to mention glorify) this phenomenon in order to increase circulation. (p. 37)

comprehensibility. Although they are unlikely to exhibit signs of psychosis, their crimes do not appear to be based on any motives that make sense to the average person.'[51] Thus, it would appear that other forms of homicide have to do with the rational, the explainable, with reasons and understanding, but serial murder has to do with the irrational -- something which cannot be dealt with reasonably. The perspective of motivelessness does, however, fail in taking account of recent feminist research on serial murder. In that context, serial murder is far from being considered motiveless, but instead, it is considered a form of violence against women, gay men, or ethnic others -- those 'others' of the white male.[52] Moreover, note how serial murder is seen by Vetter to need its experts, those who can explain the phenomenon to the 'average person.' Analyzing the role of the U.S. Justice Department and its 'interpretation' of serial murder, Philip Jenkins draws our attention to the question of expertise. The Justice Department's interpretation of serial murder 'was at its height between 1983 and 1985, but a series of cases in the early 1990s gave renewed weight to these bureaucratic claim-makers' (p. 14). He continues that

> the new emphasis on the phenomenon reinforced the technocratic belief in the work of the Justice Department's experts: the computer scientists who collated the data that permitted the recognition of serial crimes; the forensic technicians who examined physical evidence; and above all, the psychological profilers and behavioral analysts who provided invaluable information to local investigators. (ibid.)

This is, in part, how serial murder became constructed as needing its own experts (computer scientists, forensic technicians, psychological profilers and behavioural analysts) who are the ones who know how to read serial murder properly. These experts on their part have affected the way serial murder has come

---

[51] Harold Vetter, 'Dissociation, Psychopathy, and the Serial Murderer,' in Serial Murder: An Elusive Phenomenon, p. 74.

[52] Caputi's The Age of Sex Crime is an example of ultra-feminist analyses of serial murder: she finds no other explanation for, or context to, serial murder besides the patriarchal oppression of women. That is where she fails in her analyses; another failure would be the (restricted) perspective of white middle class feminism. For example, in her 'American Psychos: The Serial Killer in Contemporary Fiction,' she writes of Ellis' American Psycho that the novel 'represented a significant symbolic assault on American women' (p. 104). Most victims in the novel arewhite and middle class -- would they be the ones who comprise 'American women' for Caputi?

into existence as a type of crime.

What about fiction, then -- how have fictions about serial murder and the figure of the serial killer been read and understood? 'Structurally,' as Paul Duncan briefly notes in The Third Degree, the serial killer novel is

> ... a fusion of the 'killer on the loose' sub-genre with the 'sequence crime' type of novel in which a series of crimes has, or appears to have a pattern -- *The ABC Murders, There Was An Old Lady*...etc. Serial killer novels also use a series of crimes to set up a puzzle, but give us the additional frisson that has historically been provided by other forms of literature such as the horror novel. (p. 22; the second ellipsis in the original)

It is precisely that 'additional frisson' which sets apart the contemporary serial killer novel from the classical detective story or hard-boiled fiction: there are no such monsters in the works of Arthur Conan Doyle, Agatha Christie, Dorothy L. Sayers, Raymond Chandler, or Dashiell Hammett as in the work of Cornwell, Harris, Patterson, or Kellerman. For instance, the novel which Duncan refers to above, Christie's The ABC Murders, is not the kind of novel we would nowadays discuss in the context of the 'fascination with serial killers.' Admittedly, a series of murders takes place in the novel, but they are not the kind of monstrous murders that take place in the work of Cornwell or Harris. The killer in Christie's novel hides one significant murder within a series of murders to lead the police astray. Hence, the murders are a kind of red herring.[53]

Taking into account the subgenres of detective fiction, the classical detective story, the hard-boiled detective story, the police procedural, and the metaphysical detective story,[54] contemporary serial

---

[53] Agatha Christie, The ABC Murders (London: HarperCollins*Publishers*, 1993; orig. publ. 1936). The motif of serial murder has been used in a similar fashion by contemporary authors, too. In Jonathan Kellerman's Over the Edge (London: Warner Books, 1993), a young man is set up through a series of murders; since these murders are used in this way, the question of serial murder and motivation become slightly more problematic. In other words, what counts as 'true' serial murder?

Besides Christie, another author comes to mind here, namely Patricia Highsmith: Highsmith is especially famous for her Ripley series. Even though Ripley is a kind of a serial killer, he -- like the murderer in Christie's novel -- is not the kind of monstrous murderer that is so typical today.

[54] See Heta Pyrhönen, '"Crime is Common, Logic is Rare': Narrative and Moral Issues in the Detective Story,' Diss. University of Helsinki, 1998, pp. 16-18.

murder novels, as the ones under scrutiny in this study, often take us towards the world of the police procedural and the FBI (and psychiatry). In police procedurals, the plot 'traces the slow process of police investigation, highlighting the technical and specialized skills this investigation demands.'[55] Bodily violence, which characterizes serial murder novels, is less central in the classical or metaphysical detective story: for example, the reader of Christie may never even 'see' the body of the murdered victim in the novel (sometimes not even the detective sees it). But as objects of extreme scrutiny and expert analysis, bodily violence and victims' bodies form a fundamental presence and a mystery in serial murder novels.[56] This, I want to stress, is typical of the 1980s and 1990s variant of the serial killer novel -- of the work of Harris and Cornwell.[57]

So far it seems that the history of the serial killer figure remains to be written. Jenkins refers in his book to serial killers on screen and in literature and tries to trace the history of the serial killer in (popular) culture.[58] He divides that history into five periods, between which the perspectives on serial murder differ from each other, but we can also perceive how there are different treatments of serial

---

[55] Pyrhönen, p. 18.

[56] We could say that the hard-boiled detective story brought explicit violence to the genre -- such explicitness or the possibility of bodily violence do not characterize the earlier sub-genre, the classic detective story.

[57] As regards the definition of Cornwell's work in generic terms, Pyrhönen calls Cruel and Unusual a police procedural in '"Crime is Common, Logic is Rare,"' (p. 58).

Considering the subgenres of detective fiction, Tzvetan Todorov's words in his classic article 'The Typology of Detective Fiction,' in The Poetics of Prose (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1977), best relate to the classical detective story. In his essay Todorov refers to and develops further the definition provided by detective writer S.S. Van Dine. Both writers suggest that there are some points which characterize, or which are common, in detective stories. One of these points touches upon the insanity of the criminal: Todorov argues that the criminal cannot be insane and s/he has to have a particular motive. This, as we can see, is not the case in serial killer novels.

[58] See Using Murder, Chapter 4, 'Popular Culture: Images of the Serial Killer.' Since I am writing this study as a Finnish post-graduate student, a few words are needed on the serial murder criticism by Finnish authors. Finnish critics have paid very little attention to the topic of serial murder (either real or fictional), and very little has been written so far. But see, for instance, Jukka Sihvonen, Aineeton syli: Johdatus audiovisuaaliseen tulevaisuuteen (Tampere: Gaudeamus, 1996); Tommi Aitio, 'Pimeyden ytimessä,' Filmihullu, Nos. 4-5 (1997); Susanna Rapinoja, 'Bret Easton Ellisin American Psycho,' Kulttuurivihkot, Nos. 3-4 (1997) -- see also my response to Rapinoja's article, '"Maailma sellaisena kuin se on" - Kommentteja Amerikan psykon luentaan,' Kulttuurivihkot, No. 5 (1997). Further, see Nuori Voima, 3 (1998), eds. Tuomas Nevanlinna and Janne Porttikivi, which examines issues of crime; a number of the articles deal with serial killers. Contrary to many other countries, Finland has no known serial killers to my knowledge -- at least ones that the FBI would count as serial killers. Hence,as a phenomenon, serial killing is known to us through foreign cases and popular culture.

killer figures within each period. The first period is 1. Early treatments of the theme, and, as examples, Jenkins refers to 'true-detective' magazines in the 19th century, book-length studies on real murder cases, and to novels by James Hogg and Robert Louis Stevenson. There were also early films, particularly in Germany, which dealt with serial killers, and Hollywood expressed interest in the theme in the 1930s and 1940s.[59] The next period witnesses a significant change: 2. 'Psycho' and afterwards 1960-1978. Alfred Hitchcock's film 'Psycho' (1960) marked a new beginning -- if not a beginning in generic terms -- for serial killer figures, and later Hitchcock returned to the same thematics in 'Frenzy' (1972). Strangely, though, Jenkins does not mention Michael Powell's important film 'Peeping Tom' (1960) in connection with 'Psycho.' Other such films of this period range from 'The Boston Strangler' to 'Dirty Harry,' and from 'Badlands' to 'Texas Chainsaw Massacre.' Jenkins' examples of this period are films, not novels, and the reason for this appears to be, firstly, the influence of 'Psycho,' and secondly, the fact that both in Britain and the U.S.A. there were changes in the film censorship laws around 1970: these changes allowed more explicit violence and nudity on screen. According to Jenkins, this 'new environment radically changed treatments of serial murder' (p. 85). The 'social crusading tone[s]' of the past were no longer necessary, but, for instance, '*Frenzy* graphically portrayed rape and multiple murder, and this pioneered a proliferating series of films that were widely criticized for gratuitously exploiting the violence and sexual content of the murders. It was these which formed the basis for the emerging "slasher movie" genre of the early 1980s' (ibid.).

The slasher film (aka the stalker film, teenie kill pic, slice and dice film), indeed, marks another period for Jenkins: 3. The slasher film 1978-1990. The classic slasher film is of course John Carpenter's

---

[59] Regarding the relation between contemporary serial killer films and the history of the cinema, note what Diana Fuss writes in her Identification Papers (New York: Routledge, 1995), when she draws attention to the very form of the cinematic medium. She writes,

> Contemporary serial killer films represent not so much the emergence of a new or mutant cinematic form as the revival of an old or dormant one. These films return us to the earliest stages of the cinema and to the medium's fascination with the mutilation, fragmentation, and reconstitution of body parts. Amputations, decapitations, and other forms of bodily disfigurement were commonplace in early cinema; indeed they were one of the stock themes of the trick shorts by Edison, Biograph, Méliès, and Pathé. (p. 102)

'Halloween' (1978), and Jenkins mentions also such films as 'Friday the Thirteenth' and 'Nightmare on Elm Street.' The end of the 1970s witnessed not only the birth of the slasher film but also a 'revival of interest in horror themes in the popular novel' (p. 88). This is the next period, 4. The thriller novel, and as examples Jenkins gives novels by Stephen King, Shane Stevens, and particularly by Thomas Harris. Jenkins argues that these novelists, and many more, now wrote for an audience which was already used to 'the graphic violence of the gore films' (p. 88). The last period, 5. The new boom 1991-1994, includes such novelists as Robert B. Parker, Jonathan Kellerman, Ed McBain, and Ridley Pearson. In addition, Jenkins briefly discusses true crime books and television programmes in the 1980s and 1990s. The novels under discussion in the present study mainly comprise the last two periods, with the emphasis being on detective fiction.

As we can see from the examples above, the figure of the serial killer covers many countries, art forms, genres, and periods of time (considering the variety of Jenkins' examples, it might perhaps be better to refer to the figure of the multiple killer instead of the serial killer). Michael Myers, the killer machine in 'Halloween,' would probably have very little in common with the sophisticated Hannibal Lecter, and Norman Bates from 'Psycho' would more likely end up on Dr Lecter's couch than be regarded by Lecter as a colleague. And what would Temple Gault do to Mr Hyde?

To some extent Jenkins does acknowledge these generic and historical differences. He argues that, for example, if the serial killer was portrayed in the more 'serious' films (and fiction) of the midcentury till the end of the 1960s in terms of psychoanalytic themes and analyses, then in the 1970s, in films like 'Dirty Harry,' such psychoanalytic perspectives were replaced by 'law and order perspectives' (p. 96). In the 1980s, law and order perspectives gave way to the slasher film, especially after 'Halloween,' after which serial killers 'were increasingly portrayed as monsters' (p. 96). That is, specifically as superhuman monsters, 'representatives of total, incomprehensible evil' (ibid.). This change, Jenkins claims, also took place in literature, particularly because of the huge success of Harris' novels. The problem with Jenkins' book is, though, that he does not stress enough the distinction between the genres of horror and detective fiction: he does not analyze enough how the figure of the

serial killer is described differently in the two genres because of generic conventions. Similarly, the role of law enforcement and psychiatry in the fight against the serial killer is different in the genres (just compare, for example, 'Halloween' and 'The Silence of the Lambs'). Isn't there, in the 1990s, a kind of return to the law and order perspective of the 1970s, since the most popular and successful form of the past decade has framed serial killing within the police force and FBI agents? This is something that Jenkins does not state explicitly enough.

He does notice, however, how the massive publicity and visibility of serial murder in mass media, popular culture, and true-crime have affected the way real serial killers have lately been perceived (and vice versa). During the last decade, the type of killer that 'gained visibility was very much that of the extreme sexual sadist or psychopath.... rather than a medical murderer or woman killing members of her family or intimate circle' (p. 98). This is the type of killer that we then find in the works of Cornwell, Harris, Kellerman, and Patterson. It was for this type of killer that the U.S. Justice Department needed the forensic technicians, computer experts, and psychological profilers. If the U.S. Justice Department shaped the image of the specific expertise needed in solving serial murders, popular culture strengthened that image. As Jenkins writes, 'popular culture depictions placed massive emphasis on the heroic role of the (federal) mind-hunters, rather than the ordinary police officers and detectives from local agencies, who are virtually always responsible when serial killers are apprehended' (p. 98). Indeed, as FBI-agent Robert Ressler notes in Whoever Fights Monsters upon the changing relation between the FBI's Behavioral Sciences Unit (BSU) and writers of fiction: 'Even though the sort of publicity that Noreen Ranier [a psychic] had involved us in was not of the best sort, the BSU continued to be the focus of outside interest. Early in the 1980s, that interest changed from documenting what we did to using it as the basis for fiction' (p. 379). That is, Thomas Harris visited Quantico and interviewed Ressler (and things were never the same again).

As regards the appeal of serial murder stories, Jenkins locates such an appeal, for instance, in the conflict between good and evil, in the field of sex combined with violence, the manipulation of fear (e.g. the localization of evil into certain individuals), boundary crossing (from heroic rationality to monstrous

savagery), and the mythology of atavism and primitivism (the dangerous other as a primitive man, and thus connected to the good old beast within). I do think, however, that Jenkins' otherwise fascinating analysis of the imagery of primitivism, savagery, and cannibalism in accounts and fictions of serial murder would have gained more depth had he connected his analysis more to questions of gender, for example, and had he analyzed how the notions of the human and the monstrous are constructed in such an imagery in general. Indeed, an analysis of the monstrous, the primitive, and the beast within is essential.

The idea of the potentially dangerous unconscious and individual, based on psychoanalysis and its theorizations of psychosexual motives, is crucial in the formation of the psychotic figure in popular culture during the past couple of decades. Note in this context -- and in a larger perspective -- how Michel Foucault connects psychiatry and what he calls 'homicidal mania' when he briefly traces the history of pathological crime and criminal psychiatry in the juridical system:

> Such an interest in the great crimes 'without reason' does not, I think, indicate on the part of psychiatry a desire to take over criminality, but a desire to justify its functions: the control of the dangers hidden in human behaviour. What is at stake in this great issue of homicidal mania is the function of psychiatry. It must not be forgotten that in most Western countries psychiatry was then [in the 19th century] striving to establish its right to impose upon the mentally ill a therapeutic confinement. After all, it had to be shown that madness, by its nature, and even in its most discrete manifestations, was haunted by the absolute danger, death. The functioning of modern psychiatry is linked to this kinship between madness and death, which was not scientifically established, but rather symbolically represented in the figure of homicidal mania.[60]

In the 1980s and 1990s, serial murders -- crimes 'without reason' -- in the Unites States have been effectively contextualized both within experts of psychiatry (behavioural analysts and psychological profilers) and the FBI. During these two decades -- coinciding with the New Right movement[61] -- serial murder has specifically become a popular theme in police procedurals, in fictions

---

[60] Michel Foucault, 'The Dangerous Individual,' in Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977-1984, trans. Alan Sheridan and others, ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman (New York: Routledge, 1988), p. 135.

[61] See Jenkins, pp. 8-12.

featuring police officials, detectives, and the FBI. Such a contextualization of the fight against serial murder within the field of the FBI and law enforcement, serves to justify conservative attitudes towards crime and criminals. In other words, such a contextualization justifies the power of law enforcement on local and national levels -- and a culture of 'policing' and surveillance.

While the police investigation is in a central position -- as in Cornwell's novels -- serial killer novels within detective fiction generate terror and fear in particular ways, and as such draw from other popular genres. When in whodunits, hard-boiled novels or police procedurals without serial killers we can find 'rational' motives for criminal acts (jealousy, greed, rage), in serial killer novels the motives are more or less presented as incomprehensible and the killer is portrayed as an inhuman monster. 'The serial killer,' notes Duncan, 'like the monstrous protagonist of horror fiction, has a motivation that is societally incomprehensible, being neither financial nor personal, and the serial killer is often portrayed as "different" and "inhuman"' (p. 22). If the serial killers novels I discuss here structurally and generically remain in the realm of detective fiction, in terms of the psychological landscape and the figure of the killer -- a psychopathologically dangerous individual -- they are influenced by horror fiction and the Gothic (both in their literary and cinematic forms). The figure of the serial killer stands thus at the crossroads of not only law, order, and psychiatry and psychoanalysis but also of different genres.

It is, indeed, abundantly clear now that the faces of evil monstrosity in the late twentieth century popular culture include that of the serial killer. Literary or cinematic monsters have traditionally belonged to the fields and genres of horror and the Gothic (as well as science fiction), where they range from Mary Shelley's Frankenstein to Robert Louis Stevenson's Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde to vampires and werewolves. Peter Hutchings has even noted of the figure of the serial killer on screen that 'In an important sense, the serial killer is the 1980s movie monster *par excellence*.'[62] The same, we might add,

[62] Peter Hutchings, 'Tearing Your Soul Apart: Horror's New Monsters,' in Modern Gothic: A Reader, eds. Victor Sage and Allan Lloyd Smith (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1996), p. 91.

seems to be just as true as regards detective fiction at the end of the 1980s and early 1990s.[63] In such detective narratives, extreme bodily violation is connected to the diseases of the mind.

What I am especially interested in underscoring here is the psychology of the killer -- the view of the killer as the inhuman 'beast within.' Examining the field of horror or the Gothic might make us understand cultural, historical, and social constructions of monstrosity (and therefore serial killing) in general; that which is regarded as unnatural, deviant, immoral, or non-human by society at any given time. In other words, what or who it is that society regards and constructs as its other(s). Such an examination might also make us understand how contemporary forms of horror and terror deal not only with what is considered to be outside us (outwardly visible monsters) but also what is seen to dwell within, in our 'unconscious' (the monster, the 'beast within'), and why. That is, how popular fictions address, personify, and give face to the fear of otherness. Such fictions and critical accounts of monsters often separate physiological deformation and monstrosity (visible, outside) from psychical monstrosity (invisible, hidden inside). Serial murder novels deal precisely with the latter: with monstrosity that is seen to hide beneath the surface of normality. Many such novels deal with gothic ideas (paranoia, decay, degeneracy, sexual violence and rape, to name but a few) and gothic spaces: with secret dens, cellars, and tunnels, where the killers imprison, torture, and kill their victims. These secret and hidden places, then, undoubtedly correspond to the dangerous psyche.[64] However, when we read serial murder novels

---

[63] Like Judith Halberstam in Skin Shows: Gothic Horror and the Technology of Monsters (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 1995), Hutchings discusses Demme's 'The Silence of the Lambs' in the context of horror and the Gothic. Hutchings notes on the two terms that 'it is more useful, in broad terms at least, to consider Gothic as a distinctive mode which influences a wide range of cultural forms while horror, and especially the horror film, is best seen as a genre, a much more narrowly circumscribed area of cultural activity' (p. 89). Sally R. Munt, on the other hand, calls Demme's film a 'thriller' in her Murder by the Book? Feminism and the Crime Novel (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), see pp. 231-232. On Demme's film and horror, see Christopher Sharrett, 'The Horror Film in Neoconservative Culture,' Journal of Popular Film & Television, 21, No. 3 (1993), and Julie Tharp, 'The Transvestite as Monster: Gender Horror in *The Silence of the Lambs*,' Journal of Popular Film & Television, 19, No. 3 (1991). See also David Sundelson, 'The Demon Therapist and Other Dangers: Jonathan Demme's *The Silence of the Lambs*,' Journal of Popular Film & Television, Vol. 21, No. 1 (Spring 1993), and Greg Garrett, 'Objecting to Objectification: Re-Viewing the Feminine in *The Silence of the Lambs*,' Journal of Popular Culture, Vol. 27, No. 4 (Spring 1994).

[64] For example, see such novels as Harris' The Silence of the Lambs, James Patterson's Kiss the Girls (London: HarperCollins*Publishers*, 1995), Lauri Maerov's Copycat (London: Signet,1996; orig. publ. 1995) based on the screenplay of the film 'Copycat.' No literary or cinematic torture chamber, however, can surpass the real life 'Holmes Castle,' built by Herman Webster Mudgett (aka H.H. Holmes) in Chicago in the 1890s, the rooms of

in closer detail, we perceive how they actually often locate madness and monstrosity within ethnicity and class as well as within the disruption of the binary systems of sex, gender, and sexual identity. This is what takes place in the Gault-trilogy. Therefore, I think that we need to critically examine the 'beast within' explanations, particularly in cases where critics ignore questions of sexual, racial, or class otherness.

Analyses of monsters often refer to the very etymology of the word monster, which is in itself significant. In a general context, Chris Baldick, among others, refers to it in his study In Frankenstein's Shadow: Myth, Monstrosity, and Nineteenth-Century Writing (1992):

> As Michel Foucault reminded us in his discussion of the public performances put on by the inmates of lunatic asylums until the early nineteenth century, a 'monster' is something or someone to be *shown*.... In a world created by a reasonable God, the freak or lunatic must have a purpose: to reveal visibly the results of vice, folly, and unreason, as a warning (Latin, *monere*: to warn) to erring humanity.[65]

Baldick does not, however, restrict his analysis to physiological deformities but notes that in the past monstrosity has also been understood as a moral aberration, 'ingratitude, rebellion, and disobedience, particularly towards parents' is monstrous in Shakespeare's plays, for instance (p. 13), or as a metaphor of political disorder (the French Revolution as 'monstrous'). Monstrosity is thus, in a sense, connected to conservative attitudes. Also Rosi Braidotti stresses the etymological aspect when she discusses embodied differences, monsters, and teratology (science or study of monsters) in 'Signs of Wonder and Traces of Doubt: On Teratology and Embodied Differences' (1996). She writes that '*monster/monstrum* is primarily an object of display. This can be understood literally. Historically, monsters have always

---

which, as Seltzer informs us in Serial Killers, 'were laid out in a mazelike fashion, incorporating corridors leading nowhere, with concealed passages behind walls, sliding panels, secret staircases, peepholes into the rooms through the backs of pictures, and trapdoors covering metal chutes that communicated with the elaborately designed basement' (p. 206). The Castle -- the Gothic castle *par excellence* -- was filled with technological machinery to kill victims with gas, fire, electricity and other available means.

[65] Chris Baldick, In Frankenstein's Shadow: Myth, Monstrosity, and Nineteenth-Century Writing (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 10.

been exhibited in public spaces.'[66] In Monster Theory: Reading Culture (1996), Jeffrey Jerome Cohen specifically emphasizes the idea of reading when he writes that 'A construct and a projection, the monster exists only to be read: the *monstrum* is etymologically "that which reveals," "that which warns," a glyph that seeks a hierophant.'[67]

Then, Andrew Tudor, in his book Monsters and Mad Scientists: A Cultural History of the Horror Movie (1989), analyzes all kinds of cinematic monsters and gives a 'rank order of horror-movie monsters 1931-1984,' which includes (from top to bottom) psychotics, mad scientists, science creations, vampires, mutations, ghosts, magicians/witches, natural nasties, prehistoric, space 'men,' zombies, demons, bug-eyed monsters, Satanists, werewolves, and mummies.[68] Except for the psychotic -- of central importance here -- and the mad scientist, we notice that all the other monsters are more or less classic monsters, i.e., visibly different from (normal) humans. Noticeable, too, is the number of psychotic monsters during this time period, and Tudor remarks on its high percentage (28 per cent) that 'the fact psychotics outweigh all other monsters is partly a consequence of the modern growth of the genre: over 90 per cent of films involving psychotics appear after 1960' (p. 20) -- that is, after 'Psycho.' Contrary to the classic monsters, serial killers -- psychotics -- mark a new kind of monstrosity: they look outwardly normal (they blend in) but are dangerously psychotic behind the surface of normality. As regards the emergence of the psychotic monster in cinema, Tudor, as so many other critics, sees its origins in two influential films, both from 1960: 'The single genuinely new development of the sixties is most cogently expressed in the first films of the psychosis tradition, above all in *Psycho* and *Peeping Tom*. These two mark the beginning of the modern psycho-movie' (pp. 191-192). Tudor's characterization of this cinematic psychotic figure resembles very much its counterpart in detective

---

[66] Rosi Braidotti, 'Signs of Wonder and Traces of Doubt: On Teratology and Embodied Differences,' in Between Monsters, Goddesses and Cyborgs: Feminist Confrontations with Science, Medicine and Cyberspac, eds. Nina Lykke and Rosi Braidotti (London & New Jersey: Zed Books, 1996), p. 135.

[67] Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, 'Monster Culture (Seven Theses),' in Monster Theory: Reading Culture, ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), p. 4.

[68] Andrew Tudor, Monsters and Mad Scientists: A Cultural History of the Horror Movie (Oxford, UK and Cambridge, USA: 1989), p. 20.

fiction, except for the role of expertise (and perhaps the narrative structure):

> By the end of the seventies these innovatory fragments had fused into a highly commercial form. In various combinations this involved some or all of the following: graphic portrayal of violence; insanity conceived as a routine expectation in everyday life; declining efficacy of experts, whether coercive or psychiatric; little or no explanation for psychotic behaviour; violent misogyny as a central element in psychosis; and a narrative structure dominated by the tension requirements of the terrorizing narrative. (p. 197)

In the 1980s the psychotic turns into a 'terrorizer,' and we find numerous films in which the psychotic's 'sole purpose appears to be the pursuit and messy elimination of uninteresting juvenile victims' (p. 208) -- this is the post-Halloween slasher film that Jenkins discusses, too. What is noteworthy, then, is the emergence of the modern psychotic killer and its implications for notions of monstrosity as well as its effects outside the screen on other forms of popular culture. Typically, Tudor relies on the 'beast within' explanation and claims that the psychotic points to what is inside us, in our unconscious, since 'Horror-movie psychosis trades on our fear of what is hidden within ourselves. In its world, any of us might suddenly be transformed into unpredictable and inexplicable killers' (p. 186).[69] The psychotic is a feature of what Tudor calls 'paranoid horror' (as opposed to 'secure horror'), one characteristic of which is the danger other people possibly pose in a world seen as 'fundamentally unreliable': 'However "normal" friends, neighbours and family may seem, the presumption of paranoid horror is that they might prove unpredictably malevolent and so powerful that resistance is doomed to failure' (p. 221). In contrast, in secure horror, even though in some cases 'other people were to be

---

[69] On the Gothic and the beast within explanation, see also David Punter's The Literature of Terror: A History of Gothic Fictions from 1765 to the Present Day (London and New York: Longman, 1980). Punter, too, maintains the myth of the 'beast within':

> Gothic fiction is erotic at root: it knows that to channel sexual activity into the narrow confines of conventionality is repressive and, in the end, highly dangerous, that it is a denial of Eros and that Eros so slighted returns in the form of threat and violence. The beast within cannot be killed, but that is because he derives his strength from the pressure with which he is held down by the smooth-faced man on the outside. (p. 411)

On the slasher film and 'the eruption of uncontrollable chaotic forces from within,' see Mark Jancovich's book Horror (London: B.T. Batsford, 1992), p. 108.

feared,' these people 'were presumed to be easily recognizable, and their deviance, by definition a consequence of individual intentional activity, was therefore open to appropriate techniques of social control' (ibid.). Unfortunately, Tudor does not critically examine the notion of the beast within, nor does he problematize the question of normality as opposed to 'recognizable' deviance.

However, not all critics writing about psychotic monsters agree so easily with the idea of the beast within. Joseph Grixti, for example, questions such a naive view of psychopathological violence in his book Terrors of Uncertainty: The Cultural Contexts of Horror Fiction (1989), when he writes that,

> What I wish to underline ... is the frequency with which contemporary works of horror fiction project and reinforce a set of assumptions about the degenerative, diseased, and compulsive characteristics of this 'primitive tendency'. Fearful fantasies about the psychopathological destructiveness which is assumed to derive from this tendency are also frequently juxtaposed against a set of stereotypical images of the reassuringly controlling (though equally ruthless) representatives of law and order.[70]

By the 'primitive tendency' Grixti refers to such an understanding of the human nature in which acts of human destructiveness are seen to be attributed to '"inherited", "inevitable", or "natural" characteristics which are located "inside" the individual but which are also conceptualized as being alien and opposed to the rational mind or spirit' (p. xv). For Grixti, such an understanding of the human nature and mind is 'basically Cartesian' (p. 86). This view opposes the rational mind to the drives of the flesh. Grixti also situates it to the nineteenth-century ideas on 'man's evolutionary origins' (p. 88)[71] as well as to positivist, behaviourist and neo-behaviourist assumptions about humans as '"bundles of perceptions" which start life as a *tabula rasa*' (p. 109; emphasis in the original). It follows that Grixti examines and criticizes simplistic notions of, for example, how mass mediated violence is said to affect people. Grixti himself gives another kind of explanation for the abundance of horror monsters:

---

[70] Joseph Grixti, Terrors of Uncertainty: The Cultural Contexts of Horror Fiction (London and New York: Routledge, 1989), p. 24.

[71] Darwinism, like psychoanalysis and its hypothesis of the unconscious and uncontrollable drives, undoubtedly plays a significant role in the belief in the beast within.

> Stereotypes of psychopaths, juvenile delinquents, uncontrollable monsters, and invading demons -- as well as larger unifying myths like those of 'beast within' and 'clockwork mechanisms' allegedly underlying motivation and behaviour -- reflect but some of the recurring analogical games resorted to in the course of contemporary society's attempts to evade the implications of unpleasant social and existential realities. (p. 172)

Grixti therefore pays more attention to the social construction of deviation and monstrosity than Tudor, for example, as he analyzes the uses of universal 'unifying myths' such as the beast within.

Like Grixti, Seltzer in Serial Killers is just as interested in questioning the notion of the beast within, but he turns to another direction. In fact, Seltzer's book could be argued to be about the two commonly held 'explanations' for serial killing. The first is the above 'beast within' explanation (psychology), and the second is one in which the subject of violence is defined from without (sociology): 'the "psycho" reading and the "social" reading' (p. 148). Moreover, he interprets the fascination with the figure of the serial killer not only with the beast within explanation but also on the basis of identification, typicality, individuality, private desire, and public act. He writes that

> If the psycho killer is a pole of attraction and fascination in our culture, this is then not merely because he realizes these most fundamental workings of the mind (the unconscious murderous in itself). It is also, at least in part, because public corporeal violence threatens, or promises, to close the 'normative' gap between private desires and public acts. What makes these atrocity scenes pathological is not merely their violent content, and what makes for their public consumption is not merely a taste for senseless violence. The violent scenes that flood the pathological public sphere disclose a drive to realize private desires in public spectacle. This is the logic of public sex and public violence. (pp. 146-147)[72]

If critics like Baldick and Tudor -- or, to some extent, Grixti and Seltzer -- above ignore questions of sex and gender in their analyses of monstrosity or the beast within, this is not the case in the work of many post-structuralist, feminist, or queer critics.[73] Cohen rightly notes, for instance, that 'for the most part monstrous difference tends to be cultural, political, racial, economic, sexual' (p. 7).

---

[72] On this fascination, see also pp. 41-42, 141-142, 183, 218, 221, 280.

[73] Seltzer does discuss sex and gender in Serial Killers, but his efforts at translating the relation between self and other into that of male and female are not altogether satisfactory. He seems to remain within the binary opposition of male/female, masculine/feminine, hetero/homo, and thus ignores a more complex discussion of sex and gender.

As I shall show in this study, this is particularly the case in Cornwell's Gault-trilogy, in which serial killing is constructed multiply as a site of otherness -- a crisis of identity and category -- and, as such, cannot be satisfactorily explained in terms of such unifying myths as the beast within.

Donna Haraway, among others, notes how monsters have functioned in the formation of modern identity and how they point to the establishing and breaking of boundaries. 'Monsters,' she writes in her classic article 'A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s,'

> have always defined the limits of community in Western imaginations. The Centaurs and Amazons of ancient Greece established the limits of the centered polis of the Greek male human by their disruption of marriage and boundary pollutions of the warrior with animality and woman. Unseparated twins and hermaphrodites were the confused human material in early modern France who grounded discourse on the natural and supernatural, medical and legal, portents and diseases -- all crucial to establishing modern identity.[74]

For Haraway, then, monsters are about the limits of community and identity, about 'them' and 'us.' In 'Signs of Wonder and Traces of Doubt' Braidotti points to the double-bind in our relation to monsters when she writes that 'The peculiarity of the organic monster is that s/he is both Same and Other. The monster is neither a total stranger nor completely familiar: s/he exists in an in-between zone. I would express this as a paradox: the monstrous other is both liminal and structurally central to our perception of normal human subjectivity' (p. 141). In other words, it is impossible to define or delimit normalcy without monsters -- we need our monsters, through whom we define 'us' and our boundaries (whether they be sexual, ethnic, national, etc.). Braidotti does not thus only discuss monsters who are physiologically deformed (such as freaks on display) but she also takes into account the question of identity and otherness from a larger perspective. For Braidotti, monstrous bodies have traditionally fallen into such categories of otherness as 'sexual difference and deviation (especially homosexuality and hermaphroditism); race and ethnicity; the non-human either on an upward trajectory (the divine, the sacred) or a downward one (the natural environment, the animal, the degenerate, the mutant).... the

[74] Donna Haraway, 'A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s,' Socialist Review, 15, 1985, p. 99.

inorganic other' (p. 141). These categories, she argues, are a negation of 'human subjectivity based on masculinity, whiteness, heterosexuality, and Christian values,' yet these categories are 'central to this thinking, linked to it by negation, and therefore structurally necessary to upholding the dominant view of subjectivity' (ibid.). Monsters are thus connected to the formation of subjectivity and normality; if serial killers, for example, are deemed as evil monsters, we need to examine what it is in them -- besides their cruel crimes -- that makes them such. We need to examine how serial killers, both real and fictional, are mapped together with various categories of otherness.

From a slightly different angle, Judith Halberstam stresses questions of othering, gender, and sexuality when she examines monstrosity and the Gothic in Skin Shows.[75] She perceives differences in emphasis not only between the eighteenth and nineteenth century Gothic, but also between the nineteenth and twentieth century Gothic monsters -- differences which have to do with gender and sexuality. Whereas monstrosity in the nineteenth century 'was a combination of the features of deviant race, class, and gender,'[76] then contemporary monsters tend 'to show clearly the markings of deviant

[75] It needs to be noted first that Halberstam's use of the term 'Gothic' exceeds the traditional view of the Gothic, i.e., Gothic romances in the eighteenth century (for example, Radcliffe and Walpole) or such late nineteenth century novels of deviant bodies as Stoker's Dracula and Stevenson's Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Besides employing the term Gothic in its more generic meaning, Halberstam mobilizes the term in other ways, too. She refers to Gothic fiction as a 'technology of subjectivity, one which produces the deviant subjectivities opposite which the normal, the healthy, and the pure can be known' (p. 2). In Gothic fiction, she argues, monsters are the opposite of the human and invent the human as 'white male, middle class, and heterosexual' (p. 22). She continues that the Gothic 'may be loosely defined as the rhetorical style and narrative structure designed to produce fear and desire within the reader' (ibid.), and something which 'is the breakdown of genre and the crisis occasioned by the inability to "tell," meaning both the inability to narrate and the inability to categorize. Gothic ... marks a peculiarly modern preoccupation with boundaries and their collapse' (p. 23).

[76] In the context of serial murder here, consider the common notion at the end of the nineteenth century of Jack the Ripper as a working-class Jew. Sander L. Gilman notes in '"Who Kills Whores?" "I Do," Says Jack: Race and Gender in Victorian London' that 'The powerful association between the working class, revolutionaries, and the Jews combines to create the visualization of Jack the Ripper as a Jewish worker, marked by his stigmata of degeneration as a killer of prostitutes.' In Death and Representation, eds. Elisabeth Bronfen and Sarah Webster Goodwin (Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), p. 271. Consider, too, these astonishing (and untrue) words of Colin Wilson (with Damon and Rowan Wilson) in World Famous Gaslight Murders (London: Magpie, 1992) in which he comments upon class in serial murder: 'The study of "serial murder", which has received much attention in recent years, has revealed the interesting fact that all serial killers have been working class, and often suffered traumatic poverty and abuse in childhood. So far, at any rate, there has been no middle or upper class serial killer' (p. 114).

sexualities and gendering but less clearly the signs of class or race' (pp. 3-4).[77] In contrast to some other critics, Halberstam rejects psychological or psychoanalytical explanations of monstrosity and horror. This is because she perceives horror and monsters to be historically constructed, 'historically conditioned' (p. 6), or 'historically specific forms' (p. 24), whereas psychology or psychoanalysis may offer explanations which are too universal, too ahistorical. Instead, she argues that 'A historical study of Gothic and of Gothic monstrosity must actually avoid psychoanalytic readings just long enough to expose the way that Gothic actually participates in the production of something like a psychology of self' (p. 8).

Halberstam points to the localization of monstrosity and writes that 'Monsters ... confirm that evil resides only in specific bodies and particular psyches. Monstrosity as the bodily manifestation of evil makes evil into a local effect, not generalizable across a society or culture' (p. 162). Moreover, she links 'postmodern' monsters (including serial killers) to identity and to looking normal: 'Monsters within postmodernism are already inside -- the house, the body, the head, the skin, the nation -- and they work their way out. Accordingly, it is the human, the facade of the normal, that tends to become the

---

[77] On sexual difference and monstrosity, see also Barbara Creed's The Monstrous-Feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), in which she discusses what she calls the 'monstrous-feminine.' For her, this term emphasizes 'the importance of gender in the construction of her monstrosity,' whereas 'the term female monster implies a simple reversal of "male monster"' (p. 3). As examples of this monstrous-feminine in films, Creed gives the amoral primeval mother, vampire, witch, woman as monstrous womb or bleeding womb or possessed body, the castrating mother, aged psychopath, monstrous girl-boy, non-human animal, and so on (see p. 1). Creed very much contextualizes her study in the Kristevan notion of the abject (not an uncommon practice in discussions of monstrosity): 'the concept of a border is central to the construction of the monstrous in the horror film; that which crosses or threatens to cross the "border"' is abject' (pp. 10-11). She continues, 'The horror film attempts to bring about a confrontation with the abject (the corpse, bodily wastes, the monstrous-feminine) in order finally to eject the abject and redraw the boundaries between the human and non-human' (p. 14).

In the context of the monstrous-feminine and psychopathology, we should pay attention to the emergence of the female (heterosexual or lesbian) psychopath in Hollywood films during the 1990s. For instance, Deborah Jermyn's article 'Rereading the Bitches from Hell: A Feminist Appropriation of the Female Psychopath,' Screen, 37, No. 3 (1996), attempts to analyze some of these films ('Fatal Attraction,' 'The Hand the Rocks the Cradle,' 'Single White Female,' and so on). See also Angela Galvin's '*Basic Instinct*: Damning Dykes,' in The Good, the Bad and The Gorgeous: Popular Culture's Romance with Lesbianism, eds. Diane Hamer and Belinda Budge (London and San Francisco: Pandora, 1994). Then, on motherhood and monsterhood in films, see for example Rhona Berenstein's 'Mommie Dearest: *Aliens*, *Rosemary's Baby* and Mothering,' The Journal of Popular Culture, 24, No. 2 (1990). See also Carol J. Clover's Men, Women, and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film (London: British Film Institute, 1992). Clover examines mainly the (younger) male audience's relation to what she calls 'the female victim-hero (the hero part always understood as implying some degree of monstrosity' in horror film (p. 4). Clover is also yet another critic to examine Demme's 'The Silence of the Lambs' in the context of horror films; in addition, she discusses the slasher film and the psychotic killer therein.

place of terror within postmodern Gothic' (ibid.). It follows that what used to be monsters are 'now facets of identity; the sexual other and the racial other can no longer be safely separated from self' (p. 163). The figure of the serial killer is, indeed, portrayed in popular fiction and film as being already 'inside' and hiding behind the facade of the normal. Monstrosity and the psychotic, these popular fictions seem to suggest at first, point to what is hidden in our unconscious, uncontrollable desires and drives. But closely read, monstrosity is often located within figures of otherness -- within deviation from norms, normality, and health.

Disease and Contamination

> Pathology: 'The science of the causes and effects of diseases'; 'Pathological features considered collectively; the typical feature of a disease; a pathological condition; '(The science of) mental, social, or linguistic, etc., abnormality or malfunction' (NSOED)
>
> It is the mechanisms of ... exclusion that are necessary, the apparatuses of surveillance, the medicalisation of sexuality, of madness, of delinquency, all the micro-mechanisms of power, that came, from a certain moment in time, to represent the interests of the bourgeoisie.[78]

As mentioned earlier on, in the Gault-trilogy Gault is described by Scarpetta as a 'virus,' and this description strengthens the rhetoric of health and illness. The question of contamination is not restricted to or only found in fictions of serial murder (as in Cornwell's work). The rhetoric of disease, too close a proximity to or identification with criminals and effects of crime, and their relation to the question of contamination, are not uncommon in accounts of true crime or in criticism of texts of violence. Note what Jancovich notes in his book Horror on the language used on the genres of horror and pornography; horror being related to the topics under discussion in this study:

> The language which is frequently used to describe these genres is one of disease and contagion. They are referred to as 'sick' and 'perverted', and their diffusion is described in terms of corruption and contamination. Such descriptions, and the attitudes on which they are based, are not limited to a small group of self-appointed cultural guardians, but are part of everyday language and culture. (pp. 7-8)

The serial killer is often constructed and portrayed as a virus spreading his particular kind of disease to the other members of the society -- to the national body.

Contemporary popular fiction, film, true-crime books, pop-psychological and pop-criminological accounts of serial killers thus often point, both explicitly and implicitly, to certain 'abnormal' characteristics, symptoms and signs, through which it is possible to perceive personality disorders either in children or in adults. It is crucial that we examine such fictions and accounts critically in order to see

[78] Michel Foucault, 'Two Lectures,' in Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972-1977, ed. Colin Gordon (New York, Pantheon Books, 1980), p. 101.

how it is that they define and produce normality and the human for the mass reading or viewing audience, and how such fictions and accounts, with their lists of characteristics and classifications, give form to the 'dangerous individual.'[79] As evil monstrosity, serial killing is associated with disease and contamination in ways which have to do with, on the one hand, classifying 'criminal characteristics' and, on the other hand, reading crime -- that reading serial crime and criminals is possibly a contagious act. In the following pages, then, I shall examine the contaminating effects of serial killers and texts of violence.

We can notice in and through the work of early criminologist Cesare Lombroso (1835-1909)[80] and his later colleagues how science has functioned in the explanation, classification and 'recognition' of criminal features and characteristics. This tendency, however, is by no means over. In contemporary pop-psychological and pop-criminological -- pop-scientific -- books on serial murder, for example, physical characteristics have been replaced by psychological characteristics and profiles, and even by neurological disorders (this does not altogether exclude physicality, as in cases in which effeminacy in men or masculinity in women is discussed). We could argue that this corresponds to the similar change in the monsters of popular culture in the twentieth century: as I argued earlier on, instead of physiological, outwardly visible monstrosity, the emphasis now appears to be on psychical monstrosity.

If serial murder is defined as a disease, then it has certain symptoms. One pop-psychological book, Joel Norris' Serial Killers, teaches its readers to look for early signs of serial murder, of disease, in the young. Norris claims that this 'disease has some of its origins in diagnosable organic disorders within the subject's neurological and central nervous systems.'[81] Such organic disorders include 'injuries to the brain, prolonged and chronic biochemical imbalances, genetic disorders and severe cases

---

[79] In Serial Killers, Seltzer even refers to serial killing as 'a career option' and the serial killer as a 'type of person' and as 'a species of person' -- these terms single out the serial killer from the non-serial killing population in ways beyond the figurative (which is indeed what Seltzer examines).

[80] The work of Lombroso marks an important change, since he initiated a 'scientific' study of criminals and criminality. Lombroso argued for an inherent criminality and for physical characteristics on the basis of which criminals could be recognized.

[81] Norris, Serial Killers, p. 285. The term 'disease' also appears on pp. 28, 29, 39, 87, 118, 285, 325, etc.

of epilepsy of the limbic brain' (ibid.). Norris argues that he is not trying to define '"criminal types,"' but that is exactly what he eventually does, even though he rather refers to 'hypothesizing' himself (pp. 284-285). For him serial murder is a 'syndrome that has specific hard and soft signs' (p. 285).

The biological and social profile of the serial killer that Norris offers to his readers -- to people prone to violent behaviour and to their friends and relatives, as well as to law enforcement personnel, medical professionals and researchers -- includes, for example, the following patterns: ritualistic behaviour; masks of sanity; compulsivity; search for help; severe memory disorders, and a chronic inability to tell the truth; suicidal tendencies; history of serious assault; deviant sexual behaviour and hypersexuality; head injuries or injuries incurred at birth; history of chronic drug or alcohol abuse; result of an unwanted pregnancy; symptoms of neurological impairment; evidence of genetic disorders; feelings of powerlessness or inadequacy.[82] Moreover, as regards 'symptoms of neurological impairment,' Norris presents a list of 22 signs which 'should be considered high-risk factors if they still appear in individuals after adolescence' (p. 320). These factors include, among others, dyslexia; reading, mathematics, or directional problems; hyperreligiosity; loose, rambling, or illogical thought processes; paranoid feelings or chronic feelings of persecution; incontinence; sleep disorders; poor muscular coordination; history of seizures or seizurelike episodes; chronic headaches or migraine headaches; and so on (pp. 320-321). These are the patterns and symptoms of the serial murder disease which we as readers should look for and fear in ourselves and others; these form the image of the 'dangerous individual.' As I argued before, this is the kind of language that everybody can understand, the language of disease, symptoms, and cure.

Moreover, we notice that Norris names serial killing as a disease, and it is specifically a contagious, viral, disease. For Norris serial murder is 'a disease that is running rampant in society and threatens to overwhelm our juvenile justice, criminal justice, and correctional institutions' (p. 21). It is also an 'epidemic.' Norris tells us how 'In January 1984 the FBI announced that there was an epidemic of serial murder in America. And this coincided with my observations that serial murder and other

[82] See p. 291; there are 21 patterns in Norris' list.

severe forms of episodic aggression was a form of disease that had to be identified and diagnosed before it engulfed all of our social institutions' (p. 19). In Serial Killers, Seltzer quite correctly draws attention to this 'lurid sociobiology,' this tendency to 'merge the natural and national body,' when serial killing is named as a disease (p. 6). However, I think that he ignores such social contexts that Jenkins discusses, and also questions of reading and contamination. Seltzer is not being very helpful here -- by simply bringing up a term such as lurid sociobiology, Seltzer ignores a more profound analysis of such viral imagery in cases of serial murder.

Another popular account defines serial murder as 'a disease that criminologists have not yet even begun to understand.'[83] Jenkins notes in Using Murder how contemporary accounts of serial murder use the language of 'plague and epidemic' (p. 129). Such a 'cultural imagery of serial murder,' as Jenkins argues (ibid.), particularly suited the conservative Reagan administration and its attitude towards crime in the 1980s. Instead of drawing attention to and doing something about social problems and structures, such a rhetoric 'provides an ideological basis for wars on crime and draconian law and order policies' because it emphasizes 'the individual moral characteristics of the offender' (ibid.). Thus we can understand the conservatives' emphasis on defining serial murder as a recent phenomenon; a phenomenon which has it roots, for instance, in recent moral decay, sexual immorality, and the breakdown of the nuclear family. Thus, Jenkins suggests, a 'certain amount of historical amnesia is necessary' since if 'serial murder is acknowledged to have a lengthy pedigree in a particular society, then it is implausible to attempt to blame it on recent developments' (p. 122). The rhetoric of disease hence served the arguments of the New Right movement and their moral traditionalism, their demand for a return to traditional moral values.[84]

If the rhetoric of disease is used to strengthen conservative attitudes towards crime, serial murder has also been portrayed as a disease the proximity of which is contagious and which, as such,

---

[83] Colin Wilson and Damon Wilson, A Plague of Murder, p. xiv.

[84] On the New Right, see, for example, John Clarke, New Times and Old Enemies: Essays on Cultural Studies and America (London: HarperCollins*Academic*, 1991), especially pp. 113-152.

needs its own courageous experts and heroes (or heroines). In terms of knowledge, reading and contamination, consider, for example, these words by Brian Masters in On Murder (1994) when he discusses his writing about, and relation to, the British serial killer Dennis Nilsen:

> There was another, more subtle, danger which directly affected the jumble of my own morality. My determination to understand how such a catastrophe was possible inevitably meant my trying to picture events from within Nilsen rather than describing them from outside. This required an effort of identification which was pregnant with peril.
>
> More than this, there was always lurking the possibility of contamination. I do not pretend to know how evil operates or how one fends it off.[85]

When Masters is given some of Nilsen's possessions, he asks himself, 'Could the proximity of these objects exert some fearful influence?' (Ibid.) Are we really to believe that any moment now, Masters might rush to the street, pick up a man, and like Nilsen, strangle him and hide his body? Is Masters not in fact portraying himself here as a courageous hero, willing to sacrifice his own mental stability -- for the good of society -- in order to get to the bottom of this thing with Nilsen? In other words, Masters' words are a discursive strategy whereby he creates fear in the mind of his readers and simultaneously propagates the 'unifying myth' I referred to earlier on: that of the serial killer as the beast within. In this scenario, Masters suggests that the very proximity of Nilsen's possessions might turn him into a beast, into an inhuman killer himself. This is an idea that Masters' friends worried over, too, as some of them 'felt so endangered by [Masters'] delving into Nilsen's life that for a long time they would not set foot in [Masters'] house, especially when they knew it contained some of [Nilsen's] belongings. These are now with Madame Tussaud's' (p. 250).

When Masters writes that his understanding of Nilsen's behaviour means that he would have to 'picture events from within Nilsen rather than describing them from outside,' this points to too close a proximity and contamination through contact and analysis. This is a typical pattern in accounts of serial murder, both real and fictional. That is, Masters implies contamination through identification, since picturing events from 'within Nilsen' means becoming like Nilsen, crossing a boundary and giving up

[85] Brian Masters, On Murder (London: Coronet Books, 1994), p. 25.

one's identity as 'Masters.' As Masters sees it, his reading -- understanding -- of Nilsen inevitably comes at the expense of his own identity and morality (being outside Nilsen is thus not an option, and certainly unwise in commercial terms). Therefore, what Masters suggests is that for the expert, and, accordingly, for the heroic reader, understanding and reading the serial criminal means knowledge which contaminates. Masters' last sentence, however, implies a strange kind of innocence of evil. If Masters does not know 'how evil operates' -- having no knowledge -- this means that he is not contaminated by it. If he did have knowledge about evil and its operations, he would obviously have to be evil himself (already contaminated). Masters' alleged innocence in the face of evil (Nilsen), nevertheless, points to a readiness to give up that innocence so that he can write his book on Nilsen.

Implicitly, by choosing to write about and analyze Nilsen, the heroic reader for Masters becomes constructed as a male reader and expert. We do not find Masters writing about those 'silent' female serial killers in On Murder: about those killers who poison their victims, for example. That is, would there be anything remotely heroic in writing about and connecting with a female poisoner or mercy killer? For the male expert, danger and heroic possibilities lie in connecting with a sadist, violent, cannibalistic, male killer.

Similarly, Robert Ressler wonders about the dangers of the contagious proximity in Whoever Fights Monsters:

> At around this time, I came across a quotation from Nietzsche that stuck with me. It seemed to pinpoint both the fascination I had with this research and the dangers it posed. Thereafter, I put it on a slide that I always showed during my lectures and presentations. Here it is:
>
> > Whoever fights monsters should see to it that in the process he does not become a monster. And when you look into an abyss, the abyss also looks into you.
>
> It was important for me to keep such sobering thoughts in mind as I proceeded to muck about in the depths of human criminality. (p. 55)[86]

[86] See also Ressler's Internet homepage (http://www.robertkressler.com), on the front page of which Ressler has included a photograph of himself and then, beside himself, another of Anthony Hopkins in the role of Hannibal the Cannibal in 'The Silence of the Lambs.' What kind of identification, we may wonder, is taking place there?

Interestingly, while Ressler intends Nietzsche's words as a warning to his listeners, the very fact that he shows them to an audience means that he is already in the process of contaminating others.[87] On one level, he is spreading the fascination with and the dangers of his research. Contamination and warning go hand in hand here (not one without the other). What surfaces in these words of Masters and Ressler, then, is -- typically -- the fear of, as well as the fascination with, the blurring boundary between one person and another, and between the 'human' and the 'beast' within oneself which serial murder is typically seen to represent in contemporary society.

The idea of serial murder as something contagious touches upon the question of reading and writing, the implication being that even reading about serial killing can be dangerous and not just the physical proximity to killers or their possessions.[88] Note above how, on the one hand, Ressler adheres to a piece of text by Nietzsche, to Nietzsche's 'sobering thoughts'; a text with which he hopes to hold the corrupting influence of crime at bay. On the other hand, texts, films, TV-programmes, and popular culture in all of its forms can have an opposite effect: it has often been argued that texts or films can corrupt minds. Nowadays, questions of censorship still affect various cultural products such as books, films, TV-programmes, photographs, and so on -- especially because of new developments in technology and because of new communication technologies like the Internet (which make fast world-wide distribution possible). Violence, obscene language, and (explicit) sex are all targets particularly for white, heterosexual, right-wing, conservative, fundamentalist, 'concerned' groups or parents. No matter

[87] Note Ressler's choice of words in the last sentence: how 'to muck about' conveys an image of dirt.

[88] Let us not forget, however, that serial killers' possessions are collectors' items, too. David A. H. Hirsch quotes People in his essay 'Dahmer's Effects,' in Disciplinarity and Dissent in Cultural Studies, eds. Cary Nelson and Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar (New York and London: Routledge, 1996):

> '...eight other [victims'] families are hoping to hold an auction of some of Dahmer's possessions, including the refrigerator where he stored some body parts, a drill and pornographic videotapes. A lawyer representing the families -- who has already won in excess of $80 million for them in civil lawsuits against Dahmer (money they will never see, as Dahmer had little money) -- says he expects the auction to net more than $100,000.' (p. 466)

what a book's status might be in the literary history of a nation, it may become a target for 'well-meaning' censorship, whose aim is to 'protect' the young against corruption. According to this logic, it is not only texts and films of violence which have been heavily criticized but also, for instance, books by Mark Twain and Alice Walker have been banned in American high schools.

Texts and films of violence have, however, often been at the centre of this debate.[89] That is, it is argued that fictional texts and films of violence (for instance, texts on serial murder) are morally and ethically dangerous, contagious, in that they spread evil diseases and affect readers' or viewers' minds. In this context, note how Hitchcock's hugely influential film 'Psycho' was received. As Tudor comments upon its reception: 'Responses to *Psycho* were a little more restrained, but still dubious about the film's probable effect on impressionable minds and about its makers' allegedly perverse intentions' (p. 192). In such responses, the viewer is seen to be completely defined from the outside in, completely unable to resist anything s/he watches. Such responses, that is, express a fear of contamination and corruption. Such arguments consider films or texts of violence as imposing themselves on powerless viewers or readers -- seen to have only one position -- and they have sometimes resulted in interpretations which can at best be described as amazingly naive or dubious.

Consider, for example, the words of Jane Caputi in her article 'American Psychos: The Serial Killer in Contemporary Fiction.' She juxtaposes the murder of 14 female students at the University of Montréal in 1989 by Marc Lépine (who shouted when shooting, 'You're all fucking feminists') and a serial murder novel by George Stade. Stade's novel is a first-person narrative telling the story of a man whose wife has left him and who blames, and consequently kills, feminists for this. Caputi writes,

> As I read of this atrocity, I wondered if Columbia University English Professor George Stade was satisfied with the news. His 1979 novel, *Confessions of a Lady-Killer*, a work that Mark Schechner in the *New York Times* described as 'a study of feminism from the point of view of Jack the Ripper' ... blatantly celebrates one man's deliberate targeting of

[89] In general, popular culture, its forms and genres, have been condemned as vices. Jennifer Mann informs us in her Deadlier than the Male: An Investigation into Feminine Crime Writing (London: David & Charles, 1981) that in England, 'In 1864 a Society for Pure Literature was flourishing, with many members united in a fight to suppress popular books' (p. 43). Since then, as we know, cinema, television, music videos, computer games, the Internet, have all been condemned as dangerous activities.

feminists as the victims of a proudly anti-feminist serial killer. (p. 102)

Caputi clearly identifies the narrator of Stade's novel with Stade himself, making no distinction between the two: if Stade wrote the novel in the first-person, it follows that the opinions expressed through that first-person narrative are those of Stade himself. In addition, Caputi criticizes the view of serial killer fiction held by one New York Times critic who chose to call the film 'The Silence of the Lambs' 'escapist entertainment.' Instead, for Caputi, serial killer fictions 'frequently mirror actual crimes, suggesting that the border between representation and reality is more porous than conventional thought allows' (p. 101).[90]

Then, in Intimate Violence: Reading Rape and Torture in Twentieth-Century Fiction (1994), Laura E. Tanner points to the reception of Bret Easton Ellis' serial murder novel American Psycho.[91] Tanner writes that 'The public outcry that greeted the book even before it emerged on bookstore shelves led not only to one publisher's decision to cancel publication but to a series of personal outcries that testify to the novel's extraordinary power.'[92] American Psycho was regarded as dangerous even before its publication in 1991 (and this, we can imagine, increased the sales):

---

[90] See also Caputi's book The Age of Sex Crime. For Caputi, the crimes of Jack the Ripper, or, for that matter, those of any male serial killer, are first of all 'crimes of sexual/political -- essentially *patriarchal* -- domination' (p. 2). The following argument is exemplary of the feminist politics of Caputi's book, and one which reveals her ultimate goal:

> Finally, as I will argue (and as my use of phrase 'Age of...' implies) sex crime can be seen as a paradigmatic phenomenon of the modern period.... It is particularly the Nuclear Age which is bonded to the Age of Sex Crime, for nuclearism's inevitable goal of the mutilation and devastation of the Earth is the precise macrocosmic parallel to the crimes of Jack the Ripper and his complete mutilation and devastation of the individual female body. (p. 12)

However, Caputi is unable to explain reasons for such serial killing in which the victims are men instead of women -- the homosexual scenario does not suit her theory of the mutilation of 'Mother Earth.'

[91] Ellis' novel belongs to a category different from the novels I am discussing in this study. Even though it does not belong to the genre of detective fiction, it is relevant in that it helped to make serial murder a very visible phenomenon in culture, and Tanner's reaction to the novel (and to texts of violence in general) is quite revealing.

[92] Laura E. Tanner, Intimate Violence: Reading Rape and Torture in Twentieth-Century Fiction (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994), p. 102.

> Critics' exhortations not to buy the book, one publisher's decision not to market it, the attempts by various organizations to prevent the novel from being sold, all target resistance to the text in its status as commodity. The book is figured as something inherently infectious. Once picked up, it cannot be thrown away; once touched, it soils the reader, regardless of his or her individual characteristics. Underlying these attacks is the assumption that the reader, like Marx's capitalist or the American psycho, will be remade by the commodities he or she purchases. Having bought a way into Ellis's fictional world, the reader is caught up in a process of consumption both painful and slow; in taking in the novel, the reader appears less consumer than consumed. (p. 112)

Tanner criticizes here such an understanding of the act of reading which reduces the reader to a passive consumer -- one who becomes totally defined from the outside in. Tanner's own solution to the problem of American Psycho and other similar texts is not, however, censorship. Instead, the solution is not to read passively, but actively, and to resist the subject position that American Psycho, for example, offers to its readers. This kind of 'oppositional reading,' she argues, makes possible 'opposition to the very terms of readership implicit in the text' (p. 114). Nevertheless, she does not elaborate on the view of literature seen as infectious and corrupting beyond the Marxist context.

The reception of Ellis' novel partly has to do with the fact that the murders committed by the serial killer Patrick Bateman in the novel are not explicitly condemned and Bateman is not caught, punished, and imprisoned for his crimes (he is still on the loose in Ellis' latest novel to date, Glamorama). Reading American Psycho is not cathartic, and there is no definite closure for the reader. Considering the fact that thousands of fictional women and teenagers were routinely slaughtered on screen in the slasher films of the 1980s, the reception of American Psycho is somewhat strange in comparison. At stake here is, no doubt, the question of genre in multiple ways: Ellis' 'serious' novel as opposed, for example, to the 'popular' genre of the slasher film (we are more used to extreme violence in popular genres). Noticeably, Tanner's book ignores popular genres and the violence portrayed therein; instead, she analyzes works by Ellis, Faulkner, D.M. Thomas, Selby and so on. I find this an unusual choice, since, in twentieth century popular fictions, rape and torture have been prevalent topics -- more so than in 'serious' literature.

Tanner's reading of American Psycho (and of other texts of violence) is rather problematic,

since she propagates the idea that there is, or should be, only one way to read and interpret the novel -- one level of reading, and this level should be oppositional. Moreover, her 'oppositional reading' presupposes that the reader can intentionally and effectively posit him- or herself outside the text. Tanner's reading position is, in effect, one which wants to set up (and one which believes in) boundaries and limits between the text and the reader in order to prevent the text from contaminating the reader's mind with its violence. In addition, she more or less demands that critics be ethical in their writings about violence (whether fictional or real). Note thus, for example, the following passage in her book: 'Because the experience of reading implicates the reader in specific attitudes towards empirical violence, criticism of representations of violation must establish a means of reintroducing the suffering material body into literary analysis' (p. 7). By referring to the materiality of the body, she does not only refer to the materiality of the victim's body (the suffering body) but also to those of the violator and the reader, and her 'study, then, will focus on the process of reading as it conceals or discloses the violated and violating body through a reading act to which the reader brings varying awareness of his or her own empirical body' (p. 9). Tanner constructs her own position as an ethical one, and she contrasts this position to that of aesthetics.

Aesthetics for Tanner involves a distance between the suffering body and the reading body -- because it involves a 'consciousness without a body' (p. 37). This is exactly what Tanner is opposed to: the disembodied reader who 'enter[s] imaginatively into the scene of violence make[s] it possible for representations of violence to obscure the material dynamics of bodily violation, erasing not only the victim's body but his or her pain' (p. 9). Tanner proposes that if the reader becomes conscious of himself or herself as a reading, material, body -- and not just a reading consciousness -- the reader can begin to question the dynamics of violation critically and can consequently resist representations of violence. The aesthetic position does not allow this to take place since 'Art invites the audience's participation in its created worlds while offering that audience the comfort of aesthetic distance; that distance allows the reader or viewer to accept the work's invitation to titillation without appearing to become implicated in its trafficking with violence' (p. 18). Tanner's position is therefore clearly

prescriptive: there is the right way (oppositional and, thus, ethical) and the wrong way (aesthetic and immoral) to read.[93] In other words, from the perspective of the reader and aesthetics, texts representing violence should not be read in aesthetic terms, i.e., in artistic terms, because such terms do not allow the criticism of and the resistance to the dynamics of violence.

Tanner's prescriptive point of view remains problematic since, if we so wish, should we not be allowed to examine texts of violence in aesthetic terms, too? Isn't Tanner's own position totalitarian in a sense, and therefore does she not impose a particular kind of violence (prescriptive) on us as readers? In addition, Tanner's ethics seems to imply that aesthetics can never be a question of ethics, and that ethics is a question of resisting representations of violence and becoming (physically) conscious of those representations. But she does not question the very roles or definitions of ethics or aesthetics; how we might argue, for example, that the two are specific historical, ideological, social, and cultural constructions.

Not surprisingly, Tanner opposes Joel Black's introduction of aesthetics into the realm of murder and violence in his The Aesthetics of Murder: A Study in Romantic Literature and Contemporary Culture (1991). For Black, murder is not the sole property of sociologists, criminologists and pathologists, but murder is at the same time a 'general cultural phenomenon,'[94] and while being the subject of daily news, it is also a 'recurring, obsessive theme in a wide variety of artistic fictions' (p. 6). Black argues that for some of his readers, while an aesthetic approach might be appropriate when examining literary works, the same approach may not be applied as regards actual killings. However,

---

[93] Sometimes her stance leads her to make strange juxtapositions of the reader and the victim of violence. For example, consider how the following passage makes the reader, as it were, guilty of the act of reading and of being able to 'suspend':

> Even in the absence of a manipulatory frame, however, the reader's relationship to fictional violence is defined by the reader's ability to suspend, at any time, his or her participation in the activity of reading, to put down the novel when the violence it contains becomes too threatening. For an actual victim of violence, on the other hand, there is no frame through which to view the act of violation, no opportunity to interrupt the act of violence that claims him or her as its victim. (p. 37)

[94] Joel Black, The Aesthetics of Murder: A Study in Romantic Literature and Contemporary Culture (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), p. 5.

Black himself objects to this view and contends that 'once an event is covered, or "mediated," by the press or by television, it essentially enters into the same quasifictional, hyperreal domain of all artistic representation and misrepresentation' (p. 10). He continues, 'In this form, murder can be studied in a relatively disinterested mode as a morally neutral phenomenon, in contrast to the approach taken by the sociologist, the criminologist, and the pathologist, all of whom begin their investigations of actual murders with the assumption that murder is a moral problem and a social, as opposed to a metaphysical, evil' (p. 6). Tanner, however, refuses to accept Black's position, and especially Black's positioning of the reader in texts of violence. For her, Black's study 'perpetuates the vision of a disempowered reader overwhelmed by the representation of violence' (p. 13). Commenting upon a particular passage in Black's study -- a discussion on the position of the witness to murder in a text by Thomas De Quincey and a film by Brian De Palma,[95] which position Black juxtaposes to the position of the reader/viewer -- Tanner argues that 'Such aestheticization not only fails to empower the reader-viewer but often blinds her to her own complicity in the violence enacted by the text' (p. 14). For Tanner such passive spectatorship or readership is a form of victimization, and to be resisted. In fact, despite their different approaches to murder and representations of violence, also Black, like Tanner, positions the reader outside the text when he refers to the 'relatively disinterested mode' that murder can be examined.

I hope it has become evident from this lengthy introduction to the topic that I do not intend to follow either in Caputi's, Tanner's or Black's footsteps: I do not find their approaches adequate enough for the purposes of this study. Instead, I shall closely read Cornwell's Gault-Trilogy and argue how, through the figure of the serial killer in the trilogy, various images of threatening otherness are presented to the reader as threats to 'family': threats to the white, heterosexual, middle class family and nation. Contrary to what Tanner argues about the reintroduction of the 'suffering material body into literary analysis,' or what Black argues about murder as a 'morally neutral phenomenon,' I think that murder, bodily violence, and violent texts can be fruitfully analyzed through locating them into generic,

[95] The text is De Quincey's 'Postscript' to his 'Murder' essays, and the film is De Palma's serial murder film 'Dressed to Kill.'

cultural and historical contexts -- as opposed to, for instance, to the more narratological approach that Tanner exemplifies. Since I am here dealing with popular detective fictions -- unlike Tanner, for example -- it is perhaps useful to remind ourselves of the specificity of popular culture in general. Popular culture and its critics are not some homogeneous entity, but as Lawrence Grossberg, among others, has noted,

> Popular culture has been defined formally (as formularized), aesthetically (as opposed to high culture), quantitatively (as mass culture), sociologically (as the culture of 'the people') and politically (as resistant folk culture). Sometimes it is identified with mass culture and condemned for reducing culture (and the masses) to the 'lowest common denominator.' At other times, it is located outside of mass culture, as if it had some necessarily more authentic relation to the people and consequently had some intrinsically greater possibility of articulating resistance to the dominant culture. Often discussions of popular culture conflate aesthetic, sociological and political questions.[96]

In effect, there is no one 'right' way to examine and read popular fictions, but a multitude of ways and perspectives; this study presents one possible way.

However, we could argue that fictions of violence and serial murder -- such as Cornwell's Gault-trilogy -- are, on one level, a question of representing pain, torture, death, victimization, but, on another level, they are a question of the politics of representation, of literature, and of the place, site, of literature. That is, what writers are 'allowed,' or not allowed, to write, why, where, and who does the allowing -- whether indeed, as Jacques Derrida has noted, 'The institution of literature in the West, in its relatively modern form, is linked to an authorization to say everything.'[97] I began this chapter by quoting these words of Cornwell: 'I can't read sad, scary, or violent books.' What she says afterwards is just as interesting as regards the reality and truthfulness of representation, indeed, of the right to represent violence:

---

[96] Lawrence Grossberg, We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture (New York & London: Routledge,1992), pp. 75-76.

[97] '"This Strange Institution Called Literature" An Interview with Jacques Derrida,' in Acts of Literature, ed. Derek Attridge (New York & London: Routledge, 1992), p. 37.

> I watched only half of 'Titanic' because I could not bear its sadness. I stormed out of Anne Rice's 'Interview With a Vampire,' so furious that my hands were shaking because the movie is such an outrageous trivialization and celebration of sexual violence. For me the suffering, the blood, the deaths are real. I'd like to confront Anne Rice with bitemarks and other sadistic wounds that are not special effects. I'd like to sentence Oliver Stone to a month in the morgue, make him sit in the cooler for a while, and see what an audience of victims has to say about his films.

Cornwell's right to represent the reality of the victims of violence to her readers through her Putnam deal is worth $25 million.

2. Reading Experts

A Virus in the Family

> I thought of Gault backlit by his flashlight in the tunnel last night, of endless rails leading deeper into darkness and disease. Gault moved freely through spaces most people could not see. He nimbly stepped over greasy steel, needles and the fetid nests of humans and rats. He was a virus. He had somehow gotten into our bodies and our buildings and our technology. (FPF, p. 156)
>
> Simply stated in everyday language, sociopaths are individuals who don't respect other people's boundaries.[1]

Thus meditates medical examiner Kay Scarpetta in From Potter's Field, one of the three novels in which serial killer Temple Brooks Gault appears. Whereas Gault's presence is more or less of secondary importance in the two previous novels, in From Potter's Field it dominates the novel: now he taunts Scarpetta and the FBI -- even plagues them as a virus -- and it looks as if they will never capture him.

What is particularly arresting in the above passage is how it draws our attention to a juxtaposition of bodies, technology, and expertise, as well as contamination and proprietorship: how, for Scarpetta, Gault (human) is a 'virus,' able to penetrate people (causing evil contamination), buildings (infecting whole houses), and technology (operating as a computer virus). Moreover, Gault is described as somebody (or something even) who 'moved freely through spaces most people could not see.' Here 'spaces' refer not only to the dark and deep subway tunnels, which most people will not enter, and therefore will not see, but also, literally, to the space we cannot see in the ordinary sense of the word, electric space -- that of computers, fax-machines, modems, telephones, answering machines, and so on. While the passage, on the one hand, juxtaposes bodies and technology, on the other hand, it implies a specific expertise: the narrator is able to 'see' Gault's moves where most people cannot see. That is, she is able to see beyond the (deceptive) surface of things and places.

---

[1] Keppel, Signature Killers, p. 325.

The rhetoric of health and disease, which I referred to in the previous chapter, prevails in From Potter's Field especially in terms of viral contamination. We commonly understand contamination to signify a breaking of boundaries, a breakdown between one space and another, inside and outside, subject and world, virus and 'body.' Contamination points to ideas of purity, pollution, health, disease, immunity, detection, and identity.[2] Contamination pertains to questions of self-identity and self-presence and of what is regarded as contaminating otherness (to be destroyed), something that is 'not-me.' Viral contamination, in particular, is a complex example of the breaking of boundaries because as the parasite other, the virus is both similar to and different from its host. Initially, at least, the virus is the ideal passer as it passes as 'us.' The virus hides beneath the surface of normality, homogeny, and similarity, and it remains invisible until it has already contaminated and damaged the space it invaded -- when its effects can be 'seen.' Allegedly, the virus implies the purity and health of the space it contaminates. The virus is a very strong metaphor, because it points to the destruction of 'normal' structures: the virus is like a hidden parasite, which destroys its host deviously from within by copying itself.

It is thus noteworthy that the narrator chooses to call Gault a virus. During the latter half of the twentieth century, the virus has become one of the most pervasive metaphors -- and more than a metaphor -- of threat and contamination in a number of fields: medicine, politics, literature, film, communication technology, crime, and sexuality. Undoubtedly due to the discovery of the HIV-virus in 1981, the virus has largely replaced, for example, the cancer metaphor widely used earlier on.[3] During the past couple of decades, the virus has variably been employed to further stigmatize certain marginal groups and people (among others, sexual 'deviants' and ethnic others) within images of deception, decay, illness, and immorality.[4] Viral imagery is a way to personify threat, and a way to localize it to certain individuals or groups. Moreover, viruses and viral imagery are used to justify a culture of

---

[2] Etymologically, contaminate comes from Latin contaminare, f. contamen, -min- meaning contact, pollution (NSOED)

[3] On cancer, see Susan Sontag's Illness as Metaphor (New York: Vintage, 1979; orig. publ. 1978).

[4] On race and viruses, see, for example, Barbara Browning's recent study Infectious Rhythm: Metaphors of Contagion and the Spread of African Culture (New York and London: Routledge, 1998).

surveillance: if the virus hides behind normality, it is essential that measures are taken to reveal those among us who are sick and who do not really belong to 'us.' Viral imagery creates a culture of paranoia, in which anybody (and some more than others) can be sick underneath the surface of health and normality. The virus thus intimately belongs to, and strengthens, a culture of testing and policing as well as expertise -- a culture of visibility, making things and people visible.[5] Society needs its viral experts, the experts of the visible, those who can see and read beyond the deceptive surface of the world.

If Gault has penetrated the space of Scarpetta's team as a virus, this indicates that Gault is no longer clearly internal or external; this blurring of boundaries between investigators and criminals is actually a typical motif in serial killer novels. Because Gault is regarded as a virus by the narrator-investigator, then, the investigation of Gault's crimes is not simply 'an attempt to reinforce moral boundaries and to suppress the activity of someone who has chosen to live beyond the margins of what is permissible.'[6] Instead, while the investigation of crime in the trilogy does attempt to suppress criminal activity, it also becomes evident how the very strategies and methods of reading serial murder used in the investigation are contaminated themselves, or, indeed, even viral (causing further contamination). That is, we could argue how those very strategies,

> defensive strategies deployed -- in the realm of discourse or disease -- to combat agencies of virulence may themselves be informed by the virulence they are seeking to efface, informed by it in ways that do not produce the immunizing effect of a vaccine, but that serve, instead, to reinforce and even multiply the dangerous sites of infection.[7]

---

[5] The list operator James Junot of the former Internet discussion list devoted to the discussion of Cornwell's work, CORNWELL, informed the list members on March 4, 1998, that 'Patricia Cornwell will be speaking at the Marriott Marquis Hotel in Atlanta, GA (USA) on Wednesday, March 11 as part of the International Conference on Emerging Infectious Diseases. She will be taking part in a luncheon session entitled "Emerging Infectious Diseases: The Authors' Perspective" along with fellow authors Robin Cook, Nicols Fox and Lauri[e] Garrett.'

[6] Jerry Palmer, Potboilers: Methods, Concepts and Case Studies in Popular Fiction (London and New York: Routledge, 1991), p. 133.

[7] Lee Edelman on the pharmakon in his book Homographesis: Essays in Gay Literary and Cultural Theory, (New York & London: Routledge, 1994), p. 84. See Derrida's Dissemination for a larger discussion on the pharmakon.

The presence of Gault is 'seen' in various senses by Scarpetta and her team because Gault has contaminated a number of bounded, regulated, spaces: 'their' bodies, 'their' buildings, and 'their' computers. The double-bind here is that, as a virus, Gault has penetrated, poisoned (as the Latin virus implies), and contaminated FBI's computer network, CAIN, Crime Artificial Intelligence Network,[8] which was created in The Body Farm precisely in order to capture killers like him. As a virus and through a virus, Gault starts to abuse the network and creates uncertainty as to the status of the human vs the technological (the contamination of the former with the latter). Destruction in From Potter's Field comes from both within and without because the structure of CAIN is open to penetration in the first place. CAIN thus turns out to be as much part of the problem as its solution. In effect, CAIN functions as a kind of Derridean pharmakon, a healing poison, and inhabits two positions at the same time: those of poison and remedy. As I shall argue later on in this chapter, the same applies to Scarpetta as an expert.

In effect, Gault calls attention to the 'defensive strategies' and reading methods used by the experts in the investigation, and to the construction and localization of boundaries and limits in and by various discourses (medico-judicial, criminological, and so on). Thus, for example, the reference to 'our bodies' in the passage above inevitably needs to be expanded beyond the sense and boundaries of the biological body. Like the concept of the family used in this study, 'our bodies' implies on the part of the narrator a consideration of what or who belongs ('us') and does not belong ('Gault,' 'virus') to the given body. Hence, in this study I understand the body in 'our bodies' to encompass the expert body (the techno-family), the national body (citizenship), and the human species (the human, humanity), whereas the virus -- Gault -- is established as the 'outside,' the other in multiple ways. The passage asserts the limits and boundaries of the body (the body in multiple senses) and the construction of the body itself as a boundary.

But if the virus brings into the picture ideas of disease, contamination, and the questioning of

[8] In the novel which succeeds From Potter's Field, The Cause of Death (London: Little, Brown and Company, 1996), CAIN is mistakenly referred to as 'Crime Analysis Information Network,' p. 186.

various bodily boundaries, it also designates the death of its host, because the virus, *'neither living nor dead ... carries delayed death in its self-multiplication.'*[9] Viruses exist and disrupt the boundary between life and death, and they multiply and graft themselves. Characterized by Scarpetta as a virus, then, Gault points to the erasion of difference and to a loss of self-identity, individuality, and singularity -- to people not only as generic, serial, but also as other. Gault is a virus, who/which multiplies, constantly doubles itself and thus attempts to destroy Scarpetta and her techno-family, as it were, from within. We recall how Gault and his partner in crime, Carrie Grethen, become more and more identical in From Potter's Field. While watching the video-tape of the murder of Sheriff Brown committed by the two, Scarpetta thinks, 'Carrie Grethen walked into the bedroom, dressed like Gault. Were it not for her white hair, I might have thought she was him' (p. 281). Gault and Carrie now resemble each other like identical twins, Carrie looking more like Gault than his twin-sister Jayne (Gault and Jayne are not, however, identical twins).[10]

As I pointed out above, viral contamination centrally pertains to health and disease, purity and pollution, and methods of detection. The virus signifies the destruction of the 'normal' state, structure, and order of things. As a virus, Gault is contextualized within images of filth, poverty, and homelessness in the passage cited at the beginning of this chapter. Indeed, through mapping Gault together with such images, poverty and homelessness are conceived by the narrator, as it were, viral diseases themselves; hence, fears regarding Gault and homelessness reinforce each other. In the passage Scarpetta identifies Gault with a location, with 'the fetid nests of humans and rats,' with the marginal, animal-like, members of society, who live in the subway tunnels with rats, like rats, below the observing gaze of the more well-to-do members of the American society. It is there that Scarpetta's team has to follow him, 'deeper into darkness and disease' -- to the underworld -- and the dangers of such an

[9] Jacques Derrida, 'A Silkworm of One's Own (Points of view stitched on the other's veil),' trans. Geoffrey Bennington, Oxford Literary Review, 18, Nos. 1-2 (1996), p. 51; emphasis in the original.

[10] In this context, consider, for instance, Barbet Schroder's film 'Single White Female' (1992). The main character in the film, Allie, takes on a roommate, Hedy, and this decision becomes a fatal one. We learn that Hedy's identical twin-sister is dead, and, little by little, she begins to show signs of mental instability. She starts to use and buy similar clothes to those of Allie, and eventually turns herself into Allie's mirror-image.

enterprise are obvious. Here the underground subway tunnels and the deterioration of the physical place clearly function as a metaphor of the degeneration of the psychical place (filthy place equals filthy mind). Accordingly, this physical place under the ground, which parallels psychical space, functions as a metaphor of the edge and limit of society -- the undesirable, and distressing, elements in, and literally under, the capitalist national body. When at the beginning of From Potter's Field Gault 'nimbly step[s] over' those nests, and he is somehow above those nests and superior to their dwellers, in the end he has become like the homeless, 'emaciated and disheveled' (p. 409), as if there was something contagious in the tunnels. His crimes have become visible on his body.

There is nothing new in this urban combination of disease, marginality, and space in American or European fiction. In the nineteenth century, science -- like criminology, sexology, and racial science -- helped to make 'deviation' visible in society. During the same century, remarks Ralph Willett in The Naked City: Urban Crime Fiction in the USA (1996),

> Bourgeois imperatives sought to control dangerous elements in the urban population by keeping them out of sight. Distinguished geographically from the 'healthy' respectable working class, marginalised groups (criminals, beggars, prostitutes) were stigmatised by images of disease, fuelling an alarmed discourse, prioritising the protection (by separation) of the wholesome and productive sectors of society. Thus the catacombs and sewers of the city become in nineteenth-century French fiction the world of the savage, the sub-human and the excremental.[11]

The homeless of New York City in From Potter's Field, however, do not escape surveillance. They may be 'out of sight' for the average citizen but not outside the law, because a special police unit, New York Transit Police, patrols the subway stations and tunnels -- the place of, and allocated to, the homeless. In

[11] Ralph Willett, The Naked City: Urban Crime Fiction in the USA (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1996), pp. 4-5. Besides 'criminals, beggars, prostitutes,' we could turn to nineteenth-century Gothic fictions for examples of those not worthy of citizenship along the lines of race or sexuality. As, for instance, Halberstam notes in Skin Shows: 'The racism that becomes a mark of nineteenth-century Gothic arises out of the attempt within horror fiction to give form to what terrifies the national community. Gothic monsters are defined both as the other than the imagined community and as the being that cannot be imagined as community' (p. 15). Note also how the murders of Jack the Ripper were contextualized within urban decay, crime, race (anti-Semitism), and sexual immorality -- see Judith Walkowitz's City of Dreadful Delights: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London (London: Virago Press, 1994; orig. publ. 1992).

Cornwell's work, the homeless who live in the subway tunnels exemplify the allocation and policing of space as well as the localization of otherness. Trafficking between various spaces is controlled in her novels, and spaces are organized according to wealth, class, ethnic background, sexual identity, and so on.[12] The urban setting in the Gault-trilogy consists of a number of separate spaces and thus of boundaries which Gault eventually breaks: the tunnels (the homeless), Scarpetta's neighbourhood in Richmond (wealthy people), the projects (poor black people), the Ramble (a meeting-place for gay men), Key West (a gay space referred to in Cruel and Unusual), the morgue (the house of death), and so on. Communication between these spaces and moving from one space to another can be a dangerous activity. For instance, when Scarpetta goes 'slumming' in the projects at the beginning of From Potter's Field, she almost ends up murdered, and Gault's violation of Scarpetta's space results in his death.

The tunnels, in particular, serve as a reminder of what can happen if one catches the disease of poverty, if one lose's one's job, home, and hence one's productive place in society: one can literally fall into the tunnels with other jobless, homeless, people. The narrator neither expresses nor encourages any sympathy for the homeless in From Potter's Field. Instead, the homeless invoke dirt and drugs, and the contextualization of Gault within such an environment is thus significant.[13] Dirty homeless people live in the tunnels under Manhattan, where 'we inched our way along a catwalk that led us into dark catacombs littered with crack vials, needles, garbage and filth.... the air was fetid with the stench of human waste' and where the homeless people's 'presence was still found in filthy blankets piled with shoes, clothes and odds and ends' (p. 123). In fact, Scarpetta reduces the homeless here to the inanimate, to simple matter, to things, as their presence becomes that of blankets, shoes, clothes, odds and ends.

[12] Also serial killers -- real and fictional -- create their spaces by, for example, terrorizing particular neighbourhoods, areas, and cities, and they are sometimes named accordingly: the Boston Strangler, Skid Row Slasher, the Green River Killer, the Hillside Strangler. Thus many major American cities are 'haunted' by famous serial killers. This identification of the killer with place/space writes anew, and replaces the geographical, national, map with a murder-map -- consider here, for instance, Dominic Sena's film 'Kalifornia' (1993), in which the main male character wants to write a book on various serial murder locations in the U.S.A. Moreover, serial killers are often seen to contaminate the places in which they killed; for instance, it may be difficult to sell victims' houses (unless, of course, the buyer is fascinated by the murders), and sometimes whole houses have been demolished.

[13] Similarly, there is no sympathy for the mad: see, for instance, From Potter's Field, pp. 59-60.

This kind of merging of persons and surroundings is also what Seltzer would call the 'gothicization of space' in Serial Killers, 'the projection of semi-alive spaces that appear as the prosthetic extension of persons' (p. 213).[14] This reduction is simultaneously an extension and dispersion of the homeless; an extension and dispersion of their body into matter, odds and ends.

Undoubtedly, too, 'the stench of human waste' equals excrement, wasted humans (wasted human potential), and humans as waste ('consumed,' used-up people). These homeless and jobless people are the excrement of a capitalist society, to be ejected as waste from the capitalist national body as soon as they lose their place in the system and chain of production as well as in the consumer culture. Paradoxically, they are also what such a society 'produces' out of itself. Through such excrement the (Cornwellian) capitalist national body constructs itself, its limits and its boundaries -- those who belong and do not belong to the healthy national family, those who 'deserve' to be treated as human, and even those who are human. Such a society, then, needs its homeless people (its waste and its other) and its racial and sexual others as a necessary boundary -- as a boundary which can be policed and against which it can better define itself.

It is in those tunnels that Gault effortlessly moves: in a place which is as sick as his mind. Gault has as his final goal, as Scarpetta sees it, to destroy her and her home. Ironically, Scarpetta's home is based on productive work on dead bodies: more crime, more bodies, more work, more money: '"He's trying to take away everything I have"' she says to Marino in From Potter's Field (p. 209), and continues, '"I'm not to live anywhere or drive anything and can't tell people where to find me. Hotels, private security, are very expensive.... Little by little I will use all that I have and all that I've been"' (p. 210). In other words, she fears that Gault will finally succeed in changing her from a prosperous individual into a homeless, jobless, person -- into a 'consumed' person, waste, something generic or 'other,' even into a Jane Doe (see p. 209). Serial murder in the trilogy is mapped out as a threat to ownership and capitalism. Here Scarpetta clearly juxtaposes property and economy ('all that I have')

[14] Seltzer is primarily interested in the subject of violence and the subject's (the subject is usually a 'he' for Seltzer, which shows a gender bias in his study) experiences, but it seems justifiable to extend this to cover other persons as well in cases of serial killing.

with identity (’all that I’ve been’), and connects them with consuming (that Gault will consume, use, her). In the eyes of Scarpetta, the threat that Gault poses with his crimes and trespass of space is that he might make her lose her space/place in society -- which is then turned into a question of identity. Economy and identity become intermingled within the fear of criminal consumption. Hence, Gault’s crimes are read by Scarpetta as an individual matter, narcissistically concerning herself, at the expense of the actual murder victims: she has more (property and identity) to lose than others. Typically, then, Scarpetta positions herself at the centre of the criminal’s attention.

The subway tunnels, the dirty space under the ground, also signify the unconscious: the place where sick thoughts are fostered and dwell free of all control, and where ’endless rails [lead] deeper into darkness and disease.’ In Cornwell’s work as a whole, as readers we finally remain ’in the tunnels,’ in the realm of sick thoughts, because she is a writer of psychopathology. Like the homeless and criminals, Scarpetta and the FBI-investigators move underground as they deal with the most heinous crimes imaginable; the affinity between the investigators and the criminals is effectively made clear in the trilogy. We recall that the FBI unit, which works on violent offenders, is situated under the ground at Quantico. As Scarpetta illustrates it: ’Leaving through two sets of security doors, I hurried down three flights of stairs, boarded the elevator in the gun-cleaning room, and descended sixty feet into the Academy’s lower level, where I routinely waded through hell’ (BF, p. 10). Horrible crimes do not stand much daylight. Cornwell’s work -- like similar works -- thus serves as an invitation to the reader to dwell within and to have such sick thoughts. Indeed, her work is an invitation to ’routinely wad[e] through hell,’ to become expert in reading, and accustomed to, representations of violence. As I argued in the previous chapter, Cornwell does not write about ordinary crimes committed because of jealousy, revenge, greed or social injustice. Instead, she portrays a world of fear and terror, where things and people are not what they at first appear to be. We remain in the tunnels of darkness and disease, within sick thoughts, only to be lifted away for short periods of time. From Potter’s Field begins with Gault entering the tunnels (a dark and deep place late in the evening) and ends with Scarpetta, Lucy, and Wesley leaving New York on a helicopter: vast open space early in the morning, and the case is closed

-- at least for the time being, until the next book in the series. This is, of course, the nature of serial writing and serial characters.

As mentioned earlier on, in the tunnels Gault is connected to 'nests,' and nests suggest two contradictory things. Firstly, a nest is a place for breeding and nursing (especially animals), a place for reproduction and family, and, 'a lodging, shelter, home' (NSOED). But secondly, nests suggest something unpleasant, 'A place usually inhabited or frequented by people of a certain type or class; a place or quarter in which some state of things, quality, etc. (esp. of a bad kind), is fostered or is prevalent; a haunt *of* thieves, robbers, crime, vice, etc.' (ibid.). For a long time, Gault breeds his crimes, hides, and moves invisibly in the subway tunnels until his deeds become visible above the ground. We can almost visualize humans and rats breeding more and more dirty humans, rats,[15] and evil deeds in the tunnels, and somehow nests, family, and reproduction are given negative attributes -- they are somehow dirty, filthy.

Families are important in the trilogy because Gault is a virus who infects and destroys families: he infects his own family as well as other families. The trilogy, and specifically the two latter novels, explore death, crime, and disease within, and of, the family. The central mystery of Cruel and Unusual is how a dead man can continue to kill, but Gault also kills a young boy and a pregnant woman; in The Body Farm the team investigates a copy-cat murder, a mother who murders her child by adopting Gault's modus operandi; and From Potter's Field involves a 'homeless' daughter, sibling rivalry, and murder. In fact, the very name of the computer network, which Gault penetrates in From Potter's Field, is CAIN. This acronym immediately reminds us of another Cain and of another family -- of the mythical Cain, the biblical one who indulged in sibling rivalry and murdered his brother Abel. What emerges in this mythological story, among other things, is the irony of Cain being the first murderer of mankind -- the murderer, the first-born son Cain, born out of the first humans, Adam and Eve. This first family, so to speak, bred its own destruction, and Cain therefore implicates -- should we even say contaminates -- all mankind and future generations through his murderous act. The acronym CAIN is therefore highly

[15] Rats, as we know, are carriers of various diseases and viruses in urban settings and to be destroyed.

ironic.

Like Cain, Gault indulges in sibling rivalry and kills his sister in From Potter's Field. His contaminating effects are already evident in The Body Farm, where a mentally disturbed mother, Denesa Steiner, reads about Gault's murders in the newspapers, and finally kills her own daughter. This murder is at first attributed to Gault. Steiner, in fact, suffers from Munchhausen syndrome by proxy in which a parent repeatedly afflicts pain on a child in order to gain sympathy him- or herself.[16] Moreover, little by little, since the appearance of Gault in Cruel and Unusual, Scarpetta's substitute family (Marino, Wesley, and later, Lucy) begins to disintegrate, while it simultaneously needs to join forces in fighting against Gault. Scarpetta herself begins an affair with a married man, Benton Wesley, and begins to 'decompensate' like Gault, talk to herself as well as call people who are dead.[17] Moreover, the narrative of sibling rivalry is doubled in the trilogy because it is connected to the Scarpetta family, too: to the rivalry between Scarpetta and Dorothy. Then, Marino has a disastrous affair with Denesa Steiner and is almost killed; and Lucy has problems with alcohol and turns out to be lesbian. Like Scarpetta, Lucy will therefore have no 'proper' (heterosexually conceived) children of her own: neither will 'breed,' reproduce, transmit, and pass on their genes (they will stay single, 'whole'). Even though Scarpetta has a couple of affairs with men (she has long been divorced from her husband Tony), the affairs seem to be doomed -- the men either die, betray her in some way, or are married -- and she remains single.

---

[16] Munchhausen syndrome by proxy is distinguished from Munchhausen syndrome. As explained, for example, by Michael D. Kelleher and C.L. Kelleher in Murder Most Rare: The Female Serial Killer (Westport, Connecticut, and London: Praeger, 1998): while the latter involves 'self-induced illnesses,' the former 'involves the fabrication of illnesses in a dependent individual, who is typically a child or ward of the adult affected by the disorder. With MSBP, the perpetrator indirectly assumes the role of patient (by proxy) by fabricating or inducing illnesses in another person' (p. 201). The idea of a proxy -- a substitution -- in MSBP is, we can say, a major boundary disorder.

[17] Because of these obvious signs of irrationality, it is difficult to sympathize with some feminist critics, who wish to view Scarpetta as a rational detective figure; as a figure who positively opposes traditional literary images of women as mad and irrational. See for example Reetta Saine's article 'Kirjattu ruumis eli ruumiillisuuden kuvaus Patricia D. Cornwellin dekkarissa *Ruumistarha*,' in Murha pukee naista: Naisdekkareita ja dekkarinaisia, eds. Ritva Hapuli and Johanna Matero (Helsinki: KSL Kirjat, 1997). It is as if these critics think that Scarpetta's 'masculine' profession, forensic medicine and science, makes her automatically a rational figure. In my view, Scarpetta is portrayed as an irrational, disturbed, narcissistic, and megalomaniac character.

While the techno-family plays the role of a professional community in the trilogy and in the other novels, it also plays the role of a substitute-family. Scarpetta, Lucy, Marino, and Wesley form something like a family, something resembling family-life. Family-likeness is what is at stake here -- we only need to recall some of the scenes in which Scarpetta, Marino/Wesley, and Lucy spend time together like a family, cooking dinner, and so on.[18] Something resembling this may very well be a part of the reader's experiences and pleasure with serial characters. That is, through repetitive reading, the reader begins to intimately know the serial characters like a 'family': their likes and dislikes, their secrets, relationships, and so on (these literary families become substitute, imaginary, families).

From Potter's Field is the last of the three novels in which ingenious serial killer Temple Gault appears. The plot of the novel is rather simple: Gault has killed again, this time in New York, and the FBI comes to take Scarpetta away from her home in Richmond -- 'Whenever Gault struck, it seemed, the FBI arrived in a maelstrom of beating air and gleaming metal and lifted me away' (p. 34). As the story proceeds, it becomes clear that Gault has contaminated the FBI's computer system, CAIN, which is used to track him down. We learn fairly late in the novel that the woman killed at the beginning of the novel is Gault's twin-sister Jayne. At the same time, Christmas-time, family-time, Scarpetta's plans to visit her own family in Florida are delayed because of the investigation, and, as always, feelings of guilt surface: '"Lucy is there, and as usual I'm not"' (p. 55), as Scarpetta worries to Wesley. Typically, Scarpetta spends most of her holidays investigating crimes with her techno-family, and holidays with her biological family are therefore usually cancelled: '"In fact, I'm not sure there has ever been a holiday when my thoughts have not been darkened by some terrible case. So it almost doesn't matter whether I am with family or alone"' (ibid). The Scarpetta family cannot thus spend time together like a proper family, and they cannot do -- perform -- what it is that families usually do (or should do) together. It is, ironically, Scarpetta's position as an independent professional woman that prevents the family union from taking place; hence it is also Scarpetta herself who has broken the boundaries of the

[18] This does not, however, mean that the substitute family is necessarily more satisfying, because -- as in Scarpetta's team -- the professional aspect brings with itself professional problems into the relationships between the members.

ideal nuclear family.

Scarpetta's biological family seldom brings joy to her life; instead, it mainly breeds feelings of guilt. It is no coincidence that the events of From Potter's Field take place during Christmas. 'Christmas, the myth of a transcendent generosity, goodwill, and community love,'[19] Christmas is the time for the family to get together, the Christian celebration of the birth of the son, Christ. The novel Cruel and Unusual, too, in which Gault makes his first appearance, takes place during Christmas. Nor can it be a coincidence that Scarpetta will give monstrous, unnatural, 'birth' to a son from hell during Christmas: Gault pretends to be her son at one point, and, in general, her relative.[20] Most of Cornwell's novels take place at the end of the year, which adds to the general atmosphere of coldness, desolation, and threat in her work as a whole. It would be difficult to imagine a Scarpetta novel set in mid-summer.[21] Moreover, in the grisly context of Gault's crimes in From Potter's Field, the bright red of Christmas begins to signify something else than a family holiday, namely death, blood, and violence. At the beginning of the novel Christmas Eve is 'cold and treacherous' (p. 13), and when 'Karen Carpenter was dreaming of a white Christmas,' Marino 'rudely changed the radio station' (p. 14). Sheriff Santa -- Sheriff Brown dressed as Santa Claus -- delivers drug presents and is finally murdered by Gault and Carrie. Christmas turns into a gloomy red one for Scarpetta: 'I closed my eyes and saw bare footprints in snow. I saw blood the bright red of Christmas' (p. 56). This is the antithesis of 'Merry Christmas'; instead, when Scarpetta visits the office of New York's Chief Medical Examiner, she finds the following in the waiting area:

---

[19] Halberstam, Skin Shows, p. 22.

[20] Gault uses Scarpetta's name and credit card when he visits an art gallery and pretends to be her son, 'Kirk Scarpetta,' and he also visits an Italian restaurant called Scaletta (see FPF, pp. 296-301 and 90-96). Scarpetta herself is at first astonished to learn that somebody with the same name has visited the restaurant, since 'My name was rare. I had never encountered another Scarpetta, not even in Italy' (FPF, p. 91; by now, I would say, the reader is far too familiar with Scarpetta's rare name and exceptionality in general).

[21] Hornet's Nest, Cornwell's first novel which does not belong to the Scarpetta series but which starts another series, takes place during the summer. The novel's atmosphere is more relaxed and (inadvertently?) comic than what we see in the Scarpetta series. The ninth Scarpetta novel, Point of Origin, does take place during the summer, but even so, the novel's atmosphere is darker than ever before, to the point of (the reader's) exhaustion.

> Inscribed on a marble wall was *Taceant Colloquia Effugiat Risus Hic Locus est Ubi Mors Gaudet Succurrere Vitae*, which meant one would find little conversation or laughter in this place where death delighted to help the living. An Asian couple sat across from me on a couch, tightly holding hands. They did not speak or look up, Christmas for them forever wrapped in pain. (p. 61)

On the final pages of From Potter's Field, Gault is eventually killed in the New York subway tunnels. Even though I would personally like to argue that the novel's structure fails to satisfy the reader's expectations -- for example, because of the increasingly tiresome megalomania of the Scarpetta figure[22] and the hasty ending -- in terms of the complex relations between family, expertise, serial murder, and contamination, the novel proves to be a good object for study. In the following section, I shall examine the ways in which the techno-family's expertise -- especially Scarpetta's expertise -- is constructed in From Potter's Field and in the trilogy. I shall argue that the notion of expertise is linked to questions of power, class, ethnicity, and gender, and that Scarpetta's expertise, in particular, is marked by (upper) middle class values and prejudices. These are the values which Gault threatens as a serial killer.

[22] In Cause of Death -- a novel about radioactive contamination -- this megalomania reaches rather unbelievable proportions. A group of terrorists seizes a nuclear power plant in the United States, Scarpetta becomes involved, and there is finally a danger of a worldwide nuclear accident -- and Scarpetta claims that she would be the medical expert in the field of nuclear accidents in the whole world. Then, in Unnatural Exposure (London: Little, Brown and Company, 1997), Scarpetta succeeds in saving her country, and possibly the whole world, from a dangerous mutant smallpox epidemic. The idea of threat in Cornwell's work has moved from a more individual threat to that of a national and, finally, a global threat, and the Scarpetta figure is becoming more and more mythic, a real Superwoman.

White Spaces and Hierarchies

> The individual is an effect of power, and at the same time, or precisely to the extent to which it is that effect, it is the element of its articulation.[23]
>
> I knew what evil was. I could smell it and recognize its features when it was in my midst.[24]

If Scarpetta's expertise is directed towards analyzing causes of death, listening to or making the dead talk, her expertise is thus inscribed within institutional discourses of medical and forensic sciences and within masculine hierarchical power structures in the society depicted in the novels. These structures are maintained by differences in class, ethnic background, gender, and sexual identity. We find numerous examples in the Gault-trilogy and elsewhere in the novels of Scarpetta's conflicts with men in power. These conflicts mark more than a popular formula of the hero(ine)'s passage from humilation and failure to triumph. Such conflicts also draw attention to the problem of female agency within masculine hierarchies, organizations, and traditions.

During the last couple of decades, such hierarchies and traditions have been of great interest both in novels written by female and/or feminist detective writers and in critical texts on detective fiction by feminist critics. Questions of female agency and female investigator as well as that of the female writer, in particular, have been central in fiction and criticism since the rise of feminist scholarship. For example, Jennifer Mann, Maureen T. Reddy, Kathleen Gregory Klein, Sally R. Munt, and many other feminist critics, have questioned the origin, history, and development of the detective genre in their books. Reddy claims in her Sisters in Crime: Feminism and the Crime Novel (1988) that,

> The generally accepted history of crime fiction goes something like this: the first murder mystery is Edgar Allan Poe's 'Murders in the Rue Morgue' and the first series detective is Arthur Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes, with these two prototypes influencing all subsequent crime fiction, which reached a kind of apex in Britain between the wars in the heyday of the Detection Club and in the US in the 1920s with the emergence of a

[23] Foucault, 'Two Lectures,' p. 98.

[24] Patricia Cornwell, Black Notice (London: Little, Brown and Company, 1999), p. 141.

distinctively American variant of the form in the pulp magazines.[25]

Reddy argues for a reconsideration of the influence of the eighteenth century Gothic and nineteenth century sensation novels by women writers on detective fiction. Similarly, in 'Tracking down the Past: Women and Detective Fiction' (1989), Rosalind Coward and Linda Semple wonder 'whether women in fact have always dominated crime writing and their importance has simply been neglected because of sexism within critical attitudes.'[26] Coward and Semple link this question to the problem of 'content' vs 'form' for female (and/or feminist) detective writers and ask, 'Is it the case that while the themes explored by these novels (both the early and the contemporary ones) could be considered as radical, the fixed structure of detective fiction will always pull back towards a hierarchical, established world and a faith in traditional authority?' (P. 49)[27] In other words, can a feminist or radical content find any place in a genre often considered regressive and conservative? This is also a question to be considered in the context of Patricia Cornwell's fiction, in which the female detective/investigator is part of the official law enforcement agencies yet outside them as a female: Scarpetta struggles against the system that she herself is part of.[28]

Scarpetta's ambivalent position as an expert is thus part of a larger question, that of female agency -- woman as investigator -- within the very genre of detective fiction. In fact, such conflicts and the ambivalent position of the female investigator have already become a formula of their own in 'feminist' detective fiction. Indeed, in such fictions 'Women's authority is always in question ... and it is therefore always a struggle for a woman to establish herself as an authority in any area, as authority

---

[25] Maureen T. Reddy, Sisters in Crime: Feminism and the Crime Novel (New York: Continuum, 1988), p. 7.

[26] Rosalind Coward and Linda Semple, 'Tracking down the Past: Women and Detective Fiction,' in From My Guy to Sci-Fi: Genre and Women's Writing in the Postmodern World, ed. Helen Carr (London: Pandora, 1989), p. 41.

[27] On the history of detective fiction written from the perspective of women writers, see Klein, The Woman Detective, Mann's Deadlier than the Male, and in the Finnish context, see Murha pukee naista.

[28] Note, too, that in the Gault-trilogy women can be found in the three main character positions of detective fiction: detective, criminal, and victim.

is popularly associated with masculinity.'[29] However, it would be naive to discuss Scarpetta's ambivalent position simply as a question of 'female' agency. As I shall show in what follows, the Scarpetta figure is constructed within, as well as opposed to, various relations of class, race, and, as I shall argue in the next chapter, sexual identity. 'Being female,' then, and 'female' agency might mean two different things in the Scarpetta series and, for example, in lesbian detective fiction or in detective fiction written by women of colour. Being female is not the whole picture. As Judith Butler accurately remarks in Gender Trouble (1990),

> If one 'is' a woman, that is surely not all one is; the term fails to be exhaustive, not because a pregendered 'person' transcends the specific paraphernalia of its gender, but because gender is not always constituted coherently or consistently in different historical contexts, and because gender intersects with racial, class, ethnic, sexual, and regional modalities of discursively constituted identities. As a result, it becomes impossible to separate out 'gender' from the political and cultural intersections in which it is invariably produced and maintained.[30]

Thus, instead of presuming the existence of a pregiven and universal female agency it might be better to examine how such agency comes into existence through various acts, discourses, and disciplinary knowledges. By linking gender to class, ethnicity, and sexuality, we might better understand the specificity of the threat that Gault represents in the trilogy as a serial killer.

Adopting a term used by Sally R. Munt in her study Murder by the Book? Feminism and the Crime Novel we could characterize Cornwell's work as 'liberal feminist' detective fiction. According to Munt, in such detective fiction the detectives, 'Functioning within a fantasy environ of post-feminist opportunity, these powerful detectives resolve three unstable forms close to the liberal feminist heart -- the individual, the family, and the state' (p. 31). Munt maintains that such liberalism embraces a 'deep

---

[29] Maureen T. Reddy, 'The Feminist Counter-Tradition in Crime: Cross, Grafton, Paretsky, and Wilson,' in The Cunning Craft: Original Essays on Detective Fiction and Contemporary Literary Theory, eds. Ronald G. Walker and June M. Frazer (Macomb, Ill: Western Illinois University, 1990), p. 177.

There is a passage in The Body Farm, in which Scarpetta insists that a male trial lawyer call her Dr. Scarpetta instead of Mrs. Scarpetta when she testifies in court (see pp. 175-177).

[30] Judith Butler, Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity (New York and London: Routledge, 1990), p. 3. Hereafter abbreviated as GT in the text.

structure of common humanity, a notional centre, which all of us supposedly share, irrespective of cultural diversity' (p. 45). Therefore, this liberalism 'allows for the expression of difference. But it positions that difference as other to itself' (p. 57). No wonder then if such liberalist texts often involve two contradictory texts, one which allows and the other which condemns difference. As Munt phrases it, 'Another way of conceptualizing the political positioning of these novels is to imagine a structure of two texts, the surface text -- which is progressive -- and the depth text -- which is conservative' (p. 31). Considering my arguments earlier on how, closely read, ideas of family and body are practices of exclusion and inclusion in the trilogy (and in Cornwell's work as a whole), it seems appropriate to use Munt's term 'liberal feminism' here. This contradictory positioning of difference is what we can read in Cornwell's novels. For example, in the surface text the narrator permits and accepts homosexuality, but the depth text -- and a closer reading -- reveals how she constantly, and negatively, positions it as a disease. Further, while the perspective of liberal feminism in the novels allows for the Scarpetta figure to question male hierarchies and male bonding (in a 'feminist' vein), at the same time it embraces the values of what we could call white bourgeois feminism. Moreover, in doing so, it also accepts values traditionally deemed as 'masculine': for example, 'strong' women do not cry, they offer rational explanations, use technology efficiently, and so on.[31]

But before turning explicitly to questions of class and ethnicity, among other things, let me say a few words about the position of the narrator in the novels. As a first-person narrator, Scarpetta is a single, white, professional, middle-aged and upper middle class female. The use of the first-person narrator affects the reading experience in certain ways. As the point of view is that of the first-person narrator, the reader has the same knowledge of the events and follows the investigation in the same pace as the narrator. The story of the investigation in Cornwell's novels is narrated in a chronological order, and the narrator seldom 'hides' things from the reader. Hence, there are very few flashbacks in the novels -- such as Marcia Muller, for instance, frequently uses in her Sharon McCone series. Moreover, the reader has access into the narrator's consciousness but not to the consciousness of any other

[31] However, Scarpetta is a strange combination of rationality and irrationality; a fact examined later on.

character; the point of view remains that of Scarpetta. Thus, for example, while Scarpetta may keep information from her team during the investigation, this is not necessarily how the text positions the reader: the reader may know things that are not disclosed to the team members. Simultaneously, of course, the reader's knowledge of the investigation depends on and is limited by the first-person narrator since the reader has no access to other consciousnesses and points of views. The first-person narrative thus functions as a narrative boundary, and the third-person 'prologue' at the beginning of From Potter's Field is exceptional in Cornwell's work. Indeed, we could consider the prologue 'out of place' in her work, so to speak, as one of Gault's viral effects on the level of the narrative. As a virus, Gault is even capable of breaking and contaminating the narrative boundary -- of breaking the normal structure of the narrative in the series.[32] This prologue privileges the reader at the expense of Scarpetta so that when the investigation into the murder of Jayne begins, the reader knows more than Scarpetta and her team.

The first-person narrative may effectively encourage the reader's identification (or, disidentification) with the position of the investigator-narrator, in this case Scarpetta -- the 'model reader.' Critics of detective fiction have called the detective as a model reader and a character 'who provide[s] answers to the mystery of crime posed at the beginning.'[33] However, this is not the only position -- even if it is a central one -- or model of reading crime, that Cornwell's novels offer to their readers. Because Scarpetta is not a solitary detective figure, but part of an official team of investigators (her techno-family), the crime investigation is a combination of various perspectives and hierarchical communities, various methods and models of reading and detection. Scarpetta herself is an expert on forensic medicine and thus tackles questions of causes of death, normality and abnormality, health and illness. Marino brings police procedure and its techniques into the picture, and as an FBI profiler,

[32] The prologue at the beginning of Cruel and Unusual is not at the same level in narrative terms as the one in From Potter's Field. The former novel's prologue is a 'meditation' by the executed murderer, Ronnie Joe Waddell. As such, it does not tell what the murderer is doing -- like the one in From Potter's Field. Moreover, Scarpetta has access to Waddell's meditation: she reads it. Then, the prologue in Body of Evidence consists of two letters written by the murdered woman, Beryl Madison; and Point of Origin begins with a mysterious letter from the imprisoned Carrie Grethen to Scarpetta. Significantly, since The Body Farm the novels have had a biblical epigraph in the beginning -- such epigraphs add overtones of apocalyptic fear and destruction to the novels.

[33] Pyrhönen, '"Crime is Common, Logic is Rare,"' p. 2.

Wesley represents the FBI way of dealing with (serial) crime and often handles questions of national security and politics. Finally, Lucy works on computers, examines data, and develops sophisticated machinery. On the whole, the investigation of serial murder in the novels -- as in the trilogy -- is contextualized heavily within federal investigation, because Scarpetta and Marino are part of a special FBI unit attacking such crimes. It is after Gault has made his first appearance in Cruel and Unusual that Scarpetta is asked by Wesley to '"come on board as a consultant to the Behavioral Science Unit.... to review the medical and forensic details of cases to assist ... in working up the profiles"' (pp. 435-436). As Jenkins notes in Using Murder, various cultural trends during the last decade or so -- for example, fiction and true-crime -- 'established a public expectation that the federal experts in fact possessed the highest expertise in such cases, and that it was normal or even essential to seek their advice when murders were not solved rapidly' (p. 98). On her part, Cornwell has effectively strengthened that myth.

Expertise thus extends over various fields and communities in the novels, and is inscribed within certain discourses and hierarchical communities. The ways in which expertise is produced, maintained, and demonstrated to the outside, non-professional, world -- and to the reader -- have to do with, for instance, place, symbols and language: who speaks, when, in/from what place, and with what authority? Scarpetta herself is an expert reader/witness as medical examiner and has a degree in law: it took '"Seventeen years, if you include residencies and the years [she] was a fellow"' to finish her education after high school as she explains to the jury in Cruel and Unusual (p. 412). She has 'enough degrees and certificates to paper a wall' (ibid., p. 40). She is also consulting forensic pathologist for the FBI. Symbolic distinctions of expertise would thus comprise, for example, those of rank, degree, and uniform. We often find Scarpetta self-consciously stressing her rank as 'chief medical examiner' and referring to her 'lab coats, scrubs, business suits and titles' (FPF, pp. 207-208).

As for language and literacy, Cornwell's novels in general include numerous (almost fetishistic) examples of the use of scientific jargon and the latest inventions in forensic science and forensic pathology, computer technology, and so on, which establish and, as it were, 'prove' the expertise of the techno-family to the reader. That is, they authenticate -- make authentic and prove genuine -- those who

investigate the crime; that they have the expert knowledge, skills, and technology needed in reading the clues and signs left by the criminal, or by a certain type of criminal (e.g. a serial killer). Language and literacy are here part of a bigger picture: that of institutional discourses and disciplinary knowledges such as medicine, psychiatry, law, and forensic sciences in general. Professional language and literacy is one way to hierarchize people, one way to include, exclude, and establish boundaries between those who have the skill to interpret and read clues, evidence, data, and documents and those unskilled. Experts and expertise thus construct hierarchies between experts and laypersons, language being one of the most important means for differentiation and exclusion. As a viral serial killer, Gault undermines the ways in which expertise is maintained in the trilogy.

Language is further a way to create cohesion within professionals or between various professional groups. As Willett notes in The Naked City,

> In novels written in the last quarter of a century, urban types such as detectives, criminals, lawyers and politicos are often linked by their own language. As professionals sharing information and undergoing similar experiences, they need their own 'business' discourse. Wisecracks, slang and general verbal toughness are the means of ordering and interpreting events, marking the investigator out from the crowd, enabling him/her to function effectively in the anonymous urban milieu. (pp. 7-8)

We might, however, add something more to Willett's analysis, namely the role of the reader. A habitual reader of detective stories, for example, learns the jargon of various professional groups in such stories and thus, so to speak, shares their expertise. The reader becomes competent in analyzing events and types of crime.[34] The pleasure of reading stems, in part, from the reader's competence and familiarity with generic conventions. For example, serial murder novels often presume that the reader has knowledge of the phenomenon of serial murder -- of its history since Jack the Ripper, its most famous

[34] I have heard stories of Finnish people, who, when arrested by the police, demand that they be 'Mirandized' -- a practice which is not part of the Finnish legal system but with which the Finnish are familiar through numerous books and particularly through American crime films and TV-series.

On pleasure, generic conventions and detective narratives in general, see, for instance, Jorge Hernández Martín, Readers and Labyrinths: Detective Fiction in Borges, Bustos Domecq, and Eco (New York and London: Garland, 1995), especially pp. 3-11.

cases, its characteristics, its jargon, and of the investigative tools used by the police and the FBI. When a series of murders takes place in such a novel, it is often contextualized in and compared with earlier, other series, and these earlier series tend to be real ones, not fictional (so far it appears that only Harris' Hannibal the Cannibal-character is referred to in fictional works). We could thus speculate upon a certain intertextuality in serial murder: how the reader is expected to know about, as well as recognize, the real serial murder canon and classics, serial murder's Top Ten (Jack the Ripper, Bundy, Gacy, Ramirez, DeSalvo, Dahmer, Nilsen, etc) and to know about their style and modus operandi. By acquiring such knowledge of these crimes and their investigation, the reader becomes, as it were, part of the competent expert group reading and analyzing the murders.[35] Thus, for an occasional reader of serial murder novels such acronyms as VICAP or BSU or NCAVC do not necessarily say much, but the avid reader has learnt to expect them in the course of the investigation. Genres thus shape our expectations as readers, and we expect certain things to take place in a horror story or in a detective story. As readers, we learn generic conventions and we can recognize similarities between individual texts, films, or TV programmes.

While a shared language and jargon may create cohesion between the professionals, individual professional languages within a group of heterogeneous professionals may cause confusion. Hierarchies also exist inside Scarpetta's techno-family, since not everybody understands everybody else's language even though the team members work together. For instance, when Scarpetta visits Lucy in the ERF in The Body Farm, she thinks, 'Lucy showed us more screens and elaborated on other marvels in words difficult even for me' (p. 41). Scarpetta, reader of bodies and death, cannot always understand Lucy, reader of computer language. Moreover, during an earlier visit, Scarpetta reveals to the reader how 'The workings within [ERF] were classified, and it chagrined me a little that I was the chief medical

[35] This competence also has to do with evaluating new fictional killers on the basis of what one has already read; that is, whether the author has succeeded in portraying the new killer as more monstrous than the previous killers. Sometimes this perspective -- and rivalry -- is explicitly stated in the novels themselves, as in Patterson's Kiss the Girls. There the killer called Gentleman Caller writes to an investigating reporter: '"I am the latest, and I'm by far the greatest," the Gentleman had written. Who could argue with that? Richard Ramirez? Caryl Chessman? Charles Manson?' (P. 138) The new killer has to outdo the forefathers.

examiner of Virginia, the consulting forensic pathologist for the Bureau's Investigative Support Unit, and had never been cleared to enter hallways my young niece passed through every day' (p. 9). In other words, there are boundaries between the members of the techno-family as each member reads crime from a different perspective.

However, while language, literacy, and reading hierarchize and establish boundaries between experts and laypersons, or between experts, they can simultaneously undermine such boundaries because boundaries can be trespassed by skilful outsiders. This is exactly what Gault does: he trespasses the boundary of Scarpetta's team when he contaminates CAIN and 'learns' to read and use it. Thus one of Gault's crimes is the crime of trying to read like an expert and of undermining the ways of reading serial crime. He gains access into and can manipulate the computer system and archive CAIN like an expert, and this system also includes information of his own crimes. Gault therefore poses a threat to archivization and memorization as he can change, write anew, the archives and read crime differently (I shall return to this in more detail in Chapter 4, 'Cain and CAIN').

But let me now continue with a more detailed analysis of expertise and Scarpetta's attitude towards her team members. As I suggested earlier on, Cornwell's novels depict a world of expertise which is structured on differences based on class, ethnic background, and gender -- not uncommon in a genre often considered conservative and regressive. Class and class membership are perhaps more important in the novels than what might at first appear; consider the attitude towards poverty and homelessness discussed in the previous section.[36] Scarpetta's relation to, for instance, Marino involves class differences, and Marino is also an example of Cornwell's use of popular stereotypes in her fiction. Marino is an (all too familiar) overweight, overwrought, homophobic, and racist policeman (he has already attended cultural diversity class three times), who, nevertheless, has a heart of gold. In The Body Farm, Scarpetta describes him in the following way: 'In his early fifties, he was a casualty of concentrated doses of tainted human nature, bad diet, and drink, his face etched by hardship and fringed

[36] Note, too, how the Gault family is an old southern family with money, whereas the Scarpetta family is of immigrant Italian origin.

with thinning gray hair. Marino was overweight, out of shape, and not known for a sweet disposition' (p. 5).

Marino's (lower) middle class is explicitly marked by both homophobia and racism while Scarpetta's upper middle class is -- on the surface text -- tolerant and open-minded. In fact, we could argue that Scarpetta can hide her prejudices better and looks 'tolerant' on the surface. Despite their friendship, Marino is a reminder and stain in Scarpetta's upper middle class picture, one whose presence is not necessarily wanted in her expensive and pathologically clean house (unless, of course, her life is in danger and she needs protection). Despite having been made Captain, Marino remains more like a lower middle class figure, one whose habits testify his origins -- contrary to Scarpetta, whose rise from lower middle class to upper middle class shows in her life-style. Typically, Scarpetta turns class into a matter of cleanliness and dirt, thus fuelling the rhetoric of health and illness in the trilogy. As Scarpetta confesses to the reader, 'I was devoted to Marino but could not bear the thought of him in my house. I could see him wiping his feet on my oriental rugs and leaving rings on yew wood and mahogany. He would watch wrestling in front of the fire and drink Budweiser out of the can' (FPF, p. 204). This is, surely, what (male) lower middle class people do: they contaminate clean upper middle class houses as they literally leave dirty marks of their lack of manners and of their presence when they wipe their feet on expensive rugs and leave marks 'on yew wood and mahogany.' Considering the time that Scarpetta and Marino have been working together in a number of novels, it is somewhat strange that as readers we see our first glimpse of Marino's house as late as Point of Origin. His house seems 'dim and bare,' and in the kitchen Scarpetta examines 'the greasy stovetop and overflowing garbage can and sink,' and begins to wash the dishes (pp. 200-201). Marino's house is dirty compared to Scarpetta's obsessively clean house in a wealthy neighbourhood.[37] What, we may wonder, is she trying to wash away? Thus

[37] Scarpetta not only wishes to keep criminals outside her home, but, in a way, her techno-family, too. She cannot bear the thought of having them inside her house touching and 'contaminating' her things. The idea of Lucy touching her things is painful in Cruel and Unusual: 'I tried not to think about another human being touching my clothes, folding something in a way I wouldn't or returning a jacket to the wrong hanger' (p. 92). In Unnatural Exposure -- another novel on evil contamination -- this attitude becomes more and more evident as Scarpetta is having problems in her relationship with Benton Wesley: 'In fact, I didn't want him in my house any more than I wanted Marino sitting in my chair. When Wesley moved a piece of furniture or even returned dishes and

images of dirt in Cornwell's work do not just refer to 'greasy stovetops,' for example, but indicate specific attitudes towards persons, social classes, and gender. Dirt is always more than a substance.

In contrast to Marino's neighbourhood, Scarpetta's neighbourhood is very white, upper middle class, wealthy, and professional. In fact, she lives within a gated community. Scarpetta passes as upper middle class now, even though she comes from a not so middle class family of immigrant Italian origin. She enjoys good food and wine, drives a Mercedes (which Marino calls a 'Nazimobile'), lives in a 'gracious brick house,' and her neighbourhood is 'one of the wealthiest in Richmond' (FPF, p. 201). This wealthy neighbourhood is especially set in contrast to another, not so wealthy, part of her society: that of 'the housing projects,' where mainly poor people of colour, drug-dealers, and other criminals live (poverty, as it were, being one of the crimes in the world of Scarpetta). This is the segregated society in which people are allocated a place according to their wealth (or lack of it), ethnic background, and class. As we can notice in the trilogy, Gault is a figure who moves freely from one place to another.

Scarpetta's professional attitude towards Marino and her situating Marino in a particular place exemplify the differences between the team members' competence in their respective fields and imply a specific attitude towards class and knowledge. For instance, in The Body Farm, Marino is unable to read Denesa Steiner, the novel's copy-cat murderer, correctly, but instead, starts an affair with her and almost ends up being murdered by her.[38] Questions of class and education become a topic for argument between Scarpetta and Marino in this novel (see pp. 137-139). This argument is connected to the fact that Marino is now jealous of Scarpetta and turns towards Steiner; Scarpetta, however, is astonished to learn Marino's 'obvious familiarity with both [Steiner's] house and its owner' and her 'uneasiness' grows (p. 141). Marino falls for Steiner's feminine posture -- red-rimmed eyes, tears, trembling, despair

---

silverware to the wrong cabinets and drawers, I felt a secret anger that surprised and dismayed me' (p. 42).

[38] It is in this novel that Scarpetta begins an affair with Benton Wesley, and Marino is clearly jealous. In fact, Scarpetta expresses that Marino

> had been negative about my ex-husband, and very critical of my former lover, Mark. He rarely had anything nice to say about Lucy or the way I dealt with her, and he did not like my friends. Most of all, I felt his cold stare on my relationship with Wesley. I felt Marino's jealous rage. (p. 108)

-- but Scarpetta worries over Steiner's eyes; the eyes which 'Through their bleariness gleamed a strange cold light' (p. 147). Significantly for the reader, a couple of lines later Scarpetta remembers Gault's 'piercing eyes' which she 'would never forget' (pp. 147-148). Marino is reacting emotionally towards Steiner, whereas Scarpetta is able to behave rationally and analytically.

Then, in Cause of Death -- a novel about radioactive contamination -- traces of radioactive uranium are found, and Scarpetta and Marino take a sample for further examination. Radioactivity, like serial killers and contagious deadly viruses, point to the deceptive normality of the world and the surface of things: everything may appear clean and normal, but beneath the surface is the world of contamination and invisible killers. Experts are then those who know how and where to detect and expose the sources of contagion. Marino panicks when they argue about radioactivity, 'Sweat was beaded on the top of his head and rolling down his temple, his face dark red' (p. 223). Marino's panic is all emotion and fear, whereas Scarpetta is calm and rational, has knowledge, and thus she occupies a 'masculine' position. As she argues to Marino, '"...I do know about radioactivity. I know about X-rays, MRIs and isotopes like cobalt, iodine and technetium that are used to treat cancer. Physicians learn about a lot of things, including radiation sickness"' (p. 223). A little later, Scarpetta goes to discuss radioactivity and the nature of uranium 235 and 238 with Dr. Matthews, an expert on nuclear engineering at the University of Virginia. Their discussion is partly scientific jargon but not overtly so, and they share the same professional language and are at the same level. When Scarpetta summarizes their discussion to Marino, she places him in the position of an ignorant woman or a little child: 'I gave him a summary, leaving out as much scientific detail as I could' (p. 242; the reader, however, witnesses both discussions). Scarpetta assigns Marino a 'feminine' position because she describes him as being afraid and panicking, and knowing next to nothing about radioactivity. Unlike Scarpetta and Dr. Matthews, who are both upper middle class experts, Marino is outside certain kinds of discourses, and, as is implied, cannot really understand the nature of radioactivity. Marino is here 'feminized' when he is in contact with upper middle class professional expertise. Between the two above passages we learn that Marino presently suffers from impotence -- indeed, he is not even properly functioning as a man,

but he is impotent, 'castrated.' Marino is also feminized by Scarpetta when she refers to his inability to control himself and his body: contrary to Scarpetta, Marino is overweight, 'out of shape,' and addicted to 'bad diet, and drink.' In addition, Marino's lack of knowledge, understanding, and control emphasizes the main character's, Scarpetta's, expertise and status to the reader (this is a common pattern in detective fiction).[39] Even though the reader has on several occasions witnessed Scarpetta, too, behaving irrationally and emotionally, Scarpetta's self-image remains unshattered -- note how as late as Black Notice she analyzes herself in the following manner: 'I was a lawyer and a physician. If anything, I was more inclined to stay inside my clinical, fact-only lawyer's mind and was not given to overreactions and emotional projections' (p. 128). Well, if she calls her behaviour from Postmortem to Black Notice clinical and rational, let me just say that I would not like to have somebody like Scarpetta as my lawyer and doctor.

Even though Scarpetta draws the reader's attention to her Italian ancestry numerous times in the novels, her Italian nature appears hardly in more than in the lasagna she makes -- as natural, I think, as the Italian accent Gault uses at one point in From Potter's Field. What is more, she is not even a 'typical' Italian, but a special one (and everything is exhaustively special about Scarpetta): '"My ancestors are from Verona in northern Italy, where a sizable segment of the population shares blood with the Savoyards, Austrians, and Swiss," I patiently explained. "Many of us are blue-eyed and blond,"' as she tells the jury in Cruel and Unusual (pp. 413-414). Hearing this description, it in fact becomes not difficult to imagine Scarpetta more like a blond, blue-eyed Aryan, who, indeed, drives a Nazimobile. The response she receives for this from one of the members of the jury, '"Boy, I bet you can cook"' (ibid.) strengthens the stereotypical image of Italians who love food and cooking. That is, how a nationality -- such as 'Italian' -- is performed and what attributes are given to it in popular

[39] In order not to simplify matters too much, it needs to be pointed out that Marino himself works as an expert in his own field, that of police work. The fact that the team members simultaneously belong in their own respective fields and groups of expertise causes, time after time, friction between them. In Cruel and Unusual, for example, Marino suspects Scarpetta of withholding information concerning the murder of Susan Story (see pp. 300-306); and in From Potter's Field Scarpetta accuses Wesley of he and Lucy '"conspir[ing] against"' her and of being '"left in the dark"' (p. 326; see also p. 331); and so on.

fictions. For example, by linking food with ethnicity, that ethnicity becomes more 'authentic.'[40] Hence, food in the Scarpetta series asserts, and is a sign of, ethnicity and class membership: Scarpetta prefers Scotch, good food and wine, whereas Marino prefers Budweiser and unhealthy food.

It is significant that unlike her mother, Scarpetta now passes as a wealthy, white Anglo-Saxon, since her 'dark' and ethnic Italian blood is hidden behind her blonde hair and blue eyes. There is a marked disidentification between the daughter and the mother in terms of visibility -- how can Scarpetta be her mother's daughter? In The Body Farm, Scarpetta describes her mother in a way not altogether flattering: 'I could see her in my mind puffing a cigarette and holding the phone. My mother liked big earrings and bright makeup, and she did not look northern Italian like I did. She was not fair' (p. 343). Scarpetta's mother is, as it were, a vulgar Italian woman, and as such a stereotype. On the contrary, in terms of visibility, the narrator's dark ethnicity and foreign ancestry are not given too much emphasis. Italian ethnicity is thus made slightly exotic and palatable to the readers of Cornwell's mainstream detective fiction. Nevertheless, Scarpetta cannot successfully hide her Italian ancestry: her money is earned through hard work, whereas two of her lovers, Mark James and Benton Wesley come from old families. We learn in Cruel and Unusual that Mark's family, for instance, never invited Scarpetta to stay over Christmas, because, as Scarpetta tells Lucy, they '"had certain ways of doing things"' (p. 172). Despite her wealth and status, Scarpetta is to some extent an 'alien' figure in such a WASP environment. Besides, the fact that Gault adopts the identity of an Italian man -- he pretends to be Italian -- in From Potter's Field emphasizes the affinity between Scarpetta and Gault, investigator and criminal.

Most of the crime victims in Cornwell's novels are white and middle class. Crime in the series -- as in the trilogy -- does not deliberately focus the reader's attention on various problems in American society, such as poverty, racism, sexism, homophobia, everyday violence, corporate business and its

[40] In Murder by the Book? Munt notes the following when she discusses the work of Sarah Schulman: 'The commodification of identity can also be seen in the way Schulman chooses to depict ethnicity, in particular Jewishness, expressed metonymically through food' (p. 177). After quoting a passage from Schulman's novel, she continues, 'the prevalence of food in the novel metonymically asserts its Jewishness, but also provides a cultural reference point for all women preoccupied with the inevitable appropriation, treatment, distribution, and fetishism of food' (ibid.). Incidentally, in 1998 Cornwell published a book called Scarpetta's Winter Table, which includes the team members' favourite recipes; unlike the Scarpetta series, the book is written in the third-person.

effects on ordinary people, or social injustice in general -- as is more the case in the work of some other contemporary women detective writers, for example, Paretsky and Muller.[41] If Cornwell's novels do refer to social problems -- like homelessness, poverty, and drug addiction -- they evoke them as problems which deserve no sympathy from the part of the narrator, the reader, or society. As I argued earlier on, Cornwell's work is more concerned with psychopathologically dangerous individuals. Children or women may become victims of murder in her fiction, but even then their murderers are deranged mothers or serial killers -- and not child abusers or violent spouses. Moreover, the reasons for the psychopathic behaviour of these killers often remain mysterious, and such behaviour is more or less encapsulated by the narrator as 'evil' (no wonder that so many psychopathic serial killers die at the end of serial killer novels: they must die before the investigators have a chance to discover the reasons for their behaviour, and therefore their deaths serve to strengthen the 'mystery' of such psychopathic behaviour). As Scarpetta tells young Lucy in Postmortem,'"there are some people who are evil"' and '"Sometimes there isn't a reason. In a way, it doesn't matter. Some people would rather be bad, would rather be cruel."'[42] It follows from this line of thinking that society cannot be blamed for evil's existence and that there is little that society can do to prevent such evil behaviour from taking place. 'Evil' is turned into an individual, psychopathological matter, and in the Gault-trilogy, for example, it is a matter which seems to threaten more the values of the white (upper) middle class. That is, it threatens those values which Munt considers central within liberal feminism, 'the individual, the family, and the state.' As I showed earlier on, Scarpetta regards Gault as threatening her precious home and earnings, and thus values close to the white capitalist heart. Even though evil in the above passage is explained as an individual choice (a kind of evil jouissance), as having no reason, a closer reading reveals how evil behaviour and serial murder in the trilogy are located, among other things, within the disruption of the heterosexual binary system (I shall return to this question in the next chapter).

---

[41] Or, in this context, examine too the work of many British detective writers, for instance, Val McDermid, Gillian Slovo, and Hannah Wakefield.

[42] Patricia Cornwell, Postmortem (London: Warner Books, 1992), p. 34; hereafter abbreviated as PM in the text.

If there are non-white professionals in the trilogy or in the novels in general, their status is open to speculation. Sheriff Brown -- Sheriff Santa -- is, as his name at once informs us, African-American. At the beginning of From Potter's Field, Scarpetta recounts that the Sheriff drives 'a Cadillac for his personal car,' wears 'heavy gold jewelry,' and snorts cocaine (pp. 13-14). His 'brownness' is immediately connected with criminality: he is involved with the drug trade and also wants to have Scarpetta killed. The only character of African-American descent, who is professional and has some status in From Potter's Field, for instance, is Chief Tucker. As Scarpetta does not know Tucker well, she cannot much refer to his professional abilities, but refers, instead, to his looks. Scarpetta can smell his 'Hermès cologne' (p. 25), and describes him as 'handsome, with high cheekbones and strong white teeth, his body powerful beneath his skin as if its darkness were the markings of a leopard or a tiger' (pp. 25-26). The description here is somewhat racist and stereotypical since Scarpetta regards the African-American male -- the racial other -- as a wild and strong animal, possibly even as a sexual animal. Chief Tucker is 'young to be ranked so high' (p. 22) and a 'former basketball star' (p. 23). This suggests to the reader that, unlike Scarpetta, Tucker might in fact be Chief only on the basis of affirmative action and not on the basis of his real abilities. By mainly concentrating on Chief Tucker's looks, Scarpetta does not read beyond the surface of the skin, beyond the visibly marked body. Tucker is reduced to (animal) nature, corporeality, and his sex. The black body's 'darkness were the markings' -- and how ironically true that is here -- and Tucker is skin and surface, and he is readable because he is visibly marked as a black body, a racialized body. In effect, skin marks boundaries and limits, and not just physical ones: for medical examiner Scarpetta (like for the racial scientists of the nineteenth century) the epidermis seems to tell the essential truth about identity.

The categorization and stigmatization of African Americans as racial others is indeed noticeable. Consider, too, the stereotypical characterization of the morgue's African-American security guard Evans in From Potter's Field. This is how Scarpetta depicts Evans when she questions him about the body of Sheriff Brown which has been delivered to the morgue. Evans is 'an older black man who needed his job.... and carried a gun that I wondered if he knew how to use' (p. 218). Evans looks 'genuinely

clueless' (p. 219), tells Scarpetta that he takes care of his '"mama"' (p. 221), is 'about to cry' (ibid.), and so on. Evans is incompetent and he is feminized by Scarpetta. Moreover, as we recall, From Potter's Field begins with an episode in which Scarpetta, members of the Richmond police force, social services as well as media go slumming -- they visit the 'forgotten children of the projects and their shell-shocked mothers' in order to give them Christmas presents (p. 15). The project they visit is one of poor black people, of whom most seem to be either drug addicts or drug dealers. A little boy, Trevi, 'wore a blue cap with a marijuana leaf over the bill,' and his mother had been killed by a drug dealer, who was apparently also his father (p. 16). Blackness is here, not surprisingly, again contextualized within criminality. The project is, however, a good place for Christmas slumming and sad Christmas stories for the TV and press: 'The press had turned their attention to the grandmother because this was the story of the night' (p. 17). It is, as it were, proper to show sympathy for the poor during Christmas (as good Christians), but then they can be comfortably forgotten for a year.[43] In the trilogy and elsewhere, then, African Americans are most often represented to the reader in the context of crime, incompetence, and drugs. Through such representations they form the margin of and are excluded from the 'healthy' national family; they are seldom depicted as active agents in their own right.[44]

If there are other non-white or immigrant characters, they usually have little education and are thus mostly non-professional. In From Potter's Field, Scarpetta very carefully refers to the ethnic background of a number of working class or lower middle class characters, who are mainly service personnel. Here are some examples from the novel: '"You going solo tonight?" asked a paramedic who looked Latin' (p. 27); '"I need a receipt," I said to my Russian driver, who had spent the last ten minutes

[43] Interestingly, in Naked City, Willett points to the image of the slum, which has come to 'assume certain symbolic and narrative meanings,' particularly during the early decades of this century. He writes that 'Urban novelists steered clear of the term and its stigma, but with money and class determining urban residence patterns, it came to represent a strange, mysterious area which the bourgeoisie visited either to dispense charity or for entertainment, hence the verbal form "slumming"' (p. 13).

[44] Note also what Marino comments to Scarpetta in Cruel and Unusual when they visit the neighbourhood where one of Gault's victims, Eddie Heath, lived. The neighbourhood '"used to be all white"' (p. 62) and '"a good area to live"' (p. 63). But now Marino '"wouldn't let any kid of [his] walk around here after dark"' (p. 63) because there is a lot of drug trading in the neighbourhood.

telling me what was wrong with the world' (p. 59); 'The driver was Iranian and Marino was not nice to him' (p. 110); 'My window in back would not roll down, and it was impossible for my Vietnamese driver to communicate who I was to the guard at the FBI Academy entrance' (p. 147). Scarpetta 'recognizes' and classifies these drivers immediately, puts them in their proper places as ethnic others: through their bodies (and their language) their ethnic otherness is at once visible to her. Finally, here is Scarpetta visiting the deep South -- outside her familiar urban environment -- when she tries to find Gault's parents:

> The restaurant was the Gullah House, the woman who seated me big and dark black. She was brilliant in a flowing dress of tropical colors, and when she spoke over a counter to a waiter their language was musical and filled with strange words....I pointed to *Biddy een de Fiel* because I could not say it. The translation promised a grilled chicken breast on Romaine lettuce. (p. 350)

Here, however, Scarpetta's expertise fails her as it does not extend to the language of the big dark black woman; she needs a translation into 'proper' English. I think it would be inaccurate to read these references as simply alluding to the ethnic diversity of contemporary United States. Instead, these references to the ethnic or immigrant background emphasize the differences, hierarchies as well as the friction between Scarpetta's white, upper middle class, professional, and 'American/English' world, and the world of the immigrant,[45] non-white (visibly marked bodies), and non-professional characters. As becomes evident in some of the examples above, and elsewhere in the novels, the encounters between Scarpetta('s team) and non-professional non-whites often epitomize non-communication, lack of communication, or misunderstanding, because they do not speak or share the same language (in various senses). In other words, these differences help to construct a world where expertise and professionalism are white and properly 'American.' Nevertheless, by bringing up the question of immigrant origin time

[45] As many of the cases above involve taxi-drivers (Scarpetta seems to be obsessed with their ethnic origin), I cannot help but recall Linda Barnes' novel Hardware (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1995). The novel (not a serial murder novel though) features serial sleuth Carlotta Carlyle, this time examining a number of attacks on taxi-drivers. Taxi-driving in the novel is connected to an alien status, i.e., living and working illegally in the country as a non-naturalized person. Illegal immigrants, 'aliens,' therefore exemplify alienation/alien nation for the more well-to do members of the society -- who are only too eager to employ these immigrants and abuse their illegal status.

after time, Scarpetta points to her own position as an alien in the white upper middle class world -- among those people (e.g. Benton Wesley and Mark James) whose wealth is inherited, not earned.

In addition, it would be rather difficult to envisage 'ingenious' serial killer Temple Gault as, for example, African-American or Hispanic -- other than white. Similarly, we might speculate on the popularity and appeal of the figure of Hannibal the Cannibal in Harris' novel The Silence of the Lambs (and in Demme's film).[46] Lecter is a white, middle-aged, academic, professional male. The question for speculation would be how popular fictions of serial murder and questions of expertise and ethnicity cancel each other out: would Lecter or Scarpetta or Gault as African Americans have been popular and fascinating in the eyes of the mass reading (or viewing) public? I am tempted to answer no to this question, because a black Lecter or a black Scarpetta -- a black female as expert investigator -- would perhaps not as easily stand as objects of fascination and identification for many white readers or viewers. If they did, then the audience would probably not be counted in millions as is the case now. Besides, if the governing popular conception of the serial killer is as a white male -- that the killer could be 'anybody' hiding beneath the facade of normality -- the black male's visibility, for example, would always already have marked him as different, and not as 'anybody.' Would the author, particularly a white author, be accused of racism if s/he created a black serial killer -- especially if the killer murdered people outside his or her own ethnic group?

One popular example of an African-American investigator is, however, detective Alex Cross in James Patterson's Cross series. Cross examines serial kidnappings and murders in the novel Kiss the Girls, which was also made into a film in 1997. One major and notable difference between the novel and the film concerns the relation between Cross (a black man) and one of the victims, Kate McTiernan (a white woman): they have an affair in the novel, but not so in the film. This, I think, tells us much about the racial politics of the Hollywood film industry in the 1990s. Then, one of the few African-American

[46] I recently found out that in the film adaptation of Jeffery Deaver's The Bone Collector (London: Coronet, 1997), Denzel Washington plays the role of the main character Lincoln Rhyme: in the novel Rhyme is white, not African-American. I cannot think of any other reason for such a fundamental change, except that perhaps 'blackness' further emphasizes the passive body of Rhyme who is a quadriplegic.

serial killers -- killing young female African Americans -- that I have encountered makes his appearance in Walter Mosley's (President Clinton's favourite author) Easy Rawlins-novel White Butterfly.[47] Even there serial killing exists as a kind of sub-plot and not as a mystery of its own. Mosley, by the way, is the first African-American writer to be elected President of the Mystery Writers of America (in 1995).

The question of how murder and ethnicity, or murder and ethnicity plus gender, may cancel each other out in serial murder novels is not, in fact, restricted to such novels but concerns detective fiction in general.[48] As such it it not only a question of non-white and non-male (and non-heterosexual)

---

[47] Walter Mosley, White Butterfly (London and Sydney: Pan Books, 1994).

[48] If Cornwell's novels and many other serial killer novels represent serial killing as a white man's obsession, this is not necessarily the case with 'real' serial killing. Ethnicity and gender are relevant issues in discussions of real killings. Mark Seltzer, for instance, draws attention -- though in a confusing manner -- to popular assumptions about ethnicity and gender in such cases and argues in his article 'Serial Killers (II): The Pathological Public Sphere,' Critical Inquiry, 22, No. 1 (1995) that,

> Suffice it to note here that one of the governing popular misconceptions about serial killing is the assumption that serial killers are almost invariably white males, despite the fact that the percentage of known black male serial killers is closely comparable to their proportion in the U.S. population as a whole (the estimates run from 13 to 16 percent) and despite the fact that perhaps 10 to 15 percent of known American serial killers are women. (p. 127)

In his book Serial Killers he still makes the same claim (see p. 53). The problem of this claim in the whole context of Seltzer's book is that he constantly and systematically refers to accounts of white male serial killing as evidence for his arguments. Thus we find references to Ted Bundy, Dennis Nilsen, Jeffrey Dahmer, and so on -- to the most celebrated and known cases of white male serial killing. Seltzer ignores accounts of black male serial killers (for example, Wayne Williams or Carlton Gary) and female serial killers (for example, Aileen Wuornos) even though he acknowledges and stresses their existence -- in an endnote (see pp. 53-54). This endnote reveals, indeed, what black male serial killing or female serial killing is for Seltzer's book: an endnote, a mere 'note' to white male serial killing which then forcibly continues to occupy a central place in our mind -- as a 'popular misconception.' Hence Seltzer advocates the very thing he condemns as a misconception. Perhaps female serial killing with its 'Black Widows' and 'Angels of Death' is not as 'sexy' or fascinating a topic as male serial killing with its tortures, mutilations, rapes, and cannibalism of mostly female victims. These two categories can be found, for example, in Murder Most Rare: The Female Serial Killer, in which the authors divide female serial killers into nine categories, and suggest that 'the female serial killer typically remains undetected for a significantly longer period of time than the average male serial murderer. She is a quiet killer, who is often painstakingly methodical and eminently lethal in her actions' (p. xi; there is in this description of the female serial killer something more 'lethal,' something strange in the way this passage combines femininity and deviousness).

Further, Seltzer's figures regarding the number of black or female serial killers are suspect for other reasons, too. He does not offer his readers any 'definition' of serial killing (as is the case usually in books on this topic); instead, his analyses range from true crime to fiction, from H.H. Holmes to Ted Bundy to Jack London to Emile Zola to The Alienist to 'Copycat.' In addition, we do not really know which serial killer figures and definitions Seltzer refers to: for example, does the percentage of known female serial killers include 'Black Widows'? Does it include mercy killings? As I showed in Chapter 1, researchers disagree very much on the definition and typology of serial killing (see the articles in Egger's Serial Murder: An Elusive Phenomenon for a number of differing perspectives). It follows that we should not accept Seltzer's figures and percentages without questioning them -- even though Seltzer's book is about the politics and desire for such categorizations and definitions. Especially since Seltzer's own book advocates the very thing he wishes to criticize, the popular

detectives or characters, but relates to writers and authorship. In recent years, feminist critics of detective fiction have not only drawn attention to the position of the female detective but also thereby to the small number of black women detective writers or black women detectives. For example, Reddy comes to the following conclusion in Sisters in Crime: Feminism and the Crime Novel: 'This fact [lack of women detective writers of colour] underscores my earlier assertion that the institution of crime fiction is, or at the very least appears to be, fundamentally conservative, upholding ideals and values that members of oppressed groups must find antipathetic to their own lives and struggles' (p. 16).[49] Six years later Munt, in considering the same question, argues in Murder by the Book? that,

> Orientalist discourse locates the Other as criminal, and a threat. This discursive construction of Black identity and criminality is so powerful that even feminist writers trying to write against it largely fail to deliver an alternative because the White discourse and the crime form itself are so resistant to change in this aspect. The centre of the crime novel requires Cartesian rational Man. Black man, because of his construction as non-thinking, non-rational, and non-literate, cannot deliver the denotation of 'detective' easily. Black women writers are consequently very difficult to find; in six years of research I have only found five, all of them in the USA....The genre is not a logical choice for those positioned outside the hegemonic institution of law enforcement. (p. 85)

If the form of detective fiction is traditionally at odds with the aims of feminism -- with feminism's 'radical' content -- then in the case of non-white detectives, male and female, it must be doubly so.[50]

As I pointed out at the beginning of this section, the construction of female agency, and, hence, expertise, is a central issue in many novels by women detective writers, and so it is in Cornwell's novels, too. At the core of this issue is whether a woman, traditionally an irrational and passive figure

---

misconception that 'serial killers are almost invariably white males.'

[49] The first Finnish collection of articles devoted to women detective writers, Murha pukee naista: Naisdekkareita ja dekkarinaisia, altogether ignores questions of ethnicity; a fact unnoticed in Heta Pyrhönen's somewhat critical review of the collection, 'Naisetsivien jäljillä,' Naistutkimus, No. 1 (1998).

[50] But then again, we might also consider the ways in which some marginalized groups have found ways and publishers to express their voices through popular genres. Lesbian detective fiction is one of the most successful ones in this respect, and as lesbian popular culture, may function as 'part of an ongoing and complex process of lesbian identification' as Gillian Whitlock argues in '"Cop it Sweet": Lesbian Crime Fiction,' in The Good, the Bad and the Gorgeous, p. 107.

in Western literature, can effectively occupy the place of the detective -- a rational figure. Let me now return to this question, and especially to Scarpetta's conflicts with men in power. While Scarpetta is a professional female, an expert with a certain status and powerful position, she sees her position constantly undermined by male games of power and domination: she is an alien figure, an 'outsider,' in the masculine field of law enforcement. These power games are played by men who are either lower in rank than Scarpetta herself, or by male politicians or other professional men -- for instance, by her lover Benton Wesley. Expertise in the techno-family is also a question of rivalry and sexual difference within that family. Despite the fact that the novels have a powerful female detective figure, they construct female expertise as something suspect, abnormal, and even criminal. The main reason for this is Scarpetta's profession, which many other characters consider an unsuitable job for a woman: cutting up people with a scalpel is not 'proper' to women (I shall examine this in closer detail in the next chapter). When in Cruel and Unusual Scarpetta reveals her reason (her father's death) for choosing such a morbid profession, in From Potter's Field she remains strangely silent when questioned by Chief Tucker. Tucker's own reasons for becoming a policeman reasons are understandable and logical -- he '"had no power when [he] was a boy"' (p. 26) -- while Scarpetta's refusal or inability to answer implies that there is something abnormal about her motives. As such, an aura of mystery is attached to her choice of career.

One of the most common instances of men questioning Scarpetta's status and expertise in the novels becomes explicit when she has to prove her identity as medical examiner to such minor characters as male guards and the like (sometimes, but very rarely, she faces this problem in female company). These figures literally guard the male community and patrol its borders:

> He was getting more disconcerted. 'Then what are you, ma'am?'
> 'I am a forensic pathologist,' I said.
> 'Who is your supervisor?'
> 'I don't have a supervisor.'
> 'Ma'am, you have to have a supervisor.' (FPF, p. 370)

As I suggested earlier on, this pattern is a typical one in detective stories (and films): in this formula the

hero/heroine is initially and repeatedly humiliated, and then, against all odds, finally succeeds in solving the case (humiliation turns into triumph). Through initial humiliation, the hero/heroine gains sympathy from the readers and this may encourage identification between the hero/heroine and the reader. Cornwell's novels systematically use this formula, and add to it the problematics of sexual difference. This pattern therefore serves a double purpose. On the one hand, it is a common formula in fictions written by both men and women (with male and female characters), but on the other hand, it specifically draws the reader's attention to Scarpetta's position as a female expert in a mostly masculine field (we may wonder whether the guard in the above passage would pose the same question -- '"Who's your supervisor?"' -- to a male forensic pathologist).[51]

Scarpetta's relation to Benton Wesley most clearly exemplifies the novels' setting in which 'real' power is male power which lies, to some extent, beyond Scarpetta's reach. She is more than once reminded of how that power is connected to politics -- how the FBI and Wesley are connected to political power games in Washington. In From Potter's Field, Scarpetta remarks to Wesley how she has become '"sick and tired of your little secrets. My only agenda is to prevent more deaths"' (p. 328) and angry with '"boys and their codes of honor. I'm tired of male bonding and secrecy"' (p. 331). Wesley receives a phone call from someone in 'the Pentagon' (p. 327), whom Scarpetta has upset with her questions about Gault's uncle Luther Gault (in whose family Jayne was brought up). Luther Gault served in Korea and was Medal of Honor winner, and, as Wesley argues, '"there is a code with Medal of Honor winners. They are in their own class. The army gives a special status and they are stringently protected"' (p. 330). These games between Scarpetta and powerful men are, above all, games of information and domination through information: information may be classified information (of national

[51] See also pp. 16, 148. Some of the numerous examples where Scarpetta stresses, or has to ascertain, her identity as chief medical examiner of Virginia, could also be read from another perspective: that Scarpetta needs to feel important and stress her importance in the eyes of other people (she is, after all, becoming more and more megalomaniac and narcissistic). Scarpetta herself, on the other hand, forgets other people's names -- not, however, names of professional people, but names of service personnel; names of people who are of no real importance to her (see, for instance, From Potter's Field, p. 149).

In the latest Scarpetta novel, Black Notice, Scarpetta explains that she used to think that the reason for the incidents like the one above was her 'being a woman' (p. 16). Now she thinks that there are other reasons: 'the threats of terrorism, crime and lawsuits' (ibid.).

security or heroic reputation as in the case of Luther Gault), to which Scarpetta has no access, whereas Wesley has. That is, other people -- mostly men in power -- control Scarpetta's access to and flow of information, and therefore they may prevent her from reading crime and causes of death. Solving the crime and reading the clues properly depend on access to information so that even if Scarpetta reads the dead body's wounds for causes of death, vital information about the same body may exist in official records and archives elsewhere (e.g. fingerprint archives, criminal records, army records, and so on).[52] Detective fictions thus point to how information is stored in society, where it is stored, by whom for what purposes, and who has access to, and the ability to read, that information. On another level, the reader's access to information, and the narrator's omitting and withholding information also structure the narrative in detective fiction and hence play a major role in the reading of such narratives.[53]

While Scarpetta acknowledges, and sometimes even fights against men in power, she also uses them and leans on them for help -- because they have the very power she needs. For example, Cruel and Unusual includes a conflict between Scarpetta and 'the most powerful man in Virginia,' Governor Norring, because of the murder of Susan Story (p. 323). Scarpetta has been bad-mouthed by the press, even accused of murdering Story herself. At this time her old teacher in law school, Nicholas Grueman, whom Scarpetta visits for advice, remarks, '"Isn't your recent bad press politically motivated, at least in part?"' (p. 283).[54] Scarpetta and Norring are, in Scarpetta's eyes, opposites of each other: 'He was Republican, Episcopalian, and held a law degree from UVA. I was Italian, Catholic, born in Miami, and schooled in the North. In my heart I was a Democrat' (p. 321).[55] Then, in The Body Farm Scarpetta

[52] Access to classified and official information is a recurring problem in many detective stories. If the detective is not a member of the police, s/he often has a friend in the police department, and through this friend the detective may then gain access to official records.

[53] See, for example, Pyrhönen, '"Crime is Common, Logic is Rare."'

[54] In fact, the murders in the novel turn out to be politically motivated, to hide Governor Norring's affair with Robyn Naismith. Norring himself, however, avoids being accused of the murders, but his actions let Gault loose.

[55] But what does she mean that she is a Democrat 'in [her] heart' -- that she has to hide her political sympathies beneath the surface of conservatism?

visits Senator Frank Lord (whose last name is aptly ironic), whose phones ring 'nonstop' because 'everyone in the world wanted his help' (p. 372). Unlike Scarpetta, Senator Lord has the power to help Lucy out of a difficult situation. Lucy has been found guilty of driving a car under the influence of alcohol, and Senator Lord '"will suggest [to the judge] she volunteer to perform some sort of community service"' (p. 374).

If the perspective of liberal feminism in the novels allows for the Scarpetta figure to question male hierarchies and male bonding, it simultaneously embraces the values of white bourgeois feminism. Moreover, Scarpetta's problems with authoritarian male figures and politicians and her constant victimization therein construct her expertise as suspect and criminal, or at least something which cannot protect her. As an expert -- a female scientist and forensic pathologist -- she is often suspected of behaving, or having behaved, in a criminal way, either hiding relevant information, or resembling too much the criminal whom she is trying to catch, or even having committed the crimes herself. Thus, while gender and female agency are relevant issues here, they are linked to another typical motif in serial murder novels: that of the monstrous expert.

> It has been conjectured that at least one percent of the population is psychopathic. Genetically, these individuals are fearless; they are people users and supreme manipulators. On the right side, they are terrific spies, war heroes, five-star generals, corporate billionaires and James Bonds. On the wrong side, they are strikingly evil: the Neros, the Hitlers, the Richard Specks, the Ted Bundys.[56]
>
> My knife's so nice
> and sharp I want to get to work
> right away if I get a chance.[57]

The Gault-trilogy shows how Scarpetta's expertise is complicated by the double-bind that is expertise itself. While it situates her in a particular and somewhat powerful reading position -- she possesses and processes information which laypersons do not -- it at the same time has the potential of hurting her. Her expertise aligns her too much with the monsters she is trying to track down, and expertise and being able to read criminal activity in the trilogy become sites of contamination, or rather, expertise could be considered a pharmakon, a poison and remedy. Expertise, we are steered into thinking, is essentially infectious and can reinforce contamination and its effects, even though it is employed to stop contamination from spreading. Thus Cornwell employs in the trilogy a typical pattern in popular fictions (and true-crime books) of serial murder about the nature of serial murder expertise -- that the distance between the expert (normality) and the criminal (monstrous abnormality) disappears altogether. Expertise is mimetic by nature.

For Scarpetta, Gault (like other psychopaths) is not interested in stealing what she might own, because his interest lies elsewhere, in herself: 'It was an entirely different breed of criminal I feared, and he was not as interested in what I owned as in who and what I was. I kept many guns in the house in places where I could get to them easily' (FPF, p. 201). This translates as follows: if 'he,' the criminal,

---

[56] Postmortem, p. 67. Note the contamination of the 'real' with the 'fictional' or vice versa: James Bonds and the Ted Bundys. Note also the juxtaposition of good and bad: Bond and Bundy, agent and criminal, how the one immediately seems to call out for the other.

[57] The words of 'Jack the Ripper' as quoted in Sugden, The Complete History of Jack the Ripper , pp. 260-261.

is interested in Scarpetta's possessions, he is a common thief, but if he is interested in who and what Scarpetta is, he is a monster. In other words, there is a shift from normality to abnormality and psychopathology, from theft to questions of identity, monstrosity, imitation/mimesis, and expertise. As I argued in Chapter 1, it is through the landscape of psychopathology that serial killer novels are in dialogue with other popular genres (as with horror fiction). The role of expertise is, however, different in the two genres, horror and detective fiction. As I argued earlier, while in horror the role of the police in fighting against homicidal maniacs may be marginal, in detective fiction it is an altogether different story. There generic conventions demand that the expert and the investigation be in a central position and that the expert succeed in solving the crime. Moreover, in detective fiction the expert often identifies with the serial killer in the course of the investigation, and the serial killer becomes pathologically interested in and identifies with the expert. This is something that the reader of serial murder novels has learnt to expect and this is what takes place in numerous serial murder novels and films, classic examples being Harris' novels Red Dragon and The Silence of the Lambs. Indeed, could we now imagine a popular serial killer novel in which this identification would not take place?

In the Gault-trilogy, it is precisely this proximity and identification which are at stake in the relation between Scarpetta and Gault. In detective fiction in general, there is nothing new in this kind of juxtaposition of the investigator with the criminal, but in serial murder novels this identification is contextualized within the fear of unexpected, psychopathological, violence. Historically speaking, since Edgar Allan's Poe's 'The Purloined Letter' featuring amateur detective C. Auguste Dupin, it has been common to juxtapose the mind of the investigator/detective with that of the criminal; this identification is eventully a way of reading the crime. The juxtaposition entails an identificatory relation between the expert investigator and the criminal, in which the investigator is able to think like the criminal and put himself in the latter's place -- thus the detective tries to construct, foresee, and eventually prevent, the criminal's actions.[58] In criticism of detective fiction, as in Pyrhönen's study '"Crime is Common, Logic

[58] As regards serial murder fictions on TV, recent manifestations of this would include such American series as 'Profiler' and 'Millennium.'

Is Rare,"' this relation is called 'imaginative identification' or, as Pyrhönen also calls it, 'I-am-You approach' (p. 24).

In her analysis Pyrhönen leans and builds on John T. Irwin's book The Mystery to a Solution: Poe, Borges, and the Analytic Detective Story (1994).[59] Pyrhönen's view on identification is thereby based on Lacanian psychoanalysis (and, it seems, also on Slavoj Zizek's readings of Lacan), as she refers to the symbolic order, mirror images, and specular doubling in her analysis of imaginative identification in detective stories. According to Pyrhönen, then, because the detective and the criminal 'represent the two fundamental terms of the conflict which characterizes the genre, this positional constellation turns these two characters into each other's doubles' (p. 19). Such a doubling, and thereby imaginative identification and the I-am-You approach 'entai[l] the imaginative and affective adoption of the other's perspective and situation' (p. 24). Thus Dupin in 'The Purloined Letter,' for instance, 'produces an image of the opponent's mind by treating his own mind as other to itself and probing into its reactions. He intentionally opposes his mind to itself as a means of conceiving *somebody else's* mind' (ibid, emphasis in the original). For Pyrhönen, such an identification 'involves the recognition of the act of reflection' (ibid.), and self-reflection, for that matter, 'involves differentiation and objectification: the subject can take itself as its object of thought, recognizing its simultaneous sameness with, and difference from, itself. In imaginative identification one projects onto the external world this internal condition' (p. 32). Imaginative identification is clearly seen by Pyrhönen as a wholly conscious and intentional effort, often 'knowingly' used by investigators (p. 35), and the investigating subject is internally 'split' (p. 25) as it can take itself 'as its object of thought.' In other words, the subject can reflect upon itself outside of itself.

While this view of identification may be appealing in strategic and narrative terms in criticism of detective fiction -- for it nicely explains, as above, the detective's generically self-conscious and self-reflecting effort to simulate the criminal mind in order to catch the criminal -- it is not altogether

[59] John T. Irwin, The Mystery to a Solution: Poe, Borges, and the Analytic Detective Story (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994). It should be noted that Pyrhönen effectively reads imaginative identification also beyond the subgenre of the analytic (the metaphysical) detective story.

satisfactory in considering other, non-Lacanian, views on identification. What if we understand identification in detective fiction also as referring to something which is not conscious, intentional, self-reflexive or 'knowing'? That is, what if the detective's identification with the criminal also points to an identification which is not conscious but unconscious -- and in which there is no question of a subject who can look at him- or herself from the outside and who is internally 'split'?[60]

Interestingly, Pyrhönen does not use the term 'the unconscious,' but instead, refers to 'psychic otherness' as constitutive of personal identity. She writes -- leaning here on Irwin -- that 'The I-am-You approach is thus based on the only immediate experience we have of psychic otherness, that is, the self's original otherness to itself, that difference which constitutes personal identity' (pp. 24-25).[61] What is meant here by 'psychic otherness' or 'the self's original otherness to itself'? These questions can be answered, I think, through Irwin. The question in the above passage seems to be, not of 'psychic otherness' in any radical terms but, in fact, of specular doubling, which retains the self's self-presence and self-identity. Irwin, for example, writes that the 'mental difference of the self from itself ... constitutes self-consciousness, an internal difference whose projection onto the external world simultaneously constitutes the self's difference from others' (p. 108). In other words, the self comes to being through being conscious of itself; that is, when the self can take itself as other, look at itself from the outside. This 'difference,' according to Irwin and Pyrhönen, 'constitutes personal identity.'

Such a view of the subject (the self) has, in recent years, been vigorously challenged in Mikkel Borch-Jacobsen's The Freudian Subject (1989). In his rereading of Freud, the Oedipus complex, and identification, Borch-Jacobsen argues that there is no subject who is not always already occupied by the

---

[60] I do not wish to suggest here that fictional characters are 'real' in that they have an unconscious, for instance; instead, I wish to point out what fictional texts suggest about characters and subject-formation, or what they say about 'uncontrollable' unconscious desires. Thus I cannot totally agree with the 'I-am-You' approach, because serial murder novels do not altogether support this theory of reading crime. Otherwise I find Pyrhönen's study very well-written and interesting; her approach to detective fiction is a narratological one, whereas my perspective in this study is that of cultural studies.

[61] The latter part of the sentence is to be found in Irwin's book, see p. 25. A couple of sentences later, Irwin continues, 'It is precisely because the self's thought of another mind's otherness to itself reflects the otherness of thought to itself that the effort to imagine an opponent's thought processes produces a specular, antithetical double.'

other -- that the subject comes into being through mimetic identification.[62] Contrary to this, the (Lacanian) perspective adopted by Pyrhönen on identification fundamentally maintains the separateness of the 'detective subject' and the 'criminal subject,' who both have their 'good' and 'bad' sides. Indeed, Pyrhönen maintains the wholeness of the subject itself in its splitness: 'if the self's inner split is coded, for example, in moral terms, then the good ("master") side of the detective usually dominates his or her bad ("slave") side, whereas in the internal makeup of the criminal, the bad side dominates the good one' (p. 25). The subject is regarded as a subject -- self-present, self-identical -- even if it is split or even if it sees its image in the mirror. For Lacan, the subject exists as a subject before (temporally and spatially) its image in the mirror.

Borch-Jacobsen argues for the notions of mimetic identification and mimetic doubling, contrary to the so-called specular or theoretical doubling that Irwin and Pyrhönen, in fact, present. For Borch-Jacobsen, the subject 'has no identity of its own prior to the identification that brings it, blindly, to occupy the point of otherness' (p. 48). That is, there is no 'subject' that is not always already another, and at the point of otherness the distinction between the self and the other disappears: 'I' becomes 'another, the other who gives me my identity' (p. 9). It is through blind mimetic identification with the other that the so-called subject comes into being, but, as it were, always as (an)other; so to speak, there is no one to look at itself in the mirror, no one before identification. Thus, Borch-Jacobsen does not regard the subject as a 'split' subject, but speaks for a more radical conception of subjectivity and otherness. Mimetic identification should therefore be distinguished from theoretical or specular identification -- which Pyrhönen's 'imaginative identification' is in fact when she speaks of experiencing psychic otherness. In specular doubling and identification, the subject, as it were, exists in advance of identification when it takes itself as other. That is, first there is a subject who then identifies. Contrary to this, Borch-Jacobsen argues in The Freudian Subject that the subject comes to being through mimetic identification:

[62] Mikkel Borch-Jacobsen, The Freudian Subject, trans. Catherine Porter (London: Macmillan, 1989).

> The subject cannot see himself miming another at the moment he is miming, just as he cannot say that he is playacting precisely while he is acting. In order to do that -- in order to see the invisible, or say the unsayable -- he would have to reflect himself, absent himself from the plane on which he is speaking, take himself as reference point for his own discourse; in short, he would have to arrive at the vantage point of the lucid spectator (philosopher, analyst, director) who sees both the model and its copy, who distinguishes what is imitated from what is imitating, and thus gives himself a way to denounce either the lie of the mimetician who is passing himself off as another ... or the misrecognition of the Self that takes itself for another in the so-called specular relation (as Lacan argues). But then *he is no longer miming*. Then he has passed over into the order of theoretical doubling, where he can see himself, see himself see, and ultimately see himself not see. (pp. 39-40)

It becomes clear from this passage that Borch-Jacobsen opposes, and deviates from, Lacan's views. He makes his position even clearer in Lacan: The Absolute Master (1991) in which he formulates and further criticizes Lacan's view of the mirror-image: 'That the *ego* is outside itself from the very first, always already represented and ex-posed in front of itself, is what the subject's thought has never ceased to proclaim, at the very moment when it insisted on the transparency of that mirror.... Like it or not, an eye is still there to see itself, an ego is still there to pose before itself as ... self (ego).'[63] Let me emphasize again: the difference between specular/theoretical doubling and mimetic doubling is that the former is, in a way, accessible to the subject (in the self-theorization of the subject), whereas the latter is not because it takes place on the other scene, in the unconscious. In the specular scene, the subject theorizes itself as an another, as another itself, a double-me. But in the unconscious mimetic doubling, the subject is beyond the specular, beyond the 'theoretico-theatrical': s/he cannot see herself/himself as another because s/he is that other when s/he mimes.

Thus, I would like to argue that the identification between the criminal and the detective may be more than just 'imaginative' if we decide to use the concept of identification strategically in the analysis of detective fiction. Labelling identification as imaginative may only too easily embrace the 'beast within' explanation that I discussed in Chapter 1. Pyrhönen, for example, brings up the 'beast within' when she refers to Zizek's discussion of the 'transfer of guilt' motif (i.e., cases in which the detective

[63] Mikkel Borch-Jacobsen, Lacan: The Absolute Master, trans. Douglas Brick (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), p. 56; the second ellipsis in the original. For a more detailed analysis, see the chapter 'The Statue Man,' pp. 43-71.

is suspected of criminal activity). She writes, 'The transfer-of-guilt motif spotlights the Oedipal configuration underlying the genre, illustrating that the I-am-You method includes identifying with a murderous desire (if not with a desire for murder) as the means of finding out the criminal. Such a desire is, of course, familiar from psychoanalytical theories about the development and stabilization of individual self-consciousness' (p. 33). Here is why I hesitate now. Firstly, while imaginative identification can be adopted by the investigator 'knowingly' as a conscious effort -- as suggested by Pyrhönen -- it should, I think, also be considered in terms of the unconscious. That is, the identification of the detective character with the criminal one in detective stories is not always, and necessarily, a self-reflexive and conscious activity, which the detective is able to control and master at will. Such an activity may be needed, but it is not the whole story. Secondly, the suggestion that the I-am-You approach involves an Oedipal identification with a 'murderous desire' or 'desire for murder' (what the atavistic 'beast within' suggests) emphasizes a universal desire to kill at the expense of questions of subject formation through identification. In other words, this 'murderous desire' approach proposes that we are all murderers deep down (exemplified by the detective character in imaginative identification): that we want to murder and only civilization prevents us from fulfilling our murderous desires. This approach leaves, then, more aside the question of how subject-formation in detective narratives may be bound to violent (mimetic) identification -- which is not the same thing as to say that we are all 'beasts within.'[64]

Detective fiction might specifically, and in an exemplary fashion, draw the reader's attention to identification and subject-formation. Moreover, as I argued in Chapter 1 with the help of Grixti, the 'beast within' explanation regards the human mind as comprising a 'primitive tendency.' This kind of understanding of human nature, as quoted, attributes acts of human destructiveness to '"inherited", "inevitable", or "natural" characteristics which are located "inside" the individual but which are also

[64] See Borch-Jacobsen's The Freudian Subject, in which he forcefully questions Freud's theory of the Oedipus complex. Through Borch-Jacobsen's rereading of Freud, it would be possible to critically examine the widely held view of 'the Oedipal configuration underlying' the genre of detective fiction, but there is no place for such an examination in this study.

conceptualized as being alien and opposed to the rational mind or spirit.' Furthermore, if human destructiveness is explained by the 'beast within' and a universal desire for murder, this may very well prevent more detailed analyses of 'evil' from taking place. That is, if deep down (in our unconscious) we are all evil and murderous, if the desire for murder is something inherent in the human species, there is no need to examine society, or specific persons committing specific crimes. There would thus be no need to examine with whom it is that we identify and who are those we want to murder.

Having come across this murderous desire, it is no surprise to the reader when, at the end of the discussion on imaginative identification, Pyrhönen concludes as follows:

> Applying what she says about it to the detective story,[65] we may characterize this genre as a displaced version of a forbidden sexual or aggressive wish, allowing its narrators to express it in an acceptable way: instead of killing someone, they tell stories about killing him or her. But the narrative cannot complete its work of displacement and yield narrators their substitute pleasure without an audience. Often the presence of a third party necessitates displacement.... they cajole readers to join them in a verbal enactment of the crime that civilization prevents them from carrying out.... In a general sense, then, imaginative identification as the ability to recognize the criminal -- the embodiment of the forbidden wish -- in oneself highlights the writing and reading of detective stories as a more or less self-reflexive processing of the Oedipal complex. (p. 55)

For the detective or for the narrator or for the reader of detective fiction, the passage claims, imaginative identification points to the same thing: to forbidden sexual or aggressive wishes and to Oedipal structures, to how we all want to kill. But what if we change the perspective and the verb -- what if we all want to <u>be</u> (subjects) through identification? What if identification is not always a wholly conscious and knowing effort on the part of the detective? Consider, for example, how the serial killer expert is introduced in Harris' <u>Red Dragon</u>, for example, as not being conscious of and in control of himself. Here is FBI agent Jack Crawford analyzing the serial murder expert, Will Graham:

> Jack Crawford heard the rhythm and syntax of his own speech in Graham's voice. He had heard Graham do that before, with other people. Often in intense conversation Graham

[65] Pyrhönen refers to Meredith Anne Skura's words in <u>The Literary Use of the Psychoanalytic Process</u> and 'Freud's analysis of the joke as a transference exchange' (p. 55).

> took on the other person's speech patterns. At first, Crawford had thought he was doing it deliberately, that it was a gimmick to get the back-and-forth rhythm going. Later Crawford realized that Graham did it involuntarily, that sometimes he tried to stop and couldn't. (p. 9)

Or consider how the boundary between Graham and the serial killer is blurred in the following passage:

> First there was the entry. He thought about that ...
> *The madman slipped the hook on the outside screen door. Stood in the darkness of the porch and took something from his pocket. A suction-cup, maybe the base of a pencil sharpener designed to stick to a desk-top.*
> *Crouched against the wooden lower half of the kitchen door, the madman raised his head to peer through the glass.* (p. 16; ellipsis and emphasis in the original)

Graham's ability to identify with the criminal and with other people is sometimes involuntary and he cannot control it: it is not always something that he consciously adopts in order to catch the criminal. This shift would draw our attention from a (universal and Oedipal) wish to kill to to be.[66] Alongside the 'knowingly' used identification that Irwin and Pyrhönen argue for, we have to recognize identification also as an unconscious activity.

In the scenario of unconscious identification, the criminal character is the one who 'gives' the detective figure his or her identity, and this, I think, is radically different from claiming that the detective sees his or her mind merely 'as other to itself.' If identification is also unconscious, it is not possible for the one who identifies to 'distingui[sh] what is imitated from what is imitating.' In unconscious mimetic doubling/identification, the subject is beyond the specular, and s/he cannot see

[66] Or consider Jonathan Kellerman's novel The Butcher's Theater (New York: Bantam, 1989; orig. publ. 1988), which is situated in Jerusalem, where young Arab women are mutilated and then carefully bathed and clothed. The Jewish officer heading the investigation is called Daniel Sharavi. Little by little Daniel feels himself changing and being contaminated during the investigation: 'He spent the first few minutes of the ride back to Headquarters wondering what was happening to him, the loss of control' (p. 264); and later, '"I feel," said Daniel, "as if I'm being drawn into something ... unclean. Something beyond my control"' (p. 308; ellipsis in the original). Then, in Stephen Smoke's Pacific Coast Highway (New York: HarperPaperbacks, 1994) the similarity between the killer and the investigator is particularly evoked through combining the killer's mutilation of the victims with the plastic surgery that the investigator's wife undergoes. In some serial killer novels the expert involved with the serial killer investigation literally turns out to be the killer: see, for example, John Trenhaile's novel A Means to Evil (London: HarperCollins*Paperbacks*, 1994; orig. publ. 1993) and James Patterson's Cat and Mouse (London: Little, Brown and Company, 1997).

him- or herself as another because s/he is that other when s/he mimes. The detective can thus come to being by that very otherness that s/he consciously and knowingly tries to keep at bay. The detective subject is contaminated from the beginning by otherness and alterity, yet this contamination is his or her condition of existence. This is what the Gault-trilogy suggests, particularly by evoking viral imagery. Scarpetta's position, for instance, is that of a pharmakon, a disease and a cure. In fact, the Gault-trilogy could be characterized as a series of identifications and doublings: Scarpetta identifies with Gault, Lucy, Jayne, her father; Gault identifies with Scarpetta, Carrie, and Jayne; and so forth. Such identifications, the trilogy suggests, are the way for subject-formation and the tie to other people.

The way how specular doubling/imaginative identification and mimetic, unconscious, doubling/identification coexist in the trilogy can be exemplified by the following passages. Scarpetta is here imagining things through Gault's eyes as she knowingly takes up his position -- like the mind-hunters of the FBI:

> I buttoned my coat and put on my gloves, imagining Gault watching monsters ripping flesh as blood spread darkly through water. I saw his cold stare and the twisted spirit behind his thin smile. In the most frightening reaches of my mind, I knew he smiled as he killed. He bared his cruelty in that strange smile I had seen on the several occasions I had been near him. (FPF, p. 102)

As Scarpetta admits in From Potter's Field, she is 'decompensating' just like Gault (p. 248), 'beginning to have an instinct about him' (p. 292), and she also suffers from sibling rivalry like Gault. Moreover, the third-person narrative at the beginning of From Potter's Field, in which the focalizing character is Gault, points to the connection between Scarpetta and Gault: they are the only characters to whose 'mind' the reader has access in the trilogy.

The affinity and doubling between the detective and the criminal construct the serial killer expert as someone who is 'too much' of an expert, too much a monstrous figure. Suspicions about the nature of Scarpetta's expertise surface in the trilogy, in Cruel and Unusual, when she becomes too much of an expert. After Gault kills one of Scarpetta's employees, Susan Story (who has helped Gault for money), Story's bitter husband, one of Scarpetta's employees, and then newspapers, begin to badmouth

Scarpetta about the murders (this would be the kind of 'transfer-of-guilt' motif that Pyrhönen discusses through Zizek). Scarpetta therefore becomes victimized herself as well as tainted and contaminated in the eyes of the public -- almost ends up being accused of the murder herself -- and towards the end of the novel she even has to appear before a special grand jury to prove her innocence. Suspicions about the nature of her expertise are pronounced by the Commonwealth Attorney Roy Patterson (one of Scarpetta's many enemies), who remarks to the jury in the hearing:

> 'And when you hear tales of the *perfect crime*, who better able to carry it off than someone who is an expert in solving crimes? An expert would know that if you plan to shoot someone inside a vehicle, it would behoove you to choose a low-caliber weapon so you don't run the risk of bullets ricocheting. An expert would leave no telling evidence at the scene, not even spent shells. An expert would not use her own revolver -- the gun or guns that friends and colleagues know she possesses. She would use something that could not be traced back to her.' (p. 415)

In other words, the expert would be the perfect criminal: s/he would leave no tell-tale signs at the scene of the crime, and would know how to avoid detection. In this typical feature of many serial murder novels (and films, TV-series), the police, the media, or the public suspect either that the killer is another policeman, or somebody working on the case, some expert, because of the expert nature of the murders, or because the killer succeeds in evading capture too long; or, the works articulate the fear that the investigator is beginning to resemble the killer too much (if not literally becoming one him- or herself).[67]

In fact, such suspicions about the nature of expertise actually did arise already in the case of Jack the Ripper, the 'founding father'of modern serial murder. As Clive Bloom writes in 'The House

---

[67] See, for example, such novels as Ridley Pearson's Undercurrents (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989; orig. publ. 1988); Harris' Red Dragon and The Silence of the Lambs; Jeffery Deaver's The Bone Collector; Michael Connelly's The Concrete Blonde (London: Orion, 1998; orig. publ. 1994); A.J. Holt's Watch Me; and Perfect Cover by Linda Chase and Joyce St George (London: Bantan, 1995; orig. publ. 1994), which features a serial rapist/killer.

In terms of contextualizing motives and acts of violence, I continue to be astonished by Seltzer's account in Serial Killers of the story of Sylvestre Matushka. In 1932, Matushka 'went on trial for engineering a series of train crashes that had killed more than thirty railway passengers' (p. 29). Matushka was imprisoned for life, but escaped and 'appeared in 1953 during the Korean War -- as the head of a military unit for blowing up trains' (ibid.).

that Jack Built: Jack the Ripper, Legend and the Power of the Unknown' (1988):

> Thus, the forensic nature of the Ripper's 'work' (his 'job') provided a focal point for popular fears and prejudices against those professions dealing in the limits of the 'decent' (psychologists, doctors, post-mortem surgeons, forensic experts). The Ripper's supposed anatomical expertise suggested all sorts of horrible possibilities about the life of the 'expert' and the specialist. His ability with the knife united him to the very professionals paid to track him down![68]

Thus it is not only the criminals who are regarded as evil, but also the expert medical and forensic investigators. Their very profession becomes tainted in the process of tracking down the killers. That is, there is too much proximity, too much resemblance between the one who hunts and the one who is being hunted, and those who should protect us seem to be the ones against whom we need protection.[69] Let us consider Scarpetta's profession and her 'ability with the knife,' for example. We recall how, at the beginning of From Potter's Field, she cannot answer Chief Tucker's question of her choice of career: she has no rational answer, she does not '"know why"' (p. 26). Does this not suggest to the reader 'all sorts of horrible possibilities'? Scarpetta cuts and dismembers dead bodies, and even boils

---

[68] Clive Bloom, 'The House that Jack Built: Jack the Ripper, Legend and the Power of the Unknown,' in Nineteenth-Century Suspense: From Poe to Conan Doyle, eds. Clive Bloom, Brian Docherty, Jane Gibb, and Keith Shand (London: Macmillan, 1988), p. 129. See also Philip Sugden's The Complete History of Jack the Ripper for a number of theories on the Ripper's identity, and Walkowitz's feminist study on the Ripper case, City of Dreadful Delights. Like Bloom, Walkowitz discusses fears of the medical profession in the Ripper case.

Baldick points in In Frankenstein's Shadow to the figure of the 'transgressing doctor' in realist fiction in the 19th century. As examples, for instance, he gives George Eliot's Middlemarch, Thomas Hardy's The Woodlanders, Émile Zola's Le Docteur Pascal. The fear of such a profession is not a thing of the past: we only need to consider the sub-genre of the medical thriller in the fashion of Robin Cook. In such thrillers anxiety over modern medicine and biotechnology becomes evident, and hospitals become sites of fear and those who are supposed to cure, doctors, turn out to be doctors from hell.

[69] Consider, too, what Seltzer writes in Serial Killers. He refers to John Douglas' account of the FBI's serial killer unit, Mindhunter, and comments on the bizarre circularity of identifications:

> The mindhunter works by simulation, too. He works -- like Poe's prototype detective, Dupin (one of the crime-fiction sources Douglas cites) -- by identifying himself with the killer. He copies the copy, xeroxes Mr. Xerox....The mindhunter identifies with a criminal whose own identity has yielded to an identification with accounts of his own kind of person, accounts that, in circular fashion, include the profiler's own. (p. 16)

While many FBI professionals stress the importance of keeping true crime and fiction separate (see Ressler's Whoever Fights Monsters, for example), it does not apparently prevent them from indulging in fictional detective fantasies.

them (as in Point of Origin): these acts of mutilation resemble those of the serial killer even if the motivation behind these acts is different in the two cases. Significantly, at the end of the novel, she wounds Gault with the scalpel that Gault had stolen from her.

Scarpetta's expertise is therefore suspect and dangerous; a woman with a scalpel (a phallic symbol) is dangerous for a number of reasons. What we time after time find in Cornwell's novels is a continuous victimization of Scarpetta herself, one of the crucial reasons for this being her status as medical examiner, as expert witness -- the very reason of her existence. There is something suspect in a profession like hers, even though the purpose of such a profession is to help catch killers and maintain law and order. As Bloom put it above, 'The Ripper's supposed anatomical expertise suggested all sorts of horrible possibilities about the life of the "expert" and the specialist.' The expert becomes implicated in the killer's monstrosity, and fears about deviance and monstrosity become articulated through the very figure of the expert. In the Scarpetta series, sometimes not even the other investigators, other experts, can understand how Scarpetta does what she does as medical examiner -- especially because she is female.

As an expert reader, then, Scarpetta is often either implicated in the crimes herself (as above, she is too much of an expert), or becomes the target of a killer's attention (as in the case of Gault), or is discredited as medical examiner because of being female (it is a man's world), or is constantly assaulted by images of horribly mutilated bodies (too much knowledge of perpetrators and effects of evil and violent death, and too much identification with victims). This victimization is often related to the flow of information, so that there is either too much information (Scarpetta becomes too public a figure, and therefore a target), or too little information, or even no information at all (Scarpetta becomes paranoid, and regards other people as secretive and withholding information). Or, there are leaks and information ends up in the wrong hands; in the hands of Gault, for instance. In the trilogy Scarpetta is caught within, and victimized by, expertise, knowledge, information, and information networks. She has too much knowledge and information about criminals, victims, and death, and this has compromised, even contaminated, her identity. Inasmuch that identity is not, in the first place, formed by such knowledge

and information. Expertise may come at the cost of one's integrity and identity -- or, indeed, it might be more accurate to argue that it is specifically the question of one's 'identity,' or lack of it, which facilitates the series of identifications in the trilogy.[70]

[70] As I previously noted, Scarpetta seems particularly vulnerable and open to contamination by Gault -- like the other female characters such as Lucy and Carrie (both standing for deviant sexual identity). Marino ('feminized,' homophobic, working-class, outside Scarpetta's 'real' knowledge and power) appears somewhat vulnerable as he has an affair with Steiner in The Body Farm. However, Benton Wesley (an upper middle class, heterosexual, white professional male) seems immune to contamination despite his very status as an FBI-profiler: he remains calm and undisturbed. It is as if Gault contaminates certain minds only, leaving white, upper middle class, professional, heterosexual males untouched. Lack of interaction between Wesley and Gault is strange, since in serial killer novels profilers are usually the characters mostly involved with and affected by the killer. We are told by Scarpetta in Cruel and Unusual that 'When Wesley alluded to the Bundys and Son of Sams in the world, he did so theoretically, impersonally, as if his analyses and theories were formulated from secondary sources' (p. 236). Wesley has, however, interviewed a number of serial killers, a fact on which Scarpetta comments:

> I remembered Marino telling me once that when Wesley returned from some of these pilgrimages into maximum security penitentiaries, he would look pale and drained. It almost made him physically ill to absorb the poison of these men and endure the attachments they inevitably formed to him....In exchange for information, he did the one thing that not one of us wants to do. He allowed the monster to connect with him. (ibid.)

Nevertheless, Wesley remains a strangely undisturbed character in the novels, and finally dies as one of the victims of Carrie and her new partner in Point of Origin.

> The prohibitions concerning death have two aspects: the first forbids murder and the second limits contact with corpses.[71]
>
> For the death of the old body politic did not only issue in the return of the total leader or the rise of the spectacular star; it also led to the birth of *the psychic nation*, that is, to a mass-mediated polis that is not only convoked around calamitous events (like the Rodney King beating or the Oklahoma City bombing) but also addressed, polled, and reported as a traumatic subject (the generations that share the JFK assassination, the Vietnam War, and so on).[72]

It is not just serial killers or monstrous experts, however, who are seen as contagious in the trilogy. The location where Scarpetta practices her profession, the morgue, also functions as a site of contamination in at least two ways. The morgue can literally be contagious in that viruses and diseases may invisibly spread from there:

> AIDS was a worry if one got a needle stick or cut while working on an infected body, but a bigger threat were infections borne on air, such as tuberculosis, hepatitis and meningitis. These days we double-gloved, breathed purified air and covered ourselves with greens and gowns that could be thrown away. (FPF, p. 67).

Scarpetta and the team members have to protect themselves against the dead, whose bodies are like nests for various invisible viruses. The dead, therefore, are not necessarily kind to those who survive them and who execute further mutilation on their bodies -- this is the violence of the dead towards the living. By spreading diseases and viruses, the dead continue to be 'alive,' and the morgue cannot contain death since death can invisibly spread outside the morgue. The dead bodies can look normal and deceptive on the surface and be nevertheless contagious: they continue to be alive and they 'talk' through contagious viruses.

The morgue is not only a place signifying physical contamination but also one signifying mental

---

[71] Georges Bataille, The Accursed Share: An Essay on General Economy, Vols. II & III, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Zone Books, 1993), p. 79.

[72] Hal Foster, 'Death in America,' October, 75 (Winter 1996), p. 55.

contamination (pathology and psychopathology always go hand in hand in Cornwell's work). The morgue is both literally (as above) and figuratively a place which cannot finally be cleansed, as it always hides traces of crimes behind the visibly clean surface: 'Fluorescent lighting, pale cinder block and floors gave the corridor an antiseptic ambience that was deceptive. Nothing was sterile in this place. By normal medical standards, nothing was even clean' (FPF, p. 27). Scarpetta's employees feel uncomfortable there as if there was something contagious about it, and, as she tells, 'Many people who worked in the building could not deal with the morgue. They did not want to come near it, and I had yet to employ a security guard who would so much as poke his head inside the refrigerator. Many guards and most cleaning crews did not work for me long' (FPF, p. 213). The morgue is a polluted place from where contamination, disease, and death might spread because it contains evidence, victims, and effects of horrible, evil crimes. Filthy place equals filthy mind again, and consequently, in the eyes of non-professional people, those who work in the morgue must be abnormal and affected by the evil, perhaps evil themselves. Medical examiners doing autopsies might perhaps even like what they are doing; like serial killers, they might like cutting and dismembering bodies.[73]

The anxiety that Scarpetta's employees make manifest through their inability to work in the morgue has to be associated not only with evil crimes but also with the proximity of death and dead bodies. The morgue is, after all, full of corpses. The morgue is a house of death and violence, but it is a house unable to contain death within its walls: it leaks and contamination spreads from there. In a sense, Scarpetta's mind is like the morgue -- deceptively clean, but full of memories and images of dead bodies, mutilation, violence, and hiding traces of crimes. The dead often remind Scarpetta of themselves: 'A day never went by when a memory wasn't triggered, when an image didn't flash. I would see a face bloated by injury and death, a body in bondage' (FPF, p. 55). The morgue is, further, one of the places that Gault invades in From Potter's Field: as he has 'gotten into' Scarpetta's body (p. 156), he has similarly infected the morgue with his presence.

[73] Note, too, that the clothing Scarpetta wears when she examines crime scenes, is kept at the garage, and 'would never see the inside of [her] house,' as she explains in Black Notice (p. 14). Those clothes would contaminate her clean house.

Hence, while as expert medical examiner and expert witness Scarpetta is positioned in and by specific hierarchies and discourses, her expertise is directed towards another world, that of the dead. The dead are her subject, and it is the dead she will have to listen to and be intimate with. As medical examiner, Scarpetta deals with forensic medicine, with bodies and causes of death. Her work, therefore, attempts to mark the point when life has abandoned the body, the point of death. On another level, however, Scarpetta's profession draws the reader's attention to a consideration of death and its representations: to how the dead are, as it were, given a voice in contemporary culture. Firstly, the paradox that I shall examine in what follows is that, while as medical examiner, Scarpetta's job is to establish the point of death -- to prove that the dead are dead -- the dead continue to be 'alive' and even contagious. Secondly, I shall examine the ways in which Scarpetta reads the dead -- particularly how she reads Gault's sister Jayne, Jayne's death being the central mystery in From Potter's Field.

Cornwell has on many occasions analyzed her fictional character and discussed her writing about the victims of violent death. As I pointed out in the previous section, she claims that for her 'the suffering, the blood, the deaths are real,' whereas, in her opinion, many other authors trivialize death. Cornwell remarks in the same interview, 'Verbal Evidence,' on the Scarpetta figure that,

> It's not so much obsessive or driven as it is being devoted. For one to say that Scarpetta is obsessive or driven is like saying that a priest is. It's like a calling. She has taken on a mantle to help people who have no power. She's like a missionary, or a minister, or priest to the people who can no longer speak in a language that other people can understand. That's the way I regard what I do too.
> ...
> She can't make the child alive again, but she can make her talk. (pp. 16, 17)

The dead talk! The dead talk to the living experts, to those who can read and have the calling. As Cornwell claims, Scarpetta is a like missionary or a priest: thus she is like a medium -- a 'medium,' 'A person thought to be in contact with the spirits of the dead and to communicate between the living and the dead' (SOED). Scarpetta, our superhuman heroine and guardian of national hygiene, does not communicate with the dead in an ordinary language of the living, but in the language of the dead people,

the spirits. The dead, those 'who complained with silent tongues' (FPF, p. 71), communicate through Scarpetta about the ills that were done to them, and Scarpetta crosses the boundary between life and death. However, Scarpetta's position is also that of a gatekeeping medium, as she stands between the dead and the other people: she is like a channel through which information is, or then again, is not, transmitted. She is therefore a gatekeeper, a guardian of information. As she admits to herself in From Potter's Field, 'I could not count the violent deaths I had worked since my career began, yet I understood many of them better than I let on from the witness stand' (p. 75). She protects information and keeps things to herself (though the reader is often privy to this information), and simultaneously suspects other people, like Lucy and Wesley, of the same thing; a fact which helps to create a sense of paranoia in the novels. The dead pass through her hands, in her morgue, and what passes from her to the other people depends on her abilities as a reader of the dead people's language and on her willingness to pass on that information to other people. If Scarpetta is for us readers a model-reader analyzing the traces and clues left by the criminal, she is also both a medium and a translator between us (the living) and the dead.

In the interview, Cornwell touches upon a complex issue, that of expertise and calling in the relation between Scarpetta, the dead, and other people. However, Cornwell's words point out the violent relation between Scarpetta and the dead; violence which she appears to be unaware of. This violence concerns the words 'speak' and 'talk' and story-telling. That is, the dead cannot 'speak' in other people's language, but Scarpetta 'can make [them] talk.' It is as if Scarpetta forces the dead to talk, the implication being that the dead do not necessarily speak voluntarily to those who survive them.

Moreover, when Cornwell says above that Scarpetta is like a missionary or a priest, she sees herself in the same position (a major identification here, by the way)[74]: she understands the dead

[74] When the Internet discussion list CORNWELL was still functioning, one of the most popular topics was the film adaptation of From Potter's Field. The list members kept on discussing the potential actresses for the role of Scarpetta, and many seemed to think that Scarpetta would have to look like Cornwell herself. This identification of the main character with the author is something that Cornwell has (inadvertently?) encouraged in many interviews (as above).

people's language and she can make the dead talk.[75] Cornwell considers herself speaking for the dead (those 'who have no power'), and, in effect, she becomes a thanatographer -- one who narrates death to her readers. The relation between storytelling and death becomes explicit later on in the interview, when she claims that 'The dead won't talk to you if you don't know them as a person.... And when you think of that [who the victims are], suddenly you no longer see this bloated, hideous corpse but a man wearing a hat, T-shirt, shorts and tennis shoes, and he's out on the river fishing with his son' (p. 20). The dead 'talking,' and 'knowing' the dead, become here intimately linked to story-telling (to seeing a story), for example, to a story of a man fishing with his son. When the bloated, hideous corpse is substituted, supplemented, and doubled by a man wearing a hat, T-shirt, shorts and tennis shoes, the dead body -- and, ultimately, death -- is substituted by a story of a man who becomes his own uncanny double. This is the double movement of how a hideous corpse is turned into a man fishing and a man fishing is turned into a hideous corpse; this is also the violence of representation, of 'no longer' seeing the hideous corpse but instead, seeing a story. Indeed,

> both the corpse and a representation are 'uncanny' in that they suspend stable categories of reference and position in time and place. The cadaverous presence is such that it simultaneously occupies two places, the here and the nowhere. Neither of this world nor entirely absent from it, the cadaver thus mediates between these two incompatible positions. Uncanniness emerges because the corpse, resembling itself, is in a sense its own double.[76]

How, then, is Scarpetta's relationship to, and expertise of, the dead constructed and how does she make them talk? How is death represented in the trilogy, and what do these representations tell to the reader about the society portrayed in the trilogy -- about its reading of death?

Considering the three novels of the trilogy, we notice how Gault's position therein changes. In Cruel and Unusual, the murder victims (Waddell's murder of Naismith in the past and then the murders

---

[75] Would the final conclusion be that Cornwell regards herself as speaking in the dead's language?

[76] As Elisabeth Bronfen and Sarah Webster Goodwin write in their 'Introduction' to Death and Representation (Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), p. 12.

of Eddie Heath[77] and Jennifer Deighton by Gault) are known whereas the killer's identity (Gault) is unknown. In The Body Farm, the murder victim (Emily Steiner) is known, but the killer's identity is uncertain (is it Gault or a copy-cat killer?). Lastly, in From Potter's Field, the victim (Jane Doe/Jayne Gault) is initially unknown and the killer (Gault) known. Thus the questions change from the introduction of Gault to whether the killer is Gault to where and how Gault can be found. During the novels' crime investigations, then, a crime scene is resurrected (the murder of Naismith in Cruel and Unusual), a body is brought back to the surface, exhumed and examined (the body of Emily in The Body Farm), and an identity is 'resurrected' (Jayne in From Potter's Field). Hence, serial murder in the trilogy is constructed as a culture of the copy, of the reproducible: of copy-cat killers, reconstructed and resurrected crime scenes, spitting images, uncanny and cadaverous doubles, and exhumed bodies and lifeless doll-like figures.

The central mystery of From Potter's Field is the identity of Gault's female victim, Jane Doe, found naked and shot in New York's Central Park. Scarpetta's sister Dorothy accuses her of being more at home with the dead than with the living:

> 'Does it ever strike you, Katie, that you've spent most of your life worrying about dead people?' her voice was getting sharp. 'I think all your relationships are with dead -- '
> 'Dorothy, you tell Mother I love her and that I called. Please tell Lucy and Janet that I'll try again later tonight or tomorrow.'
> I hung up. (p. 81)

When in the novel Scarpetta -- contrary to the male investigators -- insists on the importance of identifying Gault's female victim so that she can be buried under her own name and taken back home,[78]

[77] Note that Gault 'signs' the murder of Eddie in the same way as the executed murderer Waddell in the novel; see p. 71. Gault copies Waddell to hide his own identity and to increase the mystery of Eddie's death. Like Denesa Steiner, Gault is a copy-cat killer.

[78] See the very last page of the novel: 'A rusting ferry swayed on the water, waiting to take the coffin into Manhattan for one last test. Gault's twin sister would cross the river today. Jayne, at last, would go home' (p. 412). Scarpetta's insistence on taking Jayne back home could be read at least in two ways, which complement each other. Firstly, the wandering, estranged, daughter should be taken back home to the South from the urban hell in the North. If Jayne is taken back home, she is taken back to her family where she 'belongs': the formerly independent daughter is returned to her more traditional place at home. Secondly, with the reference to crossing the

it is precisely the call of dead which prevents Scarpetta from visiting her own family in Miami. The dead serve thus as a barrier, even as a boundary, which separates Scarpetta from her family. Like Jayne Gault, 'estranged from her family' (FPF, p. 74), Scarpetta, too, is estranged from her family and worries more about the dead than her living relatives.

Scarpetta's reading position and relation to the dead is privileged, and designates identification between her and the dead victims even to the extent that she feels disconnected from her family and techno-family. Reading the dead presupposes intimacy. Elisabeth Bronfen, in her analysis of Gabriel von Max's painting 'Der Anatom' in Over Her Dead Body: Death, Femininity and the Aesthetic (1992), notes the following on the relation between the anatomist and the dead woman in von Max's painting. Bronfen writes that 'reading her places him in a position closer to the dead than to the living world. The study of death requires and implies some form of identification with the dead object.'[79] In From Potter's Field, for instance, Scarpetta reveals this to the reader about her intimate relation with the dead: 'I was accustomed to witnesses who did not speak to anyone but me' (p. 50); and later on, 'I would see suffering and annihilation in unbearable detail, for nothing was hidden from me. I knew the victims too well' (p. 56); 'We worked in the dark for more than an hour, and she was revealed to me inches at a time' (p. 69); 'I was struck by my sense of alienation.... Although I was glad for his company, I could not share my deeper thoughts with him [Marino]. He would not understand' (p. 97).[80] Scarpetta not only identifies the victims (tries to find out their names and identity) but also identifies with them, knows them 'too well.' Moreover, if Scarpetta's work promises a strange kind of after-life to the dead (the dead

river it is not difficult to think of another river, the mythological river of Styx in ancient Greek mythology; the river Styx separated the land of the living from that of the dead. Crossing the river would finally take Jayne to the land of the dead and provide a closure to the narrative.

[79] Elisabeth Bronfen, Over Her Dead Body: Death, Femininity and the Aesthetic (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992), p. 10.

[80] Whereas the dead talk or are made to talk, it is far more difficult for Scarpetta to see into the minds of living people. Not being able to read living people is frightening and disturbing for her, because people can hide things (unlike the dead who with their bodies and secrets are always available, always there for the pathologist): 'I studied her [Lucy] and got more unsettled. I did not know why she was this angry, and whenever she acted in a way that could not be explained, I was frightened again' (FPF, p. 154). Lucy's character is in a central position here: Scarpetta's fears about not understanding or not knowing focus on Lucy. Lucy's character, then, and Lucy's sexual identity, form a mystery of their own in the trilogy.

have somebody to talk to, a scribe of death, who will turn them into stories), the dead make a promise of their own kind to Scarpetta: the promise of survival for the expert witness, the promise of life and self-articulation. As Bronfen writes, 'the anatomist constitutes himself as surviving, analysing and writing subject only in relation to the other dead objects.... At the site of the corpse his sense of self is stabilised not only by virtue of the power any survivor experiences but also because a transcription of his experience of this death serves in part as a form of self-articulation' (p. 8).[81] This is the survival of the witness, the scribe of death, one who substitutes dead people with information and statistics. Death is both turned into stories and explained rationally and scientifically.

In Cornwell's work, the body itself becomes a central object of study and a mystery to be explained. As the body is read from the perspective of forensic medicine, this perspective gives rise to a tension between the 'anatomical' body and the 'socially and culturally' constructed body. In Body Work: Objects of Desire in Modern Narrative (1993), Peter Brooks discusses bodies, desire, and narratives, and specifically examines how material bodies become signifying ones through, for instance, various marks on the body (as, for example, Odysseus could be identified and recognized through an old scar on his body in Homer's Odyssey). Thus Brooks argues that bodies offer various signs of recognition for the reader, and 'Signing or marking the body signifies its passage into writing, its

[81] Along the lines of witnessing and survival, we might wonder in general about the fascination with and relation to the figure of the serial killer and death in public -- those phenomena which Cornwell writes about in her fiction. In Serial Killers, Seltzer draws attention to public spectacles of 'displays of exposed and violated bodies and persons' and claims that such spectacles 'couple the trauma of witnessing and the triumphalism of survival' (p. 271). For Seltzer, such spectacles are part of what he calls the pathological public sphere or wound culture: 'the public fascination with torn and open bodies and torn and opened persons, a collective gathering around shock, trauma and the wound' (p. 1). A related phenomenon here -- bodies as spectacles -- is the televisual representation of bodies. Mary Ann Doane, in 'Information, Crisis, Catastrophe,' Logics of Television: Essays in Cultural Criticism, ed. Patricia Mellencamp (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990), discusses the relation between television, technology, the failure of technology, trauma, and catastrophe. She notes that 'The indeterminacy and unexpectedness of catastrophe seem to aptly describe the potential trauma of the world we occupy. But such coverages also allows for a persistent disavowal -- in viewing the bodies on the screen, one can always breathe a sigh of relief in the realization that "that's not me"' (p. 235).

We might consider in passing how the figure of the forensic pathologist/medical examiner -- particularly that of the female pathologist -- has become so popular during this decade of contagious viruses and serial killers. Scarpetta's fellow sisters in this field appear, for instance, in such American TV-series as 'X-Files' (even though Dana Scully is strictly speaking not a pathologist, but a doctor, she frequently does autopsies), 'Homicide,' and the British series 'Silent Witness'; another British series, 'McCallum,' features a male pathologist. Then Kathy Reichs' female pathologist in her recent novel Déjà Dead (London: Heinemann, 1998; orig. publ. 1997) draws much from Cornwell's novels.

becoming a literary body, and generally also a narrative body, in that the inscription of the sign depends on and produces a story.'[82] Brooks claims that even though the physical body can be understood as 'precultural and prelinguistic,' the body can also be understood as 'a social and linguistic construction' (p. 7). He then situates the body in the field of desire, both sexual and epistemological: 'The desire to know is constructed from sexual desire and curiosity. My subject is the nexus of desire, the body, the drive to know, and narrative: those stories we tell about the body in the effort to know and to have it... ' (p. 5).

However, I find Brooks' understanding of how the physical body becomes a signifying one slightly problematic, since he maintains that the body is 'precultural and prelinguistic' while also being 'a social and cultural construction.' Brooks thus preserves an opposition between those two bodily positions. We could, nevertheless, also argue how the so-called precultural and prelinguistic body may, in fact, be a construction itself, for example, in terms of sex and gender. Many feminist critics -- Judith Butler among others -- have drawn our attention to this question. One of the crucial questions that Butler asks in Gender Trouble concerns precisely such a stance which Brooks adopts in his book. That is, Butler analyzes the separation of the 'precultural and prelinguistic' body from the 'socially and culturally' constructed body: whether, as she asks, there is 'a "physical" body prior to the perceptually perceived body' (p. 114). If the 'physical' body is always already a 'perceptually perceived' body, it would be naive to assume the body as something which, as Butler argues, 'preexists the acquisition of its sexed significance. This "body" often appears to be a passive medium that is signified by an inscription from a cultural source figured as "external" to that body. Any theory of the culturally constructed body, however, ought to question "the body" as a construct of suspect generality when it is figured as passive and prior to discourse' (p. 129). The body is already a signifying body, it is marked -- for example, it is 'sexed' -- for the reader/viewer before other kinds of marks like scars on the body. Similarly, of course, the body can be racially marked as a black body: it signifies blackness and it is

[82] Peter Brooks, Body Work: Objects of Desire in Modern Narrative (Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London: Harvard University Press, 1993), p. 3.

visible contrary to the white body which is 'invisible' in its whiteness.

To speak of the body as prelinguistic and precultural may, in its simplest forms, be to participate and maintain 'the naturalizing discourses of the body, those discourses that locate difference in a pre-cultural realm where corporeal significations supposedly speak a truth which the body inherently means.'[83] It is, indeed, within such naturalizing discourses that crime and reading bodies are contextualized in Cornwell's work -- the discourses of medicine and forensic sciences, which maintain anatomical differences and truths. The tension to which I referred to above specifically increases in the novels when anatomical 'facts' do not tell the same story as clothes or behaviour. This, I think, is one of the core issues in Cornwell's fiction.

If Cornwell's work is, as I argue in this study, fundamentally concerned with the question of family, it is therein concerned with the question of the body as a site of recognition and knowledge about the human. That is, do our bodies tell the truth about us, our identity, our sexuality, and our desires, and what truth is that? Scarpetta's medico-judicial profession and the rhetoric of health and illness bring with themselves certain kinds of discourses and regulatory disciplines into the picture, which construct, produce, and view class, race, sex, gender, and sexual identity in specific ways. On the surface, forensic medicine and medical sciences may appear neutral and objective to the reader -- based on scientific bodily facts that cannot be 'wrong' -- as they are used to investigate causes of death. Such scientific discourses, as it were, tame and contain death, give rational reasons to it, and imply that, yes, we can fight psychopathic criminals and death can be 'solved.' But a closer reading of the ways in which Scarpetta reads victims and causes of death reveals specific attitudes to those victims and persons in general, to what is human (normal) and what is not (abnormal, deviant, pathological).

Identification between Scarpetta and Jayne and the way in which Scarpetta constructs identity become evident in Jayne's autopsy: forensic dentist Graham helping Scarpetta 'continued charting various repairs, extractions, shapes and misshapes that made this woman who she was. She had a slightly open bite and a semicircular wear pattern to her front teeth possibly consistent with her biting

[83] Robyn Wiegman, American Anatomies (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1995), p. 4.

down on a pipe, since it was reported to him she had been seen with a pipe' (p. 72) What is noteworthy about this passage is how it proposes a relation between various signs, malformations, and identity: how 'repairs, extractions, shapes and misshapes ... made this woman who she was.' Scarpetta equates these signs with identity, and according to this logic, it is not perfection which makes us, but imperfection, repairs, misshapes, scars, wounds, and trauma. This is a culture of wounded bodies and wounded individuals, in which 'to be' means to be 'misshapen.' Moreover, to be written about in the first place means to be wounded, tortured, dead (consider the example of the hideous corpse): representation signifies violence and death.

Consider how Scarpetta's name partakes of such a logic, for the word 'scar,' indicating wound or injury, is embedded in her name. 'Scar' marks her, scars her, and also works as a sort of signature-effect: Scarpetta works on scarred, wounded, violated, bodies, and her own name has already linked her (destiny) with those dead, marked, bodies. Scarpetta's scar -- her wound -- is her father's death, which initiated her interest in forensic medicine.[84] 'Scar' is a trace, a visible sign of a past contact between the inside and the outside, marking the violent point of collision between the body, or the mind, and the world. Hence the scar signifies the permeability of the body from the outside; the skin as a bodily boundary does not hold. But the scar not only points to a violent opening of the body towards the world but also to a closing: the body, so to speak, closes its ranks and protects itself as it closes the opening with a scar. We should further take into account Lucy and her scar at the end of The Body Farm, 'Her cheeks were flushed, a scar on her forehead bright red' (p. 386). Lucy's scar is a reminder of her car

[84] Scarpetta's name stands between two languages, Italian and English, as a malformation: in Italian scarp -etta means 'small shoes,' whereas if we pronounce it in English, what we get is scar -petta. Or further, scar-petter as someone who pets (caresses) scars.

As regards other names in Cornwell's fiction, they often partake in a logic of extension and cancellation, of individuality and generalizability. For example, the very fact that the name given to anonymous female bodies, Jane (Doe), is inscribed within 'Jayne' shows this paradoxical logic. The letter 'y' in Jayne is a mark of singularity, whereas 'Jane' in Jayne refers to anonymity, generalizability, the general Jane Doe. Similarly, of course, Scarpetta's first name, 'Kay' shares this logic: 'Kay' is a proper name marking singularity, but it also signifies the letter 'k.' Consider, too, the name of Susan Story, or that of Investigator Ring in Unnatural Exposure; or the name of Commander Penn: 'Penn' as a proper name, but also homonymically referring to the noun 'pen,' not to mention reminding us of Penn Station in New York, in the tunnels under which 'the homeless form their own groupings (by age, race etc.) and establish codes of behaviour' as Willett writes in The Naked City (p. 69).

accident, which takes place earlier on in the novel, but it functions as a mark of initiation into the violent world of Scarpetta. The Body Farm is, significantly, the first novel in which Lucy officially works for the FBI.

The dead 'talk,' and, as a survivor-scribe, Scarpetta ensures them a strange after-life and the dead remain un-dead as they keep on talking and infecting the living. She knows how to read the bodies of the dead -- or how to make the dead talk -- and reads on them a history of death, of scars, wounds, torture, abuse, violence. Death in the Scarpetta series is always violent, and thus dictated by generic terms. As Scarpetta makes the dead people talk through their bodies, these bodies become, indeed, bodies of evidence and sites of writing and reading; sites of engraved and readable histories, motives, and clues, which are turned into more stories. Scarpetta reads the criminal's 'text' on the bodies, for example, Gault's 'art' -- a term used by Scarpetta's psychiatrist friend Dr. Zenner (FPF, p. 263).[85] The bodies become historical sites/sights -- where history, time, place, spectacle, and vision come together. When Scarpetta listens to the dead and reads dead people's bodies, she also reads their and their killers' minds (identifies with them), and therefore becomes a mind-reader. The word pathology is not, after all, limited to bodily states, because it pertains to mental states when we speak of 'psychopathology.' Different stories and histories, pathology and psychopathology, become intermingled in the course of the narrative. The scarred bodies are sites on which scarred, twisted, and psychopathic minds have left their traces and signatures: 'The gunshot wound to her right temple was large caliber, and I could see at a glance the distinct muzzle mark stamped into her skin when Gault had pressed the pistol's barrel against her head and pulled the trigger' (FPF, p. 67). In the case of Jayne (and of Eddie Heath, too), Temple Gault literally leaves his own mark, name -- his signature -- on his sister's body: bite marks and the wound to her right temple. Gault has marked his sister's body as his own.[86] Accordingly, Cornwell's

[85] On the level of detective narratives, Pyrhönen refers to criminal characters as 'artists who "write" their stories of crime' (see p. 3). The word 'artist' -- criminal as artist -- by the way, occurs frequently in serial murder novels.

[86] Signatures, names and pet-names of serial killers would open a way to examine the role of the proper name and signature in serial murder novels. These names and signatures reveal how serial murder is engaged with texts, names, and authorship, and with the act of signing. Often the signatures which appear in the novels are quite

work is as much about psychopathology (psychopaths and madmen) as it is about pathology (causes of death). The reader of her novels becomes another reader of psychopaths and madmen, and a reader of the dead, of a culture of fear and the dead.

Scarpetta's reading of bodies (dead and alive) is, as it were, akin to something like graphology: a reading where the body and various traces on the body metonymically testify to personality and identity. For Scarpetta, bodies seem to tell the truth about personality, race (as in Chief Tucker's case), sex, gender, and sexual identity.[87] In this frame, medicine and anatomy appear to dissolve any epistemological uncertainties about bodies, persons, and identities. In autopsies Scarpetta and medical examiners look for differences between bodies; differences which would mark a body off from all the other bodies, and thus mark as well as fix it as identifiable. Consider, for example, these descriptions of Jayne's autopsy in From Potter's Field which give the reader physical and anatomical -- seemingly objective -- 'facts' about Jayne:

---

specifically marks 'written' on a body, and if a name appears written in an alphabetical form, it usually appears in the letter which the killer sends to the police or the press -- or it is a pet-name given by the police or the press.

Derrida has drawn our attention to the structure of the signature: on the one hand, a signature must have a repeatable, iterable, form, but on the other hand, it is this repeatable, imitable structure which denies and divides the signature's sameness with itself, and makes its forgeability possible. On the structure of the signature, see, for example, Derrida's 'Signature Event Context' in Margins of Philosophy, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982). Serial murder is recognized as serial murder because of certain similarities between the murders, because of a recurring modus operandi and the signature. But if the killer's signature has a repeatable and imitable form -- like, for example, the cross in Pearson's novel Undercurrents -- this means that the signature can be copied not only by the killer himself but also by another killer (as, indeed, happens in the novel), and thus the 'original' signature is not the property of one killer. Copycat murders are always already inscribed in the structure of serial murder. Because of the imitable form of a series, the question of origin becomes complicated, and there can never be absolute certainty that there is only one origin to the signature. As the pathologist remarks to the detective in Undercurrents, 'You know as well as I do that you can never rule out a copycat completely' (p. 94). Therefore, although the signature connects a series of murders together, it disconnects the murders from the absolute 'origin,' from the 'author.' The repeatability and iterability in the structure of the signature would paradoxically seem to undermine the very agency and presence that they would first seem to stress: instead of signifying presence, they point toward uncertain origins. The very thing that first appears to be the connecting factor in a series of murders is capable of shattering the series into pieces. Who is the 'author' of the murders and is there more than one author, more than one story?

In popular fictions of serial murder the body's position as a site of knowledge and as a narrative body is twofold. While, in order to establish the victim's identity, investigators attempt to differentiate between one body and another (one person and another) through individual, distinguishing marks (such as teeth, old scars, etc), they simultaneously look for signs which would connect one body to another. That is, similar wounds and a similar MO and signature would mark bodies as victims of the same killer and as belonging to the same story. Subsequently, there is a tendency to read bodies both as individual and as general or 'generic'; a tendency towards difference and similarity.

[87] I shall examine sexual identity and autopsies in more detail in Chapter 3.

> Her skin was fair and seemed a stranger to the sun. She was poorly muscled, thin, and five foot eight. Her left ear had been pierced three times, her right ear twice, and she wore studs and small loops, all in gold. (p. 69)
>
> What this added up to was an indigent woman who had not been reported missing as far as we could tell because she had no home, no one who knew or cared she was gone. (p. 70)
>
> He continued charting various repairs, extractions, shapes and misshapes that made this woman who she was. She had a slightly open bite and a semicircular wear pattern to her front teeth possibly consistent with her biting down on a pipe, since it was reported to him she had been seen with a pipe. (p. 72)
>
> 'She was the victim of an assault, possibly many years ago,' I said. 'And it's the sort of head injury you associate with personality change.' I thought of her wandering the world and of no one missing her. 'She probably was estranged from her family and had a seizure disorder.' (p. 74)

While the narrator-pathologist may give to the reader an impression of a scientifically neutral and objective approach to the dead woman's body, a closer reading challenges the scientific objectivity of her readings. The above passages show how Scarpetta turns bodily 'facts' and traces found on the body into an affirmation of personality, and, what is more, into storytelling.

Inasmuch as the dead haunt Scarpetta by 'talking' to her, reminding her of themselves -- 'A day never went by when a memory wasn't triggered, when an image didn't flash. I would see a face bloated by injury and death, a body in bondage' (FPF, p. 55)[88] -- she, too, haunts the dead by not letting them rest in peace. It is her job not only to listen to the dead but also to force them to talk. What emerges in the relation between the dead and Scarpetta is a kind of 'techno-relation,' a coupling of bodies and technology, where the now dead organism becomes an object for a 'techno-reading' -- how to examine body weight, height, injuries, blood or DNA samples without technology? That is, bodies 'talk' because Scarpetta's reading is facilitated by technological apparatuses such as microscopes and X-rays, which encode, decode, and translate the body into evidence: the body is replaced and substituted by numbers, statistics, and a narrative. In short, there is both the extension of the body by technology and its

[88] Scarpetta cannot therefore really contain death in the morgue, cannot keep the dead at bay.

cancellation by the same technology.[89]

Through the technological apparatuses the body is scattered and dismembered into separate samples for examination. Hence the relation between Scarpetta and the dead is one of violence: bodies are cut, opened, disembowelled, and dismembered. No wonder that the body of Jennifer Deighton in Cruel and Unusual 'did not want to come out of the car, death resisting the hands of life' (p. 103), or that Gault's sister Jayne refuses to talk to Scarpetta's team at first because she will become the object of further bodily violation in the morgue: 'Rigor mortis was set, and like an obstinate child who hates the dentist, the dead woman would not cooperate. He finally pried her jaws open with a thin file' (p. 71). Moreover, if the victim's body is thus technologically extended and cancelled, so are technological apparatuses prosthetic extensions and cancellations of the agency we call 'Scarpetta,' her inhuman eyes and ears (I shall return to this in Chapter 4).

Through a double movement, the body's boundaries are both affirmed and questioned in the autopsy. Medicine and the autopsy assert 'normal' bodily boundaries as height and weight are measured, and the body is turned into statistics and numbers (in general, what is or is not 'within normal limits,' p. 248). Interior states become visible to the outside through the Stryker saw, X-rays, microscopes, and so on. This is bodily extension in a double sense: extension towards the inside of the body so that we can see beyond the skin. But the body also extends to the outside when it is scattered into microscopic samples and X-ray photographs: we see the body on the outside and the body as a carcass, an empty shell, emptied out of its organs. This is the alien body and the ruined body, the body as a ruined landscape. Paradoxically, it is on these violent ruins that a victim's identity is formed, and this is not only the erasure but also the replacement and supplement of the body as it is turned into a story, a narrative. The body can, however, hide as much it can reveal and, in fact, it hides in revealing: 'As we began to explore her internally, I understood more, even as the mystery of her deepened' (FPF,

[89] This is what Seltzer means in Serial Killers when he discusses the 'natural' body and its prosthetic reconstructions. See the book for his argument concerning the subject in machine-culture, especially pp. 190-195, 241. I shall return to the problematics of what Seltzer calls the 'natural' body in Chapter 4, 'Cain and CAIN: Flesh and Letter.'

p. 73). This is also the force of the mystery narrative, when it both hides and reveals information of the crime in question.[90]

The body becomes a site of inscription and erasure when Scarpetta reconstitutes the way a murder took place, and the autopsy is a kind of dismemberment of the body/subject, where various body parts, wounds, scars, and so on, start to metonymically function in the place of the whole. The dead body is not merely evidence of the crime and the criminal but, as in the case of Jayne, is simultaneously evidence of the dead woman herself, of her personality and identity -- indeed, hers is the body of evidence in a double sense. On the basis of old scars and injuries, 'Jayne' is constructed as somebody who is 'indigent' and 'estranged.' The 'natural' (biological, anatomical, physical) body is thus never separate from other discourses and narratives. Here it is not separate from a narrative in which scars, wounds, and injuries are evidence of homelessness, as Scarpetta builds a story of homelessness out of the body.

The dead, like Jayne, are both dead and alive, then: 'We continued our excavation of this woman who seemed to be in the room with us. I felt her personality in her paltry possessions and believed she had left us clues' (FPF, p. 141). The passage strangely functions both as a negation of the dead woman and as an affirmation of her continuing existence. Jayne 'seems' to be in the room, but as an image of herself -- as a corpse, as her own double. The word 'excavation' somehow indicates that Scarpetta and her team will have to dig 'this woman' out of her corpse, lay her open by digging, to go beyond the visible surface of the skin into the inside of the body. In order to make her visible, they must dig out her and her history like archaeologists. Indeed, through acts of dismemberment -- taking apart -- autopsy becomes a kind of creation process whereby it finally becomes possible to identify Jane Doe as Jayne Gault. This is, of course, the course of the crime investigation and narrative here: to bring to light Jayne out of Jane. These two proper names are homophonically identical, but different in their written forms. This relation of similarity and difference can, I think, also be argued to point towards representation and the detective narrative -- to how an anonymous corpse (Jane) is substituted and supplemented by a story

[90] See, for example, Pyrhönen, p. 3.

(Jayne), and to how the story of the crime is juxtaposed with the story of the investigation.

Jayne's autopsy thus draws the reader's attention to the boundaries of the body and identity as well as to story-telling. Can 'normality,' for example, be contained and explained within certain kilograms (weight), centimetres (height), and statistics -- as the novels suggest with their medical perspective? Or where do 'we' end and 'things' or 'stories' begin? Scarpetta feels Jayne's personality in 'her paltry possessions,' thus affirming the woman's existence after her death; that something of Jayne survives death. But the feeling negates Jayne again, because Scarpetta feels Jayne not inside Jayne but as scattered outside Jayne. Jayne's personality is in her 'paltry possessions'; in other words, in worthless, trashy, things. Scarpetta feels 'lightheaded and weary' when they begin 'reconstructing a life from a tin whistle and rags' (pp. 136-137). Once again we find Scarpetta viewing persons as things or possessions (we recall how she in a similar fashion reduced the homeless to things). While Scarpetta asserts bodily boundaries, that process is associated with the boundaries of identity. Again, the implication here is that we are what we own, and thus we are in our things.

Moreover, Gault's crimes and especially his murder of Jayne are mapped together with nature, homosexuality, the inhuman and animals. Note how Scarpetta describes Jayne in the autopsy in terms of nature: 'The small white light passed over the geography of the woman's body, into the dark recessed areas where her flesh had been removed, over the flat plain of her belly and gentle slopes of her breasts' (p. 68). The murdered woman is aestheticized in the narrative, and her body is turned into and identified with nature, a landscape (geography, dark recessed areas, a plain, and slopes) and it is this landscape that Scarpetta and the technological apparatuses used in the autopsy work on.[91] Furthermore, in Jayne's

[91] There is a long history of juxtaposing the feminine with nature and the masculinewith science. As Mary Jacobus, Evelyn Fox Keller, and Sally Shuttleworth note in their 'Introduction' to Body/Politics: Women and the Discourses of Science (New York and London: Routledge, 1990) on p. 6:

> It is a truism that whereas nature, the body that scientific knowledge takes as its object, is traditionally constructed as feminine, the subject of science, i.e. the scientist, has usually been seen as masculine. The fantasies that attend such gendering of the production and reproduction of knowledge are at once sexualized and territorial (we speak not only of 'penetrating' or 'unveiling' nature's mysteries but of 'opening up new horizons' or 'pushing back the frontiers of knowledge').

In this traditional framework, Scarpetta is an abnormal female: as forensic expert and scientist, she takes the place

case nature will not have her way, because Jayne 'had undergone a hysterectomy' (p. 73) -- no reproduction, no children, as is so often the case with female characters in Cornwell's novels. Jayne is also found in Central Park in New York, there specifically close to an area called the Ramble, '"We think he may have enticed her into accompanying him into the Ramble,"' as Commander Penn remarks to Scarpetta (FPF, p. 40). The Ramble, then, is considered a gay space since it is '"frequented by homosexuals,"' and Gault and Jayne were first thought to be a gay couple (ibid.). On one level, Central Park is a piece of nature in an urban setting, signifying the replacement of nature by culture,[92] but the reference to the Ramble in the park opens up a complicated web of relations. For the Ramble is at the margin of Central Park, an unnatural nature within nature, 'with twisting footpaths' (p. 40), a 'distant darkness' (p. 43), and 'an isolated area' (p. 46), and it stands for criminality and unnatural sexuality. As Commander Penn says, '"It is a meeting place for [homosexuals], a very overgrown, rocky area with twisting footpaths that don't seem to lead anywhere....It's high-crime. Probably twenty-five percent of all crime committed in the park occurs there. Mostly robberies"' (p. 40). Like African Americans, gay men are mapped together with criminality, and this mapping thus reinforces images of deviance.[93]

Similarly, Gault is mapped together with 'evil' animals, sharks. In Cruel and Unusual, Scarpetta compares Eddie's injuries to those inflicted by a shark, 'were it not for the neat edges of the wounds' (p.

---

of the masculine scientist.

[92] Incidentally, Seltzer writes in Serial Killers that Central Park was 'designed as an antidote to urban overcivilization' (p. 80) when he comments upon an incident of 'male anti-female violence that took place in that repository of nature in the heart of the city -- New York's Central Park' (ibid.). In her brief discussion of Seltzer's first article on serial murder (in which the above words appear), Halberstam rightly points out in Skin Shows how Seltzer disregards the specificity of race in the above incident:

> It is hard to imagine, given the cultural specifics of the Central Park rape, how it can be reduced to an 'episode of male anti-female violence' or an event marked by the blurring of nature and city, as opposed to, say, a case of culturally overdetermined black male aggression against white femininity or black urban discontent against white middle class security. The attempt to find a wide angle in Se[l]tzer's frame of reference forces him to overlook the specific bodies involved in specific acts of violence. (p. 186)

[93] In a serial killer film by William Friedkin, 'Cruising' (1980), the Ramble features as a place where the 'Homo Killer' murders one of his victims. The film is famous for the controversial way it portrays gay culture. I shall examine homosexuality in the trilogy in closer detail in Chapter 3.

32). In From Potter's Field, the place which Gault and Jayne first visit, the Museum of Natural History, suggests the replacement of nature within culture, and a lesson in both animal and human evolution, with its 'Komodo reptiles of Indonesia and leatherback sea turtles who would never traverse sand or water again' (p. 100). Nature in the Museum is illustrated by showcases and dead animals (stuffed ones, all skin and form and no content, carcasses), extinct animals (fossils), or imprisoned ones, like sharks with 'dead eyes' (p. 101). Gault and Jayne visit the Museum's shark exhibition. Scarpetta and Marino visit the museum, too, and watch a film on sharks. It is not difficult to see how Gault is meant to be read as a shark. As the film's narrator explains, the sharks are 'legendary hunters of the deep, the perfect killing machine, the jaws of death,' and 'no one is quite certain why some sharks attack humans' (p. 102). In short, Gault is connected with the inhuman, with the animal killing machine, and, undoubtedly, brings to mind the shark in the film 'Jaws.' This is what Gault is connected with, dead animals and the inhuman, and the Museum is where 'Gault had given [Jayne] a preview of what he had in store for her' (p. 103). In store, indeed: this is what nature and animals look like in Cornwell's novels: stored, reduplicated, infected and infecting (rats or squirrels spreading viruses), and lifelike.[94] Gault himself is like a lesson in human evolution: the evil and inhuman killer turning against his own family and species.

Jayne is, therefore, somehow both dead and un-dead, both in her body (to be dug out) and outside it (in her paltry possessions, in the story), present and absent, natural and unnatural, dead yet contagious. By excavating, Scarpetta and her team reanimate the dead body. The dead talk! Scarpetta's stories are texts of the dead talking -- multiple autopsies, piles of bodies of 'those who complained with silent tongues' (FPF, p. 71). The dead talk when they are autopsied but also when they bombard and remind Scarpetta of themselves. These are images (not altogether pleasant) of, and messages from, dismembered and violated bodies, and these images are like snatches of a book or a television

[94] This does not mean, however, that the urban setting is valorized over nature in Cornwell's work. To the contrary, I have already referred to the urban decay in the trilogy, which is juxtaposed with the dangerous human psyche. The few nature locations that we find in the trilogy include Key West in Cruel and Unusual, and 'running deep beneath the robust health of this tiny off-shore island was a mother lode of disease' (p. 328). Then, in From Potter's Field Scarpetta visits the Gault's farm in the South, the place where Gault's evil originates; and the problematic Central Park and the Ramble I have already referred to above.

programme: ’Then gradually over the years something perniciously shifted. I began to dread working late at night, and was prone to bad dreams when terrible images from my life popped up in the slot machine of my unconscious’ (BF, p. 2); ’A day never went by when a memory wasn’t triggered, when an image didn’t flash. I would see a face bloated by injury and death, a body in bondage’ (FPF, p. 56); ’But sleep would not touch me, and images from the day returned. I saw bodies without limbs or heads, and sat up, sweating’ (UE, p. 1). These are the dead talking to and calling Scarpetta, and a strange calling it is. Scarpetta’s position is therefore a double-bind: she works in order to stop the accumulation of bodies (to stop the killings), but her existence as a narrator depends on those killings and bodies. If the dead stopped talking to Scarpetta, if there were no more murders -- then, no more Scarpetta, no need for her expertise, no more narrative (exit Scarpetta).

* * *

Let me briefly summarize the main arguments of this chapter. I first argued that as a serial killer, Gault is described as a virus and contextualized within images of the homeless, health and illness. As such, he is regarded as a threat to the values of the upper middle class, the nation, and capitalism. While he is related to images of ’otherness,’ he is also seen as attempting to destroy the family (biological, professional, national, species) from within. Secondly, I moved on to examine the Scarpetta figure as a female investigator and contextualized her expertise within the crossroads of class, ethnicity and gender. I showed how the ’feminist’ content of the Scarpetta series could, in fact, be more aptly described as white and heterosexual liberal feminism. I claimed that such feminism appears to accept difference -- ethnic or sexual others -- on the surface level but finally condemns such difference. Such differences are also those that Gault represents in the trilogy. Thirdly, I analyzed the serial killer expert in terms of too close a proximity to the killer: how the trilogy, typically, expresses the fear that the monster expert begins to resemble the monster too much. I argued how, alongside imaginative identification as a means

to catch the criminal, also unconscious identification needs to be acknowledged. And lastly, I examined how Scarpetta reads the dead and makes them 'talk.' I claimed that despite the seeming 'objectivity' of forensic medicine, that forensic medicine actually produces naturalizing images of bodies, persons, and the human. Moreover, I showed how the relation between Scarpetta and the dead is also one of mutual violence; violent not just because of the violence of the autopsy but also because of the violence of story-telling.

In the next chapter, 'Kay and Gay,' I shall continue examining the question of how the body is read in the trilogy. I shall argue that serial murder in the trilogy is mapped together with male effeminacy and homosexuality, and that Scarpetta's expertise is similarly connected to female masculinity and lesbianism. I shall argue that serial murder in the trilogy is depicted as a crisis of identity and, more specifically, as a crisis of sex, gender, and sexual identity -- perhaps even a crisis of category as such.

3. Kay and Gay, or, *'The man in the family gets the big tits!'*

Gender Fabrications

> The category of 'sex' ... establishes a principle of intelligibility for human beings, which is to say that no human being can be taken to be human, can be recognized *as* human unless that human being is fully and coherently marked by sex.[1]

Popular serial killer novels typically point to the problematics of recognition and identification in cases of serial murder. That is, how is it possible to recognize deviation, those 'monstrous' serial killers among us?[2] This difficulty arises from the fact that the killer is portrayed as chameleon-like or invisible in society (i.e., he could be anybody) so that it becomes difficult to tell the difference between a killer such as Ted Bundy (white, heterosexual, male) and one's white male neighbour, for example. What these novels suggest time after time is that, on the surface, the killers look like us, or like the guy next door, and they blend in and live among us. They pass as normal -- or, rather, succeed in performing society's assumptions of 'normality' -- even though they are dangerously psychotic behind the surface of normality.

---

[1] Judith Butler, 'Sexual Inversions,' in Discourses of Sexuality: From Aristotle to AIDS, ed. Domna C. Stanton (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1992), p. 352.

[2] The term 'serial killers' here, in the context of visibility, mainly refers to white male serial killers: fictions of black or female serial killers are rare. Thus, as I argued in the previous chapter, while black or female serial killers exist in reality, popular crime fiction endorses the image of the serial killer as, basically, a white male. This is, in fact, a notion explored in David L. Lindsay's novel Mercy (New York: Bantam, 1991), in which a female and Hispanic police detective, Carmen Palma, succeeds in capturing a female serial killer. Palma accuses her male colleagues of sexist assumptions:

> 'The behavioral psychology framework you set up to analyze sexual homicides is grounded in the data you gleaned from extensive in-depth interviews conducted with thirty sexually motivated killers over a long period of time. And you've continued to add to that data base over the years by interviewing other killers. All male. So the behavioral model used to analyze all sexual homicides is based on male psychology. All of your analysts at Quantico are male. So what happens when your analysts get a case they really can't fit within the framework of the behavioral model you've established? ... It's never even occurred to you that you don't understand what you're seeing because the killer is thinking, and acting, like a woman, not like a man.' (pp. 373-374)

As stories of the killers' deeds spread, we define and redefine 'us,' 'our' beings, and 'our' normalcy and the boundaries of that normalcy through those deeds. The distinction between and the rhetoric of us and them work in a number of ways. In Criminals as Heroes: Structure, Power & Identity (1989) Paul Kooistra notes on the distinction between us and them that 'The media and politicians present a world of crime inhabited by perverted murderers and rapists who are much different from ourselves. Consequently, it becomes a simple matter to make distinctions between us -- the "normal" population, and "them" -- the subhuman criminal forces that deserve to be treated inhumanely.'[3] Such a distinction as us/them can therefore be inscribed within national as well as sexual and identity politics and can be made use of by conservative politicians. Such a distinction and rhetoric can effectively obscure differences within 'us,' the non-criminal population -- differences based on class, gender, sexual identity, or ethnic background -- and therefore make possible a certain kind of normative definition of human subjectivity like, for example, Braidotti has suggested: 'us' basically as white, heterosexual, (Christian) male.[4]

Images and theories of criminality have indeed changed during the past hundred years. As I showed in Chapter 1, physiological chararacteristics of criminality and monstrosity have been replaced by psychical characteristics. Hence, criminality in the Gault-trilogy is not necessarily defined and recognized on the basis of such physiological characteristics that, for example, Lombroso, pointed out in his work. As noted earlier on, Lombroso argued that potential criminals could be identified on the basis of certain physiological (atavistic) characteristics. Consider, for instance, what Ruth Harris writes

---

[3] Paul Kooistra, Criminals as Heroes: Structure, Power & Identity (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1989), p. 180. Kooistra also notes on the new blurring boundary between 'cops' and 'criminals' (another pair of them/us) in popular crime fiction starting in the 1960s:

> Also rising to prominence during this period was another key actor in the criminal justice system who was transformed into a symbol of the tension that apparently existed between law and justice: the 'cop.' The bad cop of the 1960s and 1970s was not on the same plane of evil as the drunken Irish cop of the 1800s or the tough cop of the 1930s. The bad cop of the 1960s was unmistakably evil, and the distinction between cop and criminal faded in the writings of popular writers like Joseph Wambaugh. (p. 170)

[4] 'Signs of Wonder and Traces of Doubt: On Teratology and Embodied Differences,' p. 141.

in Murders and Madness. According to her, in 1876 Lombroso,

> claimed to have identified significant anatomical and physiological characteristics which distinguished the criminal from his normal counterpart, and cited a range of indicators -- facial asymmetry, irregular teeth, large jaws, dark facial hair, and twisted noses -- denoting an unbalanced psychophysiological economy that could indicate insensitivity to pain, a tendency to epilepsy, and an instinctive urge towards antisocial behaviour.[5]

Harris finds a hidden agenda behind Lombroso's portrait of the criminal; one which extends beyond crime and touches upon the national politics in Italy towards the end of the 19th century: 'Lombroso sought to identify those who were not worthy of citizenship, using a scientific account of atavism to underpin their exclusion from civil and political power' (p. 82). In Homographesis, Edelman points out another aspect in Lombroso's work when he writes that, 'In the [nineteenth] century both Cesare Lombroso and A. Tardieu, applying a not wholly dissimilar logic, would claim to have developed physiological profiles that made it possible to identify "sexual deviants," thus allowing the nineteenth century's medicalization of sexual discourse to serve more efficiently the purposes of criminology and the law' (p. 5).[6] In other words, sexual deviance, non-heterosexuality, becomes an illness and linked to crime.

Similarly, I would like to argue that even though serial murder in the Gault-trilogy is not located within such clearly racial -- and racist -- characteristics as in Lombroso's theory, the way the trilogy locates criminality within what it constructs as deviant sexual and gender identity, for example, serves to strengthen certain ideas of normalcy and citizenship. That is, through the figure of the serial killer, the trilogy gives face to those worthy of citizenship and those who need to be excluded from the American family. Serial murder is mapped together with sex, gender, and sexual identity, and

---

[5] Ruth Harris, Murders and Madness: Medicine, Law, and Society in the *Fin de Siècle* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), p. 81.

[6] In a similar fashion, Lynda Hart argues in her Fatal Women: Lesbian Sexuality and the Mark of Aggression (London: Routledge, 1994) how Lombroso and other criminologists tried to distinguish the normal woman from the criminal one. This was achieved by claiming that the criminal woman is not really a woman at all, but 'an aberration of femininity ... rather a man albeit problematically in a woman's body' (p. 30).

particularly with contagious deviation from the heterosexual binary system.[7]

If the Gault-trilogy is, as I argue in this study, concerned with the question of family -- with practices of inclusion and exclusion -- it is therein concerned with the problematics of sex, gender, and sexual identity. These two concerns become intimately joined together not only through Scarpetta's 'masculine' profession but also through the character of Lucy, Scarpetta's niece, and thus include Gault and Carrie. Lucy's lesbianism is at the centre of the Gault affair, because she is seduced by Carrie, and through this seduction Gault gains access into CAIN. Non-heterosexuality therefore becomes a point of vulnerability, an opening, which needs to be controlled so that the society can function properly and law and order can be maintained.

Significantly, Lucy becomes involved with Scarpetta's investigations in Cruel and Unusual, in which Gault makes his first appearance. Despite Lucy's increasing participation in the investigations during the series, Cornwell's work cannot be defined as lesbian detective fiction alongside such contemporary North American authors as Katherine V. Forrest, Laurie R. King, Barbara Wilson, Mary Wings, Sandra Scoppettone, Sarah Dreher, or Ellen Hart, to name just a few. Lesbianism in Cornwell's novels is not central enough, and it is not engaged with what Munt, for example, refers to as the two-stage resolution in lesbian detective novel in Murder by the Book?: 'The first phase is often represented by "coming out", the second by finding a lover (romance), or the lesbian community (politicization).... The formation of identity happens through the solution of a crime' (p. 125). Note how the emphasis is here on the novels themselves and their characters, and not on the sexual identity of the novelist: the novelist's sexual identity does not determine and categorize the novels either as lesbian or heterosexual. Thus it is possible for such a writer as Laurie R. King to write two series, one with a lesbian police

[7] Note, nevertheless, how attempts have been made in this century to show how homosexuality, for example, can be recognized through certain physical features; these attempts have, however, failed to prove such a connection. For instance, Jennifer Terry writes in 'The Seductive Power of Science,' that 'Earlier studies from the 1930s aimed at determining distinct somatic features of homosexuals for the most part failed to produce any such evidence. Most of them focused on the overall physical structure of bodies, measuring skeletal features, pelvic angles and things like muscle density and hair distribution.' In Posthuman Bodies, p. 145. Acts of singling out the deviant homosexual from the hetero population are by no means over. We now live in the age of genetics, and during the past decade there have been attempts to show a '"genetic" basis for homosexuality' (p. 149).

detective set in the U.S.A., and another with a heterosexual main character, set in Great Britain. Similarly, the British writer Val McDermid has two series, one 'lesbian' and the other 'heterosexual.' I think it is safe to assume that these two series target, and are marketed for, different audiences.

Cornwell's novels do, however, deal with questions of sex, gender, and sexual identity, and especially with 'deviant,' pathological, lesbian and gay identities. Thus, lesbianism in her work -- through the characters of Lucy and Carrie -- is not to be associated with lesbian romance or politicization, but is more closely related to representations of pathologically dangerous female or lesbian characters, for example, femmes fatales and psychopaths. Indeed, as Lynda Hart argues in Fatal Women, 'Lesbians in mainstream representations have almost always been depicted as predatory, dangerous, and pathological' (p. x). Such female psychopaths -- lesbian and otherwise -- have recently appeared particularly on screen, in numerous Hollywood films of the 1990s: 'Basic Instinct,' 'Single White Female,' 'Fatal Attraction,' 'The Hand that Rocks the Cradle,' and so on. Camilla Griggers argues in her article 'Phantom and Reel Projections: Lesbians and the (Serial) Killing Machine,' especially on the figure of the lesbian psychopath on screen that,

> The proportion of *psychofemme* lesbians to appear on the silver screen compared to the total number of lesbians in general to appear on screen speaks for itself as to the state of just and equivalent representation in the mainstream cinema, and epitomizes the use of the lesbian body to channel and then screen a potential contagion of violence erupting from the breakdown of the sex-gender system in the so-called 'healthy' heterosexual social body.[8]

Lesbianism as well as homosexuality are, indeed, represented in the trilogy as unnatural and deviant, even monstrous; hence the novels partake in the long tradition in which '"lesbians" and "gay men" have been ... designated as impossible identities, errors of classification, unnatural disasters within juridico-medical discourses, or, what perhaps amounts to the same, the very paradigm of what calls to be

[8] Camilla Griggers, 'Phantom and Reel Projections: Lesbians and the (Serial) Killing Machine,' in Posthuman Bodies, pp. 168-169.

classified, regulated, and controlled.'[9]

If Cornwell's work cannot then quite be characterized as lesbian detective fiction, it certainly has been associated with new 'feminist' detective fiction in the U.S.A.: her work has often been connected to such writers as Paretsky and Grafton. That is, with writers whose main characters are independent white female investigators (amateur or professional), and mostly single (sometimes divorced), childless, and heterosexual. But Paretsky's or Grafton's work, I think, does not have the kind of tension -- or even confusion -- between heterosexuality and lesbianism/homosexuality that Cornwell's has.[10] In fact, the mainstream fiction of Paretsky or Grafton has little to say about gays or lesbians. In Cornwell's fiction non-heterosexuality becomes a complex issue on a number of levels. On the one hand, non-heterosexuality in the Gault-trilogy is inscribed within the rhetoric of health and illness and mapped together with crime and other 'addictions' and 'diseases' such as smoking and alcoholism. On the other hand, unlike many other mainstream writers, Cornwell does address non-heterosexuality in ways which, closely read, seem to undermine the overall perspective of white liberal feminism. This paradox, I think, is one of the factors which triggered this study and which is also evident in the title here -- the idea of (no) more family: more family (let us both retain it as a heterosexual unit in our substitute families and let us extend the concept of the family) and no more family (since families are always destructive, let us abandon them). Cornwell, it appears, wants to have her cake and eat it, too.

Through the career of the main character, Cornwell's work deals with the question of the body as a site of recognition and knowledge: do our bodies tell the 'truth' about us, our gender, identity, sexuality, and desires? Further, does the clothed body -- a culturally and socially visible body -- tell the same story? In the trilogy it is through the figure of the serial killer that these questions are brought

---

[9] Judith Butler, 'Imitation and Gender Insubordination,' in The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader, eds. Henry Abelove, Michèle Aina Barale and David M. Halperin (New York & London: Routledge, 1993), p. 309.

[10] It is noteworthy that Cornwell's first non-Scarpetta novel, Hornet's Nest, is full of references to lesbians and gays; references either to such characters in the novel itself or to culture in general (for instance, to the music of Elton John and k.d. lang).

together. Serial killing is presented as a contaminating crisis of identity and, more specifically, as a crisis of sex, gender, and sexual identity. With this I do not mean to suggest that the figure of Gault experiences an identity crisis,[11] but that anxiety over 'improper' or uncertain identity, sex, and gender are, as it were, expressed through his character. As a serial killer, Gault is portrayed as a virus who disturbs assumptions about sex, gender and sexual identity: disease and contamination are coupled in the trilogy with non-heterosexuality and the disruption of the binary gender system. On one level, then -- beyond the more obvious context of serial murder as crime -- Gault stands for other kind of 'criminality,' for sex and gender trouble. Gault disrupts the boundaries between, and the categories of, man and woman, masculine and feminine, hetero and homo, inner and outer, natural and unnatural, depth and surface. The same applies to Gault's partner Carrie Grethen. Indeed, Gault's 'crime' might very well be the disruption of the very notion of 'category' as such.

As we know, the distinction between sex and gender became a crucial one in feminist studies in the 1970s and 1980s. Such a distinction served, among other things, to 'avoid confusion between sex as a biological classification with sex understood as the sexual act' as well as to 'avoid biologistic and essentialist accounts of the social and political relations between the sexes by placing emphasis on the sociological category of gender.'[12] Unlike sex -- a 'biological classification' -- gender, it was argued, is not some essential property or quality of human beings, but rather, gender is produced in a social, cultural, and historical context. This distinction of sex and gender has lately been re-examined in feminist scholarship and queer studies, especially by those critics familiar with poststructuralist philosophy. In recent years, Judith Butler has most persuasively -- and influentially -- argued for a reconsideration of the binary systems of sex and gender. In Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity, she draws our attention to gender construction, and specifically raises the

[11] As a serial killer, Gault differs from many other fictional serial killers in that his actions are never narrated from his perspective; he never narrates his own story, and as readers we never witness his actions when they take place -- except for the very short passage at the beginning of From Potter's Field. This is the case with all the criminal figures in Cornwell's work.

[12] Moira Gatens, Imaginary Bodies: Ethics, Power and Corporeality (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), p. 29.

question of bodies and truth when she analyzes the systems and categories of sex and gender; she continues her analysis in Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'. I think that Butler's theories offer important insights into how to analyze and read the construction of sex, gender, and sexual identity in Cornwell's trilogy.

Butler criticizes the commonly held view (also by some feminists) of sex and gender, in which sex is seen more or less as an anatomical fact, and thereby, implicitly prediscursive, and gender as a social and cultural construction. This view constitutes sex as a binary system (there are only male and female bodies) and as a system in which gender follows from sex also as a binary system. 'The presumption of a binary gender system,' as Butler writes, 'implicitly retains the belief in a mimetic relation of gender to sex whereby gender mirrors sex or is otherwise restricted by it' (p. 6). Instead, Butler herself argues that the category of sex might be just as socially and culturally constructed as the category of gender, and therefore 'It would make no sense, then, to define gender as the cultural interpretation of sex, if sex itself is a gendered category' (p. 7). She continues,

> Gender ought not to be conceived merely as the cultural inscription of meaning on a pregiven sex (a juridical conception); gender must also designate the very apparatus of production whereby the sexes themselves are established. As a result, gender is not to culture as sex is to nature; gender is also the discursive/cultural means by which 'sexed nature' or 'a natural sex' is produced and established as 'prediscursive,' prior to culture, a politically neutral surface *on which* culture acts. (p. 7; emphasis in the original)

In other words, we need to analyze how the distinction between sex and gender has resulted in naturalizing and establishing sex as a biological fact or truth -- in naturalizing 'truths' about the human body. In Bodies That Matter she argues on the relation between sex, gender, and the 'human' that,

> the matrix of gender relations is prior to the emergence of the 'human.' Consider the medical interpellation which ... shifts an infant from an 'it' to a 'she' or a 'he,' and in that naming, the girl is 'girled,' brought into the domain of language and kinship through the interpellation of gender. But that 'girling' of the girl does not end there; on the contrary, that founding interpellation is reiterated by various authorities and throughout various intervals of time to reenforce or contest this naturalized effect. The naming is at once the

setting of a boundary, and also the repeated inculcation of a norm.[13]

If we agree with Butler here and question the validity of the sex/gender distinction in which the one is regarded as prediscursive and the other as a social and cultural construction, it would be naive to assume 'the body' as something which, as Butler argues, 'preexists the acquisition of its sexed significance. This "body" often appears to be a passive medium that is signified by an inscription from a cultural source figured as "external" to that body. Any theory of the culturally constructed body, however, ought to question "the body" as a construct of suspect generality when it is figured as passive and prior to discourse' (GT, p. 129). In other words, if gender does not follow naturally from sex (which is itself regarded by Butler as a gendered system), there can be no 'true' gender, no 'true' essence of identity (as maintained by the 'heterosexual matrix' which Butler criticizes) nor a gender which would be 'false.' Instead, in the place of an essence or a core of identity -- for Butler criticizes essentialist notions of identity, whether feminist or not -- Butler introduces the idea of the 'performative' as a way of thinking about gender and as a way of displacing the essentialist binary system:

> In other words, acts, gestures, and desire produce the effect of an internal core or substance, but produce this *on the surface* of the body, through the play of signifying absences that suggest, but never reveal, the organizing principle of identity as a cause. Such acts, gestures, enactments, generally construed, are *performative* in the sense that the essence or identity that they otherwise purport to express are *fabrications* manufactured and sustained through corporeal signs and other discursive means. That the gendered body is performative suggests that it has no ontological status apart from the various acts which constitute its reality. (p. 136; emphasis in the original)

The performative is a question of repetition, of repeated acts, and 'if gender is instituted through acts which are internally discontinuous, then the *appearance of substance* is precisely that. A constructed identity, a performative accomplishment which the mundane social audience, including the actors themselves, come to believe and to perform in the mode of belief' (p. 141). It follows that, for Butler, there can be no 'true or false self ... and the postulation of a true gender [is] revealed as a regulatory

[13] Judith Butler, Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex' (New York and London: Routledge, 1993), pp. 7-8.

fiction' (ibid.). It also follows that in terms of sexual identity, heterosexuality cannot be thought of as more truthful, as something natural and 'original,' from which the gay man and the lesbian woman 'deviate.' Moreover, as I pointed out in the previous chapter, gender and sexual identity cannot be thought of as separate from questions of class, ethnicity, and region.[14]

Finally, Butler connects her theory of the performative to the problematic question of female agency in feminist theories. It is not difficult to perceive how Butler's views on sex, gender, and the performative pose problems for the kind of feminism which embraces essentialist -- and often, thus, implicitly universalist and/or white, heterosexual -- notions of 'female' or 'woman.' What is problematic for Butler in such feminist theories which hold on to, or assume, female agency before 'the deed' is that they understand 'the "subject" ... to have some stable existence prior to the cultural field that it negotiates' (p. 142). Her own argument, to the contrary, emphasizes the role of specific discursive acts and social practices, and she claims that 'there need not be a "doer behind the deed," but that the "doer" is variably constructed in and through the deed' (ibid.). However, Butler is quick to point out that this does not mean that 'to be *constituted* by discourse is to be *determined* by discourse, where determination forecloses the possibility of agency' (p. 143; emphasis in the original). For Butler, therefore, if the performative is a question of repetition, so is agency: 'In a sense, all signification takes place within the orbit of the compulsion to repeat; an "agency," then, is to be located within the possibility of a variation of that repetition' (p. 145). Thus, to sum up, if the surface can give the appearance of substance, of some inner core or identity, it can also reveal that substance, inner core or identity as a fabrication, as the effect of various discursive and regulatory practices. In other words, bodily surfaces 'can become the site of a dissonant and denaturalized performance that reveals the performative status of the natural itself' (p. 146).[15]

---

[14] In Feminism Without Women: Culture and Criticism in a 'Postfeminist' Age (New York and London: Routledge, 1991), Tania Modleski criticizes Butler for forgetting questions of class and race too quickly (see p. 18).

[15] In The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), Butler continues her analysis and examines gender performativity in the context of psychoanalysis, because she feels that her arguments about the performative in Gender Trouble were misunderstood by some critics. The

The figure of the serial killer in the Gault-trilogy combines various constructions of deviation and otherness -- of those not belonging to 'us,' those, for example, who do not perform gender properly. Paradoxically, of course, it is only through such figures of otherness that 'we' are defined. I pointed out earlier on that many serial murder novels point to the problem of how to distinguish the killer from the 'normal' population. How, then, to tell the difference between a 'normal' male and an 'abnormal' one, and how are maleness and monstrosity produced Cornwell's Gault-trilogy? Temple Gault is strangely both visible and invisible, and the trilogy is very much concerned with the ideas of depth and surface, of vision, (in)visibility, and identity.

What is specific, and finally frightening, about Gault beyond the context of murder, is how he disrupts notions of what persons or identities are, or perhaps what they should be, because he challenges the notions of sex, gender, sexual identity as well as ethnicity seen as a stable inner substance, core, or depth. Gault stands for incoherence -- he does not have a stable subject position -- and acts of othering. He always emerges as an other: as a woman, an Italian, a shadow, a double (e.g. Carrie's double), a twin and a homeless person (like Jayne), a gay man, and Scarpetta's son. While on one level this could be regarded as a typical feature in detective novels (that the criminal, for example, tries to avoid detection by masquerading) this should also be placed within a larger social and cultural context. Particularly so since many of the images of otherness above are the others of the white upper middle class world; above all, Gault is described as an effeminate man.

---

performative should not be conceived as a wholly conscious act, and Butler claims that,

> to reduce the psychic workings of gender to the literal performance would be a mistake. Psychoanalysis insists that the opacity of the unconscious sets limits to the exteriorization of the psyche. It also argues -- rightly, I think -- that what is exteriorized or performed can only be understood by reference to what is barred from performance, what cannot or will not be performed. (pp. 144-145)

Effeminacy

Gault is portrayed as someone who, as it were, simulates both people (Italians, for instance) and physical space (the subway tunnels and the Ramble as a homosexual space). I briefly pointed out in the previous chapter that melting into place is something that Seltzer argues for in cases of serial killing in Serial Killers. For Seltzer, 'There is something uncanny about how these killers are so much alike, living composites, how easily they blend in' (p. 10), and 'Chameleon-like, the serial killer copies and simulates others; the monochrome man, he melts into place; the minus man, he plays dead and takes life' (p. 20). Seltzer associates place in serial killing with self-construction:

> What becomes visible in these cases is an extraordinary absorption in place and place making: an absorption in place and place construction that becomes indistinguishable from programs of self-making and self-construction.... It is therefore necessary to test out, and to pressure, the intimacies between subject and position (the inner logic of what is loosely called 'subject-position') that surface in serial killing. (p. 34)

If we consider the places that Gault visits and occupies -- Helen Grimes' house, the subway tunnels, The Ramble, the Italian restaurant, Frank Benelli's hotel room -- we notice how Gault simulates those places and people: a woman, a homeless person (in the end), light flashing in tunnels, a gay man, an Italian. But I do not think that it is enough to stress ideas of simulation and melting into place. As I have suggested before, Seltzer's account of serial killing ignores too much the specificity of sex and gender, of persons and bodies, in self-construction, even though he acknowledges the role and problematics of sexual difference:

> The profile of the serial killer -- his composite portrait or statistical picture -- emerges as the very icon of the mass in person. Crucially, these maladies of self-difference, or self-distinction, are, in the case of the serial killer, immediately translated into violence along the lines of sexual difference: the sex-violence thing and the identity-thing reinforce each

other at every point. (p. 7).[16]

In Skin Shows, Halberstam, too, criticizes Seltzer when she points to a passage in Seltzer's reading of Dracula in the article 'Serial Killing (1).' The same passage reappears in Seltzer's book, as he writes that

> The real threat here is not a dangerous homosexuality and not an endangered heterosexuality but the threat of an erotics irreducible to gendered bodies and gendered persons and without specific relation to female or male bodies: the panic/thrill of the highly eroticized uncertainty as to the status of identity and sexual identity. (SK, p. 79)

Halberstam claims that Seltzer 'opposes the stability of the homo-hetero binary to the "panic/thrill of the highly eroticized uncertainty" and presumes, therefore, that there is an outside to sexual and gender binaries' (p. 185). Symptomatic here is, I think, Seltzer's consistent use of the term 'sexual difference,' which for him finally seems to signify the binary oppositions of, and the difference between, male and female, heterosexual and homosexual -- at the expense of differences which cannot be reduced to the binary system. While he wishes to criticize the logics of translating 'maladies of self-difference' into 'violence along the lines of sexual difference,' his use of the term 'sexual difference' seems to prevent a more profound questioning of such translations and identity politics.[17]

Therefore, it is not enough to say that Gault simulates, copies and melts in with people and places. Instead, we need to examine the gender specificity and context of simulation and copying, i.e., what or who is being copied and simulated. Places are not neutral locations in Cornwell's work. On the contrary, descriptions of places reveal, and are connected with, particular attitudes towards class, ethnicity, gender, or sexual identity -- whether it is a question of, for example, 'Italian masculinity,'

---

[16] See also pages 67, 78-81, 275.

[17] In a similar fashion, while Seltzer presents a powerful argument in his book about the collapsing boundary between the life process and the information process -- between bodies and machines -- in cases of serial killing, he simultaneously seems to maintain that distinction. Even though his own argument emphasizes the 'miscegenation' of the two, there remains something suspect in his use of the 'natural' body. It is as if he does not take into account the idea that the 'natural' body itself is already an effect of discursive practices and not some prediscursive entity.

'black femininity,' 'black masculinity,' or 'white homosexuality.'

Accordingly, evil monstrosity in the trilogy is not evil as a metaphysical presence -- even though a surface reading of the novels might suggest just that. In the first Scarpetta novel, Postmortem, Scarpetta explains the nature of evil to Lucy. If evil simply exists -- if, in Scarpetta's astonishing lesson to Lucy in the novel, '"there are some people who are evil"' and if '"Sometimes there isn't a reason. In a way, it doesn't matter. Some people would rather be bad, would rather be cruel"' -- then society cannot be blamed for evil's existence, and there is no reason to change or criticize anything in society and in its values or structures (p. 34). That is, Scarpetta suggests that evil people are evil because they want to be evil, and that the reasons for the existence of evil do not really matter. But a closer reading reveals that evil is, nevertheless, localized in certain bodies and psyches in the trilogy, for example: it is localized in those persons who are seen to deviate from heterosexual norms. If evil is thus visible and can be localized -- singled out -- in deviant bodies and psyches (as defined by society), it can be destroyed. Scarpetta's techno-family does exactly that: they purge the American Family from deviance and contagious viruses, but they are also those who help define deviance in the first place.

As a male, then, Gault is portrayed as differing from 'masculine' men: he is described as effeminate (a homophobic category in itself) by those who see him.[18] Gault is even mistaken as female by Scarpetta herself in Cruel and Unusual. In the trilogy the beginning of Gault's criminal career is, in fact, connected with gender confusion and with his 'effeminate' visibility, which function as a starting-point for the subsequent murderous career. There are two passages in From Potter's Field which point to this. Firstly, Scarpetta recalls that Gault's

> ... first encounter with the criminal justice system had been less than five years ago when he was drinking White Russians in a bar in Abingdon, Virginia. An intoxicated truck driver, who did not like effeminate males, began to harass Gault, who had a black belt in karate. Without a word, Gault smiled his strange smile. He got up, spun around and kicked the man in the head. (p. 76)

[18] In 'Sexual Indifference and Lesbian Representation,' Teresa de Lauretis points to the 'homophobic categories promoted by sexology: man and woman, with their respective deviant forms, the effeminate man and the mannish woman.' In The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader, p. 145.

Instead of questioning the values of a culture in which effeminacy is esteemed negative and abnormal (as in the truck driver's -- a man's man -- homophobic hostility to 'effeminate' men), Scarpetta here ties together effeminacy, madness, violence, and monstrosity. Scarpetta condemns effeminate men, and effeminacy is regarded as pathologically dangerous. In this Gault resembles the effeminate Lecter in Harris' The Silence of the Lambs: Lecter is 'small, sleek' (p. 16), reads 'Vogue,' and knows about fashion. Effeminacy in men in the trilogy (and elsewhere) becomes particularly threatening because it is systematically associated with homosexuality, a threat to the health of the nation.

Secondly, in another passage Gault's parents couple his problems with gender confusion between the twins within the Gault family. When Scarpetta visits the Gaults' farm in From Potter's Field, she is told by Peyton Gault that Jayne '"was a big girl. In fact, she was about the size of Temple. And I always suspected that was part of his problem"' (p. 362). Gault's mother explains similarly that '"When [Jayne] wore [her hair] short she looked like Temple. They're twins and people used to confuse them and think she was a boy"' (p. 364). Here it is not just Gault's effeminacy which is brought into the picture, but also Jayne's masculinity, female masculinity. In other words, Gault's parents suggest that their son considers Jayne, a masculine female, a threat to his own identity as a male and son: Jayne looks too much like Gault. An analysis of female masculinity (a topic to which I shall return later on in this chapter) in the trilogy may explain how and why it is that Gault is regarded as effeminate, why he is not a 'masculine' man -- that is, how 'female masculinity ... affords us a glimpse of how masculinity is constructed as masculinity.'[19] Also Gault and Scarpetta resemble each other in that the one is an effeminate man and the other a masculine woman. Moreover, Gault's effeminacy and monstrosity are linked to mothering, nurturing, since he 'adopts' Scarpetta as his mother in the trilogy. Because they resemble each other, Scarpetta can better value Gault's art than his biological mother. Similarly, because Scarpetta is not a 'normal,' feminine, woman herself, she will have an abnormal son in Gault (like she has an abnormal daughter in Lucy).

[19] Judith Halberstam, Female Masculinity (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1998), p. 1.

Gault does not only look effeminate, but he also hides behind women; women give him shelter, they harbour and nurse his monstrosity. This is, we remember, also what Carrie and Gault's confused mother do. When in Cruel and Unusual Scarpetta catches her first glimpse of Gault, she indeed mistakes him for a woman. As she recalls, '"When I went to see Helen Grimes, he was inside her house. He looked out the door once while we were talking on the porch. I thought it was a woman"' (p. 428). Gault is literally hiding behind a woman's (Grimes') back during the visit: 'Intense blue eyes suddenly fixed on me like gun sights in the space between Helen Grimes's meaty left shoulder and the door frame. I caught a flash of a pale cheek and aquiline nose before the space was empty again' (p. 380). The way Gault and Grimes are depicted in the above passage is framed within gender: Grimes is a big woman, behind whose 'meaty' shoulder the feminine (the 'femme') Gault is hiding. Earlier on in the novel, when Scarpetta visits the prison where Grimes works, she significantly describes Grimes like a 'butch' lesbian: Grimes is 'a sturdy woman' (p. 51), and 'built like a Baptist church, her shiny Sam Browne belt the only indication she had a waist,' and her 'close-cropped hair was mannishly styled and dyed shoe-polish black' (p. 52). During this visit Grimes searches Scarpetta, and she 'manage[s] to acquaint herself with every inch of [Scarpetta's] flesh' (p. 53). Marino, in his part, calls Grimes 'Helen the Hun' and says that he is not '"her type"' (p. 51). Biological sex and gender are thus effectively distinguished from each other in the body of Grimes: she is masculine and looks like a butch lesbian yet has some sort of a pervert sexual affair with an effeminate man, Gault. Indeed, gender does not follow from a 'biological truth,' sex. In return for her help, Gault decapitates Grimes.

The second time Scarpetta meets Gault towards the end of Cruel and Unusual, when she visits the house of Hilton Sullivan -- Sullivan being a fake identity adopted by Gault. She sees 'piercing blue eyes' (p. 427) as Gault escapes, and later, when she and Marino search Sullivan's apartment, they find photographs of Gault and Grimes. In these photographs, Gault is 'nude and in poses of bondage, and Helen Grimes his sadistic guard.... He was an exquisitely pretty blond young man, with a lean body,' and his face is 'devoid of expression, his eyes cold the way [Scarpetta] imagined they would be when he killed' (pp. 428-429). Later Benton Wesley's investigations reveal that Gault is '"preoccupied with

guns, knives, martial arts, violent pornography"' and that he is '"antisocial"' (p. 432), '"completely unpredictable"' (pp. 432-433), does not '"really fit any profile,"' and is '"consummately narcissistic and vain"' -- he highlights his hair himself (p. 433). Effeminacy in men and female masculinity are mapped together with serial murder and perverse sexual acts. Sex between Gault and Grimes is something immoral, violent, and lethal: Gault (a serial killer and an effeminate man) and Grimes (a masculine woman) play sadomasochistic bondage games, abnormal games. This is in some ways typical of the series because sex and sex affairs are often associated with the illegal, the immoral, and the lethal. For example, Scarpetta has an adulterous affair with Wesley; Marino almost dies because he has an affair with Steiner; and Lucy's affair with Carrie is fatal in many respects. Sex is not 'healthy' in the novels and it almost always turns out to be a dangerous business.

In The Body Farm Scarpetta sees Gault when she visits Carrie in a spy shop appropriately called 'Eye Spy'; appropriate in that 'spying' and eyeing are so crucial in the trilogy (family members keep an eye on each other for signs of improper behaviour, illness and deviation):

> I watched a man follow her in and begin to speak to her as I sat on a bench, my heart beating hard. I did not know why he made me pause. There was something about the sharpness of his profile at a glance, the V-shape of his lean, strong back, and the unnatural blackness of his slicked hair.... I was about to walk away when he turned toward me, and for an electric instant our eyes met. His were piercing blue. (p. 277).

Gault changes his looks deliberately, and he looks unnatural with his dyed hair; at other times, too, his hair attracts attention because it is dyed carrot red. This is why Wesley calls Gault vain and narcissistic (obviously normal men do not dye their hair, or they do not do it themselves).

In From Potter's Field Scarpetta and Wesley learn that Gault has visited an Italian restaurant called 'Scaletta' a number of times. Now he is associated with ethnicity and 'Italian masculinity.' When Gault visited the restaurant, as the maître d' tells Scarpetta and Wesley, he had '"very bright red hair" (p. 92), and he had dressed unusually in '"long black leather coat and Italian trousers with maybe T-shirt"' (pp. 92-93). Gault had pretended to be not only Italian but also Scarpetta (he had used Scarpetta's

name and credit card), and had liked '"expensive scotch and nice wine,"' like Scarpetta herself (p. 95). Furthermore, when Gault is caught smoking in the subway, he claims to be '"Frank Benelli, Italian male thirty-three years old from Verona"' (p. 106; Verona, by the way, is the place where Scarpetta's ancestors come from). Gault identifies with Scarpetta and her ethnic background. Gault, that is, performs 'Italian masculinity' in these two examples, but his Italian masculinity is revealed precisely what it is, a performance. This is particularly true in the former episode, because the maître d', a 'genuine' Italian, sees through Gault's performance, even though '"he was very good"' (p. 93). However, when Gault pretends to be Benelli, the police officer who checks his ID, '"thought the man's accent seemed authentic,"' as Commander Penn explains to Scarpetta (p. 107). This officer had himself grown up in an Italian family. These two episodes draw the reader's attention to a play of true and fake identities, to gender, 'authenticity' and 'nationality': to what signs and characteristics are thought to form a true masculinity and nationality.[20] Gault specifically performs Italian masculinity, not white middle class 'American' masculinity. In Female Masculinity, Halberstam notes that 'if the nonperformance is part of what defines white male masculinity, then all performed masculinities stand out as suspect and open to interrogation' (p. 235). Through Gault, Italian masculinity -- as ethnic other to white masculinity -- is made theatrical, not authentic and stable.

In From Potter's Field Scarpetta herself sees Gault three times, but only once, as it were, face to face. The first time Gault is a shadow in the subway tunnels: 'He was a sharp silhouette in a long dark coat, his face a white flash' (p. 131). Here Gault melts into place, into the darkness of the subway tunnels and the occasional lights of the passing trains. He is a shadowy figure: he is black and white, on and off, flashing and disappearing -- which is like his position in the course of the narrative and the trilogy. Then later, Scarpetta thinks she recognizes him on a video-tape recorded at Sheriff Brown's house. Now 'Gault was unhealthily pale, every vertebra and rib clearly defined. Apparently, he had lost a lot of weight and muscle tone, and I thought about the cocaine in his hair, which now was white, and

[20] We could wonder about the effects of Gault's inauthenticity to the case of Scarpetta: she is Italian, but not a typical one as regards her looks. Therefore she would not be recognized as being of Italian origin -- she is not authentic enough.

as he shifted his position I saw his full breasts' (p. 278). This is a case of mistaken identity, because Scarpetta now mistakes Carrie for Gault. The two now resemble each other like identical twins, except for their hair colour. Gault himself does appear on the tape later on, and his hair is 'still carrot red' (p. 279), and his voice is not that of a normal adult male, but instead, 'adolescent and uneven, and ... not loud' (p. 280). Again, Gault is depicted as not strong but feminine. Finally, at the end of the novel Scarpetta and Gault meet in the subway tunnels, and Gault is in a bad shape, resembles Jayne, and has Jayne's boots: he 'was emaciated and disheveled.... He wore jeans and jungle boots and a black leather jacket' (p. 409), and 'His head was shaved beneath his cap' (p. 411). Before he dies, then, Gault resembles a homeless person and his sister, his deviation, drug-addiction, and crimes visible on his body.

As a serial killer, Gault is also mapped together with homosexuality, even though it does not become clear whether he is gay or not. This contextualization functions, however, to stigmatize gay men as abnormal and deviant, whereas white middle class heterosexual masculinity appears normal and desirable. Such a contextualization also mixes up gender issues in the trilogy in a very strange way. This confusion relates to Gault, Jayne, and Carrie and reminds us of the description of Helen Grimes (a masculine woman looking like a butch lesbian but having an affair with a man). We recall what one of the officers who saw Gault and Jayne together in New York thinks about Gault and Jayne: '"Her head was shaved. In fact, the officer wasn't certain she was a she. At first he assumed this was a homosexual couple"' (p. 39). Jayne and Gault both look 'homosexual' in each other's company. Similarly, when Scarpetta and Marino interrogate the morgue's guard Evans in From Potter's Field, it remains unclear who it is that Evans sees in the morgue delivering Sheriff Brown's body, Carrie or Gault (whether this is deliberate, or sloppy writing from Cornwell's part, is open to debate). Who is it that Evans sees and has his '"impressions"' about, when he says, '"I thought he might be homosexual"'? (P. 226) Is it Gault or Carrie?

Reading carefully, it appears that Evans sees Carrie instead of Gault, because Gault's hair has apparently never been dyed white, whereas Carrie's has (on the videotape Gault's hair is still carrot red,

and they go straight from the Sheriff's house to the morgue). In this context, the following passage, in which the team watches the videotape recorded at Sheriff Brown's house, is somewhat confusing to the reader:

> and though we could not specifically see Gault remove the letter from a pocket, he did tamper with Carrie's clothing. He certainly could have gotten her letter at that time. He could have placed it in Brown's pocket later, in the back of the van or perhaps in the morgue. (p. 284; emphasis added)

But if Evans in the morgue sees a person with white hair, it cannot have been Gault who took Sheriff Brown's body inside the morgue; it had to have been Carrie. It follows that Evans regards Carrie (a woman cross-dressing in men's clothing and passing as a man, a woman 'identical' to Gault) as homosexual, like the police officer in New York who suspected Jayne to be a homosexual, together with Gault. Thus 'homosexuality' and impressions of homosexuality, or, for that matter, 'masculinity,' are not based on the male body only in the trilogy, but can become the property of the 'biologically' female body. This is also what Butler argues in Gender Trouble when she writes that 'When the constructed status of gender is theorized as radically independent of sex, gender itself becomes a freefloating artifice, with the consequence that *man* and *masculine* might just as easily signify a female body as a male one, and *woman* and *feminine* a male body as easily as a female one' (p. 6; emphasis in the original).

The novels do not reveal any homosexual relations between Gault and men. Actually, the only 'heterosexual' relation that is revealed in the trilogy between Gault and women, is the sadomasochistic one between Gault and Grimes. In The Body Farm, Scarpetta recalls that 'Gault had killed two women and had shown no sexual interest in them. It was the boy he had stripped and bitten. It was Eddie he had impulsively snatched so he could have his perverted fun' (p. 303). Besides homosexuality and masochism, Gault is also suspected of pedophilia; all three issues can effectively become intertwined in the reader's mind, and this undoubtedly fuels the image of the gay man as a predatory pedophile. We do not know whether the relation between Gault and Carrie is a sexual one, but what we do know is that

Gault needs Carrie to seduce Sheriff Brown and Lucy. In From Potter's Field Carrie picks up a feminine looking black woman, Apollonia, in a bar -- '"She was real pretty in this little red dress"' as the woman is described (p. 309) -- and they leave the bar together to 'party' (p. 313). It does not become quite clear whether 'partying' means having sex or doing drugs or both. Apollonia does not sell '"just cigarettes"' as Marino finds out, and she also used to date Sheriff Brown (p. 314; note, by the way, how blackness is again connected to crime and drugs). For the woman who sees Carrie and Apollonia in the bar together Carrie passes as a man, '"He was in a real cool black suit with a black T-shirt under it. I remember that. I figured he was from out of town"' (p. 309). This depiction above inevitably brings to mind the relation between Gault (femme) and Grimes (butch), even repeats it, particularly if Apollonia -- contrary to the witness -- knows that Carrie is a woman.

Considering the above examples, Gault defies notions of an essential inner core or depth because in the stories of those who see him, he always emerges as something different, other, from his previous appearances. He performs a number of 'identities' with varying degrees of success, and because of his performances, it is impossible to categorize him. His performances (or those of Carrie) specifically signify the performative nature of gender and identity-construction.

In the trilogy, then, Gault -- and Carrie -- represent a failure to 'repeat' the heterosexual gender ideals of white middle class masculinity and femininity that the trilogy endorses. This failure to repeat reveals sex and gender binaries as regulatory fictions, indeed, as heterosexual ideals. Is Gault a proper male or not, is he heterosexual or homosexual, or something altogether different, and can he be categorized at all? The only 'stable' thing about Gault is that he simulates and murders -- that he exists to murder. Underneath the narrative of serial killing, there is another story; one which concerns Gault's gender and sexual identity. It is precisely the uncertainty concerning those two which makes him a frightening and inhuman figure. If Gault is not properly gendered, he becomes excluded from the category of the human. As Butler notes on the dehumanized in Gender Trouble, 'Those bodily figures who do not fit into either gender fall outside the human, indeed, constitute the domain of the dehumanized and the abject against which the human itself is constituted' (p. 111). Gault falls outside

the human in a manner which makes it difficult, or even impossible, to separate serial killing from gender trouble.

As I argue above, Gault is portrayed as differing from normal heterosexual masculinity. It is his gender-bending which alerts us to the killer-monster -- his 'effeminate' and 'homosexual' visibility. Effeminacy and homosexuality become signs of monstrosity for the reader: they become suspect, and they harbour and hide other kinds of monstrosities. Monstrosity, we learn, lies in effeminate and homosexual male bodies, in sick, unnatural, males and thus it is located outside normal heterosexual, masculine men. Monstrosity can therefore still be localized in certain bodies and psyches, and this localization in the Gault-trilogy works within particular ideological structures and identity politics, where heterosexuality in general is regarded as normal and healthy. If uncertain, or wrong, gender and non-heterosexuality provide a localization for monstrosity in the trilogy, they also provide comfort through the very localization: monstrosity is visible on the outside, and Scarpetta's team can identify, track down, and destroy the virus.[21] They can purge the nation of its sick members, and, as readers, we are given a lesson on where to look for and how to identify 'monsters' among us.

Hence, in the trilogy, when a person is seen by Scarpetta as not having a proper (read=heterosexual) gender or sexual identity, this gives rise to anxiety and disturbance. The narrative of serial murder is linked with the narrative of the disruption of the binary system and heterosexual desire. The fact that these two narratives are joined together helps to construct non-heterosexuality, non-heterosexual desire and body as criminal. Therefore, while forensic pathology (a question of psychopathology, too) and medical sciences in the series reveal causes of death, they also work as regulatory discourses and practices on another level -- and as a rhetoric of health and illness. Through such discourses certain bodies and persons are constructed and defined either as normal and healthy or as criminal and deviant.

[21] But, if it is impossible to tell the difference between one's white, 'normal,' male neighbour and a serial killer such as Ted Bundy, what does this say about white middle class normality? Does it not say, precisely, that it is a construction -- that 'normality' is a construction which can be imitated and appropriated?

Multiple Diseases

> For if homosexuality is pathological from the start, then any disease that homosexuals may sometimes contract will be uneasily conflated with the disease that they already are.[22]

As I have already argued, viral imagery and images of contamination are common in the Gault-trilogy and elsewhere in the novels. The fact that the narrator chooses to call Gault a virus in From Potter's Field is significant in terms of gender and sexuality, because Gault is contextualized within homosexuality and effeminacy. The reader does not have to think too hard to notice a link between viruses, contamination, homosexuality, and deviance. In Cornwell's novels, the only characters who have the HIV virus are gay men. In what follows, I shall hope to show how alongside the ostensibly positive attitude to gay people and their rights, the narrator harbours an opposite, negative, attitude to non-heterosexuality. In other words, the novels participate in and encourage a homophobic discourse while seeming progressive texts on the surface.

In fact, as Jenkins informs us in Using Murder, the mapping together of images of homosexuality with serial murder was typical of conservative politics and its antigay attitude in the 1970s and the 1980s (an attitude still prevalent today). Such a linkage gained strength especially when it was connected to pedophilia. Jenkins argues that 'Especially by citing cases where boys had been victimized, claim-makers were drawing attention to the widely credited link between homosexuality, pedophilia, and violent crime, and seeking to stigmatize the overt homosexual movement, which was one of the aspects of contemporary "permissiveness" most detested by social conservatives' (p. 126). Thus, not only did the conservatives stress the ideal nuclear family as the family which brings up 'normal' citizens (serial killer monsters are the product of the breakdown of the nuclear family) but they also effectively linked homosexuality together with specific threats to children, pedophilia and serial crime. 'Pedophilia,' writes Jenkins, 'was central to antigay rhetoric until the mid-1980s, when it was

[22] Butler, 'Sexual Inversions,' p. 357.

largely replaced by the still more effective terror weapon of AIDS' (p. 185).

In the Gault-trilogy, serial murder is, indeed, intimately connected with homosexuality (and lesbianism), effeminacy, pedophilia, and AIDS -- to the threats that call forth the conservative rhetoric and values of the ideal nuclear family. One of Gault's victims in Cruel and Unusual is Eddie Heath, a thirteen-year-old boy. As I pointed out above, Scarpetta emphasizes in The Body Farm how Gault had shown no sexual interest in the women he killed, but that 'It was the boy he had stripped and bitten. It was Eddie he had impulsively snatched so he could have his perverted fun.' The portrait and the characteristics of the serial killer therefore include the following: Gault looks effeminate and homosexual, is apparently a pedophile, likes sado-masochistic bondage games and pornography, and is contagious as a virus. That is, he is contagious like the gay man's (or woman's) sexuality and contagious like the gay man with the HIV virus. It is not just the image of the serial killer which is being portrayed and produced in the trilogy, but also that of the dangerous 'homosexual' (or the dangerous lesbian): contagious, pedophiliac, and pathologically violent. No wonder that in From Potter's Field Scarpetta wants to prevent Lucy from participating in the investigation; she does not 'want her in the same state where Temple Gault was' (p. 375). She wants to protect Lucy, her substitute-daughter.

In Cornwell's novels, the idea of non-heterosexuality as illness is perhaps most literally exemplified through the gay man infected with the HIV virus. According to the heterosexist logic, if non-heterosexuality is an illness, it can be infectious -- not only can the HIV virus, for instance, pass from one gay person to another, but also non-heterosexuality. As Butler writes in Gender Trouble, when she refers to Simon Watney's discussion of the homosexual as 'the polluting person':

> In a sense, Simon Watney has identified the contemporary construction of 'the polluting person' as the person with AIDS in his *Policing Desire: AIDS, Pornography, and the Media*. Not only is the illness figured as the 'gay disease,' but throughout the media's hysterical and homophobic response to the illness there is a tactical construction of a continuity between the polluted status of the homosexual by virtue of the boundary-trespass that *is* homosexuality and the disease as a specific modality of homosexual pollution. (p. 132)

Such homophobic assertions consider homosexuality as contagious and equate it with disease, or, rather, construct homosexuality as a disease. Indeed, such a homophobic discourse defines non-heterosexuality 'as something one can "catch" through contact with, for instance, a teacher or a parent who is lesbian or gay. Thus even before the historical accident of the outbreak of "AIDS" in the gay communities of the West, homosexuality was conceived as a contagion, and the homosexual as a parasite waiting to feed upon the straight body,' as Edelman phrases it in Homographesis (p. 87). Or, as Watney argues when he points to images of degeneracy and homosexuality:

> We should recall that the very notion of 'the homosexual' as a distinct type of person, defined primarily in relation to particular sexual acts, emerged in the last century at the interstices of a host of overlapping discourses concerning sickness, contamination and genetic throwbacks, and was regarded as the most concrete evidence of the results of indecency, depravity and uncleanliness.[23]

The idea that homosexuality and non-heterosexuality are contagious and polluting is something that becomes manifest in the trilogy (and elsewhere in the novels) through Gault, through the gay man infected with the HIV virus and through the 'criminal' lesbian infecting and preying on the innocent.

Gault and Carrie are, in effect, doubly contagious: non-heterosexuality is contagious in itself and the identification of Gault as a virus is menacing: both sexuality and criminality need to be policed. Viruses and viral imagery encourage a conservative culture of surveillance, testing and control -- testing and controlling those persons or groups of persons that the society regards as a threat, for example, risk groups and sexual deviants (gay men, lesbians, transsexuals) or non-white people (ethnic minorities, immigrants).

Already in Body of Evidence, the novel preceding the Gault-trilogy, we find the contextualization of homosexuality with disease, AIDS. When Scarpetta and Marino visit Key West

---

[23] Simon Watney, Policing Desire: Pornography, AIDS and the Media (London: Methuen, 1987), p. 49. Living now in a post-Foucauldian world, we know that during the nineteenth century, there occurred an important change, 'a shift in the understanding of desire, a shift in the focus from sexual acts to sexual identity: from the vagrancies of sexual desire and sexual relations to a category of person, specified and rendered intelligible by the singular nature of his sexual identity -- a social intelligibility and self-intelligibility bound up through and through with the indelible nature of one's sexuality,' as Seltzer writes in Serial Killers (p. 4).

during their murder investigation, Scarpetta depicts the island in the following way, which, typically of the series, draws the reader's attention to the deceptive normality and health of the surface:

> Never in my life had I seen so many same-sex couples, and it was patently clear that running deep beneath the robust health of this tiny off-shore island was a mother [sic] lode of disease. Wherever I looked, it seemed, I saw men dying. I had no phobia of catching hepatitis or AIDS, having learned long ago to cope with the theoretical danger of disease endemic to my work. Nor was I bothered by homosexuals. The older I got, the more I was of the opinion that love can be experienced in many different ways. There is no right or wrong way to love, only in how it is expressed. (p. 328)

While Scarpetta asserts in the passage that she is not 'bothered by homosexuals,' the passage, this novel as well as others, convey opposite ideas about homosexuality. Same-sex couples -- mainly men, abnormal in itself -- inhabit an 'off-shore island,' Key West.[24] Homophobically here, Marino calls the island '"the AIDS capital of America,"' and suggests that the island be cut off from the rest of the country and sent '"drifting out to sea"' (pp. 247-248). Key West is situated in the margin both geographically and figuratively -- in the margin and limits of the healthy national body and excluded from it -- and functions both as a haven for gay men and as a kind of prison. Key West is a place where they can form a community and a 'safe space' against the not so tolerant heterosexist and homophobic society.[25]

Beneath the healthy facade, then, this haven or prison of Key West is sick and inhabited by AIDS, since 'running deep beneath the robust health of this tiny off-shore island was a mother lode of disease.' Things are not what they appear to be as the island is, in fact, heavily infected. The island, like

---

[24] Scarpetta is trying to find out why the murdered woman, Beryl Madison, visited the island. She repeats -- doubles -- Madison's actions, and almost ends up being murdered in the same way as Beryl. (Note, again, Cornwell's typical use of names here: 'Beryl' also means a precious stone, and is connected to the mining metaphor in the above passage: 'a mother lode of disease,' which is a significant metaphor in the context of this study.)

[25] Generally speaking, while these 'safe spaces' -- gay neighbourhoods for example -- may function as 'safe havens from ... discrimination and violence, they can also become dangerous spaces in that they can 'serve as destinations of choice for "gay bashers."' See Wayne D. Myslik, 'Renegotiating the Social/Sexual Identities of Places: Gay Communities as Safe Havens or Sites of Resistance?' in BodySpace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality, ed. Nancy Duncan (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), p. 157. In such 'safe' spaces passing as straight is not necessarily possible, since the space itself marks the person as deviant.

the gay man, may look healthy on the surface but is really 'sick' beneath that surface. When Scarpetta confesses that she has 'no phobia of catching hepatitis or AIDS, having learned long ago to cope with the theoretical danger of disease endemic to [her] work,' this can be understood not only as a medical examiner accepting the dangers of her work, but also as a homophobic assertion. For Scarpetta, catching hepatitis or the HIV virus[26] is something which is connected to her work as a 'theoretical danger,' but not connected to her sex life. According to this logic, as a heterosexual woman, Scarpetta is not at risk because AIDS for her is a gay disease (a view which says much, perhaps too much, about her medical expertise). Cornwell's work thus spreads the fear of homosexuality as a doubly contagious disease. From Postmortem to Black Notice, there are no heterosexual characters with AIDS: the only characters who have the HIV virus or AIDS in the novels are gay men, and through this AIDS is contextualized and positioned to the readers specifically as a gay disease . This is how AIDS was placed in the 1980s conservative discussions in the U.S.A. and elsewhere. In fact, before the term AIDS was adopted in 1982 by the Centers for Disease Control in the U.S.A., the term GRID (gay-related immunodeficiency) was used.[27] However, as people who were not gay were also becoming ill, it was no longer possible to use the term GRID. The disease was initially seen to be restricted to four marginal(ized) groups -- the 4 H's: homosexuals, heroin addicts, Haitians, and hemophiliacs. In Policing Desire, Watney remarks on the ideology of the naming of the first three groups that 'The presence of Aids in these groups is generally perceived not as accidental but as a symbolic extension of some imagined inner essence of being, manifesting itself as a disease' (p. 8).

Gay men in Cornwell's novels, then, are persistently portrayed as victims and carriers of a terrible disease. In effect, this contextualization and positioning turn homosexuality itself into a disease, an abnormality: where there is homosexuality, there is disease. Unnatural homosexual desire -- the cause for the disease -- is literally visible on the bodies of the 'men dying,' and moral and sexual decay

[26] Both often misunderstood as venereal diseases; a view which has not altogether disappeared.

[27] See, for instance, the articles in AIDS: Cultural Analysis, Cultural Activism, ed. Douglas Crimp (Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 1988).

become visible in the sick body of the homosexual. What is really at stake here, is 'the displacement of epidemiology by a moralized etiology of the disease.'[28] At stake here too 'is the production of the homosexual subject as a bearer of death.'[29] Thus the HIV virus and AIDS are localized outside the American Family: they are localized in particular bodies, gay bodies, in particular psyches and communities, and the boundary of sickness is being defined by the narrator, our medical and national hygiene expert. Besides being seen as a disease, I briefly argued in the previous chapter how homosexuality is connected with criminality in other ways in From Potter's Field: gay men cruise one another in the Ramble, which combines homosexuality and 'high crime.' The Ramble, 'with twisting footpaths,' as a 'distant darkness,' and as 'an isolated area,' evokes criminality and unnatural sexuality.

Effeminacy in men -- not looking or behaving like properly masculine men -- always seems to translate into homosexuality, and then into disease, in Cornwell's novels. Descriptions of effeminate men in the novels direct the reader's attention to how to recognize such a man, to what 'signs' and 'practices' to look for. Gault is 'pretty blond young man, with a lean body,' who is engaged with perverted sexual practices. In Body of Evidence, Scarpetta describes Al Hunt (suspected of having murdered Beryl Madison) as weak and effeminate: he is 'fair, with receding light blond hair and a pasty complexion' and 'a weak chin' (p. 121). Marino's homophobia is immediately aroused: '"Let's just say the word *fag* went through my mind more'n once when I talked to him"' (p. 232). Furthermore, after the trilogy, in Cause of Death and Unnatural Exposure, gay men are 'doubly punished': not only do they have the HIV virus but they are murdered as well. The investigation of these murders opens the way for, and justifies, the investigation and definition of sexual identity. In Cause of Death, one of Scarpetta's employees, Danny Webster, is found murdered in Scarpetta's car. It is not quite clear whether Danny was actually gay, but through his effeminate looks the possibility is there and linked to AIDS. For example, earlier in the novel when Danny is still alive, Marino lectures him for his looks, '"Hair as long as yours gives the assholes out there one more thing to grab. Me? I'd cut it off. [B]esides, the girls

[28] Simon Watney, 'The Spectacle of AIDS,' in The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader, p. 208.

[29] Butler, 'Sexual Inversions,' p. 346.

would like you better"' (p. 42). In other words, Danny looks feminine and not masculine with his long hair, and he should conform to the heterosexual masculine ideal (in order to be 'invisible') instead of deviating from it. Later on, Scarpetta decides to do the autopsy on Danny herself, and wonders, 'I did not know if Danny had hepatitis or AIDS' (p. 183; note that these two are the same diseases which are mentioned in the context of Key West above).

In addition, while Scarpetta autopsies another murdered man at the beginning of Cause of Death, reporter Ted Eddings, she explains:

> I was almost finished with the external examination, but what was left was the most invasive, for in any unnatural death, it was necessary to investigate a patient's sexual practices. Rarely was I given a sign as obvious as a tattoo depicting one orientation or another, and as a rule, no one the individual was intimate with was going to step forth to volunteer information, either. But it really would not have mattered what I was told or by whom. I would still check for evidence of anal intercourse. (p. 37)

Scarpetta finds no evidence of 'an active homosexual lifestyle' (p. 38), yet she is going to test Eddings for HIV. Learning this, detective Roche -- one of Scarpetta's enemies -- who is witnessing the autopsy, remarks, '"Then you're thinking he might be queer"' (p. 39). Note also how in the above passage, the word 'patient' does not actually refer to any patient, male or female, but it specifically refers to men and gay sexual practices: 'I would still check for evidence of anal intercourse.' Once more, AIDS is established as a gay disease, not to mention the fact that in the previous novels Scarpetta has never before referred to the necessity 'to investigate a patient's sexual practices.'[30] Evidence of 'anal intercourse' in female patients would not point to non-heterosexuality, and neither would the presence of the HIV virus in their bodies. Not to mention the fact how Scarpetta associates 'sexual practices' with 'orientation' above: she implies that one's sexual practices testify to, and are equivalent of, one's sexual identity -- an implication of which Foucault, for example, would have much to say about.

Then, in Unnatural Exposure, Scarpetta finds out that one of her employees at the morgue,

[30] On another level -- but which is outside the scope of this study -- we could link the heightened awareness and presence of homosexuality and lesbianism in the Scarpetta series to the novels' pervasive atmosphere of paranoia. Freud, as we know, connected paranoia to homosexual desire.

Wingo, who is 'lithe and attractive, with pretty features and shaggy dark hair' (p. 44), is HIV-positive and gay. Scarpetta's remark to Wingo, '"But I worry about you because your orientation places you at risk"' (p. 64) again suggests that homosexual 'orientation' is a risk while the heterosexual one is not. For Scarpetta her work is a 'theoretical' risk, but not her heterosexual affairs with men (as already implied by the passage in Body of Evidence above). This is also what her words to Wingo reveal: '"Every physical I get, I'm tested for HIV. You know what I'm exposed to. What you're going through could be me"' (p. 65). Moreover, when Scarpetta narrates her meeting with Wingo, she depicts Wingo as weak and tearful, like a child or a woman: Wingo's eyes 'were bright with tears,' his 'voice trembled and he began to cry,' 'he nuzzled his head against me and I held him like a child,' 'he began to cry again,' 'his face tragic and defiant,' and he 'dissolved in tears again' (pp. 64-65). Scarpetta, on the other hand, is 'firm but kind' (p. 64).

Wingo finally dies as one of the victims of another virus, 'Mutantpox,' the deadly virus as named by the press, the virus deliberately spread by the female murderer in the novel. Wingo is thus doubly infected (and, as it were, punished for his sexual orientation), first with the HIV virus, and then with Mutantpox. It is clearly suggested by Scarpetta that it is one's non-heterosexual identity which is a risk factor. That is, it is implied in the novels that 'the major risk in acquiring AIDS is being a particular kind of person rather than doing particular things,' as maintained by some early studies on AIDS and risk groups in the 1980s.[31] Scarpetta therefore assigns Wingo to a risk group. While recent research on the HIV virus points to a different direction, popular fictions -- such as the Scarpetta series -- still endorse and produce conservative attitudes towards gay men in the context of the HIV virus and AIDS. As such, the very term 'risk group' is ideologically motivated. As noticed by Jan Zita Grover, among others, 'In the media and in political debate, the epidemiological category of *risk group* has been used to stereotype and stigmatize people already seen as outside the moral and economic parameters of

[31] Paula A. Treichler, 'AIDS, Homophobia, and Biomedical Discourse: An Epidemic of Signification,' in AIDS: Cultural Analysis, Cultural Activism, p. 44.

the "general population."'[32] General population (or general public) here refers to white heterosexual people as opposed to those it excludes from itself, from the family, nation and normality: for example, gay men, drug addicts,[33] and prostitutes have all been regarded as forming the 'risk groups' contrary to the normal people, who are in no danger of catching the virus. Therefore, it is quite clear that the term '"general public" is at once an ideological construct and a moral prescription.'[34] AIDS is used to confirm attitudes towards those already considered sick: gay men are immoral, degenerate, and prey on and infect others.[35]

Thus gay men are constructed as visibly different, criminal, and sick in Cornwell's novels: gay men look different -- usually effeminate -- from 'normal' men. The medical profession and Scarpetta's own field of expertise, pathology, partake in this discourse of visibility and in the construction as well as production of the homosexual body. Forensic and medical sciences are institutionalized discourses on the normal and abnormal, healthy and diseased, on what is or what is not 'within normal limits.'[36] Therefore it is not surprising if in cases including visibly different men -- effeminate men -- Scarpetta suspects homosexuality, and she finds it 'necessary to investigate a patient's sexual practices,' whereas this necessity does not exist in the case of her 'clearly' heterosexual, masculine, patients. In Homographesis, Edelman notes on the readability of the homosexual body -- that during this century,

---

[32] Jan Zita Grover, 'AIDS: Keywords,' in AIDS: Cultural Analysis, Cultural Activism, p. 27.

[33] At the beginning of From Potter's Field, Scarpetta tries to resuscitate a black drug dealer, is covered with his blood, and feels 'numb. I tasted blood and thought of AIDS' (p. 20). The black drug dealer is doubly infectious, because of his blackness and drugs.

[34] Leo Bersani, 'Is the Rectum a Grave?' in AIDS: Cultural Analysis, Cultural Activism, p. 203.

[35] The position of gay men and the HIV virus is slightly contradictory in the novels. On the one hand, gay men prey on innocent children and contaminate them, but on the other hand, the HIV virus is restricted to gay men and the gay community (since it spreads through gay sexual practices and acts). Homosexuality, like the HIV virus, is thus both potentially contagious yet restricted. If one becomes contaminated by the disease that is homosexuality, one becomes vulnerably open to other diseases such as AIDS.

[36] In this context, consider, for example, a fairly recent Finnish study on forensic medicine, Oikeuslääketieteen perusteet, eds. Antti Penttilä, Jorma Hirvonen, and Pekka Saukko (Helsinki: Duodecim, 1993). The study categorizes homosexuality under the title 'Sex crimes and sexual abnormalities' ('Seksirikokset ja seksuaaliset poikkeavuudet' -- together with rape, pedophilia, incest, lust murders, exhibitionism, masochism, transsexuality, transvestism, and so on.

> a heterosexist ideology ... has insisted on the necessity of 'reading' the body as a signifier of sexual orientation. Heterosexuality has thus been able to reinforce the status of its own authority as 'natural' (i.e., unmarked, authentic, and non-representational) by defining the straight body against the 'threat' of an 'unnatural' homosexuality -- a 'threat' the more effectively mobilized by generating concern about homosexuality's unnerving (and strategically manipulable) capacity to 'pass,' to remain invisible, in order to call into being a variety of disciplinary 'knowledges' through which homosexuality might be recognized, exposed, and ultimately rendered, more ominously, invisible once more. (p. 4)

Pathology as depicted in Cornwell's novels (and psychopathology), without a doubt, is one of those 'disciplinary knowledges,' which produces homosexuality as a deviance differing from the heterosexual norm -- and produces it as 'secondary, sterile, and parasitic' as Edelman continues later (p. 9).

The presence of the HIV virus and AIDS in the Gault-trilogy explain in their own ways the culture of testing, policing, and surveillance that characterizes the novels; that is, testing to reveal those who do not really belong to the American family, those who are really sick beneath the surface. The HIV virus and AIDS raise questions of boundaries, policing, surveillance, and technology in many ways. The fields of crime, forensic and medical sciences are the fields of testing *par excellence*, and testing is also one of the crucial questions in discussions and debates on AIDS and its effects. As Avital Ronell has put it, 'AIDS has shed light on the way modernity has technologized the subject into a testable entity under state control.'[37] On the other hand, Ronell -- like many of the writers in AIDS: Cultural Analysis, Cultural Activism -- draws attention to the fact how during the Reagan administration in the U.S.A., 'the acronym AIDS was not acknowledged by the Reagan White House to exist, either in official or common language usage' (p. 41). In Ronell's view, behind this was the strange idea that if the word AIDS was used freely, this would 'in itself encourage the referential effects of naming to spread' (ibid.). By not employing the term, the administration believed that they could keep AIDS and its effects within certain boundaries. Further, technology and research relate to AIDS in the sense of boundaries and limits since technology 'is differentially deployed to save some lives and to condemn others' as

[37] Avital Ronell, 'Queens of the Night,' in her Finitude's Score: Essays for the End of the Millennium (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), p. 43. See also Ronell's 'The Test Drive' in Deconstruction is/in America: A New Sense of the Political, ed. Anselm Haverkamp (New York and London: New York University Press, 1995).

Butler remarks in 'Sexual Inversions' (p. 358). In other words, who does the nation consider those worth saving? Or, are those infected with the HIV virus worth saving at all -- are sexual deviants or drug addicts worth saving, both literally and figuratively? Butler also continues that,

> When we consider which technology receives federal funding, and we note that recent AIDS appropriations bills have been drastically cut, it becomes clear that inasmuch as AIDS is understood to afflict marginalized communities and is itself taken as a further token of their marginalization, technology can be precisely what it withheld from a life-preserving deployment. (ibid.)

But what more do homosexuality, the HIV virus, and AIDS suggest in the context of the family? They undoubtedly evoke the death of the family, and even species, and function as a discourse of limits and boundaries of who is included and excluded from the family (biological, techno, national, global) on the basis of health, sickness, and sexual/ethnic identity. Edelman draws attention above to how homosexuality has been regarded as unproductive and sterile in heterosexist discourse, meaning that as opposed to heterosexuality and 'procreative intercourse,' homosexuality is a 'murder of the race' and 'wasting of the seed' (p. 89). Then, in 'The Spectacle of AIDS,' Watney argues that the image of AIDS as a 'gay plague' -- an image fostered in Cornwell's work -- cannot be accounted for 'by available sociological theories of scapegoating, boundary protection, or "moral panics"' (p. 204). Instead, Watney refers to 'the active legacy of eugenic theory, which is as much at work within the sociobiological dogmatics of contemporary familialism as it was in the biomedical politics of National Socialism' (p. 204). Watney continues that,

> It is the sense of a *totalized* threat to a biological identification of self with nation that characterizes both Nazi medical politics and modern familialism. Thus Jews, antifascists, gypsies, and 'degenerates' (including, of course, large numbers of lesbians and gay men) were postulated as intrinsic and self-evident threats to the perceived unity and the very existence of the German *Volk*, and the policy of killing them all 'as a therapeutic imperative' only emerged in relation to the deeply felt danger of *Volkstod*, or 'death of the people' (or 'nation,' or 'race'). It is precisely this sense that people with HIV infection, usually misdescribed as 'AIDS carriers,' are widely understood to threaten the equally spurious unity of 'the family,' 'the nation,' and even 'the species.' Hence the overriding need to return to the pressing question of the contemporary government of the home... (pp.

204-205)

The systematic portrayal of AIDS as a 'gay plague' and gay men as infected and infecting in Cornwell's novels is thus an exclusionary process whereby gay men are, and need to be, excluded from the 'national,' 'healthy,' body -- most literally in the example of Key West. Many gay men (as well as lesbians) are abandoned by their biological families -- like Wingo in Cruel and Unusual, who cannot tell his family about being HIV-positive since his '"father hates [him] anyway"' for being gay (p. 64). Gay men, that is, are excluded from familial life and driven away to the margin of the national body. Non-heterosexuality breaks up the nuclear family of father, mother, and children, and in conservative familial discourse it is necessary to connect such non-heterosexuality with illness -- which then justifies various forms of surveillance and testing in the name and for the good of the family, nation, and species.

In addition, being gay is constructed in Cornwell's novels as a form of suicidal self-destruction: death through sexual 'orientation' and AIDS. The passage quoted at the beginning of this chapter, 'Never in my life had I seen so many same-sex couples, and it was patently clear that running deep beneath the robust health of this tiny off-shore island was a mother lode of disease. Wherever I looked, it seemed, I saw men dying,' forms part of the iconography of AIDS as a 'gay plague.' Considering such exclusionary processes and discourses which define who is and who is not 'sick' (in more ways than one), it is not difficult to agree with Sander Gilman, who has remarked that,

> This 'free-floating' iconography of disease attaches itself to various illnesses (real or imagined) in different societies and at different moments in history. Disease is thus restricted to a specific set of images, thereby forming a visual boundary, a limit to the idea (or fear) of disease. The creation of the image of AIDS must be understood as part of this ongoing attempt to isolate and control disease.[38]

On one side, then, the representations and the production of AIDS as a gay plague in the novels serve as part of a regulatory discourse of sexuality and desire. In other words, Cornwell's readers 'learn' that being gay means being sick, as gayness becomes constructed as a contagious disease (even a crime) in

[38] Sander Gilman, 'The Iconography of Disease,' in AIDS: Cultural Analysis, Cultural Activism, p. 88.

itself, an illness not only self-destructive, but destructive of family structures, of the national body, and of the human species. On the other, constructed as a gay plague, such representations of AIDS are, indeed, as Gilman argues above, part of the 'ongoing attempt to isolate and control disease,' and the 'limit to idea (or fear) of disease.' Homosexuality is really the limit of AIDS in Cornwell's novels: there is no danger or fear of catching the HIV virus through 'heterosexual practices'; and if those already sick -- gay men -- can be controlled and kept under surveillance, then the HIV virus can be contained.

Reading the body works on two levels in the series, and these two levels breed uneasiness. On the one hand, pathology and forensic medicine in the series are occupied with the anatomical body as an organism to be taken apart, measured, photographed, and analyzed. It is as if the body and its analysis were, scientifically, a neutral and objective ground. On the other hand, there is the 'other' body, the one which is clothed, culturally visible and readable. This body cannot quite so easily be taken apart and analyzed with microscopes and X-rays. The interaction between these two levels in the novels -- between the 'anatomical' body and the 'culturally constructed' body -- eventually reveals, however, how the 'anatomical' and the 'cultural' are both effects of various discursive and regulatory practices. Determining a man's sexual identity, for example, by checking 'for evidence of anal intercourse' is not some neutral medical activity, but already inscribed within certain disciplinary knowledges, because evidence of 'anal intercourse' already equals, for Scarpetta, being a 'homosexual.' That is, certain signs on the anatomical body reveal the presence of homosexuality and homosexual 'practices.'

(M)othering Monsters

If certain (groups of) people are excluded from the family on the basis of deviant sexuality and sexual practices, the family itself may appear as the site where things go 'wrong' -- the family may breed its own destruction. Family is a site of proper, or improper, gendering: a site of sexual politics where children can become improperly nurtured and gendered.

Behind Scarpetta's problems with her biological family -- mother, sister, and niece -- there is more than their conflicting views on careers, family-life, and what is 'proper' to a woman. In the following pages, I would like to argue that the Gault-trilogy examines the nature of motherhood, mothering, nurturing, biological reproduction, and the relation between mother and child. In other words, the trilogy examines the relation between nature and culture -- again -- when it opposes biological essentialism and determinism with social and cultural constructions of motherhood and nurturing. Despite the ideal of the nuclear family, biological mothers are substituted and replaced in the novels: for instance, Lucy is mothered by Scarpetta, and according to Scarpetta's psychologist friend Anna Zenner, Gault considers Scarpetta his mother, and Zenner is for Scarpetta like a substitute mother. However, this does not mean that these substitute mothers are necessarily better than, or valued over, biological mothers, or vice versa. Instead, there is a systematic problematization of mother-child relationships in the trilogy, and this problematization produces motherhood and mothering as something dangerous and monstrous, even as something giving rise to monstrosity. As I pointed out in Chapter I, blame is often put on mothers in serial murder novels. Further, while some of the features discussed here precede and succeed the trilogy, it becomes evident that it is in the trilogy that the idea of family comes to a crisis. Lucy's role is, of course, crucial in this crisis since she is the object of Scarpetta's mothering and since she plays a major role in the Gault affair. Ironically, as soon as Lucy is old enough to participate in the expert techno-family as a professional -- old enough to move from one family to another -- she becomes a problem.

Consider, then, Scarpetta's family, which offers various images and roles of women and motherhood as models of identification for the novels' readers. Scarpetta's family is specifically a family of women. There is Scarpetta herself, a wealthy upper middle class career woman with an unnatural and unsuitable job for a woman. She has no family and children of her own, but she mothers her niece Lucy. Then there is Scarpetta's aged mother, a Catholic and 'traditional' Italian woman, who holds on to holidays and family-gatherings, and who always quarrels with her daughters. There is also Scarpetta's middle-aged sister Dorothy, who cares more about men and her literary career than about her only child Lucy. Finally, there is young Lucy, with a 'male' job and who is a lesbian, and who will therefore not conceive children properly. Thus, in the Scarpetta family the images and roles of women and mothers differ according to age and generation (a young adult, a middle-aged woman, and an aged woman), career and children (a young professional woman, divorced middle-aged professional women with and without children, and a traditional house-wife), as well as sexual identity and sexual activity (lesbianism as opposed to heterosexuality, single heterosexual women with affairs, and mothers as sexual subjects, like Dorothy, as opposed to asexual images of mothers).

Indeed, images of (bad) mothering abound in Cornwell's work. Besides the Scarpetta family, we find further images of mothers in the trilogy. There is Scarpetta's employee, the pregnant -- and slightly greedy -- Susan Story who helps Gault for money and gets herself killed in Cruel and Unusual; there is Denesa Steiner in The Body Farm, who suffers from Munchhausen's syndrome by proxy and kills her daughter; there is Gault's mother, who continues to help her evil son and thus helps him kill her daughter Jayne; and there is Jayne in From Potter's Field, who has undergone hysterectomy and in whose case biological, natural, reproduction is therefore no longer possible. There is Scarpetta as Gault's mother -- mother to 'Kirk Scarpetta' -- to whom Gault '"brings ... what he kills"' as Anna Zenner suggests (FPF, p. 263). According to Zenner, Gault wants to impress Scarpetta with his murders. Gault has, as it were, replaced his biological mother with Scarpetta, since, because of her expertise, Scarpetta knows how to value Gault's '"art"' (ibid.) in contrast to his biological mother. Scarpetta knows how to read Gault because they resemble each other, whereas Gault's biological mother reads

him incorrectly and this misreading results in Jayne's death. Similarly, Marino does not read Steiner correctly in The Body Farm but starts an affair with her, whereas Scarpetta suspects her at an early stage.

In the Gault family, there is a difference between the father's and the mother's reading of their son. It appears that Gault's father has been able to read his son properly from the beginning. '"He's never been right from the day he was born,"' he remarks to Scarpetta when she visits the Gault plantation in From Potter's Field (p. 353). This is the father who 'somewhere in his father's heart ... still loved his son' (ibid.) but who, nevertheless, feels that '"About the only communicating I intend to do with Temple is with a double-barrel shotgun... I don't give a damn if he is my son"' (p. 359). He strongly condemns his son's crimes, but the mother, Rachael Gault, '"won't just accept it,"' as he explains, not to mention the fact that she 'had never faced the reality of her offsprings' blighted [sic] destinies' (p. 361). The influence of Gault's mother appears to be stronger than that of the father, and this influence is that of mothering, and, to some extent, family resemblance. Whereas Scarpetta finds no resemblance between the father and the children -- 'If Temple Gault was his son, I saw no resemblance' (p. 352) -- it is to the mother that we have to turn for resemblance: 'I was fascinated that Temple and Jayne had gotten their looks from their mother and their uncle, and I chose not to speculate but to attribute this to Mendel's law of dominance or his statistics of genetic chance' (pp. 362-363). Scarpetta thus absolves the father and finds fault in the mother. The mother is too soft, too feminine, too much out of this world, too much of a mother, whereas the father acts strongly and rationally towards his son's crimes: he condemns Gault like a proper man.

The image of Rachael Gault, which is being portrayed in From Potter's Field, is one of an elderly Southern lady. Rachael Gault, as Scarpetta imagines, had been in the past 'a fair beauty with light skin, eyes and hair' (p. 362), lives in a plantation, is somewhat distracted and out of this world. She insists on good manners, '"You know, I don't know your name. Now, Peyton, let's not be rude. Introduce me to this new friend you've made"' (p. 363), and is surrounded by things which suggest both beauty and old Southern money, family inheritance. These delicate surroundings are in contrast to

Gault's hideous crimes:

> An old brass chandelier hung from the high ceiling, and a graceful spiral stairway led to the second floor. In the living room were English antiques, oriental rugs and formidable oil portraits of people from lives past. Rachael Gault sat on a prim sofa, needlepoint in her lap. I could see through a spacious archway that needlepoint covered the dining room chairs. (p. 362)

In short, Rachael Gault is depicted as a figure of the past and as somebody who lives in the past.[39] No wonder, then, if Gault turns to Scarpetta for appreciation: his contemporary 'art' does not include oil portraits of people but instead, like a mad sculptor, he turns people into his art when he murders.

When Peyton Gault explains to his wife that their daughter is dead, she refuses to accept the news, 'resume[s] her needlework with nimble fingers,' and starts to discuss weather (p. 363). Finally Scarpetta manages to learn that Rachael has been sending money both to Jayne and Temple, and even '"told him he ought to look up his sister and wish her a Merry Christmas"' (p. 364). Gault did exactly as he was told, but not quite in the manner that his mother suggested. While the passage in the Live Oaks Plantation portrays Rachael Gault as a mother who refuses to accept the harsh realities of life, she offers a possible explanation for her son's behaviour: gender confusion between the twins. She also explains why Jayne's personality changed:

> 'I remember her at the piano playing up a storm, singing "Happy Birthday" to beat the band. Then Temple took her to the barn. She'd go anywhere with him. I never understood why. But Temple could be charming.'
>
> A tear slipped between her lashes.
>
> 'She went out to ride that darn horse Priss and never came back.' More tears spilled. 'Oh Peyton, I never saw my little girl again.'
>
> He said in a voice that shook, 'Temple killed her, Rachael. This can't go on.' (p. 368)

Had Rachael Gault acknowledged the real nature of her son instead of refusing to accept it (contrary to

[39] Similarly, of course, Scarpetta's own mother belongs to another age; to an age when children came home for Christmas and Thanksgiving -- something which Scarpetta rarely, if ever, manages to do. However, there is a class difference between Rachael Gault's family and that of Scarpetta: whereas the Gaults descend from an old Southern family, the Scarpettas are fairly recent emigrants from Northern Italy.

Peyton Gault), and had she not told him where to find his sister, Jayne could be alive. Rachael Gault should have stopped communicating with her son like her husband. In a way, then, it is suggested that Rachael Gault causes the death of her daughter, when she wishes her a Merry Christmas through Gault. Rachael Gault has not been able to read or mother her children properly, and the results are disastrous.

Like Gault looks for understanding, appreciation and mothering elsewhere, so does Lucy: both turn to Scarpetta. But substitute mothers can be just as dangerous because, as Dorothy argues, Scarpetta's mothering of Lucy ends up with Lucy becoming exposed to unnatural femininity and sexuality. Indeed, Lucy has become an object of jealousy and rivalry between the sisters. In The Body Farm Dorothy accuses Scarpetta of passing on lesbianism to Lucy:

> 'You ought to take a hard look at your contributions to Lucy's development. I mean, who the hell's she like?'
> 'Lucy's not like anyone I know,' I said.
> 'Bullshit. She's your spitting image. And now she's a drunk, and I think she's queer.' She burst into tears again.
> 'Are you suggesting I'm a lesbian?' I was beyond anger.
> 'Well, she got it from someone.' (p. 287)

Dorothy, then, suggests that lesbianism is something which one learns or copies, something one 'gets' like a viral and contagious disease -- unlike heterosexuality which is, in this logic, the natural, normal, and original state of human beings. Dorothy suggests that Lucy was infected by Scarpetta, because Lucy is Scarpetta's 'spitting image.' There is almost something panicky in Dorothy's emphasis on her own interest in men. When Scarpetta and Dorothy are having an argument over Lucy's sexual identity in The Body Farm, Dorothy claims that '"Nobody appreciates and enjoys men"' like she does (p. 286). She absolves herself and provides as proof her affairs with men. Scarpetta, however, is not a normal woman because she does not 'enjoy' ('consume' might be another word for it) men like Dorothy does. Instead, as Dorothy accuses Scarpetta in From Potter's Field, all of Scarpetta's relationships are with dead people. The idea of lesbianism as something copied is strengthened when Dorothy explains Lucy's lesbianism as part of hero worship: Lucy '"watches every goddam thing"' Scarpetta does (p. 285).

Lesbianism is not real and original in the sense that heterosexuality is, because lesbianism is, so to speak, a reflection, like Lucy is Scarpetta's spitting image. As for Scarpetta, she 'never enjoy[s] Lucy when her mother [is] around' (p. 287). Dorothy herself, Scarpetta thinks, 'mothered people she imagined much better than she did her only daughter' (p. 263).

'Queerness' is not only something contagious for Dorothy, but when Dorothy mentions it together with alcoholism in the above passage (Lucy's father was an alcoholic), being lesbian emerges as just another addiction (in the family). Lucy, we recall, is a person who becomes easily addicted: she smokes and drinks too much. As lesbianism is mapped together with such unhealthy addictions like alcohol and smoking, it becomes stigmatized through the rhetoric of health and illness. Lesbianism is an addiction, it is addictive, and it points to decay and lack of control. Thus Dorothy implies, indeed, that lesbianism is not original in the sense that heterosexuality is, for she would hardly be of the opinion that heterosexuality is a contagious addiction.[40]

Nevertheless, it could also be argued that Dorothy has not mothered Lucy properly. She is too much committed to her literary career and to her fictive characters (ironically, she writes children's books), and therefore ignores the 'realness' of her daughter. From this perspective, she resembles Scarpetta, who pays more attention to the dead than the living. She mothers (gives birth to and nurtures) her fictive children better than she mothers Lucy. Dorothy worries more about the effects of Lucy's problems on her own literary career than she worries about Lucy's wellbeing. As she complains to Scarpetta in The Body Farm, '"You're not the one who has a book about to come out. We're talking days, and then I'm on tour again. And what am I supposed to say when some interviewer asks about my daughter? How do you think my publisher is going to feel about this?"' (p. 299) Dorothy, too, is an 'unnatural' mother because she has a career of her own; hence she refuses to maintain the ideal of the nuclear family. Because Lucy cannot find proper mothering at home, she turns to Scarpetta -- and becomes, again, exposed to an unnatural female (a career woman). Thus the novels seem to both

[40] Note also how Lucy's affair with Carrie is not in a sense 'real': Carrie deliberately seduces Lucy, pretends to be in love with her. I shall return to the question of lesbianism later on in this chapter.

maintain and deconstruct mothering and the nuclear family. Lucy is, as it were, both motherless and doubly mothered.

> I excelled in science and was intrigued by human biology. I was poring over *Gray's Anatomy* by the time I was fifteen, and it became the sine qua non of my self-education, the vessel of my epiphany. I was going to leave Miami for college. In an era when women were teachers, secretaries, and housewives, I was going to be a physician. (BE, p. 162)

If mothers are everywhere in the trilogy and novels, fathers are either dead or absent. Scarpetta's father is dead, and so is Lucy's alcoholic father; Marino does not communicate with his only child (his son)[41]; and Denesa Steiner's husband is dead and thus unable to prevent the murder of his daughter in The Body Farm. When in From Potter's Field Chief Tucker asks Scarpetta about her motives for becoming a medical examiner, she simply answers, '"I don't know why"' (p. 26). As I pointed out in Chapter 1, Scarpetta does, however, reveal the following in Body of Evidence:

> I was only vaguely aware of what I was doing. The career I had embarked upon would forever return me to the scene of the terrible crime of my father's death. I would take death apart and put it back together again a thousand times. I would master its codes and take it to court. I would understand the nuts and bolts of it. But none of it brought my father back to life, and the child inside me never stopped grieving. (p. 162)

The wound in Scarpetta's life is the death of her father; we find the same scenario in Harris' The Silence of the Lambs, in which Clarice Starling values the memory of, and identifies with, her dead father and harbours negative feelings towards her mother.[42]

The passage above draws attention to two crucial things. Firstly, it provides an explanation for

---

[41] Marino's son may, in fact, be gay. Scarpetta tells us in From Potter's Field how she 'rarely heard him even allude to his only child' (p. 101). When Scarpetta hears Marino call his son Rocky, she expresses her astonishment at this name. Marino answers that his son's name is '"really Richard. When he was a kid we called him Ricky, which somehow turned into Rocky. Some people call him Rocco. He gets called a lot of things"' (ibid.). It is especially the last sentence -- together with Marino's homophobia -- that raises the reader's suspicions about the son.

[42] The father of Clarice Starling was shot to death when Clarice was a little girl, and afterwards her mother could not take care of the family. Clarice was first sent to the family of her mother's cousin, and, as she ran away from there, she was consequently sent to an orphanage. The wound caused by the death of the father becomes clear, for example, in Clarice's relation to, and identification with, both the 'father figures' in the novel, Jack Crawford and Hannibal Lecter.

Scarpetta's choice of career and suggests identification with the dead father; secondly, it implies that the 'crime' of her father's death is a 'crime' which destroys (the unity of) the Scarpetta family. Because the father dies, Scarpetta becomes alienated from her mother and sister and becomes an 'unnatural' woman, a masculine woman: she takes the place of the father in the family. Female masculinity is thus a crucial issue in the trilogy, and besides Scarpetta, we can notice a number of masculine female figures: Lucy, Carrie, Jayne, and Penn. Like effeminacy in men, female masculinity is monstrous and often raises suspicions of deviant sexuality. When it is mapped together with lesbianism, it becomes 'most threatening' -- a point made in Halberstam's Female Masculinity (p. 28). Hence we can perceive how there is tension and anxiety not only between heterosexuality and homosexuality/lesbianism in the trilogy, but also between female masculinity and lesbianism. The latter two should not be mistaken to be identical with each other, but instead, as Halberstam argues in Female Masculinity, 'By making female masculinity equivalent to lesbianism ... or by reading it as protolesbianism awaiting a coming community, we continue to hold female masculinity apart from the making of modern masculinity itself' (p. 4 6). The analysis of female masculinity therefore contributes to the very analysis of masculinity -- a fact ignored by many contemporary critics in the field of men's studies. Moreover, Halberstam rather speaks in the plural, for female masculinities. Similarly, she warns against using the term lesbianism as an 'umbrella term,' as a 'transhistorical label for all same-sex activity between women' (p. 51).[43]

As an infectious virus, then, Gault not only poses a threat to Scarpetta's status as an expert in the techno-family but he also brings questions of gender and sexual identity in Scarpetta's techno-family to the surface (and on the larger level of the national family). Indeed, gender trouble is not restricted to Gault as the gender trouble that he is made to represent is doubled in the case of Scarpetta herself. In terms of detective narratives, this doubling undoubtedly strengthens the genre's typical motif of doubling between the detective and the criminal, but such a doubling should be analyzed as being more

[43] On lesbianism and images of the lesbian body in culture and popular fictions, see also Barbara Creed's 'Lesbian Bodies: Tribades, Tomboys and Tarts,' in Sexy Bodies: The Strange Carnalities of Feminism, eds. Elizabeth Grosz and Elspeth Probyn (London: Routledge, 1995). Creed goes as far as claims that 'All female bodies represent the threat or potential -- depending on how you see it -- of lesbianism' (p. 87).

than a generic motif. We need to examine the context of such a doubling and the specificity of who or what is being doubled. Such an analysis illuminates how it is that popular detective fictions produce, represent, maintain or contradict contemporary values and ideals as well as images of normality and deviance. As I argued in the previous chapter, the feminism in the trilogy (and elsewhere) propagates a particular kind of feminism -- white, heterosexual, bourgeois, and seemingly liberal. If the trilogy presents various images and roles of women as models of identification (or disidentification) for readers, it specifically presents images of female masculinity. Scarpetta herself thus emerges as a contradictory figure: on the one hand, she both condemns difference and produces it as an other, but, on the other hand, she herself is that other she condemns, an abnormality, a masculine woman.

In the Scarpetta family, the father's death destroys the nuclear family structure of father, mother, and children, in which each member has his or her place. Because the family structure breaks down, the family members cannot retain their 'traditional' places and roles within the family, and the family cannot therefore maintain one of its primary functions, the sexual education of children into 'proper' roles. The father's absence results in abnormal femininity in the two daughters: in female masculinity in Scarpetta and in panicked femininity in Dorothy. The illness and death of the father is also related to hatred, aggression, sibling rivalry, and jealousy in the Scarpetta family. When Scarpetta and Dorothy meet at Scarpetta's house after Lucy's car accident in The Body Farm, this meeting turns into an argument about childhood traumas. Scarpetta is astonished that 'Dorothy did not recognize a script that was as old and predictable as we were' (p. 286). This is the old script of Cain and Abel, Scarpetta and Dorothy, Jayne and Gault, sibling rivalry within the family. In the Scarpetta family, sibling rivalry is specifically connected to the sick father and his power over the family, to how, as Scarpetta recalls, the sisters 'learned to hate each other quietly while Father was dying' (ibid.). This is the father who 'dominated [their] lives from his sickbed down the hall' (ibid.), and this is the father over whose death Scarpetta 'did not cry' since 'He had been sick so many years' that she 'became expert at cauterizing [her] emotions (BE, p. 161). This is the father whose place Scarpetta takes within the broken family. As Dorothy reminisces, accusingly, in The Body Farm, '"Cooking, fixing things, taking care of the car,

paying the bills. You were just a regular man of the house when we were growing up"' (p. 286). Moreover, Dorothy accuses Scarpetta of being doubly a father, of becoming Lucy's 'father' and being '"more of a man"' than she herself is, which is '"so unfair, and then [Scarpetta] gets the tits in the family to boot. *The man in the family gets the big tits!*"' (ibid.). In the latest Scarpetta novel, Black Notice, Dorothy continues in the same vein, when she comments the relationship between Scarpetta and Wesley, now dead. She remarks, '"You were the *man* in that relationship, *Miss doctor-lawyer-chief*. I've told you before and I'll tell you again, you're nothing but a man with big tits."'[44]

Dorothy thus associates Scarpetta's taking their father's place not only with doing what is 'proper' to fathers or men and what men do in the family -- fix things, for instance -- but also with monstrous appearances and gendering. The Scarpetta family emerges as a site of improper gendering: a site of sexual politics where things go wrong. That is, Scarpetta in particular is not properly heterosexual and a normal female, as she does not perform heterosexual femininity correctly. Instead, Scarpetta has become a monstrous figure: a mixture of male and female, a man with 'big tits.' The point when things begin to go wrong in the Scarpetta family seems to be when the father becomes ill and is not able to do what fathers usually do: fix things, take care of the car, pay the bills, and earn money. Instead, Scarpetta's father becomes an immobile, yet powerful, figure; a figure who cannot take care of his family. He is unable to perform masculinity and fatherhood actively from his sickbed. Since he is unable to do what father physically do, somebody else -- Scarpetta -- takes his place within the family structure and becomes 'a regular man of the house.' After all, a family has to have a father, even if that father is a female with big tits. Scarpetta admits her double-position as child-father, man-woman, in Cruel and Unusual when she confesses that,

> In a sense, I had become my father after he died. I was the rational one who made A's and knew how to cook and handle money. I was the one who rarely cried and whose reaction

[44] Cornwell, Black Notice, p. 262. In this novel Scarpetta mourns Wesley, and it is noticeable that Scarpetta's mourning is expressed through a rhetoric of dirt and cleanliness. Otherwise an obsessively clean person, now her house is dirty: '"I used to be so neat,"' she complains to Senator Lord (p. 5). Now that Wesley is dead, her house has turned into 'perfectly arranged shit' (ibid.).

> to the volatility in my disintegrating home was to cool down and disperse like a vapor. Consequently, my mother and sister accused me of indifference, and I grew up harboring a secret shame that what they said was true. (p. 397)

This is then how Scarpetta defines 'fatherhood' and 'masculinity': men are rational, intelligent, and active, and they (at least Italian men) know how to cook, handle money, do not cry, and are calm. Through such a definition of masculinity, we can envisage a definition of femininity, a counter-image: 'woman' would thus be someone who is irrational, emotional, passive, and is not capable of handling money.

Suspicions about Scarpetta's gender and sexual identity are raised more implicitly, too. In the middle of From Potter's Field Scarpetta and Marino wonder whether it would be better for Scarpetta to stay alone in her house or to leave the house and seek protection against Gault elsewhere:

> I drifted to sleep pondering about this and had a disturbing dream. A figure with a long dark robe and a face like a white balloon was smiling insipidly at me from an antique mirror. Every time I passed the mirror the figure in it was watching with its chilly smile. It was both dead and alive and seemed to have no gender. (p. 207)

The epistemological uncertainty evident in Scarpetta's disturbing dream about gender (through a mirror-image)[45] is dissolved by the heavily (and necessarily) heterosexual episode which succeeds it.[46] Scarpetta goes downstairs, where Marino is sleeping on the couch:

---

[45] Another mirror-image (these are rare in the trilogy) can be found later on in From Potter's Field. Scarpetta has just met Lucy and Janet and we find her, an aging woman, in the act of self-reflection. It is as if both Scarpetta's age and her work have become visible on her body:

> I returned to the bathroom as they went out the door, and I washed my face and stared in the mirror. My blond hair seemed grayer than it had this morning and the cut had somehow gotten worse. I wore no makeup, and my face looked like it had just come out of the dryer and needed to be pressed. Lucy and Janet were unblemished, taut and bright, as if nature took joy in sculpting and polishing only the young. (p. 160)

[46] We cannot altogether dismiss questions of marketing and money: emphasis on heterosexuality might be a question of readership. When Cornwell published Hornet's Nest, it was rumoured in the CORNWELL-discussion list that she had first written the main character in the novel (Andy Brazil) as a female figure, but turned her into a male one later on. In the novel Andy falls for a middle-aged female police professional, and with Andy being a man, the novel remains safely heterosexual.

> I sat next to him on the couch. It occurred to me that I had a nightgown on and he had never seen me like this, but I did not care.
>
> 'Is something wrong?'
>
> I laughed ruefully. 'I don't think there's much that isn't.'
>
> His eyes began to wander, and I could feel the battle inside him. I had always known Marino had an interest in me that I could not gratify. Tonight the situation was more difficult, for I could not hide behind walls of lab coats, scrubs, business suits and titles. I was in a low-cut gown made of soft flannel the color of sand. It was after midnight and he was sleeping in my house. (pp. 207-208)

The anxiety produced by the first episode, the anxiety about not being one gender or another, about being outside the male-female binary, vanishes with the re-emergence of the binary system and heterosexual desire in the second episode. On the one hand, being outside the proper binary system is evoked in a dream (or rather a nightmare), and being outside here is not a question of joyful liberation from heterosexual ideals, but one of anxiety and distress: to have no gender is disturbing. On the other hand, to have no gender might be more accurately interpreted here as having no proper gender. That is, proper meaning that one is either male or female, masculine or feminine. This would better explain how heterosexual desire is brought into the picture in the latter episode with a classic scenario, in which a man and a woman are intimately linked together by a shared sense of danger and threat: 'It was after midnight and he was sleeping in my house.' Even though Marino is sexually attracted to Scarpetta, he admits to her in the novel that she is '"more like a guy"' (p. 196), and, according to Marino, '"some people think"' she is gay (p. 181). In the latter passage above, then, Scarpetta looks and behaves like a heterosexual woman -- a properly gendered person. Dressing in 'a low-cut gown made of soft flannel the color of sand' and needing protection makes Scarpetta a woman. Now she 'could not hide behind walls of lab coats, scrubs, business suits and titles,' that is, dressing like a man and performing a rational and active masculine position. The initial implication is that beneath the surface of her masculine stance, Scarpetta is nevertheless -- and truly -- a woman, vulnerable, soft and feminine inside (therefore, as readers we should look beyond the surface of lab coats and titles into her soft heterosexual femininity).

However, we could read the passage from the perspective of the performative so that 'being woman' reveals itself in the passage as a performative and dressing-up (or rather, in this case,

undressing). In other words, Scarpetta performs traditional femininity, she is weak, soft, and not in control: she is now the damsel in distress. Significantly, later on in the novel Lucy's girlfriend Janet accuses Marino of '"acting like a man,"' because Marino is being '"overly protective'" and wanting '"to be in charge and control everything"' (p. 295). Commander Penn, another professional woman within a masculine organization, dresses inside her elegant apartment 'in black jeans and a gray wool sweater with sleeves shoved up' (FPF, p. 117). In contrast to her masculine job and clothing, her apartment is 'filled with light and art and the fragrances of fine woods' (p. 116), and Scarpetta sits on 'a soft leather couch the color of honey' (p. 117). This time, in female company, Scarpetta prefers wine over her usual Scotch -- Scotch she drinks with men, even '"like a man,"' as Wesley remarks in the novel (p. 54). Penn may look masculine in her black jeans and sweater, but her home -- her 'inside' -- is overtly soft and feminine.

In addition, Gault's sister Jayne, too, is described as a masculine woman to the extent that, as a biological female, she looks like a 'homosexual' in the company of Gault. In From Potter's Field, we learn that Jayne 'was dressed in a man's topcoat and an Atlanta Braves baseball cap. Her head was shaved' (p. 39), and further, 'At a glance [Jayne] did not look like a female' (p. 47), she had owned 'one pair of men's black jeans' (p. 138), 'two pairs of gray sweatpants and three pairs of athletic socks' (p. 140), and she 'had worn men's undershirts instead of bras' (p. 141). On the contrary, as I pointed out in the previous chapter, Scarpetta depicts Jayne's body in the autopsy in terms of nature and landscape. She 'refeminizes' Jayne's body; a body dressed in and concealed by masculine clothing. The above examples, among others, exemplify what Butler means with gender as performative, and sex as being neither essential nor prediscursive. While the trilogy maintains a heterosexual ideal and binary system, it simultaneously undermines that ideal and system by drawing the reader's attention to the fabrication of ideals and genders through, for example, various practices such as clothing.

While clothing, cross-dressing, and, in particular, clothing as disguise (false appearances), have always played a role in detective fiction (consider, for instance, the various disguises that Sherlock Holmes and his colleagues adopt), it seems that they have not always received the critical attention they

deserve. In generic criticism they have often been taken as a 'natural' part or device of detective stories; that is, in generic terms it is 'natural' for a detective figure to disguise him- or herself in order to obtain information. Sometimes, of course, the very life of the detective figure, or that of the criminal, may depend on disguise, on him/her being able to pass successfully as other than him- or herself (it would not perhaps be too much to suggest that in some ways detective fiction is fiction about passing as another, as normal and innocent).[47] But clothing and/as disguise should not be simply read just as a typical device or formula in detective fiction but should also be thought otherwise -- 'identity-wise' -- as drawing attention to questions of gender and sexual identity. 'Dress,' as Kaja Silverman has noted, 'is one of the most important cultural implements for articulating and territorializing human corporeality -- for mapping its erotogenic zones and for affixing a sexual identity.'[48] Thus, for example, when a female investigator dresses herself up as and adopts the position and role of a 'feminine' woman (wearing the 'disguise' of a miniskirt, high heels, and heavy make-up) to chat up a male suspect, this should not be narrowly read as a typical device of detective fiction. It should also be read in the larger framework of how popular fiction and detective stories partake in stereotyping and in identity and sexual politics: what is, for instance, regarded as 'feminine' or 'masculine' in a particular genre, society, point of time, by a particular writer, and how such fictions maintain and strengthen certain images of femininity and reject others -- or how such fictions challenge and rewrite traditional images of femininity.

If Scarpetta's expertise in forensic pathology and medicine -- reading bodies and analyzing causes of death -- in the series occupies a central position both in epistemological and ontological terms, reading bodies proves to be more problematic than it at first appears. That is, it is difficult to read socially and culturally visible bodies, clothed bodies. Does the anatomical body tell the same story as the clothed body? In other words, does clothing necessarily reveal or prove some inner core or depth, an

---

[47] In spy fiction, in particular, passing as another -- as one of the enemy -- is of crucial importance.

[48] Kaja Silverman, 'Fragments of a Fashionable Discourse,' in Studies in Entertainment: Critical Approaches to Mass Culture, ed. Tania Modleski (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1986), p. 146.

essential correspondence between sex and gender, the inner and the outer, depth and surface, or should we, again, rather think of it in terms of the performative? Clothing is, in fact, yet another field in the trilogy which both supports and undermines the binary systems of sex and gender as well as sexual identity. Clothing may function as a visible marker of rank, degree, profession, or competence; for example, Scarpetta's masculine lawyerly suits and lab coats not only hide her female body in a mostly masculine community but also show and prove her status as medical expert. Clothing thus communicates credibility, authenticity, and membership in a particular community, while it also provides us with signs -- deceptive and otherwise -- of how to read gender and sexual identity. The latter especially applies to Scarpetta, Lucy, Carrie, and Jayne, who all 'cross-dress' and who are all connected to images of deviant sexuality and female masculinity. Indeed, as Marjorie Garber notes in her book Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing & Cultural Anxiety,

> ... one of the most important aspects of cross-dressing is the way in which it offers a challenge to easy notions of binarity, putting into question the categories of 'female' and 'male,' whether they are considered essential or constructed, biological or cultural. The current popularity of cross-dressing as a theme in art and criticism represents, I think, an undertheorized recognition of the necessary critique of binary thinking, whether particularized as male and female, black and white, yes and no, Republican and Democrat, self and other, or in any other way.[49]

Clothing is, further, related to acts and behaviour, to proper gender behaviour. As noted above, the Gault-trilogy is full of biologically female characters who dress in masculine clothes and some of whom have masculine jobs: Scarpetta, Penn,[50] Lucy, Carrie, and Jayne. The relation between Scarpetta and her sister Dorothy, for example, is eventually constructed so as to point to 'feminine' and 'masculine' clothing and identity. When Scarpetta and Dorothy meet in The Body Farm, Dorothy tries to engage Scarpetta in a discussion of 'the change' (p. 283), but Scarpetta does not realize that Dorothy

[49] Marjorie Garber, Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing & Cultural Anxiety (New York: HarperPerennial, 1993), pp. 10-11.

[50] Note that Penn's first name is ambiguously Frances. When pronounced, the difference between a woman's name (Frances) and a man's name (Francis) disappears.

is referring to the menopause. Scarpetta refuses to participate in this feminine discussion and 'turn[s] on the radio' instead (ibid.). She describes Dorothy in the novel as being 'acutely insecure, which was why she could be so mean, and she had a habit of changing her hair and dress regularly' (p. 282). Dorothy is also 'fashionably thin in jodphurs and lace-up boots' (p. 282) and has expensive jewelry (p. 297). By Point of Origin, she has had a facelift and '"her teeth crowned"' as Lucy tells Scarpetta (p. 160). Dorothy is not 'stable' but changes with the latest fashion. Scarpetta's wardrobe, however, points to stability and practicality -- she is immune to fashion and thus has a firm, individual, mind -- and is less feminine, even though Lucy thinks in Cruel and Unusual that most of Scarpetta's clothing '"is too dressy. All these lawyerly suits in midnight blue and black, gray silk with delicate pinstripes, khaki and cashmere, and white blouses. You must have twenty white blouses and just as many ties"' (pp. 92-93). Scarpetta's wardrobe is full of uniforms of the professional woman: lawyerly suits equivalent of the professional male suits. Then, Dorothy is divorced from Lucy's father, is overtly heterosexual, and writes children's books. According to Lucy in Cruel and Unusual, Dorothy '"sleep[s] with every dickhead who takes her out to dinner and a movie"' (p. 396). In short, Dorothy is the opposite of Scarpetta, who is described by Marino in From Potter's Field as being '"more like a guy"' (p. 196), is suspected of being gay, dates rarely, and is committed to dead people. In The Body Farm, Scarpetta herself reveals this to the reader when she ponders over her affair with Wesley: 'I was a woman who was not a woman. I was the body and sensibilities of a woman with the power and drive of a man' (p. 341).[51] Indeed, a man -- doctor-lawyer-chief -- trapped in a woman's body.

I already showed earlier on how Dorothy accuses Scarpetta of passing on lesbianism to Lucy, but female masculinity is coupled with lesbianism more clearly in the case of Lucy herself and Carrie; Carrie even passes as a man in From Potter's Field. In their case female masculinity and lesbianism are, further, mapped together with criminality, and this fact effectively produces the masculine woman and

[51] Sex between Scarpetta and Wesley is depicted, strangely, in the context of female intimacy. In The Body Farm, Scarpetta marvels how Wesley's hands 'moved as if they knew a woman's body as well as a woman did' (p. 341), and that she had told Wesley that she 'had never known a man to truly enjoy a woman's body' (p. 342). Otherwise Wesley is depicted as a masculine man.

the lesbian as deviant criminals. As we learn by the end of The Body Farm, Gault planted Carrie to work inside the FBI, and to work with Lucy on CAIN. When in The Body Farm Scarpetta visits Lucy in the FBI she also meets Carrie for the first time, and immediately dislikes her without quite knowing why (this uneasiness is, typically, an indication of criminal presence). Carrie looks feminine: she is 'tall, with a graceful but strong ride' (p. 41), her hair is 'long and pinned back in an old-fashioned French twist' (p. 42), and she is 'in her mid-thirties, her smooth skin, dark eyes, and cleanly sculpted features giving her face a patrician beauty both remarkable and rare' (ibid.). Nevertheless, Scarpetta is 'bothered by her eyes' (ibid.), and when Carrie leaves Scarpetta and Lucy, Scarpetta is 'startled by the emotion flickering in [Lucy's] eyes' (ibid.). Scarpetta's suspicions concerning Carrie deepen as Lucy is reluctant to discuss her new friend and withholds information (paranoia, as we know, is always near Scarpetta). Soon Scarpetta begins to suspect that Lucy has a drinking problem, for Wesley has seen Lucy at a bar with somebody -- possibly with Carrie -- having '"a pretty good time"' (p. 46). Scarpetta's comment is revealing, '"The side you're talking about is completely foreign to me," I said, and did not feel relieved. The idea that there were elements of Lucy I did not know was only more disconcerting' (p. 47). Lucy is becoming a mystery of her own to Scarpetta.

In the first Scarpetta novel, Postmortem, Lucy is only ten years old and a child-genius, 'doing high-school level science and math,' and playing with computers already (p. 28). Scarpetta's attitude towards Lucy is protective, because she does not want Lucy 'to be like' her, 'robbed of innocence and idealism, baptized in the bloody waters of randomness and cruelty, the fabric of trust forever torn' (p. 32). This is why Scarpetta 'had never fully explained to Lucy the details of [her] profession' (ibid.).[52] Lucy plays no significant role in Body of Evidence and All That Remains (another serial killer novel), but appears again in Cruel and Unusual, this time as a beautiful seventeen-year-old (she grows

[52] Similarly, Wesley wants to protect his wife Connie against knowing too much about his job and the world of violent crime -- because, as he explains to Scarpetta in From Potter's Field, '"of what it does to us. We change color, just as when cities become sooty, moths change color"' (p. 57). On the other hand, for Scarpetta, intimacy involves knowledge: she thinks that she '"could [not] be intimate with someone who does not understand what it's like"' for her (p. 56).

In fact, this wish to protect prevents Connie or Lucy from seeing the world as it 'really' is, violent and cruel -- they innocently see the safe surface of the world only.

amazingly fast whereas Scarpetta remains more or less of the same age), whom Scarpetta scarcely recognizes at first. Little by little, Lucy starts to help Scarpetta in the investigations with her special talent for computer programming -- a talent not traditionally feminine. In The Body Farm, Lucy is about to graduate from the University of Virginia, doing her internship at the FBI, and has been asked to come back to the FBI after she graduates, to work at the Engineering Research Faculty, ERF (to which Scarpetta, by the way, has no access). Lucy is thrilled, but Scarpetta is not, because she still does not want to share her reality with Lucy; she does not want Lucy's mind to become contaminated by violence.[53] Instead, she wants to keep things from Lucy and to prevent Lucy from seeing the violent world beneath the world of normality. Scarpetta herself, however, is the problem, is the very reason why Lucy is now working for the FBI. Her 'mothering' of Lucy has contaminated Lucy's mind and Lucy has become her 'spitting image,' as Dorothy argues. Then, in From Potter's Field, Lucy, the computer whizz-kid, appears to be the only one who can locate Gault, since it is she who created CAIN and gave Gault access to CAIN through Carrie.

In Cruel and Unusual, when Lucy comes to visit Scarpetta, she has changed from a 'pudgy teenager with long, dark red hair' (p. 85) into 'a lean, leggy athlete' who is 'dressed in snug, faded jeans several inches too short, a white blouse, a woven red leather belt, loafers, and no socks,' and Scarpetta is 'fairly certain she was wearing neither makeup nor bra' (ibid.). What Scarpetta is most surprised at is 'the change in her body' (ibid.). It is in this same novel that Dorothy begins to '"worry that [Lucy's] going to start looking masculine"' (p. 82). Looking masculine here is not separate from what one does: Lucy lives '"inside her brain all the time,"' as her grandmother complains to Scarpetta. According to her, living inside one's brain and reading 'science books' is also what destroyed Scarpetta's marriage (p.

---

[53] The idea and fear of contamination becomes clear in this novel:

> The clean pages my young niece was showing me in her pristine computer would soon carry names and physical descriptions that would make violence real. She would build a data base that would become a landfill of body parts, tortures, weapons, and wounds. And one day she would hear the silent screams. She would imagine the faces of victims in crowds she passed. (p. 40)

I shall return to this passage and to the idea of contamination in closer detail in the next chapter.

83). In Black Notice, Dorothy accuses Scarpetta of corrupting Lucy: '"You filled her with all this guns and ammo and crime-solving shit! You turned her into a fucking little computer nerd by the time she was ten, when little girls should be going to birthday parties and riding ponies and making friends!"' (p. 261). Hence, 'being feminine' excludes athletic fitness, science, computers, reading, and the use of one's brain.

As Lucy starts to work for the FBI, she starts to use 'FBI-clothes.' When Scarpetta visits Lucy at the ERF in The Body Farm, 'Lucy was easy to spot. She was the only analyst wearing FBI fatigues' (p. 38). In From Potter's Field, the first time they meet, Lucy wears 'sweatpants, running shoes, and a dark FBI sweatshirt with a hood. Her auburn hair was short, her sharp-featured face flawless except for the bright scar on her forehead. Lucy was a senior at UVA' (pp. 150-151). Lucy is also 'athletic and superbly fit' (p. 152).[54] Later on, Lucy has 'changed into khaki slacks and a denim shirt with the FBI logo embroidered on it. She wore hiking boots and a sturdy leather belt. All that was missing was a cap and a gun' (p. 187). In contrast, Lucy's new girlfriend Janet (another FBI-agent in training) has 'shoulder-length blond hair and blue eyes that were almost violet' (p. 160) and 'could fill a polo shirt in a manner that was riveting' (p. 188). On a later occasion, Lucy is again 'typically dressed in range pants, boots and a ski jacket' (p. 254). Lucy's wardrobe remains constant after the trilogy, and thus in Cause of Death we find her 'dressed in FBI sweats and ski socks' and looking 'flawlessly healthy' (p. 54); in Unnatural Exposure, 'whenever [Scarpetta] saw her, she was either in khaki fatigues or sweats' (p. 103);

---

[54] Garber, in her reading of Stephen Gordon (a biological woman in men's clothing) in Radclyffe Hall's famous lesbian novel The Well of Loneliness (1928), remarks in Vested Interests that

> Yet re-read from the perspective of the 1990s, Stephen Gordon's anguished glance in the mirror offers an object lesson in historical relativism, for the monstrous body of 1928 is the *ideal female body of the fitness generation*. Cropped hair, menswear suits, thin flanks -- these are not only the signature characteristics of 'cross-dressed' entertainment figures like Annie Lennox or k.d. lang or Madonna, but also the high-style looks of the mainstream fashion magazines since the sixties. (p. 136; emphasis added)

Later on, Garber refers to the words of sexologist Havelock Ellis in 'Sexual Inversion in Women' (a survey published in 1895). Ellis, she writes, 'noted that sexually inverted women had not only a "pronounced tendency to adopt male attire" and a "capacity for athletics" but also a "pronounced taste for smoking"' (p. 155). See thus Chapter IV, 'Sexual Inversion in Women,' in Havelock Ellis' Studies in the Psychology of Sex, Vol. II: Sexual Inversion, 3rd rev. ed. (Philadelphia: F.A. Davis Company, 1922).

and in Point of Origin, Lucy wears 'Nike running shorts and a tank top' (p. 153).

We never find Lucy wearing anything 'feminine,' such as skirts, jewellery, or make-up. Lucy occasionally borrows Scarpetta's clothes but rejects the more feminine-looking ones; instead, she prefers Scarpetta's warm-up suits and leather jacket. As the examples above illustrate, she mainly wears FBI fatigues and clothing that could be described masculine in general: khaki slacks, boots, leather belts, and the like. In the FBI environment these clothes look normal -- normal like a uniform. In other words, Lucy blends in with the other agents who have no reason to wonder about her masculine clothing, because the FBI is a very masculine community on the whole and Lucy's clothes express that masculinity and profession. Lucy dresses, as it were, like one of the guys, but even when she is not working, she wears the same clothes. Like Scarpetta's lawyerly suits and her lab coats indicate profession, competence, and expertise, so do Lucy's FBI fatigues. Such professional clothes also hide the two women's female body in male communities and organizations (masculine clothing can, however, also emphasize the female body precisely through the contrast between the female body and masculine clothing/uniform).

But besides professionalism, Lucy's clothing tells another story, too, that of sexual identity. In the FBI environment her masculine clothing functions as a kind of camouflage, which hides her sexual identity and which helps her pass, albeit in a very strange way, as normal, as heterosexual. In another context and environment, that clothing -- for example, 'hiking boots and a sturdy leather belt' -- might be read differently.[55] If Lucy's clothing works as naturalizing her into her environment, cannot we say the same of the clothes that the male agents wear? Such clothes are a sign of belonging to a specific masculine organization and community, and such clothes make membership in, and the masculinity of, that community culturally visible and recognizable. Clothing is thus a way to blend in, and sometimes it can be a way to make oneself visibly different, as when one does not conform to and refuses a

[55] What I have in mind here is the expression of sexual identity through clothing and appearance -- through various subcultural signs. In fact, Creed uses the term 'lesbian uniform' in 'Lesbian Bodies' when she refers to the 'lesbian-feminism of the 1970s ... obsessed with appearance' (p. 101). Within such lesbian-feminism, 'The proper lesbian had short hair, wore sandshoes, jeans or a boiler suit, flannel shirt and rejected all forms of make-up' (p. 102).

particular dress code. Consider here, too, the signs of a 'real' FBI agent in Harris' The Silence of the Lambs. Clarice Starling, another agent in training, is given the opportunity of getting involved with the hunt for Buffalo Bill. Clarice gets a new ID card from her boss, which, to quote, 'simply said FEDERAL INVESTIGATOR -- and expired [sic] in a week' (p. 44). She also gets an FBI car, a telephone, and later, a gun. She also wonders whether she should sew her jacket like other the FBI agents, who 'sewed washers into the tail of the jacket so it would swing away cleanly' (p. 190). In other words, it is through certain signs and possessions that the FBI agent blends in, is authenticated, and becomes visible.

By Cause of Death, Lucy declares to Scarpetta that she has become tired with office work and computers:

> 'Look,' she said with feeling, 'I'm tired of programming computers and robots, and then every time something big goes down -- like the bombing in Oklahoma City -- the guys head off to Andrews Air Base and I get left. Or even if I go with them, they lock me in some little room somewhere like I'm nothing but a nerd. I'm not a goddam nerd. I don't want to be a latchkey agent.' (p. 60)

In other words, Lucy does not want to be a 'goddam nerd,' a position usually reserved for non-masculine men in many popular texts and films (contrary to Lucy's grandmother, for whom computers and 'living inside one's brain' signify masculinity). In the passage above, the nature of a 'real' FBI agent becomes equivalent with a masculine position; a position which requires an active role in 'something big.' Acting and being on the move are opposed to computer programming and being locked up 'in some little room,' and this pair is constructed as the binary of masculine and feminine, 'real' work (the masculine body of the action man) and 'merely thinking' (the mind of the feminine/female computer-nerd). A similar pattern can, in fact, be seen in the American TV-series 'Profiler,' in which the computer expert in the FBI's investigative team is a gay man. When the other team members fly off to investigate various crimes (often serial murders), the computer expert usually stays in the FBI headquarters, finds information through the computer, and examines data. It is not difficult to see his

position as a feminine one, even though computers and communication technology have traditionally been a masculine domain.

While a certain dress code may be expected from the members of a particular community, the same applies to their behaviour within that community. As I showed in Chapter 2, spaces are not neutral in the trilogy, but they are constructed not only along the lines of class and race but also of gender and sexual identity. Lucy's position and blending in with her environment is complex and there is a double-bind in her position in the FBI. The same environment which hides her sexual identity actually keeps her in the closet; her environment continuously threatens to expose her secret. The fact that Lucy works as a beautiful woman in a masculine and heterosexual organization specifically threatens to expose her secret because she is often asked for dates. Since she constantly refuses to date men -- to act like a proper woman -- she is labelled as lesbian. As a hierarchically constructed masculine organization, the FBI, as portrayed in Cornwell's novels, rejects and condemns non-heterosexual behaviour. The FBI does not allow deviance in its members -- deviance within the family. Even though women can wear masculine clothing within the community, they are still expected to date men, because 'the production of heterosexual space is not only tied up with the performance of heterosexual desire but also with the performance of gender identities.'[56] For why, as the heterosexist masculine logic goes, would a beautiful woman (ugly women do not count here) refuse to date men unless she is lesbian?

This is what takes place in the two novels which succeed the trilogy, Cause of Death and Unnatural Exposure. Lucy is not interested in the men who ask her for a date, and, accordingly, she is stigmatized immediately: rumours of her being a lesbian begin to circulate (the same is said of Scarpetta, too). Not dating members of the opposite sex is a clear sign of deviance, of one's lesbianism or homosexuality and helps in distinguishing the deviant from the normal. Moreover, one of Scarpetta's enemies, Investigator Ring in Unnatural Exposure, deliberately tells the prosecutor in the case of Carrie

[56] Gill Valentine, '(Re)Negotiating the "Heterosexual Street": Lesbian Productions of Space,' in BodySpace, p. 147.

(now imprisoned) that Lucy had an affair with Carrie.[57] If this fact was made public within the FBI, then, as Wesley says to Scarpetta, '"What usually happens is you stop getting promoted, get lousy assignments, field offices out in the middle of nowhere. She and Janet will end up three thousand miles apart. One or both will quit"' (p. 215). The heterosexual masculine organization thus punishes its members for improper gender and sexuality. The homogenous FBI family does not allow deviation in its members, and the homogeneity of the family is strengthened through making visible, condemning, and driving out the deviant members -- those who never really belonged to the family in the first place, those outsiders who pretended to be insiders. Law enforcement cannot accept 'alien' members within itself; in fact, the rejection of non-heterosexuality is a question often explored in detective novels featuring gay and lesbian police detectives (the same applies to non-white detectives).

I noted above that Lucy's masculine environment in the FBI makes it 'natural' for her as a female to wear masculine clothing. This same clothing works to camouflage her identity as lesbian and makes passing possible. Simultaneously, however, through her clothing and job, she is, as it were, constructed as desiring women as a 'masculine' woman -- because she is a masculine woman. It appears that in Cornwell's novels the mainstreaming of lesbian characters has some limits that cannot be broken: it would be impossible, monstrously abnormal, for a 'feminine' woman to desire another 'feminine' woman in the novels. Both of Lucy's lovers are portrayed as feminine. Carrie disguises herself as a feminine woman at the beginning of The Body Farm, with her hair 'long and pinned back in an old-fashioned French twist' (p. 42). Janet, in From Potter's Field, with her 'shoulder-length blond hair' and the way she 'could fill a polo shirt' is feminine (femme) compared to Lucy. Even Marino is 'unable to shift his eyes from Janet's chest' (p. 188). Similarly, we need to consider Carrie's behaviour in a later episode in From Potter's Field: she passes as a man (looks exactly like Gault), goes to a bar and picks up a very feminine-looking woman, Apollonia, who was '"black. She was real pretty in this little red

[57] Ring also tells Scarpetta that he suspects Keith Pleasants of the murder that takes place in the novel. The colleagues of Pleasants at the landfill -- where the body is found -- think that Pleasants is gay, because '"he doesn't date women or even seem interested in them when other guys make remarks, jokes"' (p. 91). Not dating the members of the opposite sex or refusing to participate in heterosexist jokes point to homosexuality.

dress. It was low cut and kind of short. I remember she had bright red lipstick and all these little braids with little lights winking in them"' (p. 309).[58] These scenarios suggest that a woman desires another woman if, or because, she is masculine (or vice versa, a feminine woman desires a masculine woman).

Moreover, as regards the mainstreaming of lesbian characters, the relation between Lucy and Janet in the novels is somehow desexualized, and Lucy herself is sometimes depicted as a tomboyish figure. As I pointed out above, Lucy is 'a lean, leggy athlete,' and wears 'neither makeup nor bra.' It is noteworthy, too, that when in Cruel and Unusual Scarpetta is astonished by Lucy's looks, what astonishes her in Lucy's body is not Lucy becoming a woman (having a feminine body), but Lucy's change from a pudgy teenager into an athlete (a boyish figure). Similarly, we never see Lucy and Janet embracing or kissing each other in the novels; instead, they seem to be either working on a case or jogging and exercising like good friends instead of passionate lovers. It is after the trilogy that Lucy is 'sexualized' by Scarpetta; and sexualized in ways which even suggest something incestuous. During the investigation in Unnatural Exposure, Scarpetta and Lucy share a motel room and recall Lucy's visits to Scarpetta's house. Then, 'A pillow sailed through the dark and hit me on the head. I threw it back. Then Lucy pounced from her bed to mine, and when she got there didn't quite know what to do, because she was no longer ten and I wasn't Janet. She got up and went back to her bed, loudly fluffing pillows behind her' (p. 310). Similarly, in Point of Origin, they share a motel room and Scarpetta pays attention to, and appreciates, Lucy's body as if it were the first time she sees it:

> It was as if I had never really noticed her full lips and breasts and her arms and legs curved and strong like a hunter's bow. Or maybe I simply had refused to see her as someone apart from me and sexual, because I chose not to understand her or the way she lived. I felt shamed and confused, when for an electric instant, I envisioned her as Carrie's supple, hungry lover. It did not seem so foreign that a woman would want to touch my niece. (p. 58)

There is, indeed, something sexual and incestuous in both passages.

[58] Note, thus, that this 'masculinization' of Carrie takes place after the affair between Lucy and Carrie has ended, and Lucy no longer desires Carrie.

Lucy and Janet have a home of their own only as late as Point of Origin -- in an neighbourhood which is 'bohemian and mostly gay' (p. 148) -- when Lucy no longer works for the FBI. Even then their home is instantly broken because of Lucy's new job. Significantly, the reader thus never witnesses this lesbian home as a permanent one; however, we are told that Scarpetta has visited Lucy and Janet numerous times. The fact that Lucy has been 'homeless' for a long time and that she has often stayed at Quantico, under the surveilling gaze of the FBI, has made a certain kind of policing of lesbianism and sexuality literally possible. This policing becomes evident in The Body Farm, when Lucy's bed has been found empty at night, a fact which immediately couples lesbianism with criminality.

While suspicions of Lucy's lesbianism grow in Scarpetta's mind in The Body Farm, so do suspicions of Lucy's involvement in breaking into the FBI's Engineering Research Faculty's classified files in the middle of the night. As she remarks to Lucy, '"It has been alleged that there have been nights when your bed was empty"' (p. 171). Lucy's bed has been empty either because she has slept in Carrie's bed (and with Carrie), or because she has left her bed in order to break into the FBI, or both. By juxtaposing the story about Lucy's lesbianism and the story about the criminal break-in, it is not only the second story which finally becomes deemed as criminal, but also the one concerning Lucy's sexual identity. Hence lesbianism becomes contextualized and constructed as criminal as well as pathological, and, as in Carrie's case, predatory. Questions about criminal acts quickly become questions about immorality and deviant sexual identity.[59] In fact, at one point in From Potter's Field, Marino blames Lucy's lesbianism for their present problems with Gault: '"If Carrie hadn't been Lucy's girlfriend, ERF probably never would have been broken into, and we wouldn't have Gault running around inside the computer"' (p. 192). There is always something pathologically dangerous or contagious about non-

[59] As I pointed out earlier on, sex in the Scarpetta series always seems to be 'wrong.' Even Scarpetta's affair with Benton Wesley has to be kept secret because Wesley is married. Thus, having an affair becomes something illicit, criminal: 'I returned the cap to its proper position as I thought of anyone taking a picture of us together. I was reminded we were outlaws, and the merry moment vanished' (FPF, p. 86); 'Wesley and I once came here often. Then we began knowing each other too well, and we no longer went out in public too much' (ibid., p. 191; see also pp. 54-58). Scarpetta's affairs typically involve something illicit or criminal: either it is a question of having an affair with a married man, or suspecting the man of betrayal or criminal activity. Nevertheless, in Lucy's case deviant sexual desire is more directly associated with criminality.

heterosexuality in the trilogy, and this is used to justify the surveillance of lesbian and gay characters: lesbian women and gay men constitute a risk to national security and to the proper functioning of law enforcement agencies.[60]

All in all it appears that while Cornwell's novels 'liberally' have a lesbian character in a central position -- lesbianism is thus 'tolerated' in mainstream publishing and lesbianism is made palatable to the majority of readers -- that lesbianism is at the same time produced by a homophobic and heterosexist discourse. Lesbianism in the novels is desexualized (for reasons of marketing, let there be no lesbian bodies which are too sexy and no lesbian relationships which are too romantic) as well as criminalized and shown to be in need of controlling and policing. Indeed, the way lesbianism is presented in Cornwell's novels reminds me of Butler's words in Gender Trouble, when Butler criticizes Julia Kristeva's view on lesbianism. For Kristeva, Butler argues, lesbianism becomes a site of irrationality, and 'the description of lesbian experience is effected from the outside and tells us more about the fantasies that a fearful heterosexual culture produces to defend against its own homosexual possibilities than about lesbian experience itself' (p. 87).

Lucy marks a failure, Scarpetta's failure to read correctly; Scarpetta fails as a reader because her starting-point is fundamentally heterosexual and essentialist. Her feelings towards Lucy can at best be described as ambivalent, and since Postmortem, the ambivalence is there. This ambivalence couples Lucy's talent in computer-programming with her sexual identity -- both dangerous, potentially destructive, 'practices.' While Lucy's talent is valuable, it can work in an opposite direction, too, as becomes evident in the trilogy. In Postmortem Scarpetta first finds out that Lucy's interest in computers is potentially dangerous: when she comes home from work, she discovers that Lucy has cleaned up her

[60] This has been a motif in numerous novels and films, and it has a counter-part in reality. Homosexuality, in particular, has been regarded as a risk to national security and condemned as a crime. For example, Bruce Mazlish remarks the following in 'Turing's Test and Sexual Identity' when he discusses the fate of the famous British mathematician and cryptographer Alan Turing, who was gay: 'In the Cold War that followed, homosexuals were viewed as especially liable to blackmail, and the Criminal Justice Act of 1948 (building on the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885), defined anew Gross Indecency, i.e., homosexuality, as a crime, now more seriously to be prosecuted.' In Contention: Debates in Society, Culture, and Science, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Spring 1996), p. 93. Turing and the 'Turing-machine' occupy a central position in the development of computer systems.

computer data base. Scarpetta recalls another computer incident, which happened years ago:

> I was remembering Dorothy calling me, absolutely hysterical, several years ago. While she was out shopping, Lucy had gone into her office and formatted every last one of her diskettes, erasing everything on them. On two of them was a book Dorothy was writing, chapters she hadn't gotten around to printing out or backing up yet. A homicidal event. (p. 31)

Lucy's potentially destructive talent in computer-programming marks more than a talent, and Lucy can, in fact, be argued to stand for a double-bind. With this I mean that Lucy is not only one who erases data and information, but one who also disrupts and writes anew the heterosexual binary system and family in the novels. Despite this, Lucy is one under erasure herself, because her sexual identity as lesbian is under erasure, to be kept secret. Furthermore, already in Postmortem, Lucy's presence can be dangerous. She forgets to lock a window in Scarpetta's house and thus makes it possible for the novel's serial killer to gain access into the house. Lucy is a vulnerable point, an opening, one who can break up the biological family (an object of rivalry between the two sisters) or the techno-family (Lucy as an opening for Gault, providing him, albeit unknowingly, with an entry into CAIN), or the national family (the dangerous lesbian).

Scarpetta's description of Lucy as remarkably beautiful and unblemished in The Body Farm -- Lucy is 'frighteningly beautiful and brilliant' (p. 170) -- and, as such, untouched by the cruelty of the world, ties in with both Lucy working for the FBI and with lesbianism. In other words, Lucy becomes blemished by Scarpetta, lesbianism, and her work. We recall how after Lucy's car accident in The Body Farm Scarpetta visits Lucy at the hospital, and she does not immediately recognize her 'because she did not look like anyone I knew. Her hair, stiff with blood, was dark red and standing up, her eyes black-and-blue' (p. 251). As I already pointed out in the previous chapter, at the end of the novel 'a scar on her forehead bright red' marks Lucy's initiation into the world of Scarpetta and the end of innocence. When Scarpetta meets Carrie in this novel for the first time, she is 'startled by the emotion flickering in [Lucy's] eyes' when Lucy looks at Carrie. At this point, Scarpetta fails to read Lucy correctly. When

she does realize later on what she witnessed, she recalls Lucy's perfection and innocence before her contamination by Carrie's lesbianism: 'I remembered [Lucy's] perfect bones and skin, and incredible green eyes. I remembered the way she had looked at Carrie Grethen and believed that was part of what went wrong' (p. 250). Despite Scarpetta's ostensibly positive attitude towards non-heterosexuality in the novels, that non-heterosexuality is nevertheless 'wrong.' Note, too, how Carrie's looks change from 'patrician beauty' in The Body Farm to being 'gaunt and glassy eyed, with harsh white hair' in From Potter's Field (p. 282), as if her looks now reveal on the surface the inner sexual and criminal decay and corruption. Similarly, first described as pretty, vain, and narcissistic in Cruel and Unusual, Gault looks 'emaciated and disheveled' at the end of From Potter's Field (p. 409).[61]

Finally, Lucy's sexual identity becomes, as it were, a subplot and a mystery of its own in the novels: is it going to remain a secret, or is Carrie going to reveal the secret and thus destroy Lucy's career at the FBI? Paradoxically, the moment Lucy's secret is out -- revealed to Scarpetta's team and to the readers in The Body Farm -- is also the moment when it is closeted in the novels, and her lesbianism becomes a haunting secret within the techno-family. As suggested earlier on, Lucy's lesbianism is under erasure and it is, as it were, introduced only to be erased. For the sake of her career (as Scarpetta and Wesley argue), Lucy's lesbianism has to remain a secret and she cannot come out within the FBI. But what, then, is the politics of 'coming out' itself?

The word 'out,' argues Diana Fuss, 'cannot help but carry a double valence for gay and lesbian subjects. On the one hand, it conjures up the exteriority of the negative -- the devalued and outlawed term in the hetero/homo binary.'[62] Fuss continues, 'On the other hand, it suggests the process of coming out -- a movement into a metaphysics of presence, speech, and cultural visibility' (ibid.). Lucy's 'secret' is a form of violence and homophobia in itself, and helps to maintain the binary opposition of heterosexual/homosexual, which Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick has called the 'pseudo-symmetrical

[61] Scarpetta's dream of the genderless balloon figure in the mirror might be read in the same vein. That is, her work has contaminated and confused her gender and raised suspicions of her sexual identity.

[62] Diana Fuss, 'Inside/Out,' in Inside/Out: Lesbian Theories, Gay Theories, ed. Diana Fuss (New York and London: Routledge, 1991), p. 4.

opposition.'[63] Lucy's secret not only closets her, but also the other members of the techno-family (as well as readers) who know about her secret. In the novels, Lucy's coming out does not exist as an option if she wants to hold on to her job in the FBI.[64] Thus Lucy's lesbianism simultaneously provides the novels with a tension between, and a subplot of, secrecy and disclosure; tension not unlike the 'actual' murder mysteries with which Scarpetta is involved. Coming out to 'cultural visibility' would mean separation from Janet and an end to promotion. In other words, coming out would drive Lucy and Janet into the margin (in more ways than one), into 'offices in the middle of nowhere' -- much like the gay men who are driven to Key West.

Deviant gender and sexual identity within such a hierarchical and same-sex community such as the FBI is therefore a question of margins, borders, and limits. In other words, it is a question of border-making and exclusionary practices -- as in who belongs and does not belong to the 'FBI-family,' who 'head[s] off' and who 'get[s] left' behind, who has been an outsider all along, and who is hetero and who is homo. Lynda Hart, in her study on representations of lesbian sexuality and aggression, Fatal Women: Lesbian Sexuality and the Mark of Aggression, writes that,

> The prominent manifestation of lesbian sexuality as a 'secret' derives not from some hidden, mysterious, or esoteric *content*, but is rather a discursive *act* performed by the hierarchical ideology that systematically reconstructs the hetero/homo binary. By tracing some of these 'ghosts' as recurrent perseverations -- pathological repetitions of a profoundly paranoid heterosexist/patriarchal culture that persistently and ostentatiously exhibits and produces its necessary other in order to keep it under erasure -- I hope to expose the discursive/material violence of this system's effort to secrete (set apart, sift, distinguish) the hetero from the homo. (p. iv)[65]

---

[63] Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, 'Epistemology of the Closet,' in The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader, p. 55.

[64] On coming out and passing, see, for example, Carole-Anne Tyler, 'Passing: Narcissism, Identity, and Difference,' in differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies, 6, Nos. 2 + 3 (1994), and Amy Robinson, 'It Takes One to Know One: Passing and Communities of Common Interest,' Critical Inquiry, 20, No. 4 (1994).

[65] Hart's study is problematically dedicated to 'Aileen Wuornos and for all the women who have been vilified, pathologized, and murdered for defending themselves by whatever means necessary.' Aileen Wuornos has been called (mistakenly, though) the first female serial killer in the USA. As a prostitute in Florida, she killed seven white middle-aged men in the 1980s, and Wuornos is also a lesbian.

The Gault-trilogy deals, among other things, with the outsiders in the family, with the problem of distinguishing 'the hetero from the homo' in ways which cannot be regarded as neutral but, instead, as heterosexist and homophobic. Indeed, heterosexuality in the trilogy and elsewhere in the novels 'produces its necessary other in order to keep it under erasure' and reinforces conservative morality and values. In effect, non-heterosexual characters are introduced only to be constructed as criminal and contagious -- as the 'polluting person' -- in need of policing and surveillance. If there is anything subversive in the trilogy, it is to be found, paradoxically, through that heterosexism and homophobia. That is, a close reading of the very introduction of deviant non-heterosexuality within the heterosexual ideal, reveals how heterosexuality and the binary gender system in the trilogy are essential fabrications, instead of being the real, natural, order of things.

* * *

Let me now sum up the arguments presented in this chapter: I first pointed to the problem of how to distinguish the serial killer from the 'normal' person. I argued that the trilogy locates serial murder and criminality within what it constructs as deviant sexual and gender identity, and thus it strengthens conservative ideas of normalcy and citizenship. I suggested that we could examine Gault's 'identity' -- or, rather, 'identities' -- in the context of what Judith Butler has called the performative. Gault disrupts the boundaries between, and the categories of, man and woman, masculine and feminine, hetero and homo, inner and outer, natural and unnatural, depth and surface: Gault stands for incoherence as he always emerges as an other. Secondly, I claimed that what finally makes Gault a frightening figure is that he disrupts 'normal' masculinity and the binary system of gender. He is described as an effeminate man, and this effeminacy itself becomes a sign of deviance in the trilogy. Thirdly, I examined how effeminacy is systematically connected to gay men and the HIV virus in Cornwell's novels --

effeminacy is a sign through which it is possible to separate the hetero from the homo (the normal masculine man from the deviant and sick one). After this I argued that mothering becomes a site of monstrosity in the trilogy since serial killers are born through bad or improper mothering. Finally, I claimed that monsters not only include serial killers but also masculine women. Female masculinity and lesbianism are mapped together with monstrosity and serial murder in the trilogy.

While the trilogy is engaged with crime detection, it is at the same time engaged with questions of gender and sexual identity, with the 'mystery' of deviant sexual identity. Non-heterosexuality emerges as a site of unintelligibility and psychopathology. That is, unintelligible because of the 'suicidal' behaviour of the gay man who has anal intercourse despite the HIV virus, and because of the psychotic, addictive, and pathologically dangerous behaviour of the lesbian. These two questions, crime and sexual identity, become so intermingled that it becomes difficult to examine one without the other in the trilogy. In the next chapter, 'Cain and CAIN: Flesh and Letter,' I shall continue the discussion on serial murder from another angle, that of nature, technology, reproduction, and family.

4. Cain and CAIN: Flesh and Letter

Technology and Raising CAIN: Threats and Promises

> I have said many times that what I really consider myself to be is a scribe to the people out there doing the real work, whether it is the forensic pathologists, the FBI agents, the police, the scientists, the prosecutors... Someone needs to tell their stories, go in their labs and find out exactly what they're doing today. 'Well, I'm using a gas chromatograph to do this...', or '...the scanning electron microscope to determine which element this is...' They need someone like me to do that, and that's really what I consider my job.[1]

> Lucy showed us more screens and elaborated on other marvels in words difficult even for me. Computers were the modern Babel, I had decided. The higher technology reached, the greater the confusion of tongues.[2]

If ascertaining and maintaining the differences between the expert and the layperson, the dead and the living, man and woman, or between hetero and lesbian/gay, are problematized in the trilogy, so is the relation between the human and the machinic, the natural and the artificial, physis and techne. Fighting serial crime is framed not only in the field of medicine but also in the fields of technology and science -- it is both medicalized and technologized. The threats and promises that technology poses in the trilogy consist of the double-role of technology in fighting crime (technology as a pharmakon, poison and remedy) and relate to prosthetic, technological, extensions of the 'human.'

Indeed, technology is that which contaminates the human as becomes clear through the numerous doublings and reduplications of humans, criminals, crime, and crime scenes in the trilogy. In other words, serial murder in the trilogy is mapped together with technology -- with the death that technology, and particularly technical mechanisms for reproduction, doubly suggest: the 'lifelessness' of technology as such and the death that is inscribed within the structure of technological reproduction (i.e., repeatability, iterability in the Derridean sense). Described by Scarpetta as a virus, then, Gault is

[1] 'Verbal Evidence,' pp. 16-17; emphasis added.

[2] BF, p. 41.

a virus not only in the medical sense but he is also a technological virus, a virus that 'had somehow gotten into ... our technology.' Gault is a virus that reproduces itself, like technical mechanisms reproduce a 'copy' of the 'original,' and such a reproducibility points to death. Like contagious non-heterosexuality, technical mechanisms produce 'spitting images.'

The problematic role of new technology and science in the fight against real crime was acknowledged already in the nineteenth century. In When Old Technologies Were New (1988), Carolyn Marvin quotes an Inspector Bonfield as remarking to a Chicago Herald reporter in 1888 that '"It is a well-known fact that no other section of the population avail themselves more readily and speedily of the latest triumphs of science than the criminal class."'[3] Marvin refers to the double-role (I would call it a double-bind or pharmakon) of especially communication technology in the battle against crime, when she writes that 'The conviction that new technologies of communication could help fight crime was no less popular than the idea that they would encourage it. There was no aspect of criminal surveillance or police intelligence to which their application was not suggested' (p. 97). Thus, various technologies can not only be used for criminal purposes but can create new forms of criminal activity. Also Ruth Harris points this out in her Murders and Madness. When referring to the work of French criminologist Henri Coutagne in the 19th century, she writes that 'Rather than stressing a purely "anthropological" account of criminality, Coutagne emphasized a social and economic interpretation, taking into consideration the new criminal opportunities opened up by "modern" society in which rapid communication systems helped to promote new and more ingenious forms of theft and fraud' (p. 89). In today's world, we face more and more such 'criminal opportunities' due to the developments in computer technology and the whole digital culture.

Historically speaking, technology and science are also a part of detective fiction. We only need to recall Sherlock Holmes and his use of the latest scientific discoveries. It appears, however, that the role of technology and science vary depending on the type of detective fiction under discussion. Thus,

---

[3] Carolyn Marvin, When Old Technologies Were New: Thinking About Electric Communication in the Late Nineteenth Century (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 92. For instance, Marvin includes numerous examples of the use of the telephone for criminal purposes at the end of the nineteenth century.

for example, we can note how they play a relatively small role in the act of detection in hard-boiled fiction (e.g. Chandler and Hammett), or in classic puzzles and whodunits (e.g. Sayers, Christie, and, more recently, Amanda Cross), or in the metaphysical detective story. Christie's novels, for example, stress the power of the intellect instead of technology and science. As I argued in the previous chapter, in police procedurals the situation can be different because the analysis of the crime scene occupies a central position in the investigation. Such an analysis depends on various technical skills and expertise; and Cornwell's novels, like many others serial murder novels, very much fall into this category. The role of technology and science is more crucial in her work than in the fiction of many other contemporary women detective writers (e.g. Barnes, Paretsky, Grafton, Muller),[4] or in contemporary lesbian detective fiction (e.g. Scoppettone, Forrest, Wings, Hart). In thrillers the situation can also be quite different so that in medical thrillers in the vein of Robin Cook, for example, technology and biotechnology are of central importance, and in techno-thrillers the very subject matter is technology and ownership, technology in the 'wrong' hands.

Indeed, what Jessica Mann wrote in 1981 in her Deadlier than the Male about the role of scientific knowledge in detective novels, does not thus seem valid in the context of contemporary detective fiction. Mann remarked that 'The very refinements of science which gave birth to the classic detective novel and were just within the grasp of the non-scientist have now reached the stage where they are not suitable material for reader, or even hero, participation. Even the "police procedural" story tends to be either uninteresting (because of its technicalities) or unconvincing' (p. 52). Understandably, Mann could not foresee the development of biotechnologies shaping our bodies and the development of communication technologies and their effects on various forms of writing, both thematically and otherwise. Neither could she foresee the growing interest in, and the further politicization of, the human body. Moreover, during the last couple of decades, popular culture has increasingly turned to the human body as a subject matter, and serial murder novels have a central place in popular fictions about the

[4] For example, Marcia Muller's serial sleuth Sharon McCone begins to use computers and other apparatuses rather late in the series, and even then with the help of her nephew Mick. Similarly, Linda Barnes' sleuth Carlotta Carlyle has a roommate who helps her with computers.

body and bodily violence. Police procedurals with their 'technicalities' have become fascinating for the mass-reading audience.

In Cornwell's work technology and science play a crucial role in the investigation of crime, and one of the most important reasons for this is the main character's profession as medical examiner: the human body is an object for scientific study. The role of science and technology increases in the Gault-trilogy, since the trilogy deals with serial murder, psychopathological crime. As I shall argue later on in this chapter, the Gault-trilogy is a good example of how serial murder in novels is coupled with questions of information, information processing, and archiving -- with communication technologies. When the killer turns out to be a stranger who chooses his or her victims randomly, questions of criminal records, typicality, statistics, profiles, and classification become central to the investigation. Such killers are compared with and contrasted to former killers and with former series of murders, solved and unsolved.[5] Statistics, for example, and the definition of the normal are made possible by (communication) technology. Joan Copjec has even argued that 'In detective fiction, to be is not to be perceived, it is to be recorded.'[6] This seems especially true as regards serial murder novels with their typologies and classifications of killers.

Besides Cornwell, as concerns various technological apparatuses used as investigative tools in contemporary popular fictions on serial murder, one of the most astonishing ones is certainly Jeffery Deaver's The Bone Collector, which features former 'head of forensics for the NYPD,' Lincoln Rhyme (p. 33). Rhyme is quadriplegic and suicidal, and reluctantly agrees on investigating the murders. As he is paralyzed, he depends in his investigation on other people and especially on various technological apparatuses; therefore both people and technology serve as his prosthetic hands, eyes, and ears at crime

[5] There are, of course, 'habitual criminals' (e.g., mafia hitmen, gang members, bank robbers, and so on) in detective ficiton, the information of whom is stored in various criminal archives. But serial killers differ from those criminals in that they become objects of typologies, categories, and classifications; and specifically, classifications of normality and abnormality.

[6] Joan Copjec, Read My Desire: Lacan against the Historicists (Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 1994), p. 167. Copjec even intimately links statistics to detective fiction when she writes that 'Statistics ... created a mathematical expectation within which we could come to believe in the calculability of risk. Before statistics, this sort of expectation was strictly impossible, and so, I would argue, was detective fiction' (ibid.).

scenes. The useless and immobile body of Rhyme is extended by technology which, as it were, prosthetically takes the place of active masculinity. The novel even has an appendix (excerpts from the book written by Rhyme) which explains such investigative tools as ALS, AFIS, D-G, SEM, and so on. Or, we could also consider such recent popular fictions of serial murder which are situated in the 19th century and early 20th century -- the era before the computer and the fax, but, for instance, with the telephone, telegram, and the (popular) press already in existence -- and in which new (communication) technologies play a central role. In Caleb Carr's novel The Alienist (1995), set in New York in 1896, the first-person narrator John Moore is a reporter for the *New York Times*. In the novel Moore and his friends try to solve the murders of young male prostitutes, and they innovatively communicate with each other through telephones and telegrams. Moreover, with the help of a psychiatrist friend (the 'alienist' in the novel), they make an attempt at a kind of elementary profiling of the killer, and there are references to scientific techniques for criminal identification and classification recently adopted in police investigation -- anthropometry, for instance, the object of which is to 'record the body-part sizes of known criminals.'[7] Anthropometry was developed at the end of the nineteenth century by Alphonse Bertillon, who also developed 'the current form of the mug shot, as well as the composite drawing, which he used to compare criminals' features. By the turn of the century Bertillon's system was used throughout Europe and the United States, and a modified version was used in Britain, where police were also beginning to use fingerprints.'[8]

Anxiety over technology, surveillance techniques and the role of communication technology has been especially crucial in other genres (popular and otherwise), and particularly in science fiction, during the past few decades. Contrary to studies made on science fiction, it seems that the relation

---

[7] Caleb Carr, The Alienist (London: Warner Books, 1995), p. 130. In this context, note how new developments in communication technology quickly become part of serial murder novels: the Internet and virtual reality have become popular frameworks -- and more than that -- in many novels. See, for instance, such novels as Holt's Watch Me, Phillip Finch's F2F (London: Orion, 1995), Cole Perriman's Terminal Games (New York: Bantam Books, 1995), and George Foy's The Shift (London: Bantam Books, 1997).

[8] Robin Woods, '"His Appearance is Against Him": The Emergence of the Detective,' in The Cunning Craft, p. 24.

between humans, machines, and technology has not been given enough attention in studies on detective fiction. Nevertheless, the situation appears to be changing as detective fiction as well as films are more and more engaged with new communication technologies -- the Internet, virtual reality, and the digital culture in general -- thematically and otherwise. Hackers, computer experts, and surveillance technology abound in contemporary popular detective writing and film, not only voicing promise and hope of the possibilities opened by the Information Society and the 'Information Super Highway,' but also voicing anxiety as to the coming true of a kind of nightmarish Orwellian 1984-society, in which privacy is a thing of the past.[9]

Cornwell's novels, nevertheless, are not concerned with explicit critical analyses of the role of technology and communication technology in contemporary society. If such technologies pose any threat, they are presented as a threat to Scarpetta and her techno-family (representatives of institutional law enforcement agencies) in the form of abuse of such technologies by criminals -- and not by government or state officials, for instance, whose use of such technology always seems justified and proper. The threat aspect becomes manifest through the violation of CAIN by Gault and Carrie in From Potter's Field, or in the e-mail messages that Scarpetta receives from the deranged murderer in Unnatural Exposure. This kind of contextualization of communication technology with criminal intentions and criminal activities turns the threat aspect into a question of deranged, psychopathic

[9] An article in Time by Joshua Quittner, news director for Pathfinder, summarizes the uses and abuses, the threats and promises, posed by communication technology on everyday (American) life:

> After all, most of us voluntarily give out our phone number and address when we allow ourselves to be listed in the White Pages. Most of us go a lot further than that. We register our whereabouts whenever we put a bank card in an ATM machine or drive through an electronic toll booth on the highway. We submit to being photographed every day -- 20 times a day on average if you live or work in New York City -- by surveillance cameras. We make public our interests and purchasing habits every time we shop by mail order or visit a commercial Website.

'Invasion of Privacy,' Time, August 25, 1997, p. 36. Quittner's list is vast as regards U.S. examples, and he further refers in his article to cellular telephones, supermarket scanners, registering to vote, employee ID scanners (which Microsoft, for example, has developed further so that the whereabouts of every employee are known at any given time when s/he is at work on the Microsoft premises; this is not mentioned by Quittner however), and so on. On technology and control, see also G.J. Mulgan, Communication and Control: Networks and the New Economies of Communication (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).

individuals or criminals groups, and not into a larger question on the level of society, government, bureaucracy, and business.[10] The latter question would concern the privacy and rights of citizens: who, when, and where has the right to use such technologies and archives for what purposes, and what is the information that the state collects of its citizens. These are the classic paranoid questions à la 'X-Files.'

Instead, since the Cornwellian landscape is inhabited by psychopaths (like in the trilogy), science, technology and communication technology play the role of rationality against madness and psychopathy in the novels -- that is their justification. That is the role of technology, 'usually understood to be part of the domain of economic and functional efficiency, related to rationality, science, and industrial production.'[11] The use of technology serves as the weapon against madness and strengthens the reader's belief that madness can be destroyed, that society can still function properly and efficiently and, yes, crime can be localized, contained, and fought successfully with that technology (well, at least until the next book in the series).

If, firstly, technology in the trilogy is used as a means to fight and analyze crime, then secondly, like Gault, it breeds uneasiness on another level -- that of its relation to the 'human.' Technology cannot be thought of as something separate from and external to ourselves, but, as the editors of The Technological Imagination suggest,

> the pervasive technologization of everyday life, since the beginning of this century at least, has shaped and transformed all cultural processes from the ways in which we communicate with each other to the ways in which we perceive ourselves and the world. Values, beliefs, and attitudes -- both personal and social -- are inextricably bound up with technical developments. For as we propose, modern technology cannot be thought of as merely a set of tools or techniques which are 'used' to produce objects or commodities. (p. viii).

Technology is, in effect, one of the ways through which we define and perceive 'ourselves.' Technology in the Gault-trilogy is one of the things which draws (attention to) the boundaries of what is considered

[10] By this I do not wish to suggest what Cornwell should or should not do in her novels; I simply wish to draw attention to the role of technology in her work.

[11] 'Foreword' to The Technological Imagination: Theories and Fictions, eds. Teresa de Lauretis, Andreas Huyssen, and Kathleen Woodward (Madison, Wisconsin: Coda Press, 1980), p. vii.

human, 'Man' as a species, the family of Man. As Mary Ann Doane, among others, asserts:

> 'Man' is the one who speaks, the one who is aware that he must die, the one who is able to use language not only as it is dissociated from referentiality but as it contradicts it intentionally, and finally, the one whose use of tools is extensive, elaborate, and sophisticated enough to constitute a technology.[12]

Our relation to technology is not just a question of what separates humans from other species (boundaries between species), but, as Doane continues, it has to do with bodily boundaries and limits because 'technology has been inextricable from certain explicit or implicit assumptions about the body and its limits and limitations' (pp. 1-2). For example, such assumptions regard the body as 'flawed' or as 'the last site of humanness' (p. 2), or see technology as a prosthetic tool either extending or replacing the body, or dream of 'disembodiment, of eliminating a body marked by failure, lack, limitation' (p. 22). Technology is thus inseparable from our bodily boundaries and limitations.

The trilogy certainly envisions technology as a weapon against, and a means of surveillance of, psychopathic criminals; as a weapon which can, unfortunately, be abused by criminals. In addition, a closer reading shows how technology breeds uneasiness, particularly through its relation to the idea of the human. The serial killer, like technology, is that which is not human. The novels signify a prosthetic culture: how the human and the natural body are contaminated and prosthetically extended, replaced, and cancelled by technology. Such a contamination becomes evident, for example, through the technological metaphors that are used to represent the mind and the way it functions. Technology thus forms a site which contaminates the 'naturalness' of the human and which brings 'lifelessness' to the heart of the human. Contamination also works the other way, as in when Scarpetta personifies the computer system CAIN: she calls it a 'he,' and wonders whether 'he knew what we were saying' (FPF, p. 176).

The way communication technology, in particular, breaks the boundary between home and work,

[12] Mary Ann Doane, 'Technology and Sexual Difference: Apocalyptic Scenarios at Two "Fins de Siècle,"' differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies, 9, No. 2 (1998), p. 1.

private and public, inside and outside, physical world and information world, is exemplified by its paradoxical role in Scarpetta's life. Since Cruel and Unusual she has lived in a very quiet, safe, and rich neighbourhood with private security in Richmond -- a fact which Lucy is quick to comment on when she comes to visit her:

> Lucy slowly scanned her surroundings, her eyes finally resting on me. 'You've got cameras in your doors, motion sensors, a fence, security gates, and what else? Gun turrets?'
>
> 'No gun turrets.'
>
> 'This is your Fort Apache, isn't it, Aunt Kay? You moved here because Mark's dead and there's nothing left in the world except bad people.' (pp. 89-90)

Scarpetta lives inside a fortress (indeed, her home is her castle), but the boundaries of this fortress are constantly undermined by the communication technology she has at home -- telephone, fax, modem, computer, TV, and so on. Electric communication of criminals and criminal acts knows no ordinary boundaries as it is not held back by cameras, motion sensors, fences, security gates, or guns.[13] Scarpetta's life is by and large controlled by an attempt to maintain the boundaries between the inside and the outside, the private and the public, her home and the outside world, but she fails time after time, because her home is assaulted both literally and electronically by Gault and other criminals, by the living and by the dead.

The irony here is partly that while the security system is there to keep an eye on potential intruders, it keeps an eye on Scarpetta, too: 'Red lights on the burglar alarm's control panel across from the bed glowed ominously, and when I turned or rearranged the covers, motion sensors I did not arm while I was home watched me silently with flashing red eyes. My dreams were strange' (CU, p. 26). Such a surveillance system watches Scarpetta, and in the place of Scarpetta, as her prosthetic eyes. This, however, is the double-bind of the surveillance and security system: it not only keeps an eye on potential intruders, 'bad people,' but also on those who have installed the system, because such systems

[13] Power cuts do not have an effect on telephone lines: they do not prevent unpleasant telephonic communication from taking place. See, for example, Body of Evidence, pp. 320-322.

survey everybody and turn everybody into a potential criminal. Even though Cornwell's novels refer to such surveillance technology, there is no criticism as to the more negative aspects of the prevalence and effects of such systems in and on society on the whole. As I argued earlier on, the anxiety that technology produces in her work is of a different nature. The emphasis, again, seems to be on the threat that psychopathic individuals pose on 'decent' citizens, and this threat then justifies any (conservative) means (gated communities, surveillance systems or guns) and any systems of surveillance which keep the psychopaths from intruding into 'our' homes. 'Our' inevitably translates as white, middle class, professional citizens; those who can afford such systems in the first place, and who, according to this logic, have more to lose than others. The 'outside' of Scarpetta's wealthy neighbourhood is constructed as a dangerous place inhabited by psychopathic murderers and other criminals, like the poor (black) people of the projects.[14] Since this outside can invade the privacy of her home and neighbourhood at any moment, any means are justified and finally become deemed as necessary and natural. The privacy of one's home therefore becomes a boundary. There are, again, those who can afford to protect themselves and their homes against criminals and those who cannot, and anyway -- ultimately -- if they cannot afford it, what do they have to lose in the first place? Scarpetta, as we are emphatically and repeatedly told, always has more -- more identity, more property -- to lose than others.

In the trilogy, fears concerning technology and its abuse and theft by criminals materialize clearly through CAIN, the Crime Artificial Intelligence Network developed by Lucy. '"*CAIN?*"' Scarpetta marvels in The Body Farm, '"That's a rather ironic acronym for a system designed to track violent criminals"' (p. 39). The acronym is 'ironic' because it reminds us of another Cain, the biblical one, who indulged in sibling rivalry and murdered his brother Abel. What emerges in this mythological story, as I pointed out in Chapter 2, is how Cain implicates, even contaminates, the whole mankind and future generations through his murderous act. From the beginning, the word 'brother' evokes murder

[14] 'Crime' is therefore localized outside that wealthy, upper middle class neighbourhood, the boundaries of which need to be patrolled. Pay attention to these words of Scarpetta in From Potter's Field: 'Green Top was an area gun shop that catered not to felons, but to normal citizens who enjoyed sports and home security. I reminded Marino of this, although I could not deny that by normal standards I owned too many guns and too much ammunition' (p. 290). It is normal to own guns and protect one's home with them.

and not just positive affiliation: there is always the possibility that the family breeds its own destruction, as in the case of the Gault family. To use the acronym 'CAIN' is even more ironic here, suggesting more than the irony of using Cain to catch other murderers; or, should we conclude that it takes one (CAIN) to know another? The doubling and coming together of the acronym CAIN and the name Cain -- homophonically identical yet different in their written forms -- and the implications of the story of Cain, designate violence and threat in the relation between humans and machines, humans and technology: the 'doubling' of humans by technology. Hence, CAIN presents a threat of to the living presence of humans, to self-presence and self-identity. CAIN, like Gault as a virus, indicates lifelessness through reproducibility.

Moreover, while CAIN as communication technology embodies in the trilogy a promise of new technology in the hunt for serial killers and a belief in the tradition of progress, it poses the threat of 'turning' against its creators like Frankenstein's monster.[15] Thus, when Scarpetta notes in The Body Farm that CAIN, 'he,' is 'supposed to think and act the way we do' (p. 39), this anthropomorphization does not only refer to positive human qualities, but, as the acronym implies, to potentially negative ones as well. CAIN can be as fatal as its human namesake, capable of murder and destruction, and as a he, CAIN is less machinic (a technological servant) and more human (a master). Fears of the violent effects of technology and the threat of autonomous technology are, implicitly, given voice through mapping serial murder with CAIN; this coupling makes serial murder appear more inhuman and threatening.[16]

---

[15] For critical discussions on the role of various forms of (communication) technology from a number of perspectives, see, for example, The Technological Imagination; Resisting the Virtual Life: The Culture and Politics of Information, eds. James Brook and Iain A. Boal (San Francisco: City Lights, 1995); and Immersed in Technology: Art and Virtual Technology, eds. Mary Anne Moser and Douglas MacLeod (Cambridge, Mass. and London: The MIT Press, 1996).

[16] In the foreword to The Technological Imagination, the editors note the following:

> Autonomous technology conjures up the nightmare of technics spinning out of control, the horrible vision of Prometheus turning into Frankenstein. At the same time, however, the idea that technology follows its own inherent laws of development has become an ideological and political force, a means of supporting new technologies at a time when our technological civilization is increasingly under attack. (p. viii)

There are many examples in popular culture of destructive and murderous autonomous machines which start to 'think' for themselves and which finally become a threat to human beings (who lose control over the machines).

CAIN also represents the threat of new technology in the wrong 'criminal' hands, for example, in Gault's hands. In effect, CAIN is not only a site for negotiating and renegotiating humanness and the machinic but also a site for the manipulation and interpretation of information and reality, as well as a site for the struggle over the use and control of technology -- rivalry over technology and what such a rivalry entails. As such, then, questions of power, boundaries, limits, reading, contamination, and access become intertwined with each other through CAIN.

Let me now turn to CAIN and examine the way it functions in closer detail. In From Potter's Field Scarpetta describes CAIN as 'a centralized computer system linking police departments and other investigative agencies to one massive database maintained by the FBI's Violent Criminal Apprehension Program, or VICAP' (p. 111).[17] The use of CAIN is therefore open to police investigators and medical examiners, even though at first Scarpetta has her (paranoid) doubts about whether she will be included in or excluded from the network.[18] In other words, CAIN establishes boundaries since not everybody has access to it, and thus it is used to set limits to the kind or type of person who is allowed to use it. Then, this is the way CAIN functions in a murder investigation: when a victim is unidentified or attributed to a killer who has killed before, investigators are expected to fill in a crime analysis report for CAIN's use (CAIN always asks the same basic questions). CAIN is interactive, and if it needs more information or if it gets a hit, it may send a message to the investigators by e-mail or otherwise. CAIN not only asks questions but it also collects, classifies and archives information about violent offenders and crimes. In effect, CAIN is always on call, always waiting for more murders and more information to be processed

---

Examine, for instance, the novel Gridiron by the British author Philip Kerr (London: Vintage, 1996; orig. publ. 1995), which features a 'serial killing' high-tech building, which begins to trap and kill people in various ways with the help of a central computer system. Kerr is also the author of another serial murder novel, A Philosophical Investigation (London: Vintage, 1996; orig. publ. 1992), which is more critical of the forms of technology, surveillance and control than the average serial murder novel.

[17] VICAP, unlike CAIN, exists in reality, and is part of the jargon of serial murder novels. As the FBI's Internet homepage tells us, VICAP's mission is 'to facilitate cooperation, communication, and coordination between law enforcement agencies and provide support in their efforts to investigate, identify, track, apprehend, and prosecute violent serial offenders,' see http://www.fbi.gov/vicap/vicap.htm. It is further 'a nationwide data information center designed to collect, collate, and analyze crimes of violence -- specifically murder' (ibid.).

[18] See p. 40 in From Potter's Field.

and stored into its archives.

It is precisely this system into which Gault wishes to acquire access by implanting Carrie to work for the FBI's Engineering Research Faculty in The Body Farm; this is the very system which they then contaminate with a virus and the boundaries of which they upset. The virus, which attaches itself to an existing programme (a host) in CAIN, gives Gault access to CAIN and VICAP, and, like Lucy says, it '"opens up every room in the house"' (FPF, p. 156). The viral effects soon become clear in From Potter's Field as CAIN starts to send strange messages and ask questions it was not programmed to ask. At first the team members do not realize that Gault and Carrie have tampered with the system. Suspicions of CAIN's humanness and autonomy surface as CAIN seems to lead the team astray: as Lucy admits to Scarpetta, '"Something strange has been going on for a while, but so far I've been unable to track it. It's as if he's thinking for himself"' (p. 112).

The mystery of CAIN's 'identity' deepens because CAIN not only sends messages to the police through the computer, but because it sends letters to Scarpetta, too: there is something extremely threatening from receiving mysterious messages, as it were, from an inhuman machine. Later on it becomes clear that while the e-mail messages were actually sent by Gault, the letters were from Carrie. Both masquerade as CAIN when they sign their messages with the name CAIN. Gault's messages as CAIN are mainly warnings to the police (what CAIN could 'do' to them), whereas Carrie's letters are Christmas greetings to Scarpetta.[19] The stationery which Carrie uses as CAIN is pink, perhaps an unusual colour in this context (signifying a 'feminization' of CAIN and the masculine culture of technology?).[20] CAIN is personified and gendered in terms of threatening uncertainty (is CAIN a he or a she?). That is, the deviant lesbian Lucy has not been able to mother, 'raise,' CAIN properly, as she cannot protect CAIN against viruses and outsiders. Instead, Gault and Carrie contaminate and reprogramme CAIN. CAIN becomes 'sick': under the surface of normality, it is sick and contaminated.

[19] See From Potter's Field, pp. 155, 319 (e-mail messages), and pp. 202, 217 (letters).

[20] It is also somewhat strange that Carrie, a computer expert like Lucy, should send letters instead of e-mail messages.

It is as if something from the contagious non-heterosexuality that Lucy, Carrie, and Gault represent becomes transferred onto CAIN, the implication being that CAIN's illness is not only caused by the computer virus but also by non-heterosexuality (another illness). Because of the virus, CAIN literally begins to ask perverse questions about sex and pleasure in murder cases. The normal context of CAIN asking questions (law enforcement) turns into a perverse one (reading crime for pleasure). Moreover, because Lucy is CAIN's mother, the problems with CAIN originate in the maternal, not in the paternal: CAIN has no father, only a mother.

Significantly, we should note that it is through electronically mediated messages that Gault 'speaks' to Scarpetta, the police, and to the reader -- but even then as someone, or rather as something else, as CAIN, the machinic other and double to the human. We recall that there is only one passage in the trilogy in which Gault speaks directly to and face to face with Scarpetta as 'Gault': he speaks as the emaciated killer -- wasted, consumed, used-up, read through -- in the subway tunnels at the end of From Potter's Field.[21]

Even though it becomes quite evident in the trilogy that Gault's (and Carrie's) crime is that of killing people, of violating the social order, there is another crime which they are guilty of in the eyes of the expert team: that of being an intruder and violating another law. This second crime is of a different nature. There is a prohibition against murder in civilized societies, but Gault's contamination of CAIN violates one of the ways in which law and order are maintained in the first place -- Gault disturbs and undermines the very system. With advanced technology such as CAIN it becomes possible to fight crime in more efficient ways, but, as the trilogy implies, that advanced technology might become a threat, too, because it can be abused by criminals. By penetrating and abusing CAIN, Gault writes anew CAIN and the techno-family, and he simultaneously mocks the system which cannot protect itself against people like himself (the latter being, in fact, a typical pattern in serial murder fictions). Gault's crimes are crimes not only against society and its laws but also, at the same time, crimes of and

[21] At the end of Cruel and Unusual, Gault says three words as 'Hilton Sullivan,' but even then he does not face Scarpetta: she hears his voice through the closed door.

against the family, against Scarpetta's expert techno-family, against the 'rightful' use of technology. In addition, since CAIN is also an archiving system -- a mnemonic device -- Gault implicitly poses the threat of changing, and reading differently, the national history and memories of serial crime and criminals. For Gault, reading serial crime through CAIN is also a question of pleasure (a topic to which I shall return later on in this chapter); not unlike the position of the reader of Cornwell's work, who reads about serial murder for pleasure, enjoyment, and thrills.

As I have argued earlier on, the Gault-trilogy deals with questions of expertise, space/place, inside/outside and with the surveillance of spaces and/by technology. Scarpetta, Marino, Wesley, and, little by little, Lucy, are the people who work together in the trilogy: they form the expert techno-family, and they are the expert readers who have been given the power to read crime. They are not only expert readers in their own fields, but also guardians, gatekeepers, of information and of the space/place where information is stored. Besides reading crime, they constantly have to protect the boundaries of their expertise as well as prove their own status and competence. They guard what they have to guard against outsiders, against monstrous viruses such as Temple Gault, who 'had somehow gotten into [their] bodies and [their] buildings and [their] technology.' The case of Gault and CAIN is symptomatic of boundaries and boundary-protection, and this protection is depicted in viral terms, through the rhetoric of health and illness in the trilogy. One of the viral effects of Gault in the trilogy is the way in which the human and the machinic become contaminated by each other.

> How can it be that the subject, taken to be the condition for and instrument of agency, is at the same time the effect of subordination, understood as the deprivation of agency?[22]

> I did not know what had awakened me until the telephone rang again. I found the receiver without fumbling.
>
> 'Dr. Scarpetta?'
>
> 'Yes.' I reached for the lamp and switched it on. It was 2:33 A.M. My heart was drilling through the ribs.
>
> 'Pete Marino here. We got us one at 5602 Berkley Avenue. Think you better come.'[23]

> *I could never say no. Going to answer it already meant yes. Yes, it's me. I'm answering to it, I'm indebted and responsible.*[24]

Through technology, questions of power, authority, social and political control are negotiated and renegotiated in the trilogy, but technology is, furthermore, a field through which the human, human subjectivity and human presence are examined. Here we should distinguish the role of communication technology in the course of the narrative from the more general and specific implications of such technology. Computers, telephones, portable radios, pagers, and telecommunication in general -- technical mechanisms for reproduction and techniques of archivization in general -- very much structure the narrative in Cornwell's novels. In terms of the narrative, such mechanisms spur the characters into action and the story can begin and then continue: Scarpetta's telephone rings, somebody has been murdered -- the line is always open for yet another victim -- an investigation needs to be launched.[25] From Potter's Field is exemplary in this respect as the investigation of Gault's and Carrie's crimes

---

[22] Butler, The Psychic Life of Power, p. 10.

[23] Cornwell, Postmortem, p. 1.

[24] Avital Ronell, 'The Walking Switchboard,' in Finitude's Score, p. 237; emphasis in the original.

[25] On telephones and narratives, see, for example, Nicholas Royle's Telepathy and Literature: Essays on the Reading Mind (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991), in which he discusses Chandler's The Little Sister (see pp. 160-179). He writes that 'Chandler's text at once dramatizes and investigates the extent to which the telephone can structure a narrative. Or rather, the extent to which the telephone structures and de-structures, orders and disorders, sets up and upsets' (p. 163).

moves forward through the various -- mostly electronic -- messages that the team receives from the murderous pair (messages through the telephone, e-mail, letters, and pagers). It is noteworthy that Gault and Carrie send their messages -- they call Scarpetta -- under 'false' names (such as CAIN) or with the technical apparatuses that they have stolen from the police. Accordingly, it is especially the space of electric communication which becomes a field of threat and a field which spreads fear -- a contagious, viral, field. Note how in Cornwell's first novel, Postmortem, the serial killer finds out his future victims' names and addresses through the telephone: for one reason or another, the victims call 911 and the killer answers their calls as a communication officer for 911. The safe line of 911 becomes a fatal one, bringing death.

Telephone creates suspense for the reader, who, like Scarpetta, waits for the next call (or the next fax or e-mail message) from the dead, waits for the next narrative turn, the next body in the murder series. Nobody wants to receive the next call, yet the call is absolutely necessary for the narrative to continue. In From Potter's Field, when Scarpetta is about to have dinner at Commander Penn's place, the telephone rings: 'But we did not get that far before the telephone rang. Commander Penn answered it and I watched the pleasant evening drain from her face' (p. 122). Besides informing the two women here about a new murder, the telephone also interrupts communication between Scarpetta and Penn: Scarpetta is left wondering what might have passed between them, had they been able to talk. What Penn might have disclosed to Scarpetta is actually never resolved in the novel -- which is intriguing, since Scarpetta in the company of another female professional is a very rare phenomenon in Cornwell's work (there is no professional female community in the novels, functional or dysfunctional).[26]

[26] There is something strangely intimate, even something sexual, about the two women meeting. We remember the intimacy of the invitation: 'it was clear that he [Marino] wondered and was bothered that he had been excluded from the communication' (FPF, p. 109). Then, at the end of the novel, there is the following passage: '"That was no fun to do," [Commander Penn] said, standing behind us, the pistol on her belt almost touching my ear' (p. 390). Considering the complex issue of sexual identity in the trilogy, it is not difficult to envisage Commander Penn's pistol and name as phallic symbols here.

In Point of Origin we meet another female professional, Teun McGovern, Lucy's team leader in her new job at the ATF (The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms). Scarpetta's initial reaction to McGovern is hostile, since she is, again, jealous of Lucy's affections.

Telephone means bad news, news about criminals, danger and death.[27] Pagers, telephones, and other (electrically) mediated messages in general, create suspense and signal and spread fear in the trilogy. Unexpected telephone calls and the like are a common device in tales of terror, creating fear: what could be more terrifying than the telephone ringing in a house thought empty? 'A telephone rang somewhere and I started. The creaking of my chair made me jump' (FPF, p. 254). In addition, telephone lines become lines for contamination and illegal access in the trilogy, because Gault gains access into CAIN through telephone lines, through a modem. As I pointed out earlier on, Gault appears to be part flesh, part electricity. It is as if something from the electric devices that Gault uses becomes transferred onto Gault himself when Scarpetta describes his presence in terms of electricity that she can 'smell' or 'feel.' Telecommunication and technical mechanisms, however, signify more than the movement of the narrative in the case of serial murder and Gault.

As regards telecommunication and communication technology, there is a good reason to concentrate here on the trilogy (and on the novels succeeding the trilogy, too). As Lucy, the computer whizz-kid, gains more room in the novels, so do the latest developments in communication and information technology -- in the whole digital culture. There is a certain logic to be seen in the series; a logic of challenging more and more the distance, relation, and boundary between humans and machines. In Cruel and Unusual, Lucy helps Scarpetta to find out whether the records in the AFIS (Automated Fingerprint Identification System) have been changed, because the fingerprints of an executed criminal have been found at a crime scene. In The Body Farm, Lucy develops CAIN (artificial intelligence simulating the human mind), a separate machine, which is then employed in From Potter's Field; and later, in The Cause of Death, she develops as well as controls a robot (robots imitate human action). Moreover, in Unnatural Exposure, Lucy is working on virtual reality, literally connecting herself to a machine, becoming part of the machine and vice versa. These machines are Lucy's unnatural 'babies' -- her monstrous technological offspring -- and place her, together with her sexual identity as

[27] One stalker novel, which turns into serial killing, solely consists of and is structured by fax, e-mail, and phone messages as well as memos. See Ronald Munson's Fan Mail (New York: Onyx, 1994).

lesbian, outside normal heterosexual practices of (biological) reproduction.[28] Fears of deviant sexual identity are threateningly coupled with the technological and the reproducible: if, as lesbian, Lucy is Scarpetta's 'spitting image' and a copy, so are the machines she develops copies of the human. Family and humanity are endangered by their 'copies,' by menacing likenesses that are not the 'real' thing. On one level, the machines are Lucy's monstrous babies, but, on another level, they point to a motherless reproduction, the replacement of the maternal by the technological.

Accordingly, besides structuring the narrative, CAIN and other forms of communication technology in the trilogy suggest a specific kind of relation between the human and the machinic. What begins to surface is something like viral pathology: humans, machines, and viruses spread diseases and contaminate one another, and the cure seems to be the poison and the poison the cure. There is a specific coupling of the human subject and technology, and the novels represent subjects as subjects of technology, and subjects identify themselves, or are identified with, not just with other subjects, but with technical mechanisms for reproduction. As a close reading of the trilogy reveals, this is how the novels' narrator constructs 'human subjectivity' to her readers. In other words, if CAIN is personified and anthropomorphized by her, she similarly describes the human subject often in terms of the machinic, death, and lifelessness, the non-human. Note, for example, how Scarpetta defines Parkinson's disease in Cruel and Unusual: 'Parkinson's disease is when the machine shakes up violently just before it conks out, as if it knows what is ahead and protests the only way it can' (p. 110). Note also how she describes the deranged man at the beginning of From Potter's Field: 'He opened his mouth wide, obscenely rolling his tongue over the glass and thrusting his pelvis back and forth as if he were having sex with the building' (p. 60), or herself in Black Notice: 'I began scribbling notes on a call sheet, my handwriting more illegible than usual, my central nervous system as crashed as a bad hard drive'(p. 10).

[28] Incidentally, in 'Technology and Sexual Difference: Apocalyptic Scenarios at Two "Fins de Siècle,"' Doane refers to Lyotard, who has noted how the word 'technology' is etymologically connected to the word 'offspring.' Doane writes: 'But as Jean-Francois Lyotard has pointed out, *techné* is also "the abstract from *tikto* which means *to engender, to generate* [*tekontes*, the genitors; *teknon*, the offspring]," (52) a lineage which would seem to mark the phrase "technologies of reproduction" with redundancy' (p. 2).

Let me now give more examples of the uneasy relation between humans and communication technology. One of the narrator's favourite words is scan (both as a verb and a noun) and its derivatives, which she uses in a number of ways. Scan is a word which refers to reduplication and reproduction. Firstly, the word scanner appears at the beginning of the first chapter in From Potter's Field: 'Christmas Eve was cold and treacherous with black ice, and crime crackling on scanners' (p. 13). In this passage, crime is somehow given a form and a voice: it 'crackles,' it is alive as it announces itself and materializes through police scanners. Then, scanning is a means for verifying somebody's identity, a means used by the FBI in the trilogy for granting access into restricted areas: 'Modem lights blinked red and green, and an eighteen-inch video display announced CAIN in bold bright letters that looped and whorled like the fingerprint of the person who was just scanned in' (FPF, p. 175).[29] As a verb, to scan has two opposite meanings: it means both to 'investigate or consider minutely' and to 'look at or over intently or quickly' (NSOED). Typically of the trilogy, then, the act of scanning refers both to the surface of the world and to the depth. When Scarpetta examines her environment closely, she 'scans': 'I moved closer to my desk, scanning, and as I got near my computer terminal I could almost smell a presence, or feel it, like an electrical field' (p. 225).[30] To scan is, further, used in connection with Gault in the third person narrative at the beginning of From Potter's Field: 'Beneath the bill of a baseball cap, his eyes scanned' (p. 11). It is not only Scarpetta who scans her surroundings with her eyes, but other people do it, too. Scanning in the series is thus a form of reading the outside world.

Indeed, to scan is a proper verb to use in the context of pathology and psychopathological criminals -- not only because it refers to the surface and depth readings but also because it specifically relates to communication technology and medicine. In this context, to scan means to 'convert (an image) into a linear sequence of signals in this way for transmission or processing; *spec.* in *Med.,* produce an

[29] See The Body Farm for the use of the biometric scanning system, i.e., scanning a person's fingerprints for access. Lucy is suspected of stealing classified information from the FBI, because the computer files show that she has scanned her fingerprints in order to be granted access into a restricted area. In fact, Gault's spy inside the FBI, Carrie, forged Lucy's fingerprints -- but as a mirror image.

[30] As a verb, this word appears in Hornet's Nest: people scan their surroundings there, too.

image of a surface or cross-section of (the body or part of it) using a scanner' (NSOED). Scanning refers to a technique of transferring information with a scanner, i.e., duplication. Therefore, when Scarpetta or Gault scan their surroundings, something inanimate and machine-like is added to them, because the word to scan is a word with technological connotations. Like scanners, they transfer, duplicate, and store information from their surroundings in their brains, which is then like a hard-disk, storing and processing that information. It is also as if something from the machinic flawlessness, truthfulness, and efficiency becomes transferred onto them in acts of scanning. Scanning becomes a kind of way of always being on call (being alert) in a technologized world, perhaps even a kind of 'techno-paranoia.' That is, paranoia as suggested by the Greek etymology of the word paranoia, para and noos (beside, beyond, mind) -- being beyond one's mind, not being 'oneself.'

'Scanning' is not the only example of how the human is modelled on and related to the machinic in the trilogy. The human is depicted by Scarpetta in terms of electricity and the binary logic of on and off, deleting and filling up. Consider, in this context, how Scarpetta describes Gault and also her lover, profiler Benton Wesley. As Scarpetta tells in one of the passages above, in From Potter's Field she can 'almost ... feel' Gault's presence, 'like an electrical field'; in The Body Farm, their eyes meet 'for an electric instant' (p. 277). Then, she compares Wesley's mind with a computer: 'Wesley ... was always direct and often terse when his profiler's mind was going through its convoluted subroutines and searching its scary database' (FPF, p. 47), and, later, in Point of Origin, Wesley 'began running through the violent database in his mind' (p. 2). Scarpetta herself is told by Wesley to '"learn to turn it off"' (FPF, p. 55), to learn to forget crimes, as if one could turn off one's mind like one can turn off a computer (I shall return to this question later on in this chapter, in 'Contaminating Databases').

Hence, communication technology and technical mechanisms for reproduction structure the narrative in the series, point to the contamination of the human by the non-human, generate and spread fear, and give Gault access to CAIN (make contamination possible). Moreover, the very formation of the investigative subject (Scarpetta) is intimately linked to communication technology. Scarpetta is always 'on call': Kay on call, like CAIN on call, waiting for more murders, listening to and reading the

dead, waiting news about and from the murderers.[31] Incidentally, the name Kay is homophonically embedded into and doubled by the acronym CAIN. While the idea of calling in relation to Scarpetta's biological family in Miami is literally a question of hanging up and disconnection rather than connection, the idea of calling in relation to the dead is a different question altogether.

Let me first illustrate telephonic calling inside Scarpetta's family. The telephone connects Scarpetta to her distant (in more senses than one) family but, as the following examples show, functions more as a medium for dis-connection than connection: 'Whenever I dealt with my family, I felt irritated and annoyed' (CU, p. 396); 'Needless to say, when our conversation was ended, which simply meant I could take no more and got off the phone, my bath had been undone' (BF, p. 344); '"Dorothy, you tell Mother I love her and that I called. Please tell Lucy and Janet that I'll try again later tonight or tomorrow". I hung up' (FPF, p. 81); 'We walked without talking for many blocks, and I thought about my family in Miami. I probably would call them again before the end of the day, and my reward would be more complaints' (ibid., p. 85); and so on. On the one hand, instead of the telephone bringing Scarpetta's family together, it works to distance them further from each other. The telephone has become a medium for arguing, blaming, and complaining inside the family. Telephoning inside the family means bad news and complaints, and Scarpetta wants to hang up, disconnect herself. On the other, telephone lines function as a kind of long-distance electric umbilical cord between Scarpetta and her mother, suggesting a break (disconnection between mother and child) while still binding them together.

However, as expert medical examiner Scarpetta is, literally and figuratively, always 'on call' -- as Lucy remarks in Cruel and Unusual, '"You went to a scene last night when you supposedly weren't on call. You're always on call, Aunt Kay"' (p. 147). Scarpetta is immersed in communication technology, immersed in telephones calls, faxes, e-mail messages, and so on. The boundary -- both physical and psychical -- between home (inside, private) and work (outside, public) does not hold,

[31] Note that when in From Potter's Field Marino asks Scarpetta about the letters that have been sent to her house, she tells how one letter '"was more along the lines of missing me"' (p. 203).

because communication technology, in particular, breaks the boundary between one space and another, inside and outside, home and work, private and public.[32] Consider, therefore, the role of the pager (a call to call), or especially that of the telephone, in any Scarpetta novel. It is through the telephone, and through more advanced communication technology in general, that Scarpetta is always on call, always 'at work' -- the dead call on her incessantly, and there is a constant ringing in the series. In fact, five Scarpetta novels out of ten begin with phone calls, and one, From Potter's Field, with crime 'crackling on scanners,' and another, Point of Origin, with a letter from a murderer; whereas Black Notice begins with a letter from a dead man, Benton Wesley. The idea of Scarpetta being always on call is at the same time one of the instances of megalomania in Cornwell's novels. This is well exemplified by the following passage in From Potter's Field, where Scarpetta compares herself to her lover, Benton Wesley: 'The phone had not stopped ringing since my arrival, and I knew it was always like this. His office was like mine. The world was full of desperate people who had our numbers and no one else to call' (p. 166; we also recall the similar case of Senator Frank Lord earlier on). 'To be' in the series means to be on call.

Medical examiners -- like Scarpetta -- are always on call, because the dead with their tales cannot wait. The telephone breaks the silence between the living and the dead, when death is announced through the telephone (or the pager, fax, or e-mail) and when the living have to stop whatever they are doing to respond to the (tyrannic) call of the dead. Scarpetta answers to the dead in a double sense: both responds and is responsible to the dead. She is always in a state of emergency, always ready to leave home: 'My telephone rang at a little past seven P.M. as I was chopping onions and peppers for an omelet I wasn't destined to eat.... Cary Harper had been murdered' (BE, p. 137). The trilogy, and especially From Potter's Field, exemplifies well how telephone calls and the like are essential to Scarpetta and her story: her story begins and she comes to be through the calls. Such calls may come at any hour, anywhere. Since the death of her father she has prepared herself to such calls and such

[32] Marvin notes in When Old Technologies Were New that 'the telephone was the first electric medium to enter the home and unsettle customary ways of dividing the private person and family from the more public setting of the community' (p. 6).

situations; note thus this confession at the beginning of The Body Farm: 'Since medical school, I had been accustomed to exposing myself to any trauma at any hour. I had worked around the clock in emergency rooms and performed autopsies alone in the morgue until dawn' (p. 2). Isn't there something pathological about this? Indeed, the words of Avital Ronell ring true when she writes about the telephone's 'terroristic effect, which also means that, to the extent that you are always expecting it to summon you, the call comes from you.'[33] Yes, yes, on the very first page of the first Scarpetta novel, Postmortem, Scarpetta receives a call from Marino, and thinks that 'Details were unnecessary.... Maybe I knew the instant the telephone rang' (p. 1).

Being on call, at any hour, anywhere, at home or in the morgue, translates into 'being available' for the dead, always. Scarpetta is at the service of not only the medico-judicial system she is part of but also at the service of the dead -- subordinated by and subjected to/by the call of the dead. Being on call is fundamental here; indeed, it is a state of emergency, a state of coming into being and surviving through witnessing death and crisis. In the case of Scarpetta, being on call confirms the power of the dead to subject-formation and agency. Consequently, the idea of Scarpetta on call, always there for and because of the dead, marks more than the breaking or questioning of the boundaries between home and work, inside and outside, private and public; and it does more than structures the narrative. If Scarpetta is always on call, prosthetically (in)formed by electric devices and technical mechanisms for reproduction, is she then not continuously open to contamination, vulnerably open to such viruses as Gault, 'who had somehow gotten into' her body?

The telephone -- here exemplary of telecommunication and technical mechanisms for reproduction, 'a synecdoche for technology,'[34] a 'prosthetic organ, a supplement and technological double to an anthropomorphic body,'[35] and 'instrumental in linking up with absence' [36] -- forms and

---

[33] Ronell, 'The Walking Switchboard,' n. 1, p. 348.

[34] Avital Ronell, 'Worst Neighbourhoods of the Real,' in Finitude's Score, p. 229.

[35] Ronell, 'The Walking Switchboard,' p. 254.

[36] Ronell, 'Finitude's Score,' in Finitude's Score, p. 34.

informs, locates and dislocates Scarpetta. The telephone and being on call undermine the metaphysics of presence, that is, being on call undermines the idea of the self as identical and present to itself.[37] As serial murder in the trilogy is framed within various (electronic) messages and telecommunication, it is therein mapped together with the uncertainty of the identity of the sender or the receiver (i.e., who is calling whom under whose name, and who has stolen whose technology?). Gault and Carrie abuse CAIN, send messages under CAIN's name, and steal pagers and telephones from the police: they undermine internal communication within the techno-family. The above uncertainty is ultimately inseparable from the spacing and death in the very structure of communication technology -- from the capacity of such technology to reproduce and reduplicate 'us.' What is at stake, thus, is the metaphysics of presence, of self-presence and self-identity, that telecommunication and the technological in general undermine. In other words, who or what are we, if we can be reproduced and reduplicated by the technological and by such viruses as Gault? Hence, sometimes there is 'no one' at the other end when the telephone rings. In From Potter's Field, a body has been delivered to the morgue, and Scarpetta senses that something is wrong, especially after she finds a familiar pink envelope on the body (a letter from 'CAIN'). Scarpetta rushes to lock all the doors, calls for help, and just when everything appears to be safe -- the telephone rings:

> The telephone rang and I jumped. I grabbed the receiver.
> 'Morgue.' My voice trembled.
> Silence.
> 'Hello?' I asked more strongly.
> No one spoke. (p. 215)

---

[37] It is interesting how the telephone and schizophrenia -- both being a question of hearing (distant) voices -- connect with each other. For example, Ronell writes in 'The Walking Switchboard' that,

> It soon became clear that schizophrenia recognized the telephone as its own, appropriating it as a microphone for the singular emission of its pain. Schizophrenia was magnetized by the telephone the way neurosis rapped on Freud's door. In a fundamental sense, we can say that the first call the telephone makes is to schizophrenia -- a condition never wholly disconnected from the ever-doubling 'thing.' (p. 239)

See also Marvin's When Old Technologies Were New for examples of the telephone in the context of schizophrenia.

Scarpetta is here talking to herself, there is no proper communication (who is calling whom?), nobody speaks at the other end: what she hears is the trembling of her own voice only. This passage creates the terror we all know, the terror of receiving an anonymous phone call and nobody speaking at the other end -- the terror of anonymity (who is it?) and threatening silence (am I the proper addressee?). The passage creates terror also through hearing-oneself-speak, being forced to listen to one's 'own' voice only,[38] and indeed, through speaking to no one.

The above passage needs to be linked to a bizarre passage later on in the novel, where Scarpetta finds herself 'decompensating,' hearing herself speak, talking to herself again and talking to a tape recorder:

> 'What happened earlier is the past,' I went on. 'You've got to get control of yourself. You're decompensating.' I took another deep breath.
>
> I could not believe I was talking to myself. That wasn't in character, either, and I worried as I began dictating the morning's cases. The hearts, livers and lungs of the dead policemen were normal. Their arteries were normal. Their bones and brains and builds were normal.
>
> 'Within normal limits,' I said into the tape recorder. 'Within normal limits.' I said it again and again. (p. 248)

Again, there is no one at the other end, Scarpetta is repeating herself, and she is not 'in character.' She is beyond the boundaries of 'herself'-- beyond her normal limits -- and drawn toward the mechanical and the dead, toward lifelessness and Gault. The voice dictated into the tape recorder can be reproduced endlessly, and Scarpetta herself becomes uncannily converted into a machine, a tape recorder. She repeats the same words time after time, and thus imitates the tape recorder. While we might literally think of medical examiner Scarpetta as one who records death (a public recorder of causes of death), when Scarpetta identifies with the machinic this is not within normal limits. By imitating the tape-recorder -- 'I said it again and again' -- Scarpetta becomes a machine, a recorder in another sense, a

[38] On hearing-oneself-speak, see Royle's discussion in Telepathy and Literature, pp. 164-165.

'surface of inscription.'[39] Thus, one of Gault's viral effects in From Potter's Field is the breaking of the boundaries of the 'Scarpetta' character, just as he breaks the boundary of the first-person narrative at the beginning of the novel. Note in this context of Scarpetta and machines, what Dorothy remarks to Scarpetta in Black Notice, when she wants to 'settle' things: '"You're nothing but a machine, a computer, one of those high-tech instruments you love so much. And one has to ask what's wrong with a person who chooses to spend all her time with dead people. Refrigerated, stinky, rotting dead people, most of them lowlifes to begin with"' (p. 261).

Communication technology can also resurrect the dead. If sometimes there is no one at the other end of the telephone, at other times the dead talk to Scarpetta 'literally,' with their voice, as in when a dead person answers the telephone. If in Cruel and Unusual Scarpetta resurrects a crime scene and if in The Body Farm she brings the body of Emily Steiner back from the dead (exhumes her), then in From Potter's Field she makes a dead person literally 'talk.' When she phones Sheriff Brown, she already knows that the sheriff is dead, having seen the video-tape in which Gault and Carrie murder him. Why does Scarpetta phone a dead person? Why would anybody call a dead person? 'To see what would happen'? What could happen? It is as if she expects the sheriff to pick up the phone, which he does, strangely enough, through the answering machine, so that in this case Scarpetta succeeds in resurrecting, reanimating, the dead person:

> I asked for Lamont Brown's number. The operator gave it to me and I dialed it to see what would happen.
>
> 'I can't get to the phone right now because I'm out delivering presents in my sleigh...,' the dead sheriff's voice sounded strong and healthy from his answering machine. 'Ho! Ho! Ho! Merrrrrrry Christmas!' (p. 253)

This is thanatophony: the dead talk! Scarpetta succeeds in resurrecting the dead and in listening

[39] A term used by Doane in 'Technology and Sexual Difference' when she discusses psychotechnics (also known as psychophysics). During the end of the 19th and early 20th centuries, psychotechnics experimented in 'placing a subject in front of a machine that generated random letters or syllables in order to measure the subject's memory of these material traces without any recourse to meaning. The subject here becomes a mere surface for inscription' (p. 16).

to the dead person's 'own' voice. The dead sheriff continues to be 'alive.' But 'the dead sheriff's voice ... strong and healthy' draws attention to a disturbing question of death and identity: what is, or what constitutes, a person, when s/he can continue to talk after death? This is a question of our relation to telecommunication and technical mechanisms for reproduction: to prosthetic organs and their relation to the natural body. Technology opens up multiple lines for listening to the dead as it upsets the boundary between life and death, natural and artificial, human and machine. While the telephone and the answering machine here reanimate and give 'life' to the dead, they simultaneously erase life as they draw life to the field of the technical and mechanical, the repeatable and the iterable. When Sheriff Brown continues to talk, he is, in fact, resurrected and erased at the same time: resurrected by the technological but erased as a living presence because he can be endlessly reproduced.

Electric communication and technical mechanisms for reproduction, such as tape recorders, telephones, computers, cameras, and so on, are thus associated in the trilogy with the narrative structure, the inhuman and reproducibility, death, resurrection, the uncanny and with the idea of being beside oneself, not being 'oneself.' The presence of such mechanisms produces feelings of strangeness and uneasiness, for example, like the motion sensors which cause Scarpetta's dreams to be 'strange.' Such mechanisms relate to death not only in the sense that Ronell argues about the exemplary telephone in 'The Walking Switchboard,' 'Inasmuch as it belongs, in its simplest register, to the order of the mechanical and the technical, it is already on the side of death' (p. 238), but also in other senses as well. Such mechanisms are connected to being dead, and specifically, to representation and to being murdered and dismembered (reproduction being murder of the present in itself). In other words, being reproduced -- written about, photographed, X-rayed, measured, and examined with microscopes -- equals being dead and lying on the autopsy table.[40] For instance, when in From Potter's Field Scarpetta and Wesley take a walk in New York together, he wishes that they '"had a camera,"' but Scarpetta is quick to answer

[40] Note what Clover argues about Powell's film 'Peeping Tom' in Men, Women, and Chainsaws: 'Those who are photographed are, with the sole exception of Mark as a child, females (prostitute, actress, models), and the experience of being photographed -- of gazing reactively -- is figured as an experience of being bruised, scarred, terrified, made to faint, and stabbed to death' (p. 175).

’”No, you don’t”’ (p. 86.). On the surface level, her answer could simply be read as implying the fear of discovery, since Wesley is married and Scarpetta is reminded that they ’are outlaws’ (ibid.), but taking into account the crucial role that technical mechanisms for reproduction (like cameras) play in the novels, such a simple answer is not enough. On another level, being reproduced by a camera equals ’murder’ and being dead. Being reproduced by cameras and the like is, indeed, unnatural exposure: it is ’laying open or bare,’ being ’open to danger,’ and being ’exposed to light’ (NSOED).

> *You are reading this because I am dead.*[41]
>
> Reproduction is the guarantee of a history -- both human biological reproduction (through the succession of generations) and mechanical reproduction (through the succession of memories). Knowledge is anchored to both.[42]

If telecommunication and technical mechanisms for reproduction draw the reader's attention in the trilogy to the uneasy construction of the investigative subject in terms of the mechanical and death, they also point to how the human is prosthetically constructed by such mechanisms. Such mechanisms, that is, can reveal a world otherwise 'hidden' to the human eye, and make possible a reading of 'invisible,' dirty, traces of crime and criminals. Such mechanisms are part of the rhetoric of health and illness in the trilogy. This is what Scarpetta does as an expert reader and investigator: with the help of technology, she reads beyond the deceptively clean surface of bodies and places, under which there is, and there are traces of, another world -- that of crime, dirt, illness, and viruses. No wonder that paranoia is so close to the narrator: anyone could be potentially sick under the surface of normality and cleanliness. The reader learns through Scarpetta's method of investigation that, in solving the crime, s/he cannot trust his or her human eyes only -- under the surface of immediate visibility, anything can be potentially significant. This is, of course, how detective narratives work, how they point to themselves and to the act of reading: appearances are deceptive, things or people are not what they seem to be, and every little detail or trace could be significant (a clue) for the solving of the crime. Appearance and reality are thus played off against each other in detective narratives, and in Cornwell's serial murder trilogy this opposition becomes a particularly relevant issue.

As I pointed out in the previous section, in the trilogy CAIN and other technical mechanisms are symptomatic of the uneasy relation between the human and the non-human, flesh and letter (Cain and

---

[41] Cornwell, Black Notice (the 'prologue'); emphasis in the original.

[42] Mary Ann Doane, 'Technophilia: Technology, Representation, and the Feminine,' in Body/Politics: Women and the Discourses of Science, p. 172.

CAIN), physis (nature) and techne (art, skill), life and death. It is not enough to say -- like Scarpetta -- that CAIN is 'supposed to think and act the way we do.' Critically examined, CAIN is a prosthetic device, something which we could call a 'prosthes[i]s of so-called live memory' as Derrida writes in Archive Fever (1996), when he refers to various technical mechanisms for reproduction.[43] Besides processing information, CAIN stores information and thus helps the investigators remember what they cannot remember 'themselves': as artificial intelligence, CAIN simulates memory and the psychic apparatus.

But what do prostheses signify? Prostheses bring forth the question of supplementarity, and I refer to supplementarity and the supplement here in the Derridean sense -- the supplement as a lack. Derrida writes, for example, in Of Grammatology (1976) that 'the supplement supplements. It adds only to replace. It intervenes or insinuates itself *in-the-place-of*; if it fills, it is as if one fills a void.'[44] The supplement both replaces and adds. He continues, 'Through this sequence of supplements a necessity is announced: that of an infinite chain, ineluctably multiplying the supplementary mediations that produce the sense of the very thing they defer: the mirage of the thing itself, of immediate presence, of originary perception. Immediacy is derived' (p. 157). In this section, supplementarity becomes a question of how various technical devices and mechanisms supplement the natural, human, body reading crime in the trilogy. It becomes a question of, as it were, techno-pathology -- of Luma-Lite, X-rays, microscopes, scanning devices, and further, of CAIN, computers, archives, and profiles. Such devices, like the telephone Ronell writes about, draw us towards 'the order of the mechanical and the technical ... the side of death.' CAIN, for example, when it simulates and supplements human memory, 'bear[s] witness to the finitude of the mnemic spontaneity which is thus supplemented. The machine -- and, consequently, representation -- is death and finitude *within* the psyche.'[45]

---

[43] Jacques Derrida, Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression, trans. Eric Prenowitz (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), p. 15.

[44] Jacques Derrida, Of Grammatology, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), p. 145; emphasis in the original.

[45] Derrida, Archive Fever, p. 14; emphasis in the original.

Mark Seltzer has suggested, like so many others, that technology can be thought of as a supplement, prosthesis, to human agency. In Serial Killers, by referring to the 'small fantasy' in Henry Ford's autobiography My Life and Work -- in which Ford envisages the number of legless, one-legged, armless, one-armed, or blind men who could replace 'able-bodied' men in some of the work-operations needed in the serial production of the Model T -- Seltzer concludes that Ford's fantasy not only '*empt[ies] out of human agency*' but also 'projects a transcendence of the natural body and the *extension of human agency through the forms of technology that supplement it*' (p. 69; emphasis Seltzer's). This is the 'double-logic of technology as prosthesis,' which entails that technology is both self-extension and self-mutilation or self-cancelation (p. 70). Taking into account both such a double-logic that Seltzer suggests and the idea of the supplement in the Derridean sense, I think we can begin to question the localization and boundaries of human agency in the Gault-trilogy: what/where is the boundary between the animate and the inanimate, the human and the non-human, in reading crime? For example, when Scarpetta 'sees,' how does she see? In what follows, I shall suggest that Scarpetta's reading is a techno-reading of the crime and the crime scene.

Let us take the example of Luma-Lite, which, as Scarpetta informs us in Cruel and Unusual, 'could pick up fingerprints that never would have been seen in the past' (p. 145). In other words, new forms of technology have changed the investigation and reading of crime. With the help of Luma-Lite, Scarpetta succeeds in resurrecting an old crime scene at the house of Robyn Naismith. In From Potter's Field Luma-Lite is used again:

> Rader set up a light energy source called a Luma-Lite, which was a simple black box with an enhanced blue fiber-optic cable. It was another set of eyes that could see what ours could not, a soft white light that turned fingerprints fluorescent and caused hairs, fibers and narcotic and semen stains to glare like fire. (pp. 67-68)

What becomes evident in the case of Luma-Lite, 'another set of eyes that could see what ours could not,' is that Luma-Lite supplements and replaces human eyes. The human subject and agency are prosthetically extended but also cancelled by Luma-Lite at the same time. Thus Luma-Lite -- like

microscopes and X-rays -- makes us consider human agency, its possibilities and its limitations as well as the limits of reading. In an exemplary fashion, Luma-Lite brings into the picture the limits of reading, vision and the sense of seeing, of what can or cannot be seen. Luma-Lite reveals evidence and clues of a world of crime that would otherwise remain invisible and hidden to the human eye: 'Like the writing that wasn't there on the sheet of paper found on Jennifer Deighton's bed, there was blood invisible to the naked eye inside the rooms where Robyn Naismith had been accosted and killed' (CU, p. 335). The world is not what it at first appears to the 'naked' human eye, and it is the job of the expert investigator to make the world of crime 'visible' to the reader. It is the expert's job to go beyond the surface of the world: to detect, that is, to 'uncover, expose, display' (NSOED) the real, ugly, character of the world.

Thus, Luma-Lite not only extends the boundaries of the human agency called 'Scarpetta,' since it reveals to her eyes what she cannot ordinarily see, but it also cancels that agency, because it makes her see what she cannot see with her own naked eyes. In terms of supplementarity and lack, Luma-Lite undermines self-presence. In other words, as Luma-Lite produces a sense of what it defers, it reveals a lack, an absence in self-presence. Hence, Luma-Lite not only brings to light fingerprints or narcotic stains otherwise invisible to the human eye, but, on another and more disturbing level, it uncannily brings to light absence: that Scarpetta cannot see the stains without Luma-Lite, that she is 'naked' without it. Scarpetta is not present to the invisible traces without Luma-Lite but, instead, there is spacing and delay. In order to see and read crime, the expert investigator needs to be 'clothed' with forms of technology.

It is noteworthy how crime and its reconstruction are emphasized in Cruel and Unusual. In crime investigations, everything (when? who? how? why? where?) that is thought to constitute the crime is reconstructed by the investigators -- described, written down, photographed, archived, and so on -- who try to 'replay' the crime exactly the way it took place. This is how detective narratives point, self-reflexively, to reading -- to how clues are read and how the story of the crime is reconstructed and doubled, indeed, supplemented by the story of the investigation. The reconstruction and the investigation of the crime reconstitutes, repeats, fills a lack, supplements, 'produce[s] the sense of' the

originary crime, which it defers. This is how Scarpetta describes the crime scene and their work at Naismith's house: 'The latent smudges, smears, spatters, and spurts that we had followed were as close to an instant replay as I had ever seen in the reconstruction of a crime' (p. 349). Luma-Lite and the chemical called luminol used in Cruel and Unusual can be used to resurrect, 'replay,' the crime scene. In fact, in Cruel and Unusual, when the team tries to reconstruct past events at Naismith's house, Scarpetta points quite explicitly to the changes in crime investigation and its reading techniques and technologies:

> Ten years previously, when Robyn Naismith's house was processed by the police, they would not have arrived with laser or Luma-Lite. There was no such thing as DNA printing then. There was no automated fingerprint system in Virginia, no computerized means to enhance a bloody partial print left on a wall or anywhere else.... If we could spray her house with chemicals, it was possible we could literally resurrect the scene. (p. 335)

Luma-Lite and other technical mechanisms bring to light another world beyond and on the visible world. Therefore, they point to the opposition between surface and depth as well as to deferral, spacing, and difference: 'With the lights on there was not so much as the slightest trace of the horror we had seen in the dark. On this sunny winter's afternoon, we had crawled back in time and witnessed what Ronnie Joe Waddell had done' (CU, p. 347).[46] That is, the image that the naked human eye receives of the world does not correspond to the image of the world received through the eyes of technology. The world is not what it looks like because it is different from itself: like the serial killer, the world may look normal on the surface but is actually sick, dirty, and violent beneath. The world consists of various temporally distinct layers, yet for the naked human eye, there is only one layer, one world, to be seen. However, when the world is 'reproduced' by the expert, traces of horror become visible. This, of course, is also the movement of the detective narrative itself -- to make the crime 'visible' through the investigation.

[46] Note also how Luma-Lite and other such devices establish boundaries: there are those who are capable of reading and those who are not. When in Cruel and Unusual Scarpetta and Wesley watch a video-tape recorded of their investigation at Naismith's house, Scarpetta indicates how Lucy, 'working on dinner,' is not disturbed by 'the luminescent images,' and how 'At a glance, the uninitiated could not possibly know what they [luminescent images] meant' (p. 349).

With the idea of the Derridean supplement it becomes possible to slightly question Seltzer's view of the 'natural' body. While Seltzer presents a powerful claim in Serial Killers about the collapsing boundary between the life process and the information process -- between bodies and machines -- in cases of serial killing, he simultaneously seems to maintain that distinction. His use of the term natural body[47] questions views which consider the body separate from its prosthetic reproductions (reduplications and simulations), but despite this fact, there remains something suspect in his use of the term. It is as if he does not examine how the natural body itself is already an effect of discursive practices, and not some prediscursive entity. This is again the question Butler asks in Gender Trouble when she wonders whether there is a '"physical" body prior to the perceptually perceived body' (p. 114). When Seltzer refers to the natural body's prosthetic reproductions, it is as if the natural body appears as a kind of essential origin for its subsequent prosthetic reproductions by technology. This view, however, is what the idea of the supplement displaces. In other words, there is no recourse to something like a natural body but that body is always already an effect of various discursive practices. The natural body -- and human agency -- should thus not be contextualized and analyzed only in terms of technology but also in the context of language and discursive practices.

Through various technical mechanisms for reproduction used in autopsies and at crime scenes, Scarpetta asserts the boundaries of the natural body and the human. However, the idea that the natural -- anatomical, biological -- body is far from being natural becomes evident in the trilogy (and the series) through the medico-judicial discourses combined with technological discourses. Forensic pathology and medicine are discourses of 'normality,' as they produce normal bodily boundaries (what or who is or is not 'within normal limits') as height and weight are measured, and the body is turned into statistics and numbers. The autopsy extends the human body as bodily interiors are made visible on the outside through the Stryker saw, X-rays, microscopes, and scanners. Through such devices as Luma-Lite, the outside -- and boundary -- of the body, skin, becomes a site of traces otherwise invisible to the eye. As I argued in Chapter 2, the former is extension in a double sense: extension towards the inside of the

[47] See, for example, pp. 33, 35, 97, 213, 242.

body so that we can see beyond the skin and into the body. But the body also extends to the outside, because the body is reproduced and scattered as and into microscopic samples and X-ray photographs. The body is reduplicated and reconstructed in autopsy. This would be what Seltzer calls the replacement of the natural body by its prosthetic reconstructions: the natural body violently turned into numbers, statistics, images, and information. But, as I pointed out above, the more important question might be whether there ever was something like a natural body -- a body separate from discursive practices.

If technology helps to reveal visible and invisible traces on the body and at the crime scene, such traces function as evidence not only to the crime but also as evidence to the one who left the traces and who is missing, the killer. As Scarpetta reflects after she has helped to reconstruct Waddell's murder of Robyn Naismith in Cruel and Unusual: 'we felt pretty certain that we had captured it [Waddell's personality]' (p. 349). Like writing, these traces supplement, stand in the place of the killer: they reveal the killer's past presence inasmuch as they conceal, efface, and erase it. Especially in cases of serial murder these traces are later on replaced -- again supplemented -- by a profile, which is made on the killer on the basis of those traces and the crime scene, modus operandi, signature, victim selection, and so on. The profile of the killer both gives face to the dangerous individual and stands in his place; like Gault is profiled by Wesley in Cruel and Unusual as being '"preoccupied with guns, knives, martial arts, violent pornography,"' '"antisocial,"' '"completely unpredictable,"' not fitting '"any profile,"' and being '"consummately narcissistic and vain"' (pp. 432-433).

What is profiling if not supplementary? The profile of the killer supplements and is put in the place of the absent 'flesh and blood' killer. These profiles of killers are processed, produced, and archived, and in the trilogy this is achieved through CAIN. CAIN archives information about the killers in an electronized and computerized form -- profiles, data about apprehended killers, killers on the loose, and so forth. The killers inhabit CAIN like ghosts, like simulacra, as they are reproduced in an electronic form. While an archive such as CAIN is a 'prosthes[i]s of so-called live memory' -- it remembers in the investigators' place -- it does not only help them remember but it also produces killers in particular ways: it typifies the killers. These ways are specific historical, social, and ideological

constructions since CAIN always asks the same basic questions, always views the killers from certain angles.

Hence, CAIN produces the serial killer as a particular type of person with certain psychological characteristics (it stresses certain features but ignores others). Consider here also the example I gave in the previous chapter: in Lindsay's novel Mercy, the female Hispanic police detective questions the work of her male colleagues and the 'behavioral model used to analyze all sexual homicides,' which she thinks 'is based on male psychology.' In other words, where do such models and profiling systems lead the investigation, how do they construct the killer, and could -- or should -- such reading and archiving systems be thought and organized differently? In Serial Killers, Seltzer informs us about CAIN's counterpart in reality, the computerized archiving programme used by the FBI, VICAP: 'The FBI serial-crime unit attempts to fill in the blank -- through its vaunted profiling system and fifteen-page, fill-in-the-blanks Violent Crime and Apprehension Program (VICAP) form -- for police reports on repeat crimes' (p. 13; see pp. 14-15 for exemplary VICAP pages). However, while Seltzer recognizes the multiple effects of such classificatory systems as VICAP, he again fails to acknowledge the specific questions of gender or ethnicity when he refers to 'a type of person.'

Indeed, CAIN is a discursive practice which produces the serial killer as a particular kind or type of person, who commits particular kind of acts. As an archive CAIN is, further, a question of restricted access, and, as such, the experts and guardians have to constantly protect it against the outsiders -- against those who have no right nor proper competence to read and analyze the information stored in CAIN.[48] As argued earlier on, Gault's crimes are not only crimes against law and order but also crimes against the maintaining of law, order, and expertise. What makes Gault frightening as a serial killers, is that he '"doesn't really fit any profile"' as Wesley tells Scarpetta in Cruel and Unusual.[49] He disrupts

[48] In Archive Fever, Derrida calls the archive's guardians 'archons,' who 'are first of all the documents' guardians. They do not only ensure the physical security of what is deposited and of the substrate. They are also accorded the hermeneutic right and competence. They have the power to interpret the archives' (p. 2).

[49] Among popular fictions of serial murder, the case of Gault is exceptional because he is not nick-named in the novels and because his identity is known at an early stage (since the end of Cruel and Unusual).

classification systems: he is both 'organized' and 'disorganized' as Wesley continues his analysis (ibid.). In other words, it is difficult to foresee what it is that Gault might do next. The fact that Gault has penetrated CAIN and listens to and uses the police scanners and radios makes the case even more difficult to solve: he uses the investigators' communication technology and investigative tools against them.

What is so special about the role of CAIN -- besides the ways in which it draws our attention to the relation and uncertain boundary between the human and the non-human -- is how it is, as archival technology, tied to the question of future, the future of serial murder. Could we now imagine serial murder without communication technology, that is, without newspapers, TV, radio, telephones, faxes, and especially computers, data centres, and databases? The future of serial murder is linked to the future of techniques of computerization and archivization. A system such as the fictive CAIN (or its real-life counterpart, VICAP), for example, affects the way serial murder is perceived and defined by the fact that it archives (is made to archive) specific and detailed information about killers, which then makes various typologies possible. This was not possible in the past, before the pre-computer age. An archiving system affects by the very practice of archiving itself. As Derrida notes on the archive, archival technology and their effects in Archive Fever:

> ... the archive, as printing, writing, prosthesis, or hypomnesic technique in general is not only the place for stocking and for conserving an archivable content *of the past* which would exist in any case, such as, without the archive, one still believes it was or will have been. No, the technical structure of the *archiving* archive also determines the structure of the *archivable* content even in its very coming into existence and in its relationship to the future. The archivization produces as much as it records the event. This is also our political experience of the so-called news media. (pp. 16-17)

Whereas in the past, before the age of computer and sophisticated communication technology, the term 'mass murder' covered a whole range of murders, there is nowadays a wide range of different classes and subclasses of multiple killers: mass murderers, spree killers, serial killers with subclasses (mission-oriented types, hedonistic types, etc), and so on. As Derrida points out, the technical structure

of the archive and techniques of archivization do not merely conserve and record past events but, radically, produce them and determine their relationship to the future. This is why, in this study, I rather use the terms Derrida employs in Archive Fever ('techniques of archivization' and 'archival technology') instead of the term Seltzer uses in his texts on serial murder ('technologies of writing'). Derrida's terms would signify both the technological aspect (writing, printing, inscription, reproduction, ciphering, microcomputing, electronization, computerization, and so on) and the archivable aspect (what is archived, where, how, and by whom) as well as the skill required, whereas Seltzer's term refers more to the level of 'material deployment.'[50]

As regards communication technologies and the way they have affected (the analysis of) serial murder cases, take into account, for example, the impossible situation of FBI-agent John Douglas, who 'In the early 1980s ... was holding in his head about 150 cases at a time, without active backup and without, as yet, computer backup.'[51] Classes, typologies, and categorizations of serial killers are made possible by centralized databases, by communication and archival technology in general. For there to be 'serial murder,' one has to see the link between one murder and another, even when they are geographically or temporally distant from each other. It is through such classifications and categorizations that profiles, 'types' of criminals and criminal acts are made. Moreover, if archival technology and archiving are themselves significant, we can hardly ignore the role of those who do the

---

[50] The latter term is used in David E. Wellbery's foreword to Friedrich A. Kittler's book Discourse Networks 1800/1900, trans. Michael Metteer and Chris Cullens (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990):

> Inscription, in its contingent facticity and exteriority, is the irreducible given of Kittler's analysis, as the original German title of his book -- *Aufschreibesysteme* -- makes evident. That title, a neologism invented by Dr. Schreber, can be most literally translated as 'systems of writing down' or 'notation systems.' It refers to a level of material deployment that is prior to questions of meaning. At stake here are the constraints that select an array of marks from the noisy reservoir of all possible written constellations, paths and media of transmission, or mechanisms of memory. (p. xii).

Seltzer's use of the term 'technologies of writing' seems to come from Kittler's book (as he does refer to Kittler). Wellbery's argument above about the 'level of material deployment that is prior to questions of meaning' is problematic: it is debatable whether we can discuss 'systems of writing down' without their being a question of meaning. Wellbery makes a distinction between those systems and meaning, and strangely implies as if those systems were, as themselves, prior or outside 'meaning.' Derrida, on the other hand, connects the archive and archival technology both to the recording and content aspects.

[51] Seltzer, Serial Killers, p. 16.

archiving. As I illustrated in Chapter 1 through Jenkins, in the 1980s and 1990s serial murder was turned into an object of specific expertise in the U.S.A.; an image which prevails in true crime and in fiction. Jenkins writes that,

> the new emphasis on the phenomenon reinforced the technocratic belief in the work of the Justice Department's experts: the computer scientists who collated the data that permitted the recognition of serial crimes; the forensic technicians who examined physical evidence; and above all, the psychological profilers and behavioral analysts who provided invaluable information to local investigators. (p. 14)

If the role of forms of technology, and particularly communication technology, is not recognized (in real or fictional accounts), we might end up with deceptive figures -- like Holmes and De Burger in their study Serial Murder. The occurrence of serial murder in the U.S.A. is a hotly debated issue. Holmes and De Burger refer to the U.S. society's growing awareness of violent behaviour, an indicator of which 'is the extent to which violence is addressed in print. In the years from 1974 to 1985, no less than 325 periodical articles appeared on this topic!' (P. 29). They also claim that serial murder is not truly a modern phenomenon, but, nevertheless, 'it occurred much less frequently in the early years of this nation. Even during the relatively high-homicide-rate years from 1900 to the mid-1930s multicide was infrequent, while capital crimes of passion and felony-related killings predominated' (p. 21). But Holmes and De Burger somehow fail to see that the question of the frequency of serial murder is deceptive, because in the early decades of this century -- perhaps until the 1960s -- there were not many means to discern serial murder (or 'multicide') unless it was local and therefore very visible (i.e., the so-called linkage blindness prevailed, since there were no proper means nor technology to connect a series of murders together). Nationwide networks, computer networks, computerized data, and information centers are needed for preventing linkage blindness from taking place. The growing awareness and the growing numbers of serial murder are intimately connected to the invention and growing use of various techniques of archivization (no wonder that the very term 'serial killer' was invented as late as mid-1970s). Thus, note what J.W.E. Sheptycki critically notes in his review of Egger's Serial Murder: An

Elusive Phenomenon; Sheptycki comments upon Hickey's article in the book and writes that,

> Drawing on newspapers, journals, bibliographies, biographies, and computer searches of social science abstracts, the essay by Eric Hickey ... attempts to plot the prevalence of serial murder on an historical basis. His conclusion, that the trend in serial murder in the United States since 1750 is of a slow rise accelerating markedly after 1950, is not wholly convincing. One suspects that the data available before the Second World War, and certainly those available before the turn of the century, are too patchy to be considered a valid measure of the relative incidence of this type of crime. Certainly the growth in the management and output of 'information' since the dawn of the 'TV age' and on into the 'ansaphone age' would need to be controlled for. This is particularly so considering the sources which he uses -- largely biographical texts, almanacs, and newspapers.[52]

The view that serial murder has greatly increased in numbers since the 1950s and 1960s is, in particular, a view that federal experts, true crime books, and many serial murder fictions maintain and encourage. Thereby they may either implicitly or explicitly encourage further control and policing of citizens and deviation. In Using Murder Jenkins, too, criticizes the views which claim that serial murder is a fairly modern phenomenon in the U.S. context, something that did not frequently take place during the first decades of this century. On the contrary, he argues that the period before 1940 was 'a time of quite intense activity' (p. 33), and that,

> Between 1900 and 1940, American police agencies often demonstrated their familiarity with the concept of serial murder and pursued investigations accordingly, so that offenders were frequently detected and apprehended. As a matter of course, investigators traced the earlier movements of suspects, and attempted to link them with crimes in other jurisdictions or even other nations. (p. 32)

---

[52] J.W.E. Sheptycki, in The British Journal of Criminology, 33, No. 1 (1993), p. 104. As I pointed out in Chapter 1, also Kenna Kiger's article in Serial Murder: An Elusive Phenomenon voices some doubts over the actual figures and how various investigators have arrived at those figures. Both Sheptycki and Kiger share the concern over reliable sources, but whereas Sheptycki points out the problem with believing in the accelerating growth of serial murder in the twentieth century, Kiger's essay attacks other problems as well -- such as the very definition of serial murder. However, both draw attention to the role of newspapers and, in general, to the very data available in the first place -- for example, newspapers, periodicals, bibliographies, biographies, almanacs, and computer searches. Strangely enough, this data appears to exist outside 'official' records, particularly as regards the data prior to the World War II. Then, as various investigative techniques are developed, the data seems to concentrate more and more on official databases: the more the techniques advance, the more serial murder appears to become a question of (federal) expertise (who collects information and where, and who knows how to read that information).

This detection took place despite the lack of modern record-keeping techniques. However, I find Jenkins' arguments on the investigators' familiarity with serial murder cases not convincing enough, particularly as concerns the problem of local vs. national serial murder. I hesitate because of the examples of serial murder that he gives for 1900-1940. If, at that early point, police agencies were familiar with and competent in analyzing serial murder even across state or national lines, why is it then that most of Jenkins' examples on pp. 33-35 are locally (i.e., more visible) committed serial crimes? Wouldn't this fact partly negate Jenkins' argument and would it not imply that modern record-keeping techniques are actually needed? To convince his readers, Jenkins should give examples of serial murder cases which are geographically or temporally distant from each other.

As I argue above, without communication and archival technology, serial murder would remain a locally and temporally restricted rare phenomenon, or, it would not be 'serial murder' at all. Historian Philip Sugden suggests in The Complete History of Jack the Ripper that 'the Ripper heralded the rise of the modern sexual serial killer. He was not the earliest such offender. But he was the first of international repute and the one that first burned the problem of the random killer into police and public consciousness' (p. 2).[53] Jack the Ripper, 'the archetype of "evil genius,"'[54] is, indeed, sometimes referred to as the 'founding-father' of serial murder, even though the term 'serial murder' as such did not exist at Ripper's time in 1888. With advanced communication technology, serial murder has become what it is nowadays: in many ways a national, even an international, phenomenon; a phenomenon 'increasing' in numbers. The 'birth' of Jack the Ripper, for example, is inseparable from the rise of the popular press and media, because somebody like 'Jack the Ripper' could be 'born' only after mass

[53] It is ironical that Sugden's study is called The *Complete* History of Jack the Ripper: it is far from complete since it fails to ascertain not only the real name of Jack the Ripper but also the number of his victims. Sugden's study fails as soon as it begins, it collapses with its title, The Complete History of Jack the Ripper. What is included in a 'history,' or in a 'complete history'? The complete history of Jack the Ripper implies the end of Jack the Ripper, the end of, and to, his story. But there can be no 'complete history of Jack the Ripper,' because that history is being written and rewritten, and because the history of the Ripper is connected to other histories and stories, which are being written and rewritten, now and in the future. The history of Jack the Ripper is yet to be written. In a sense, then, the Ripper belongs to the future, and, in another sense, he is a ghost, haunting his/story and other stories.

[54] Sheptycki, p. 105.

production and circulation of news came into existence in capitalist and industrialized societies. As Colin Wilson and Damon Wilson write in A Plague of Murder,

> the Ripper murders were a long way from being the first sex crimes; such crimes had been going on intermittently throughout the nineteenth century. But earlier crimes -- like those of Vincent Verzeni -- were hardly known outside the countries in which they occurred. Reuter had opened a news office in London in 1851; but it was not until Edison invented the 'quadruplex' telegraph in 1874 -- in which four messages could be sent along the same wire -- that the age of mass communication suddenly began. Jack the Ripper, with his gruesome pseudonym, was the first mass murderer to receive worldwide publicity. (p. 26)

With nationwide and worldwide data centres it is now possible to see links between murders which occur in different parts of a country or in different parts of the world. In Unnatural Exposure, Scarpetta suggests that serial murder is a phenomenon which the U.S.A. has exported to the outside world, beyond its national borders (serial murder is also a 'product' which American film industry and publishing companies have exported and capitalized on enormously, like Cornwell with her multimillion dollar contract). Scarpetta is giving a lecture-series in Ireland, from where she phones Marino and makes the following remark: '"We export our violence to other countries," I said. "The least we can do is teach them what we know, what we've learned from years of working these crimes... "' (p. 5). Serial murder is capable of breaking national boundaries, and, since the U.S.A. contaminates other countries by exporting its violence, it is Scarpetta's duty to teach others how to fight against and cure themselves of such violence (the U.S.A. as a poison and remedy).[55] In addition, the U.S.A. and Europe are contrasted in the novel as regards communication technology and technology in general. As we know from the trilogy, too, Scarpetta's morgue is full of the latest high-tech apparatuses, whereas her Irish colleague's morgue does not even have enough computers. The Irish morgue and its 'white porcelain autopsy tables that probably belonged in a medical museum and old iron stove that heated nothing

[55] In his analysis of Jack the Ripper, by the way, Sugden points to the suspicions of whether the Ripper emigrated to the States. Sugden refers to the strangling and mutilation of an aged prostitute, Carrie Brown, in New York in 1891. Sugden writes, 'Inevitably newspaper headlines raised the spectre of Jack the Ripper. The police refused to comment but the press made the most of the possibility that the Ripper had come to New York' (p. 464). The murderer of the prostitute was never caught, but Jack the Ripper definitely penetrated the American consciousness for good.

anymore' is a place with 'modern equipment nonexistent except for electric autopsy saws' (p. 9). Scarpetta seems to suggest how serial murder and high technology (both communication and otherwise) go hand in hand, not to mention the implication of the U.S.A. as having more sophisticated, and more terrible, crimes than any other country in the world.[56]

[56] Jonathan Kellerman's novel The Butcher's Theater more or less proposes a similar idea.

Contaminating Databases

> The institution of literature in the West, in its relatively modern form, is linked to an authorization to say everything, and doubtless too to the coming about of the modern idea of democracy.[57]

As I argued in Chapter 2, Scarpetta is caught within, and victimized by, criminals, knowledge, information, and information networks. Scarpetta's team has too much knowledge and information about criminals, and this has compromised, even contaminated, their identity -- inasmuch that identity is not, in the first place, formed by such knowledge and information. In this framework, knowledge about criminals and criminal acts refers both to identity-formation and contamination. In the trilogy, the contamination of the mind by violence is particularly mapped together with communication technology -- with the means through which violence spreads and through which criminals like Gault infect others.

I claimed earlier on how criminals violate Scarpetta's house and mind in the form of electric information, which is not held back by burglar alarms or motion sensors. The distinction between flesh and blood criminals and criminals as information, and the dangers therein, are further exemplified by the following passage in The Body Farm. The passage suggests that while flesh and blood criminals may be threatening, information about criminals may be just as dangerous, if not even more dangerous. Wesley takes Scarpetta to visit Lucy in the ERF, where Lucy works on CAIN. Scarpetta thinks she knows why

> he had brought me here. This cubicle felt far removed from inner-city field offices, bank robberies, and drug busts. Wesley wanted me to believe if Lucy worked for the Bureau, she would be safe. Yet I knew better, for I understood the ambushes of the mind. (p. 40)

This passage implicitly separates the physical world (real bank robberies and drug busts) from the

[57] Derrida, '"This Strange Institution Called Literature,"' p. 37. There is, of course, a difference between writers like Cornwell and those writers who are persecuted for their political beliefs. The 'authorization' that Derrida speaks of requires that the writer be 'safe from all censorship, be it religious or political' (p. 37). However, despite the freedom to say everything, which can function as a 'powerful political weapon,' this weapon may 'let itself be neutralized as a fiction' (p. 38).

information world (working on those robberies and drug busts with computers, in an electric form, and turning those crimes into writing and electric information). But, as Scarpetta knows from her own experience, Lucy is not 'safe' in her cubicle. The next passage illuminates the 'ambushes of the mind' -- it not only implies how violence and criminals invade Lucy's mind from the outside but it also juxtaposes and identifies the mind with the computer:

> The clean pages my young niece was showing me in her pristine computer would soon carry names and physical descriptions that would make violence real. She would build a data base that would become a landfill of body parts, tortures, weapons, and wounds. And one day she would hear the silent screams. She would imagine the faces of victims in crowds she passed. (ibid.)

The database that Scarpetta is envisaging above is not only that of the computer and CAIN, but also that of Lucy's mind: as the computer is filled with descriptions of 'body parts, tortures, weapons, and wounds,' so is Lucy's mind, like Scarpetta's before her. Lucy's mind will become a database (like a computer database) -- a database of violence and a violent database.[58] What the passage further implies is that violence becomes 'real' when it is reproduced and mediated through the computer and this reproduction of violence signifies contamination. In effect, it is not just the contaminating presence of flesh and blood killers which might be dangerous for the (alleged) purity of one's mind, but, likewise,

---

[58] On one level, the identification of the mind with the computer is the relation of the mind to archival technology -- how the mind and the psychic apparatus are perceived. One of the crucial questions that Derrida asks in Archive Fever concerns the juxtaposition of the psychic apparatus and 'archival techno-science':

> Is the psychic apparatus *better represented* or is it *affected differently* by all the technical mechanisms for archivization and for reproduction, for prostheses of so-called live memory, for simulacrums of living things which already are, and will increasingly be, more refined, complicated, powerful than the 'mystic pad' (microcomputing, electronization, computerization, etc.)?

The core of the passage is 'whether ... the structure of the psychic apparatus...resists the evolution of archival techno-science or not. Is the psychic apparatus *better represented* or is it *affected differently* by all the technical mechanisms for archivization and for reproduction...'? In other words, Derrida examines the relation between the structure of the psychic apparatus and that of archival techno-science (technical mechanisms for reproduction): whether computers and the like represent or, more radically, affect the structure of the psychic apparatus. What interests me in Derrida's arguments in Archive Fever in the context of this study is not perhaps so much the discussion on Freud and psychoanalysis, but the arguments which concern archival technology (if the two can be separated) and which, I think, are relevant to the discussion of the relation between the subject, communication technology, and writing here.

writing, reading and processing information about ’body parts, tortures, weapons, and wounds’ can become the means for the contamination of the mind. Like Scarpetta, through her work Lucy will become ’robbed of innocence and idealism, baptized in the bloody waters of randomness and cruelty, the fabric of trust forever torn’ (PM, p. 32). Note, therefore, how Scarpetta describes Lucy’s new computer -- and, implicitly, Lucy -- in terms of cleanliness: it is a ’pristine’ computer, pure and unspoilt before being filled with descriptions of violence. Lucy is unable to resist contamination, and she is totally defined from the outside in. She will become inhabited by death and the ’silent screams’ of victims.

We may well wonder about what the above implies about the situation of the reader of and in Cornwell’s work, or the reader of texts of violence in general. It is not, in fact, difficult to imagine how the reader of texts of serial murder builds a database of his or her own out of those texts. With this I do not wish to point to the potential effects of violent texts on readers (a debatable question to begin with and a topic for another study), but particularly to how many such texts demand readers’ knowledge of the phenomenon of serial murder -- of its history since Jack the Ripper, its most famous cases, its characteristics, its jargon, and of the investigative tools used by the police and the FBI. But, as readers, we cannot entirely ignore the fact that Scarpetta -- our model-reader -- does intimate that reading violence irrevocably points to contamination.

I suggested in an earlier section how technical mechanisms for reproduction such as tape recorders, telephones, computers, and cameras are associated in the trilogy with death and with the idea of being beside oneself, not being ’oneself.’ Lucy’s mind above is not just contaminated by violence, but through the identification of her mind with the computer -- a prosthetic memory-aid -- her mind becomes contaminated by the ’machinic,’ lifelessness as such. Thus, in this context, the description of the mind in terms of the machinic is more than metaphorical: such descriptions point to death within the psyche. Moreover, in the trilogy Scarpetta typically turns the mind into a question of binary logic and

binary opposites, of coding and decoding, of filling and deleting, of turning on and turning off.[59] A passage in From Potter's Field exemplifies what Scarpetta considers an ideal mind. When she objects to Lucy taking part in the business of locating Gault, she argues the following: '"Lucy doesn't have an off button. She doesn't always understand limits"' (p. 326). In Scarpetta's view, Lucy should have that off button so that if she is malfunctioning -- not understanding the proper limits -- Scarpetta could, as it were, shut her down and Lucy would not be engulfed by her work. Somehow, in this context of technology, the human mind, and binary logic, I cannot help but recall Donna Haraway's words on communication technologies in 'A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s.' Haraway writes,

> Communications technologies and biotechnologies are the crucial tools recrafting our bodies.... Furthermore, communications sciences and modern biologies are constructed by a common move -- *the translation of the world into a problem of coding*, a search for a common language in which all resistance to instrumental control disappears and all heterogeneity can be submitted to disassembly, reassembly, investment, and exchange. (pp. 82-83)

Haraway continues that 'Microelectronics mediates the translation of *labor* into robotics and word processing; *sex* into genetic engineering and reproductive technologies; and *mind* into artificial intelligence and decision procedures' (p. 84). Although I do not share Haraway's optimism concerning the figure of the cyborg, I think she makes a number of important points concerning the relations between humans and technology and the ways in which communications technologies affect societies (how we presently understand the 'human').

---

[59] This resembles the kind of 'Western' logic explicit in Holt's novel Watch Me. Various Western themes emerge in the novel as FBI-agent Jay Fletcher starts to hunt down and kill serial killers, finally becoming one herself: 'In the end it came down to a black-and-white moral decision. Yes or No, Plus or Minus, On or Off, Vigilante Justice or Due Process? Elegant and simple, just like a computer...or a John Wayne movie. *I say we hang the bastard, Sheriff!*' (p. 123). The narrator in the novel compares the Internet and computer networks -- new communication technologies -- with the 'frontier':

> The White House was promoting the expanding use of nationwide computer networks as though it was some kind of go-west-young-man new frontier. They forgot to mention that as well as honest settlers and explorers, the frontier also had its fair share of virtual reality gunslingers, data rustlers, and marauding gangs of hacker outlaws. (pp. 122-123)

As we can notice, the relation between the physical, real, world and the information world is constructed by Scarpetta as contagious, as contamination, particularly in the two latter novels of the trilogy: the human world -- the physical world -- is dangerously doubled and reproduced by various forms of technology. If such reproductions are dangerous in themselves, so are technology and its effects on our minds. Computers and their effect on Lucy, in particular, are depicted as opposed to the real world and real work. I argued earlier on in this chapter how scanning is a way of 'being alert,' a way of being -- machine-like -- conscious of the outside world. Computers, however, can have the opposite effect, too. Lucy is read by Scarpetta as being immersed in and hypnotized by computers, somehow beside herself and out of this world: 'I headed for my study, where I found my niece sitting at my desk staring intensely at the computer monitor' (CU, p. 121; Lucy spends most of her time in this novel going in and out of Scarpetta's study); '... Lucy was too far gone into her esoteric world to give much thought to where to store a book or stack paper' (BF, p. 42); Lucy is 'absorbed in a row of monitors' (FPF, p. 386); 'It was as if Lucy were in a trance' (FPF, p. 404); 'Lucy registered no emotion at all. She sounded like one of the robots or artificial intelligence computers she had programmed at earlier times of her career' (BN, p. 161), and so forth. Computers make Lucy forget the real world outside, and she is drawn into and tranced by an 'esoteric' (inner, secret) world.[60] Paradoxically, it is those computers -- tekhne -- that make violence 'real' for Lucy.

If Scarpetta describes Lucy's mind in terms of a machinic database, she similarly describes Wesley's mind: the mind with 'its scary database.' The case of Wesley here is interesting, since he is a profiler (profilers already being stereotypical characters in serial murder novels). Besides contamination, what becomes evident in his case is a peculiar coupling of the human with the machinic and rationality with imagination. On the one hand, when Wesley's mind is identified with the machinic, this identification strengthens the idea which I referred to earlier on: that crime can be fought successfully with science, machines, computers, and technology in general. In other words, Wesley is

[60] On another level, this is again the inert passive body of the female computer-nerd reduced to a mind, as opposed to the 'real' work or 'real' action of the male.

rational and efficient in that he is less human and more machinic -- he can fight against psychopathic criminals efficiently and impersonally like a computer. As Scarpetta recalls in Cruel and Unusual, 'When Wesley alluded to the Bundys and Son of Sams in the world, he did so theoretically, impersonally, as if his analyses and theories were formulated from secondary sources' (p. 236). Wesley's analysis and investigation of serial murder are fundamentally based on being impersonal and beside oneself, not being oneself and 'in person' -- like Scarpetta is not herself, 'in character,' when she is after Gault. On the other hand, Wesley is more than a machine (machines can be too mechanical and unthinking) since he cannot help being human, an imaginative human being. He is less machinic and more human because he 'loses' character when he interviews serial killers:

> I remembered Marino telling me once that when Wesley returned from some of these pilgrimages into maximum security penitentiaries, he would look pale and drained. It almost made him physically ill to absorb the poison of these men and endure the attachments they inevitably formed to him.... In exchange for information, he did the one thing that not one of us wants to do. He allowed the monster to connect with him.' (ibid.)

Profiling, the investigative tool developed by the FBI to track down serial killers and other violent offenders, then, combines as well as opposes the art of human imagination with the world of science and the machinic.

In the context of serial murder, profiling, imagination, and science, pay attention to the attitude of former FBI-agent Robert Ressler towards profiling in Whoever Fights Monsters. What becomes implicitly evident in his book is the contamination of the 'real' by the 'fictional,' the contamination of the real by fictional reproductions and reduplications. When Ressler refers to profiling, in particular, he is unable to decide whether profiling is art or science, and, symptomatically, he returns to this distinction more than once:

> Criminal profiling was a relatively young science (or art) then, a way of deducing a description of an unknown criminal based on evaluating minute details of the crime scene, the victim, and other evidentiary factors. (p. 4)

> ... when the murders matched the profile, that gave us at the BSU more information on how to evaluate subsequent crime scenes and identify the characteristic signs that murderers leave behind; in short, it helped us to refine further the art (and I do mean the *art*, because it had not yet approached the status of being a science) of profiling. (p. 15)

> That just goes to prove that every single attribute on our list does not apply to every single killer. In a sense, that's why profiling remains an art and not a science.... (p. 207)

> ... I had managed to start a program to train experienced field agents as profiling coordinators, bringing them to Quantico in 1979 for an intensive course in what was becoming a bit more of a science and accordingly less of an art, then sending them back to their field offices. (p. 309)

When Ressler wants to emphasize profiling as an important investigative tool for the agents (important, too, since he helped to develop it), then profiling belongs to the field of efficient science. However, when profiling fails, its status as art is suggested: 'That just goes to prove that every single attribute on our list does not apply to every single killer. In a sense, that's why profiling remains an art and not a science.' 'Art' becomes a scapegoat for Ressler when profiling does not work (it is only art, you know, and art cannot be trusted).

Similarly, when Ressler comments upon the film 'The Silence of the Lambs,' he remarks that he 'objected to several aspects of it' (p. 382). This is because he 'felt that if the FBI was going to be involved in the filming, to the extent of allowing Quantico to be used as a set, [they] ought to exert more influence to make the film realistic' (pp. 382-383). It is evident here how Ressler's objections have to do with power and expertise -- who has the right, competence, or authority to say what about serial murder and its representations, and who is the expert? That is, what representations are allowed to form, as it were, the database for us as viewers or readers and what representations are seen to contaminate the real database? Ressler asserts that dozens of changes could have been made in the film without 'damage to the fictional structure' (p. 383). Ressler demands that the film be more realistic, true to the FBI facts -- ironically, that it should create a realistic, <u>true</u>, illusion of how the FBI hunts for serial killers -- and that the FBI would have had a right to change the facts because it was involved in the film-making process. According to Ressler, the result of the film contorting the facts is that 'New applicants to the

BSU are taking Jodie Foster's character as a role model; they, too, want to be supersleuths' (p. 384). While admitting this, Ressler is blind to the 'fact' of how fiction already affects or produces his reality, or the FBI's reality: that they get new applicants and these applicants take 'Jodie Foster's character as a role model.'

However, earlier on in the book, when Ressler recalls his first meeting with the Vampire Killer, Richard Chase, in 1979, he does not hesitate in recalling fiction to help him:

> He was in leg irons and clanked as he walked, and I thought immediately of Marley's Ghost in Dickens's *A Christmas Carol*.... Here was this skinny odd-looking young man with long black hair; but it was his eyes that really got me. I'll never forget them. They were like those of the shark in the movie *Jaws*. No pupils, just black spots. These were evil eyes that stayed with me long after the interview. (p. 26)

Now here Ressler 'contorts' facts himself: he makes Chase resemble somebody -- or, rather, <u>something</u>, a ghost -- who does not even exist in the real world, not to speak of Chase's eyes being 'like those of the shark in the movie.' Not to mention the fact that sharks like the one in 'Jaws' hardly exist, because animals are not 'evil' in the sense that Ressler implies. Fiction seems to be the only way in which Ressler can describe his experience of the inhuman in Chase, and by conjuring up a ghost and a shark, he strengthens the image of Chase as an inhuman killer. Further, perhaps Ressler regards the shark as a serial killer in the film: from one point of view the shark in 'Jaws' is an animal serial killer, one who chooses victims randomly, then mutilates and kills them. If the shark in the film is evil, it is not because it is hungry, but because it <u>wants</u> to kill. In effect, Ressler is thus doing what he wants to prevent others -- those creating fiction -- from doing: imposing 'fiction' on 'reality.'

Examine, too, the words of the British serial killer Dennis Nilsen in Masters's <u>On Murder</u>:

> He [Nilsen] read *The Silence of the Lambs*, though he has obviously not seen the film....
>
> 'The Hannibal Lecter character is a fraudulent fiction,' Nilsen insists. 'Nobody does what he is supposed to have done through power and control. My offences were committed precisely because I never had any power in my life.
>
> 'They are the acts of weak men, not impressively intelligent characters. Lecter is invented to titillate the public, not to give any idea of truth.' (pp. 38-39)

Nilsen objects to the representation of the serial killer Hannibal the Cannibal in Harris' novel. For him Lecter does not represent truth, but fiction invented for the pleasure of the readers: Lecter is 'a fraudulent fiction,' who is 'invented to titillate the public.' The word 'fraudulent' is more than ironic in this context: Nilsen, a real criminal himself, accuses the character of Lecter for being a fraud, a criminal deception. We might, however, reflect upon Nilsen's understanding of serial murder and self-understanding: how have his institutionalizion and examination by various professionals affected, or, indeed, formed his self-understanding, and whose words is he speaking? Indeed, Seltzer points out in Serial Killers the bizarre circularity of such acts of understanding and the ways in which the real and the fictional become intermingled with (and contaminated by) each other:

> Serial killers read many books about serial killing, and the pop-psychologists' visions make up part of their curriculum.... What is Thomas Dillon's 'confession' in the papers other than the inhabiting of the popular understanding of the serial killer as a self-understanding?... There is evidence that these fictional accounts are often based on official accounts, which in turn often draw on fictional accounts... (pp. 114-15).

What surfaces here is a bizarre network of relations and effects. In order to be able to analyze, define and classify serial killers, the experts of psychology, psychiatry, criminology, and sociology would have had to have some of the killers imprisoned and analyzed. As Holmes and De Burger remark in their study Serial Murder, their findings about serial murder are based on about a hundred imprisoned killers. Such findings as theirs, are then effectively transferred back onto other killers, killers like Nilsen, who then gain 'insight' into themselves and their actions. For instance, when Nilsen regards himself as a 'regressive personality' (On Murder, p. 37), he is returning the experts something that they gave to him in analytic sessions: he uses the language of psychiatry.

In popular fictions of serial murder, the contagious relation between the real and the fictional is often implied through the phenomenon of 'copycatting.' In this phenomenon the person copies the modus operandi of a previous killer, and there the idea of contamination emerges in that the copycat

killer becomes contaminated through reading about the 'original' murders in newspapers and books, or through watching TV and films.[61] We notice that the Gault-trilogy is, specifically, a trilogy about copies, copycats, and reduplications. In The Body Farm, we find Denesa Steiner as a copycat killer; a killer suffering from Munchhausen's syndrome by proxy. Even Gault is a copycat killer, because he copies another killer's, Waddell's, signature in Cruel and Unusual: 'The grotesque display of that twenty-seven-year-old anchorwoman's body was Waddell's special signature. Now a little boy was dead ten years later and someone had signed his work -- on the eve of Waddell's execution -- the same way' (p. 71). Typical of the trilogy, copies, reproductions, and reduplications appear as dangerous: as the dangerous contamination of the 'original' and 'real.' On another level, such a contamination concerns the act of reading (about) violence and criminal acts. As I showed in Chapter 1, accounts and fictions of violence and serial murder have been regarded as dangerous and contagious by a number of critics. This is ultimately how writing and reading serial crime are constructed in the trilogy, too: representation is dangerous, because, as the narrator in the series implies, it is through representation and stories that violence spreads and we are 'robbed of innocence and idealism, baptized in the bloody waters of randomness and cruelty.'

---

[61] As regards fictions of serial murder, examine, for instance, such novels as Pearson's Undercurrents, Deaver's The Bone Collector, Connelly's The Concrete Blonde, Mary Willis Walker's Red Scream (New York: Bantam, 1995; orig. publ. 1994), and the film 'Copycat.'

William Hjortsberg's novel Nevermore (New York: St. Martin's Paperbacks, 1996) is not only concerned with copycats, newspapers and mass media (which circulate the news of the murders) but thereby also with writing and literature, literary forefathers. The serial killer in the novel is named The Poe Killer, because he copies the murders from the stories of Edgar Allan Poe. As the reporter in the novel, Damon Runyon, informs the readers of the *New York American* in his article 'MURDER BY THE BOOK...?'

> Being a Poe fan, the death of Mrs. Speers brings to mind a double homicide I am privileged to observe from baseline seats about a month ago. The losing side is Mrs. Esp and her blond daughter. Widow Esp with her throat cut. The daughter is stuffed up the chimney. Exactly like 'The Murders in the Rue Morgue.' (p. 63)

The main characters of the novel are two real historical figures, magician Harry Houdini and novelist Arthur Conan Doyle, who meet in New York in the 1920s: they attempt to solve the mystery of the Poe murders. While the killer is finally revealed to be Houdini's rival magician, the reader is left wondering about the possible, although somewhat spectral, and rivalrous, literary relation between Conan Doyle and Poe (Conan Doyle was born when Poe had been dead for ten years). That is, rivalry concerning the birth and popularity of the detective figure -- particularly as Conan Doyle is the only character in the novel who confronts, or, should we say, who is haunted by Poe's ghost. In this context, one cannot help wondering whether the name 'The Poe Killer' might also implicate Conan Doyle in another sense, that is, as 'the one who kills Poe.'

* * *

Let me summarize the main points of this chapter. I first claimed that technology and communication technology are used in the fight against criminals in the Scarpetta series. Such a mapping implies how psychopathological crime -- such as serial murder -- can effectively be fought against with the latest forms of technology. However, such forms of technology can also be abused by the criminals -- this is exactly what takes place in the Gault-trilogy and, thus, Gault undermines the very ways in which law and order are maintained. I also argued how technology breeds uneasiness: while technology is anthropomorphized by Scarpetta in the novels, technology (like the serial killer) is also that which contaminates 'the human' as becomes clear through the numerous doublings and reduplications. Then I moved on to argue how electric communication becomes a field of threat and a field which spreads fear -- a contagious, viral, field. I connected this to the idea that the narrator is always on call, always waiting for more murders like the mnemonic device and archiving system CAIN. I examined how the 'natural' human body -- like that of the investigator -- is prosthetically supplemented by various technical devices and mechanisms. Moreover, characteristic of the trilogy and the series is that subjects identify themselves, or are identified with, not just with other subjects, but with technical mechanisms for reproduction. Such identifications are more than metaphorical; indeed, they point to death within the psyche -- even to reproduction and representation as the murder of the present. And finally, I discussed the contamination of the real by the fictional and vice versa on a number of levels. I argued that it is not just the contaminating presence of flesh and blood killers which can be dangerous in the novels, but that writing, reading and processing information about crime, criminals and victims can become the means for the contamination of the mind.

5. (No) More Serial Murder Experts

> 'I'm so tired of cruelty. I'm so tired of people beating their horses and killing little boys and head-injured women.'[1]

> However, Blanchot would ... seem to be advancing the proposition that language is murder, that is, the act of naming things, of substituting a name for the sensation, gives things to us, but in a form that deprives those things of their being. Human speech is thus the annihilation of things *qua* things, and their articulation through language is truly their death-rattle: Adam is the first serial killer.[2]

As I hope to have shown in the previous chapters, serial murder in the Gault-trilogy is associated in a fundamental sense with the dark side of the family: the trilogy explores the dangers that threaten the biological, professional, and the national family -- even the very species of man and humanity in a technological age. Psychopathological crime, serial murder, is contextualized within and mapped together with 'family' in the Gault-trilogy. Through the figure of the serial killer in the trilogy, various images of threatening otherness are presented to the reader as threats to family: threats to the white, heterosexual, middle class family and nation. Family is thus that which the serial killer is not, and thereby, an image of normality materializes. As the killer emerges in various 'disguises' -- as a homosexual, woman, double, Italian, shadow, virus, machine -- those disguises, or the identities which they are seen to represent, appear as dangerous and contagious. Moreover, the rhetoric which prevails in the trilogy is that of health and illness, and through such a rhetoric the above identities appear as bad, sick, copies of the original, that is, of white middle class heterosexuality.

It is therefore the copy, that which stands for reproduction and reduplication, that is threatening in the trilogy. Serial murder is constructed as a culture of the copy, of the reproducible, in the novels: of

---

[1] FPF, p. 80.

[2] Simon Critchley, Very Little -- Almost Nothing: Death, Philosophy, Literature (London: Routledge: 1997), p. 53. Critchley discusses Maurice Blanchot, language and things, in the context of Hegel and dialectics.

copycat killers, viruses, reconstructed and resurrected crime scenes, spitting images, uncanny and cadaverous doubles, exhumed bodies, electronized criminals and profiles, lesbians and gay men as bad copies of the 'original' heterosexuality, twins as a threat to singularity and individuality, Gault's victims like lifeless dolls, and machines which 'act the way we do.' Ultimately, it is also writing and representation -- as opposed to the living human presence, self-presence, and speech -- which are menacing and contagious, artificial and sick in the trilogy. In the context of serial murder, technical mechanisms for reproduction in the trilogy signify the uneasy relation between flesh and letter (Cain and CAIN), humans and machines, physis (nature) and techne (art, skill), between reality and representation.

Being represented, reproduced, photographed, X-rayed, measured, examined with microscopes, and being written about equal being dead and lying on the autopsy table. That is, as a bad copy of reality, representation, understood as a negation of living presence, points to death in the trilogy. This is why the virus is such a significant metaphor in the novels: the virus multiplies and makes copies of itself -- indeed, the virus 'carries delayed death in its self-multiplication' as Derrida suggests. Like Carrie becomes Gault's copy and double, Lucy's being Scarpetta's 'spitting image' partakes of the same logic of reproduction and copying. Like the viral serial killer, the lesbian woman and the gay man signify contagion and death of the family in the trilogy, because they are copies; copies which can themselves be contagious, however. CAIN, as a machinic copy of the human mind and intelligence, is dangerous and lethal as a reader of crime: it not only reads crime but it also reproduces crime. Moreover, the human mind becomes contaminated by prosthetic technology such as CAIN and by the machinic to the extent that the mind is seen to function like a machine in the novels: it reproduces images, it inhabits and multiplies (sites of) death. This is the uncanniness of how 'A day never went by when a memory wasn't triggered, when an image didn't flash. I would see a face bloated by injury and death, a body in bondage' (FPF, p. 56). This is what Scarpetta looks like in the age of telecommunication and communication technologies: she is constantly 'on,' there is round-the-clock transmission of body parts and bodies in bondage.

Reading crime in the Gault-trilogy is an act both enjoyable but also one that needs to be condemned, because reading is a means for spreading fear and contamination and because reading crime for pleasure is 'wrong.' This is what the first-person narrator, our model-reader, never fails to indicate. The narrator works to stop the accumulation of bodies (no more serial killers, no more expertise), but her investigations only increase the number of bodies: they double the number. In effect, as a narrator and witness, Scarpetta is perversely guilty of infecting her readers, because through narrating the murder investigations, she spreads the fascination with and the horror of serial murder (more readers, more serial murder expertise, more series of killers and books). Fascination and condemnation/warning go hand in hand; writing is a pharmakon, poison and remedy in multiple ways.

Noticeably, it is the normal context of CAIN reading crime that Gault and Carrie displace when they penetrate and contaminate CAIN in the trilogy. In From Potter's Field, they send messages in CAIN's name and they make CAIN ask different questions from the ones it was programmed to ask. For example, CAIN asks what it was never programmed to ask, questions of sexual nature. It reads and analyzes crime differently through Gault and Carrie: as Lucy recalls in From Potter's Field, '"Specifically, CAIN wanted to know the color of the assailant's pubic hair and if the victim had had an orgasm"' (p. 112). The e-mail messages that Gault sends in CAIN's name are warnings to the police and to Scarpetta, and the letters sent by Carrie in CAIN's name are 'Christmas presents' from CAIN. The letters succeed the murders of Jayne and Sheriff Brown. Indeed, what would Scarpetta, or we as readers, do during Christmas if she/we did not receive such morbid 'presents' as Jayne and Sheriff Brown? Murder, pleasure, and economy become intermingled.

However, even though it is finally made clear when it is really CAIN 'himself' who is asking the questions (as properly programmed), there remains something disturbing about CAIN's questions, something disconcerting and strangely 'human.' Scarpetta's personification of CAIN in terms of gender, for example, creates for the reader an image of CAIN wanting to know about murder and mayhem for reasons which have little to do with processing crime and information. This is what Commander Penn tells Scarpetta about CAIN asking questions about Jayne's death in From Potter's Field: '"It was

interested in the mutilation, wanting to know from which parts of the body skin had been excised and what class cutting instrument had been used. It wanted to know if there had been a sexual assault, and if so, was the penetration oral, vaginal, anal or other"' (p. 120; note that these are the kinds of questions that Scarpetta tries to answer through autopsies). It sounds as if CAIN was interested in the victim for reasons beyond the police investigation -- as if CAIN had a 'personal,' morbid, interest in death and mutilation (so to speak, CAIN as Crime Artificial Intelligence Network). Particularly so, since on the next page Scarpetta interprets Gault's morbid interest in CAIN in the following way: '"What wouldn't he like better than to get inside CAIN and have at his disposal a database containing the details of the most horrendous crimes committed in the world?"' The implication here is that, besides gaining information through CAIN, Gault would enjoy reading about horrendous, violent, crimes. Moreover, Point of Origin begins with a letter from imprisoned Carrie Grethen to Scarpetta, in which she, enigmatically, 'wants photos.' Scarpetta and Wesley interpret this as Carrie wanting to have photos of Gault's autopsy, so that she could, as Wesley says, '"see Gault mangled like chopped meat, so she can fantasize and get off on that"' (p. 10). Representation, reproduction, pleasure, bodily violence, and fantasy are intimately coupled here.

The position of the reader of the trilogy is similarly two-fold: s/he is both fascinated and horrified by the violence depicted in the novels. Like CAIN, the reader hesitates between and occupies two positions. On the one hand, we are like the 'good' Scarpetta and CAIN and read crime properly for information. On the other, we occupy the position of the 'bad' CAIN, contaminated by Gault and Carrie: like the bad CAIN and Gault, we read crime for pleasure. Because of the virus, CAIN literally begins to ask perverse questions about sex and pleasure in murder cases; that is, certain questions and information are prohibited and improper in crime investigations as there are the 'right' questions and the 'wrong' questions (as defined by the experts). Self-reflexively in the novels, because of Gault and Carrie, the normal context of CAIN asking questions (law enforcement) turns into a perverse one (reading crime for pleasure). As readers of the trilogy, we therefore become guilty of the act of reading -- that we read Gault's crimes perversely for pleasure. This is an act that the narrator condemns, and such a

condemnation places the reader in an impossible, ambivalent, situation. It is certainly for pleasure that we read sad, scary, or violent books.

From another perspective, and to put it another way, we are witnesses like Scarpetta to the countless (representations of) victims of bodily violence and serial murder. We could characterize this witnessing like Hal Foster does in his reading of Andy Warhol's art in the context of death and mass subjectivity. Foster writes that witnessing 'is not neutral or impassive; it is an erotics that is both voyeuristic and exhibitionist, both sadistic and masochistic.'[3] This is the triumphant survival of the witness that I pointed out in Chapter 2 -- or, as Foster puts the double position of the mass subject as witness to a disaster: 'even as he or she may mourn the victims, even identify with them masochistically, he or she may also be thrilled, sadistically, that there *are* victims of whom he or she is *not* one' (p. 55). We are not victims ourselves, but enjoy representations of death and disaster from an ambivalent position.

Texts of violence and serial murder -- such as Cornwell's Temple Gault-trilogy -- are, on one level, a question of pain, torture, death, mourning, and victimization, but, on another level, they are a question of genres, representation, the politics of reading and representation, and of the violence of representation. It would be a mistake to condemn or read such popular texts only as generic 'mass entertainment,' or as 'escapist entertainment,' with no content worth analyzing (i.e., all form and no content). Instead, as I have shown in the present study, such popular fictions need to be analyzed precisely because of their content, so that we become aware how such fictions maintain, undermine, or produce images of criminality and deviation -- or normality. That is why I have used a wider critical framework here in my close reading of the serial murder-trilogy, sometimes perhaps deliberately ignoring generic conventions and generic criticism: I did not want to examine generic forms, plots, characters, and typical narrative turns only. Besides, as I have argued, the serial killer is specifically a figure who crosses boundaries, generic and otherwise, inhabits many contexts, and generates multiple readings. Truly, there is 'no place like home' for the serial killer.

---

[3] Foster, 'Death in America,' p. 51.

As can be seen from my analyses in this study, my view on Cornwell's fiction is rather pessimistic. Throughout this study, I have argued that, as a serial killer, Gault is a figure through whom deviation and normality are defined and the boundaries of the family are drawn. I have repeatedly claimed that Cornwell's novels embrace a particular kind of family structure, the ideal nuclear family, where everybody has his or her proper place. However, through a double gesture, such a normative family structure is exposed as an ideal and a fabrication no more real and original than other kind of family structures. This is achieved through the very act of representing, taking into account, those other kind of homes, families, and 'deviant' sexualities -- even though they are ambivalently positioned as deviants. The readers of Cornwell are, at least, given the possibility of engaging themselves in discussions on ideals, gender and deviation. Perhaps it it precisely the ambivalence between ideal and fabrication which would allow more open readings of Cornwell's novels to take place: indeed, perhaps they are the subversive opening for future readings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Cornwell, Patricia. All That Remains. London: Warner Books, 1993. Orig. publ. 1992.

----------. Black Notice. London: Little, Brown and Company, 1999.

----------. The Body Farm. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1994.

----------. Body of Evidence. London: Warner Books, 1992. Orig. publ. 1991.

----------. Cause of Death. London: Little, Brown and Company, 1996.

----------. Cruel and Unusual. London: Warner Books, 1994. Orig. publ. 1993.

----------. From Potter's Field. New York: Scribner, 1995.

----------. Hornet's Nest. London: Little, Brown and Company, 1997.

----------. Point of Origin. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1998.

----------. Postmortem. London: Warner Books, 1992. Orig. publ. 1990.

----------. Unnatural Exposure. London: Little, Brown and Company, 1997.

Secondary Sources

Aitio, Tommi. 'Pimeyden ytimessä.' Filmihullu. Nos. 4-5 (1997), 24-25.

Arman, Derek Van. Just Killing Time. New York: Onyx, 1993.

Baldick, Chris. In Frankenstein's Shadow: Myth, Monstrosity, and Nineteenth-Century Writing. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Barnes, Linda. Hardware. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1995.

Bataille, Georges. The Accursed Share: An Essay on General Economy. Vols. II & III. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Zone Books, 1993.

Berenstein, Rhona. 'Mommie Dearest: *Aliens*, *Rosemary's Baby* and Mothering.' The Journal of Popular Culture, 24, No. 2 (1990), 55-73.

Bersani, Leo. 'Is the Rectum a Grave?' AIDS: Cultural Analysis, Cultural Activism. Ed. Douglas Crimp. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 1988, 197-222.

Black, Joel. The Aesthetics of Murder: A Study in Romantic Literature and Contemporary Culture. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

Bloom, Clive. 'The House that Jack Built: Jack the Ripper, Legend and the Power of the Unknown.' Nineteenth-Century Suspense: From Poe to Conan Doyle. Eds. Clive Bloom, Brian Docherty, Jane Gibb, and Keith Shand. London: Macmillan, 1988, 120-137.

Borch-Jacobsen, Mikkel. The Freudian Subject. Trans. Catherine Porter. London: Macmillan, 1989.

----------. Lacan: The Absolute Master. Trans. Douglas Brick. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.

----------. Remembering Anna O.: A Century of Mystification. Trans. Kirby Olson with Xavier Callahan and the author. New York and London: Routledge, 1996.

Braidotti, Rosi. 'Signs of Wonder and Traces of Doubt: On Teratology and Embodied Differences.' Between Monsters, Goddesses and Cyborgs: Feminist Confrontations with Science, Medicine and Cyberspace. Eds. Nina Lykke and Rosi Braidotti. London & New Jersey: Zed Books, 1996, 135-152.

Bronfen, Elisabeth. Over Her Dead Body: Death, Femininity and the Aesthetic. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992.

----------, and Sarah Webster Goodwin, eds. 'Introduction.' Death and Representation. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993, 3-25.

Brook, James, and Iain A. Boal, eds. Resisting the Virtual Life: The Culture and Politics of Information. San Francisco: City Lights, 1995.

Brooks, Peter. Body Work: Objects of Desire in Modern Narrative. Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Browning, Barbara. Infectious Rhythm: Metaphors of Contagion and the Spread of African Culture. New York and London: Routledge, 1998.

Butler, Judith. Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'. New York and London: Routledge, 1993.

----------. Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity. New York and London: Routledge, 1990.

----------. 'Imitation and Gender Insubordination.' The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader. Eds. Henry Abelove, Michèle Aina Barale and David M. Halperin. New York & London: Routledge, 1993, 307-320.

----------. The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.

----------. 'Sexual Inversions.' Discourses of Sexuality: From Aristotle to AIDS. Ed. Domna C. Stanton. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1992, 344-361.

Caputi, Jane. The Age of Sex Crime. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Press, 1987.

----------. 'American Psychos: The Serial Killer in Contemporary Fiction.' Journal of American Culture, 16, No. 4 (Winter 1993), 101-112.

Carr, Caleb. The Alienist. London: Warner Books, 1995.

Chase, Linda, and Joyce St. George. Perfect Cover. London: Bantan, 1995. Orig. publ. 1994.

Christie, Agatha. The ABC Murders. London: HarperCollins*Publishers*, 1993. Orig. publ. 1936.

Clark, Urszula, and Sonia Zyngier. 'Women Beware Women: Detective Fiction and Critical Discourse Stylistics.' Language and Literature, 7, No. 2 (1998), 141-157.

Clarke, John. New Times and Old Enemies: Essays on Cultural Studies and America. London: HarperCollins*Academic*, 1991.

Clover, Carol J. Men, Women, and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film. London: British Film Institute, 1992.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. 'Monster Culture (Seven Theses).' Monster Theory: Reading Culture. Ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996, 3-25.

Connelly, Michael. The Concrete Blonde. London: Orion, 1998. Orig. publ. 1994.

Copjec, Joan. Read My Desire: Lacan against the Historicists. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 1994.

Coward Rosalind, and Linda Semple. 'Tracking down the Past: Women and Detective Fiction.' From My Guy to Sci-Fi: Genre and Women's Writing in the Postmodern World. Ed. Helen Carr. London: Pandora, 1989, 39-57.

Creed, Barbara. 'Lesbian Bodies: Tribades, Tomboys and Tarts.' Sexy Bodies: The Strange Carnalities of Feminism. Eds. Elizabeth Grosz and Elspeth Probyn. London: Routledge, 1995, 86-103.

----------. The Monstrous-Feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Critchley, Simon. Very Little -- Almost Nothing: Death, Philosophy, Literature. London: Routledge: 1997.

Deaver, Jeffery. The Bone Collector. London: Coronet, 1997.

De Lauretis, Teresa. 'Sexual Indifference and Lesbian Representation.' The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader. Eds. Henry Abelove, Michèle Aina Barale and David M. Halperin. New York & London: Routledge, 1993, 141-158.

----------, Andreas Huyssen, and Kathleen Woodward, eds. 'Foreword.' The Technological Imagination: Theories and Fictions. Madison, Wisconsin: Coda Press, 1980, vii-x.

Demos, John. Past, Present, and Personal: The Family and the Life Course in American History. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Derrida, Jacques. Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression. Trans. Eric Prenowitz. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.

----------. Dissemination. Trans. Barbara Johnson. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981.

----------. Of Grammatology. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

----------. 'Signature Event Context.' Margins Of Philosophy. Trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982, 307-330.

----------. 'A Silkworm of One's Own (Points of view stitched on the other's veil).' Trans. Geoffrey Bennington. Oxford Literary Review, 18, Nos. 1-2 (1996), 3-65.

----------. '"This Strange Institution Called Literature." An Interview with Jacques Derrida.' Acts of Literature. Ed. Derek Attridge. New York & London: Routledge, 1992, 33-75.

Doane, Mary Ann. 'Information, Crisis, Catastrophe.' Logics of Television: Essays in Cultural Criticism. Ed. Patricia Mellencamp. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990, 222-239.

----------. 'Technology and Sexual Difference: Apocalyptic Scenarios at Two "Fins de Siècle."' differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies, 9, No. 2 (1998), 1-24.

----------. 'Technophilia: Technology, Representation, and the Feminine.' Body/Politics: Women and the Discourses of Science. Eds. Mary Jacobus, Evelyn Fox Keller, and Sally Shuttleworth. New York and London: Routledge, 1990, 163-176.

Duncan, Paul. 'Verbal Evidence.' The Third Degree: Crime Writers in Conversation. Ed. Paul Duncan. Harpenden, Herts: No Exit Press, 1997, 12-25.

Edelman, Lee. Homographesis: Essays in Gay Literary and Cultural Theory. New York & London: Routledge, 1994.

Egger, Steven A. 'Serial Murder: A Synthesis of Literature and Research.' Serial Murder: An Elusive Phenomenon. Ed. Steven A. Egger. New York: Prager, 1990, 3-34.

Ellis, Bret Easton. American Psycho. London: Picador, 1992. Orig. publ. 1991.

Ellis, Havelock. Studies in the Psychology of Sex. Vol. II. Sexual Inversion. 3rd rev. ed. Philadelphia: F.A. Davis Company, 1922.

Finch, Phillip. F2F. London: Orion, 1995.

Flax, Jane. 'The Family in Contemporary Feminist Thought: A Critical Review.' The Family in Political

Thought. Ed. Jean Bethke Elshtain. Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1982, 223-253.

Foster, Hal. 'Death in America.' October, 75 (Winter 1996), 37-59.

Foucault, Michel. 'The Dangerous Individual.' Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977-1984. Trans. Alan Sheridan and others. Ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman. New York: Routledge, 1988, 125-151.

----------. 'Two Lectures.' Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972-1977. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York, Pantheon Books, 1980, 78-108.

Foy, George. The Shift. London: Bantam Books, 1997.

Fuss, Diana. Identification Papers. New York: Routledge, 1995.

----------. 'Inside/Out.' Inside/Out: Lesbian Theories, Gay Theories. Ed. Diana Fuss. New York and London: Routledge, 1991, 1-10.

Galvin, Angela. '*Basic Instinct*: Damning Dykes.' The Good, the Bad and The Gorgeous: Popular Culture's Romance with Lesbianism. Eds. Diane Hamer and Belinda Budge. London and San Francisco: Pandora, 1994, 218-231.

Garber, Marjorie. Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing & Cultural Anxiety. New York: HarperPerennial, 1993.

Garrett, Greg. 'Objecting to Objectification: Re-Viewing the Feminine in *The Silence of the Lambs*.' Journal of Popular Culture, Vol. 27, No. 4 (Spring 1994), 1-12.

Gatens, Moira. Imaginary Bodies: Ethics, Power and Corporeality. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

Gilman, Sander. 'The Iconography of Disease.' AIDS: Cultural Analysis, Cultural Activism. Ed. Douglas Crimp. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 1988, 87-107.

----------. '"Who Kills Whores?" "I Do," Says Jack: Race and Gender in Victorian London.' Death and Representation. Eds. Elisabeth Bronfen and Sarah Webster Goodwin, Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993, 263-284.

Gresswell, David M., and Clive R. Hollin. 'Multiple Murder: A Review.' The British Journal of Criminology, 34, No. 1 (1994), 1-14.

Griggers, Camilla.'Phantom and Reel Projections: Lesbians and the (Serial) Killing Machine.' Posthuman Bodies. Eds. Judith Halberstam and Ira Livingston. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995, 162-176.

Grixti, Joseph. Terrors of Uncertainty: The Cultural Contexts of Horror Fiction. London and New York: Routledge, 1989.

Grossberg, Lawrence. We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture. New York & London: Routledge,1992.

Grover, Jan Zita.'AIDS: Keywords.' AIDS: Cultural Analysis, Cultural Activism. Ed. Douglas Crimp. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 1988, 17-30.

Halberstam, Judith. Female Masculinity. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1998.

----------. Skin Shows: Gothic Horror and the Technology of Monsters. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 1995.

----------, and Ira Livingston. 'Introduction.' Posthuman Bodies. Eds. Judith Halberstam and Ira Livingston. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995, 1-19.

Haraway, Donna. 'A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s.' Socialist Review, 15 (1985), 65-107.

Harris, Ruth. Murders and Madness: Medicine, Law, and Society in the *Fin de Siècle*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Harris, Thomas. Hannibal. New York: Delacorte Press, 1999.

----------. Red Dragon. London: The Bodley Head, 1982. Orig. publ. 1981.

----------. The Silence of the Lambs. New York: St. Martin's Paperbacks, 1989. Orig. publ. 1988.

Hart, Lynda. Fatal Women: Lesbian Sexuality and the Mark of Aggression. London: Routledge, 1994.

Hawthorne, Nigel. Sex Killers. London: Boxtree, 1994.

Hickey, Eric. 'The Etiology of Victimization in Serial Murder: An Historical and Demographic Analysis.' Serial Murder: An Elusive Phenomenon. Ed. Steven A. Egger. New York: Prager, 1990, 53-71.

Hirsch, David A. H. 'Dahmer's Effects.' Disciplinarity and Dissent in Cultural Studies. Eds. Cary Nelson and Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar. New York and London: Routledge, 1996, 441-472.

Hjortsberg, William. Nevermore. New York: St. Martin's Paperbacks, 1996.

Holmes, Ronald M., and James De Burger. Serial Murder. Newbury Park, CA and London: Sage, 1988.

Holt, A.J. Watch Me. London: Headline Feature, 1996.

Hutchings, Peter. 'Tearing Your Soul Apart: Horror's New Monsters.' Modern Gothic: A Reader. Eds. Victor Sage and Allan Lloyd Smith. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1996, 89-103.

Irwin, John T. The Mystery to a Solution: Poe, Borges, and the Analytic Detective Story. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Jacobus, Mary, Evelyn Fox Keller, and Sally Shuttleworth, eds. 'Introduction.' Body/Politics: Women and the Discourses of Science. New York and London: Routledge, 1990, 1-10.

Jancovich, Mark. Horror. London: B.T. Batsford, 1992.

Jenkins, Philip. Using Murder: The Social Construction of Serial Homicide. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994.

Jermyn, Deborah. 'Rereading the Bitches from Hell: A Feminist Appropriation of the Female Psychopath.' Screen, 37, No. 3 (1996), 251-267.

Kelleher, Michael D., and C.L. Kelleher. Murder Most Rare: The Female Serial Killer. Westport, Connecticut, and London: Praeger, 1998.

Kellerman, Jonathan. The Butcher's Theater. New York: Bantam, 1989. Orig. publ. 1988.

----------. Over the Edge. London: Warner Books, 1993. Orig. publ. 1987.

Keppel, Robert D., and William J. Birnes. Signature Killers. London: Arrow, 1998.

Kerr, Philip. Gridiron. London: Vintage, 1996. Orig. publ. 1995.

----------. A Philosophical Investigation. London: Vintage, 1996. Orig. publ. 1992.

Kiger, Kenna. 'The Darker Figure of Crime: The Serial Murder Enigma.' Serial Murder: An Elusive Phenomenon. Ed. Steven A. Egger. New York: Prager, 1990, 35-52.

Kittler, Friedrich A. Discourse Networks 1800/1900. Trans. Michael Metteer and Chris Cullens. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Klein, Kathleen Gregory. The Woman Detective: Gender & Genre. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1995. Orig. publ. 1988.

Kooistra, Paula. Criminals as Heroes: Structure, Power & Identity. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1989.

Lindsay, David L. Mercy. New York: Bantam, 1991.

Maerov, Lauri. Copycat. London: Signet, 1996. Orig. publ. 1995.

Mann, Jennifer. Deadlier than the Male: An Investigation into Feminine Crime Writing. London: David & Charles, 1981.

Martín, Jorge Hernández. Readers and Labyrinths: Detective Fiction in Borges, Bustos Domecq, and Eco. New York and London: Garland, 1995.

Marvin, Carolyn. When Old Technologies Were New: Thinking About Electric Communication in the Late Nineteenth Century. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Masters, Brian. On Murder. London: Coronet Books, 1994.

Mazlish, Bruce. 'Turing's Test and Sexual Identity.' Contention: Debates in Society, Culture, and Science, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Spring 1996), 91-95.

Modleski, Tania. Feminism Without Women: Culture and Criticism in a 'Postfeminist' Age. New York and London: Routledge, 1991.

Moser, Mary Anne, and Douglas Macleod, eds. Immersed in Technology: Art and Virtual Technology. Cambridge, Mass. and London: The MIT Press, 1996.

Mosley, Walter. White Butterfly. London and Sydney: Pan Books, 1994.

Mulgan, G.J. Communication and Control: Networks and the New Economies of Communication. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.

Munson, Ronald. Fan Mail. New York: Onyx, 1994.

Munt, Sally R. Murder by the Book? Feminism and the Crime Novel. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

Myslik, Wayne D. 'Renegotiating the Social/Sexual Identities of Places: Gay Communities as SafeHavens or Sites of Resistance?' BodySpace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality. Ed. Nancy Duncan. London and New York: Routledge, 1996, 156-169.

Nevanlinna, Tuomas, and Janne Porttikivi, eds. Nuori Voima, No. 3 (1998).

The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary (NSOED). Ed. Lesley Brown. Vols. I & II. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Norris, Joel. Serial Killers: The Growing Menace. London: Arrow, 1990.

Palmer, Jerry. Potboilers: Methods, Concepts and Case Studies in Popular Fiction. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.

Parker, T. Jefferson. Summer of Fear. New York: St. Martin's Paperbacks, 1994.

Patterson, James. Cat and Mouse. London: Little, Brown and Company, 1997.

----------. Kiss the Girls. London: HarperCollins*Publishers*, 1995.

Pearson, Ridley. Undercurrents. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989. Orig. publ. 1988.

Penttilä, Antti, Jorma Hirvonen, and Pekka Saukko, eds. Oikeuslääketieteen perusteet. Helsinki: Duodecim, 1993.

Perriman, Cole. Terminal Games. New York: Bantam Books, 1995.

Piipponen, Maarit. 'Hämmentävä sarjamurhaaja Hannibal.' Helsingin Sanomat. December 11, 1999.

----------. '"Maailma sellaisena kuin se on" - Kommentteja Amerikan psykon luentaan.' Kulttuurivihkot. No. 5 (1997), 24-26.

Pottinger, Stanley. The Fourth Procedure. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1995.

Punter, David. The Literature of Terror: A History of Gothic Fictions from 1765 to the Present Day. London and New York: Longman, 1980.

Pyrhönen, Heta. '"Crime is Common, Logic is Rare": Narrative and Moral Issues in the Detective Story.' Diss. University of Helsinki 1998.

----------. 'Naisetsivien jäljillä.' Naistutkimus, No. 1 (1998), 68-69.

Quittner, Joshua. 'Invasion of Privacy.' Time. August 25 (1997), 34-41.

Rapinoja, Susanna. 'Bret Easton Ellisin American Psycho.' Kulttuurivihkot, Nos. 3-4 (1997), 26-52.

Reddy, Maureen T. 'The Feminist Counter-Tradition in Crime: Cross, Grafton, Paretsky, and Wilson.' The Cunning Craft: Original Essays on Detective Fiction and Contemporary Literary Theory. Eds. Ronald G. Walker and June M. Frazer. Macomb, Ill: Western Illinois University, 1990, 174-187.

----------. Sisters in Crime: Feminism and the Crime Novel. New York: Continuum, 1988.

Reichs, Kathy. Déjà Dead. London: Heinemann, 1998. Orig. publ. 1997.

Reid, Roddy. '"Death of the Family," or, Keeping Human Beings Human.' Posthuman Bodies. Eds. Judith Halberstam and Ira Livingston. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995, 177-199.

Ressler, Robert K., and Tom Schachtman. Whoever Fights Monsters. London: Pocket Books, 1993.

Robinson, Amy. 'It Takes One to Know One: Passing and Communities of Common Interest.' Critical Inquiry, 20, No. 4 (1994), 715-736.

Ronell, Avital. 'Queens of the Night.' Finitude's Score: Essays for the End of the Millennium. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1994, 41-61.

----------. 'The Test Drive.' Deconstruction is/in America: A New Sense of the Political. Ed. Anselm Haverkamp. New York and London: New York University Press, 1995, 200-220.

----------. 'The Walking Switchboard.' Finitude's Score: Essays for the End of the Millennium. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1994, 237-254.

----------. 'Worst Neighborhoods of the Real.' Finitude's Score: Essays for the End of the Millennium. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1994, 219-235.

Royle, Nicholas. Telepathy and Literature: Essays on the Reading Mind. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991.

Rule, Ann. The Stranger Beside Me. London: Warner Books, 1994. Orig. publ. 1980.

Saine, Reetta. 'Kirjattu ruumis eli ruumiillisuuden kuvaus Patricia D. Cornwellin dekkarissa *Ruumistarha.*' Murha pukee naista: Naisdekkareita ja dekkarinaisia. Eds. Ritva Hapuli and Johanna Matero. Helsinki: KSL Kirjat, 1997, 319-339.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. 'Epistemology of the Closet.' The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader. Eds. Henry Abelove, Michèle Aina Barale and David M. Halperin. New York & London: Routledge, 1993, 45-61.

Seltzer, Mark. 'Serial Killers (I).' differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies, 5, No. 1 (1993),

92-128.

----------. Serial Killers: Death and Life in America's Wound Culture. New York and London: Routledge, 1998.

----------. 'Serial Killers (II): The Pathological Public Sphere.' Critical Inquiry, 22, No. 1 (1995), 122-149.

Sharrett, Christopher. 'The Horror Film in Neoconservative Culture.' Journal of Popular Film & Television, 21, No. 3 (1993), 100-110.

Sheptycki, J.W.E. A Review of Steven A. Egger's (ed.) Serial Murder: An Elusive Phenomenon. The British Journal of Criminology, 33, No. 1 (1993), 103-108.

Sihvonen, Jukka. Aineeton syli: Johdatus audiovisuaaliseen tulevaisuuteen. Tampere: Gaudeamus, 1996.

Silverman, Kaja. 'Fragments of a Fashionable Discourse.' Studies in Entertainment: Critical Approaches to Mass Culture. Ed. Tania Modleski. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1986, 139-152.

Smoke, Stephen. Pacific Coast Highway. New York: HarperPaperbacks, 1994.

Sontag, Susan. Illness as Metaphor. New York: Vintage, 1979. Orig. publ. 1978.

Stacey, Judith. In the Name of the Family: Rethinking Family Values in the Postmodern Age. Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.

Sugden, Philip. The Complete History of Jack the Ripper. London: Robinson, 1994.

Sundelson, David. 'The Demon Therapist and Other Dangers: Jonathan Demme's *The Silence of the Lambs*.' Journal of Popular Film & Television, Vol. 21, No. 1 (Spring 1993), 12-17.

Tanner, Laura E. Intimate Violence: Reading Rape and Torture in Twentieth-Century Fiction. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994.

Terry, Jennifer. 'The Seductive Power of Science.' Posthuman Bodies. Eds. Judith Halberstam and Ira Livingston. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995, 135-161.

Tharp, Julie. 'The Transvestite as Monster: Gender Horror in *The Silence of the Lambs*.' Journal of Popular Film & Television, 19, No. 3 (1991), 106-113.

Todorov, Tzvetan. 'The Typology of Detective Fiction.' The Poetics of Prose. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1977, 42-52.

Treichler, Paula A. 'AIDS, Homophobia, and Biomedical Discourse: An Epidemic of Signification.' AIDS: Cultural Analysis, Cultural Activism. Ed. Douglas Crimp. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 1988, 31-70.

Trenhaile, John. A Means To Evil. London: HarperCollins*Paperbacks*, 1994. Orig. publ. 1993.

Tudor, Andrew. Monsters and Mad Scientists: A Cultural History of the Horror Movie. Oxford, UK and Cambridge, USA: 1989.

Tyler, Carole-Anne. 'Passing: Narcissism, Identity, and Difference.' differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies, 6, Nos. 2 + 3 (1994), 212-248.

Valentine, Gill. '(Re)Negotiating the "Heterosexual Street": Lesbian Productions of Space.' BodySpace. Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality. Ed. Nancy Duncan. London and New York: Routledge, 1996, 146-155.

Vetter, Harold. 'Dissociation, Psychopathy, and the Serial Murderer.' Serial Murder: An Elusive Phenomenon. Ed. Steven A. Egger. New York: Prager, 1990, 73-94.

Walker, Mary Willis. Red Scream. New York: Bantam, 1995. Orig. publ. 1994.

Walkowitz, Judith R. City of Dreadful Delights: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London. London: Virago Press, 1994. Orig. publ. 1992.

Watney, Simon. Policing Desire: Pornography, AIDS and the Media. London: Methuen, 1987.

----------. 'The Spectacle of AIDS.' The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader. Eds. Henry Abelove, Michèle Aina Barale and David M. Halperin. New York & London: Routledge, 1993, 202-211.

Weston, Kath. Families We Choose: Lesbians, Gays, Kinship. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.

Whitlock, Gillian. '"Cop it Sweet": Lesbian Crime Fiction.' The Good, the Bad and the Gorgeous: Popular Culture's Romance with Lesbianism. Eds. Diane Hamer and Belinda Budge. London and San Francisco: Pandora, 1994, 96-118.

Wiegman, Robyn. American Anatomies. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1995.

Willett, Ralph. The Naked City: Urban Crime Fiction in the USA. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Wilson, Colin, and Damon Wilson. A Plague of Murder: The Rise and Rise of Serial Killing in the Modern Age. London: Robinson, 1995.

----------, and Damon and Rowan Wilson. World Famous Gaslight Murders. London: Magpie, 1992.

Woods, Robin. '"His Appearance is Against Him": The Emergence of the Detective.' The Cunning Craft: Original Essays on Detective Fiction and Contemporary Literary Theory. Eds. Ronald G. Walker and June M. Frazer. Macomb, Ill: Western Illinois University, 1990, 15-24.

Filmography

Demme, Jonathan, dir. 'The Silence of the Lambs.' Orion Pictures, 1991.

Friedkin, William, dir. 'Cruising.' United Artists, 1980.

Mann, Michael, dir. 'Manhunter.' Touchstone Pictures, 1986.

Schroder, Barbet, dir. 'Single White Female.' Columbia Pictures, 1992.

Sena, Dominic, dir. 'Kalifornia.' Viacom, 1993.

TV Programmes

White, Stephen, dir. 'Clive Barker's A to Z of Horror.' Part 1. A BBC/A&E Network Co-Production, 1995.

WWW-Documents

Cornwell, Patricia. 'Kay Scarpetta Would Get Tough on Young.' Richmond Times-Dispatch. September 13, 1998 [wysiwyg://155/http://gateway-va.com/rtd/special/opedcols/cornwell13.shtml].

Dobson, Roger, and Jonathan Leake. 'First artificial DNA can create new forms of life.' The Sunday Times. January 23, 2000 [http://www.sunday-times.co.uk/].

http://www.fbi.gov/vicap/vicap.htm.

http://www.robertkressler.com.