UNIVERSITY OF VAASA

Faculty of Humanities

Department of English

Erica Håkans

The Voyeuristic and the Oppositional Gaze in Two Novels by P. D. James

Master's Thesis

Vaasa 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT 3

1 INTRODUCTION 5

2 THE VOYEURISTIC, OPPOSITIONAL AND PANOPTICON GAZE 12

2.1 The voyeuristic and the oppositional 15

2.2 The panopticon gaze, the narrator and privacy 22

3 THE PANOPTICON GAZE OF THE NARRATOR IN THE TWO NOVELS 29

3.1 Outside looking in: thoughts and memories 30

3.2 Mediating a character's gaze 33

4 THE VOYEURISTIC AND
THE OPPOSITIONAL GAZE IN THE TWO NOVELS 36

4.1 The voyeuristic detective 36

4.2 The oppositional gaze 48

4.2.1 Criticism of authority 48

4.2.2 Suspects: the overt and the averted gaze 53

4.2.3 The uncanny gaze 58

5 CONCLUSIONS 64

WORKS CITED 67

VASA UNIVERSITET
Humanistiska fakulteten
Institution: Institutionen för engelska språket
Författare: Erica Håkans
Avhandling pro gradu: The Voyeuristic and the Oppositional Gaze in Two Novels by P. D. James
Examen: Filosofie magister
Ämne: Engelska
Årtal: 2007
Handledare: Gerald Porter

SAMMANFATTNING:

Syftet med avhandlingen var att analysera kriminalromanerna *A Taste for Death* (1986) och *The Lighthouse* (2005) av P. D. James med hjälp av Laura Mulveys filmteoretiska begrepp ”the gaze” (fritt översatt ”blicken”). Med sin essä ”Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema” (1975) gjorde Mulvey ett genombrott inom feministisk filmteori genom att hävda att biofilmer från Hollywood skapar njutning uteslutande för den manliga tittaren. Han identifierar sig med den manliga huvudrollsinnehavaren på samma sätt som ett barn identifierar sig med sitt ideala ego via sin egen spegelbild. Vidare tar han kvinnan som sexuellt objekt för att undvika kastrationsångest antingen via voyeurism, som även är kopplat till sadism via berättelsens kraft att driva handlingen framåt, eller fetischism. Mulvey har kritiserats kraftigt och numera är det allmänt accepterat att även kvinnor, homosexuella och olika etniska grupper besitter en egen typ av gaze.

I avhandlingen behandlades enbart voyeurism för att beskriva detektivernas sätt att betrakta de misstänkta, offren, deras hus och bevisföremålen. Voyeurism definierades som ett intrång på privatområden, att korsa tröskeln både fysiskt och psykologiskt. Anpassningen av Mulvey till litteratur innebar att kommentarer från berättaren och karaktärernas repliker användes för att urskilja the gaze i texten. Begreppet modifierades även för att det bättre skulle lämpa sig för ett professionell sätt att betrakta och den största förändringen var att detektivernas gaze inte har någon sexuell anknytning. Däremot känner detektiverna skuldkänslor över att de är tvungna att inkräkta på andras privatliv. Att de misstänkta kan returnera blicken visades vara en orsak till dessa skuldkänslor. Andra orsaker var att den ena detektiven, Adam Dalgliesh, har dubbelgångare i de huvudsakliga offren i bägge romanerna. Offren är patriarker och fungerar därmed som den tredje parten i förhållandet mellan detektiv och misstänkt. Dessutom är både detektiverna själva och de misstänkta ofta kritiska mot auktoriteter.

Det konstaterades att de misstänkta kunde bemöta voyeurism genom att förhandla om kontrollen över the gaze, genom att bemöta den direkt eller genom att titta bort. Även offren besatt en viss gaze, liksom byggnader och mordvapen, vilket ledde till en övernaturlig upplevelse hos detektiverna. Vidare behandlades berättaren med ett alternativ till voyeurism enligt Michel Foucaults teori om totalitär, allseende panopticism.

NYCKELORD: voyeuristic gaze, oppositional gaze, Panopticon, crime fiction

1 INTRODUCTION

Since the concept of the gaze was introduced by Laura Mulvey in 1975, a discussion of whether the gaze is gendered and in what manner has taken place. Mulvey's binary opposition of man as bearer of the look and woman as image within Hollywood cinema (Visual 116) has been challenged and modified into accepting the existence of a female gaze. Yet Mulvey's contribution remains a cornerstone and her idea of the controlling gaze, of cinema as "an illusion of looking in on a private world" (Visual 114) is fruitful in the case of the detective novel. The aim of this study is to make an application and modification of Mulvey's gaze theory to crime fiction.

According to Jeremy Hawthorn (2000), the term 'the gaze' does not have a standard meaning since it originates from diverse fields, such as psychoanalysis and social psychology, and since it is also used within several different fields, most prominently film theory and postcolonialism (157). Mulvey was one of the first to adopt a feminist angle in gaze theory, but her work was preceded by and built on Jaques Lacan's theory of the construction of subjectivity where the gaze is a central element (Hawthorn 157). Ann E. Kaplan defines the gaze as "one-way subjective vision" while merely looking invites a relation between subject and object (qtd. in Hawthorn 158). In the postcolonial context Kaplan sees the colonialist gaze as corresponding to Mulvey's male gaze. It is objectifying and it "refuses mutual gazing, mutual subject-to-subject recognition" (qtd. in Hawthorn 159). The very opposite is true of the novels in this study. Martin Jay, in line with Levin, for one draws a distinction between an 'assertoric' gaze which is indeed inflexible and exclusionary and an 'aletheic' one which allows for inclusion and awareness of the context (qtd. in Hawthorn 159). Last but not least, the gaze is significant in Michel Foucault's theory of power relations.

Starting with the simple fact that you can rarely watch someone or something without simultaneously being watched, the hypothesis is that the gaze of the police detectives in their occupational role is voyeuristic in Mulvey's and Sigmund Freud's senses of the word (Visual 119–20) with the crucial adjustment that this gaze is non-sexual in nature. A voyeuristic gaze here implies the assertion of control inherent to the crime investigation and therefore includes an element of intrusion. In this case, voyeurism is constructed in the interaction between detective and suspect, victim or

evidence. I claim that the detectives, as a direct consequence of murder, are forced to invade the private space of the people involved and that this, far from bringing them pleasure, gives birth to feelings of psychological guilt. This is what Mulvey, in her discussion of Alfred Hitchcock, refers to as an "uneasy gaze" (Visual 121). Thus the focus lies, not on the power of the police as representatives of the state, but on the gaze of the police as having been authorized by the crime that has been committed. As Tiina Mäntymäki (2004) argues, the detective is a part of "the discussion of power relations created by violence" (313). The power then lies mostly in the hands of the murderer. Guilt is also a result of the murder victims becoming significant others to Commander Dalgliesh.

Accepting the gaze as a means of control involves the question of who is there to return the gaze and in what manner. Paul Willemen's (1976) idea of the "fourth gaze" is appropriate for exploring this area since it is defined as "a unisex look directed back at the 'viewer surprising the voyeur in his or her activities and generating shame'" (qtd. in Vice 175). In this study, I will combine Willemen's idea with bell hooks's term "the oppositional gaze" since this concept in the context of black female spectators is useful to explain how the returned gaze can be interrogating, critical and a site for resistance (hooks 208).

It is suggested that two main categories can be found: naturally, the gaze can be returned by an actual person. Preliminary sub-categories for this phenomenon include a defying gaze in reply to a controlling one, and the option of not returning the gaze at all, that is of the averted gaze. The latter can be a sign of submission, deception or simple prudence. The voyeuristic gaze can also be met by an inanimate thing, like a house or a dead body, or by something imagined. This causes an experience of the uncanny.

Since the gaze cannot actually be observed in the written text in terms of camera angle and the cinematic gaze between film characters, I will use comments made by the narrator, descriptions of characters and the characters' thoughts, lines and memories. The narrator mainly represents the detectives' perspective and is discussed in terms of the Foucauldian Panopticon[1]. Special attention will be paid to the gaze of the detectives,

1 Panopticon with a capital letter refers to Bentham's architectural structure. In other expressions, such as "the panopticon gaze" the word is spelt with a small p.

but the reciprocal nature of the gaze will require that attention is paid to other characters as well.

In brief, the relationship between the different types of gaze in this study is, due to the element of negotiation, not entirely hierarchical. However, the two main categories are the voyeuristic and the oppositional gaze. The voyeuristic corresponds to Mulvey's male gaze, while the oppositional is, at least in the abstract, female. In this study, the voyeuristic gaze will occasionally be referred to as the 'occupational gaze'. This simply implies the voyeuristic gaze in the context of police work, with the adjustment that it is a non-sexual type. A second sub-category under the voyeuristic is the panopticon gaze, which means a totalitarian gaze that usually does not derive from a single individual. The oppositional gaze can be further divided into the overt and the averted, both returned by persons, and the uncanny gaze, which originates from dead bodies or objects. Next I will discuss some previous research in the field and introduce the material, which is selected from women's crime fiction.

Surprisingly little research has been done on the gaze in crime fiction and drama, considering that this is where Mulvey herself began. Previous studies tend to focus on other literary genres, or on television series. Lorraine Gamman (1988) discusses the police series *Cagney & Lacey* and thus concentrates on a female occupational gaze. Gamman claims that while the majority of women in the series "are portrayed either as victims of crime or petty criminals", Cagney and Lacey provide a gaze based on shared female experience. The protagonists present a whole range of looks which form an overall female perspective, disturbing the status quo of the dominant male gaze. (12) The gaze is very much an object of negotiation, although in this case mostly between colleagues. Cagney and Lacey adopt a mocking attitude towards machismo, while distancing themselves from mastery (15), thus avoiding the sphere of the male gaze altogether (cf. Visser below).

Heather Nunn and Anita Biressi (2003) analyse the role of female police officers and (female) victims as eroticised objects of a voyeuristic gaze, that of the viewer and of the male police officers (193). They then proceed to a series that has been able to negotiate this "masculine" genre and its support of patriarchal culture, and create a balance between emotional and professional work: *Silent Witness* (194–95). By possessing the gaze, the female protagonist rejects objectification and grants both perpetrators and

victims a subjectivity of their own (195). I will return to this matter in section 4.1. A more thorough survey of research on the gaze is presented in chapter 2.

Yvonne Tasker (1998) claims that women's (feminist) crime writing occurs within "a genre that is both masculine and reactionary" (328), and that this genre can be subverted from within. She maintains that women have had both a literary tradition and a popular culture of their own all along (329), and so women have participated in forming this allegedly masculine genre somewhat in their own interests. The crime novel essentially supports capitalist patriarchy, since it involves "the disruption of order" and "the individual hero" is seen to restore it (329). However, Tasker emphasizes the role of experimentation in giving even popular literary works high status (329). Women's fiction often contains a heroine who "progresses from ignorance to a knowledge of self and a position of strength" (331), a theme which is certainly present, although not central, in the novels of P. D. James. According to Tasker, another aspect of women's crime fiction is that the focus is on personal relationships (331). Ultimately, feminism masquerading as popular fiction, says Tasker, is a never-ending search for "the perfect object" (332).

P. D. James is considered to be one of the main authors in whose work elements of the classic detective story persist (McCracken 53). Her attempt at constructing a heroine called Cordelia Gray has been deemed significant for later developments within feminist crime fiction (Knight 162, Rzepka 240, Munt 23). Cordelia has also been the object of previous research, including that of James F. Maxfield (1987). Maxfield discusses Cordelia's lack of mastery in *An Unsuitable Job for a Woman* (1972), and her projection of herself on to and identification with the victim, Mark Callender (213). This Freudian analysis also brings out Cordelia's emotional deprivation in childhood, how her fear of parental rejection leads her into mirroring Mark's victimization as her own (217, 219). Dalgliesh is a minor character in this book, exploiting Cordelia's need to confide, but is otherwise presented as a strict father figure offering the possibility of reconciliation (222). Since James's later novels offer promising material for a study of the gaze in literature due to the many perspectives that they provide, the two novels chosen for this purpose are *A Taste for Death* (1986) and *The Lighthouse* (2005). These novels were written almost twenty years apart, but both feature James's detectives Adam Dalgliesh and Kate Miskin, thus allowing for comparability.

According to Sally R. Munt (1994), P. D. James was the best-selling living crime novelist in Britain in the early 1990s (22). The novels belong to the sub-genre of crime fiction called the "police procedural" (Scaggs 103). John Scaggs (2005) gives *A Taste for Death* as a typical example of how the social and the personal are validated through work, since Inspector Kate Miskin has come to a greater insight into herself during the investigation. The police procedure thus opens up possibilities of self-discovery and fills an important gap in the rootless life of Kate, and later her partner Francis Benton-Smith. The focus in such novels, Scaggs stresses, lies on "a team of individuals, separated by age, experience, gender, race, and ethnicity" and on the way this team works "collectively to restore and maintain social order" (103). Apart from the detectives Adam Dalgliesh and Kate Miskin, a minor role is played by a partner to Kate, in the first book John Massingham and in the second Francis Benton-Smith. According to Stephen Knight (2004), *A Taste for Death* is the first book after the two featuring Cordelia Gray which has a woman detective in it (165), and so *The Lighthouse* is a late example.

A Taste for Death revolves around the murder of the politician Sir Paul Berowne, who is found with his throat cut in a dismal church vestry, in which he has had a religious revelation. A tramp has been killed in the same manner, but the theory of suicide followed by murder is dismissed on technical grounds. The car accident which killed Berowne's first wife enabled him to marry his brother's widow Barbara, an issue which rent his relation to his daughter Sarah. Two other deaths, neither of them murders, are linked to the killer, Barbara's brother Dominic Swayne. Berowne's mother Lady Ursula has a nurse, Theresa Nolan, who commits suicide after aborting Swayne's child. Diana Travers is an agent planted into the Berowne household by the secret service, and Swayne lets her drown at the site of his sister's birthday party, after being defeated and thrown into the river by Berowne himself. Swayne has an accomplice in the servant Evelyn Matlock, whom Berowne took on at the end of his career as a lawyer. He lost the case and Miss Matlock's claustrophobic father died in prison. At the end of the novel, Swayne takes Kate's grandmother hostage in her own flat, and the grandmother becomes his "final" victim before capture. Munt observes how this event shows Kate being introduced "for the sake of realism", her home being thus violated by the murderer (24). However, Munt is premature in her claim that Kate has not "lasted long". In fact, she has remained a major character to this day, while her male colleagues have been

exchanged several times over. Later I will discuss how Dalgliesh's acquaintance with Berowne is central to the story, which also concentrates on aging and the mutual substitution of religion and politics.

The main victim in *The Lighthouse* is the famous novelist Nathan Oliver, who is spending a week of solitude on the island of Combe, specialized in hosting VIP visitors, together with his daughter Miranda and his copy-editor Dennis Tremlett, who are having an affair. Oliver is a heartless and selfish man and sees the pair as a willing appendage to his fading talent. He has set his mind on getting Emily Holcombe, who has lived all her life on the island where he was born, out of the cottage he covets, and threatens the trust executive Rupert Maycroft with a withdrawal in his testament if he does not have his way.

Oliver is found hanging from the top storey of the lighthouse, and again many of the residents wish to believe he committed suicide. However, Dan Padgett has come to the island with his dying mother, who on her deathbed confesses that Oliver is his real father. Utterly despised and dismissed by Oliver, Padgett's misery of a life gets the better of him. Other visitors to the island include the German ambassador to China, Dr Speidel, from whom Dalgliesh catches SARS. Speidel's grandfather was burnt alive by Oliver when he was a child, the German soldier having come to the island during the war as some sort of mock conquerer. Dr Mark Yelland is a scientist who accuses Oliver of having based an unpleasant character intentionally on his own person.

Padgett also batters the ex-priest Adrian Boyde to death, since he has found him out, a death which makes the investigation a failure. Padgett locks himself into the lighthouse with the young employee Millie as hostage, but Kate heroically squeezes through a window, and her partner Benton manages to appeal to the murderer's ego and prevent further deaths.

Commander Dalgliesh is James's middle-aged poet-detective, who has been her main character since her first novel, *Cover Her Face* from 1962. Dalgliesh is a widower as his young wife and child both died in labour, and he is a man who is particular to draw a line between his public and personal life. Kate is the orphaned, working-class woman, who through sheer determination has made herself an independent life, although her past returns to haunt her. The team she is part of as a police officer makes her belong somewhere, but she is also an ambitious social climber. The relationship

between the two detectives is one of mutual but controlled attraction, and on this level a development can be seen between the two novels. *The Lighthouse* ends with wedding bells ringing for Dalgliesh and his fiancée Emma, while Kate stoically accepts that it is time to move on. In 2005, James herself commented that Dalgliesh has "become much more sensitive to the great hurt that a murder investigation inflicts on the innocent, as well as the guilty", and that as he is required to "violate the privacy of so many other people", he has become more introspective (qtd. in Picker). This development can be seen clearly from the analysis in chapter 4.

The following chapter begins with a general survey of theories of the gaze before introducing the voyeuristic and the oppositional. The 'panopticon gaze' is presented in connection with the narrator and the issue of what is private. In chapter 3 I will analyse the gaze of the narrator and in chapter 4 that of the detectives and the different kinds of oppositional gaze in James's novels respectively. In the final chapter the conclusions of this study are given.

2 THE VOYEURISTIC, OPPOSITIONAL AND PANOPTICON GAZE

Ways of Seeing by John Berger (1972) anticipates Mulvey's famous essay (1975) and certain comments on the nature of vision made in this book are fundamental for the following discussion. He notes that "To look is an act of choice" (8) and that "we are always looking at the relation between things and ourselves" (9). This certainly has implications for how the gaze is an instrument of power. It also indirectly points to the option of averting one's gaze since not to look must be another act of choice. At the same time, Berger comments on the reciprocal nature of vision, the awareness of seeing and being seen (9), which is the exact way that an oppositional gaze can come into existence. Attention is also paid to the (male) spectator and his relation to the image: "the ideal spectator is always assumed to be male and the image of woman is designed to flatter him" (64). From this it follows that a woman is forced to keep a continual watch over herself: "*men act* and *women appear*. Men look at women. Women watch themselves being looked at." (47). Here Berger describes the inseparability of woman and her image and places women in a position of passivity, aware of the male gaze but unable to return it.

Berger, of course, was mostly concerned with European art and to some extent advertising, but the connection to "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema", published in 1975, is obvious. Irene Visser (1997) aptly sums up that Berger and Mulvey are the two core texts regarding *feminist* gaze theory, while Foucault and Lacan are concerned with power structures in general (278). With a political adaptation of Lacan and Freud, Laura Mulvey sets out to prove how the gaze in Hollywood cinema is notoriously male and phallocentric: "pleasure in looking has been split between active / male and passive / female" (116). The quotations from Berger above are strikingly similar.

Mulvey argues that the male spectator, in viewing the image of woman, is confronted with his own fear of castration (112). In cinema, there are two ways for the male spectator to escape this anxiety. Firstly, he can adopt a voyeuristic gaze in order to ascertain guilt, assert control and subjugate the "guilty person through punishment or forgiveness" (119). This path, Mulvey claims, has connections with sadism and also functions to drive the narrative forward since sadism ultimately introduces a conflict or a struggle which makes something happen. Secondly, he can make a "complete

disavowal of castration by the substitution of a fetish object" (119). This is a focus on the beauty of the object and, as Antony Easthope (1999) adds, according to Freud it is the look in itself that is actually fetishised (Introduction 15). A fetish is in itself a body part or an object that functions as a substitute for what cannot actually be there, namely the woman's penis. According to Freud (1953–74), taking on a fetish object is what "saves" the fetishist from becoming a homosexual (28–29). Voyeurism is the relevant choice for this study since, in her discussion of fetishism in Sternberg's films, Mulvey herself points out that the controlling male gaze is "the most important absence" in these fetishistic scenes.

Mulvey also declares that cinema works in much the same way as the Lacanian mirror phase when the child first recognizes its own person by a misrecognition through its own mirror image. Just as this mirror image is seen as somehow more complete than the child's real body, the spectator sees the male protagonist in the film as his ideal ego and identifies with him (115). This is the second aspect of the pleasure in looking for the male spectator: the creation of subjectivity through narcissism.

After being criticized for always speaking of the spectator in the masculine third person, Mulvey revised her original thesis in the essay "Afterthoughts on 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema' inspired by King Vidor's *Duel in the Sun*" (1981). In this revision Mulvey took a female spectator into account, but claimed that the only way for women to be active bearers of the gaze is to adopt a temporary masculinization, since conventions of femininity work to repress such a fantasy of 'action' (133). Thus, Mulvey concludes, the female spectator's fantasy becomes "restless in its transvestite clothes" (133). This argument still does not quite admit that women can and certainly do gaze at the surrounding world from their very own perspective.

Mulvey has been most notably criticized by Kaja Silverman, who argues that the erotic gaze in cinema is in fact masochistic and emphasizes that males can also secretly identify "with the suffering female object" (MacKinnon online). This can be expanded to apply to voyeurism in general. In the case of the police, certainly the voyeuristic gaze can be masochistic since some of the (less likely) suspects are sometimes pictured as devastated by grief and yet the police must interrogate them to get the information required. Other critics include Gledhill (1988), who remarks on the negative view of female spectatorship inherent in the field of cine-psychoanalysis in general (236). She

proposes using the concept of negotiation to consider which positions are actually put on offer (238). Negotiation is another way of describing how the suspects can challenge the voyeuristic gaze and compete for control with the police detectives. This points to the continuously changing (not fixed) nature of the gaze which might alter perspective and status repeatedly.

Postcolonial criticism is another field in which Mulvey's ideas have been appropriated, allowing for an expanded view of the power relations in connection with the gaze. Sarah Mills (1996) discusses how British women in the colonial context could adopt a position of spectatorial power simply because it is the relations of power in themselves that determine viewing positions (704). Thus, women could be viewers of landscape by negotiating "meanings within the context of dominant discursive fields" (713). This is a step forward from Mulvey, who describes the male spectator incidentally as "a figure in a landscape" (Visual 118). The colonial setting virtually made women spectators of a surrounding landscape. Ania Loomba (1998) comments on the intrusiveness of the colonial gaze (99), a theme also reflected upon by bell hooks (1992). hooks notes that "[mainstream feminist film criticism] does not even consider the possibility that women can construct an oppositional gaze", this through an "awareness of the politics of race and racism" (214). For this study, one important point here is that not only does Mulvey ignore the issue of race, but through her choice of psychoanalytic criticism as the background for her thesis, she has also ignored other power relations such as class and generation (Gamman and Marshment 7).

Critics have further focused upon the appropriateness of the Freudian/Lacanian approach. John Docker (1994) for one asserts that the development between child and adult experience as proposed by Mulvey is essentially linear, and he is doubtful about the very existence of a perfect patriarchal society (77). Julia Kristeva suggests that the whole idea of castration corresponds to the big bang theory, "which enables explanation of many otherwise inexplicable phenomena" (Parkin-Gounelas 167), including the reason why Mulvey's male spectator goes down the voyeuristic avenue to begin with. Castration then becomes an overly theoretical concept which is just a model without substantial proof.

Barbara Creed (1993) dismisses the whole idea of woman as castrated and criticizes Freud strongly for ignoring the numerous myths of woman as castrator (105–108).

Creed also discusses how genre is crucial to spectatorship. She asserts that contemporary horror films with male victims, far from affirming the controlling gaze, draw on a masochistic one and provide a very different point for identification: "the extreme moment of masochistic viewing seems to occur when the viewing subject, male and female, is forced to look away" (154). Horror, this suggests, is likely to give way to masochism rather than sadism. In addition, the averted gaze of the spectator questions the pleasurable side of film viewing.

However, Mulvey is perhaps more often built upon than criticized (MacKinnon online). I have already mentioned Willemen, whose concept of the "fourth gaze" will be used in this study. Other followers include Richard Dyer (1992) and Steve Neale (1983), who discuss how disavowal can be a means of men becoming covert erotic objects (MacKinnon online). In the next section, I will concentrate on the voyeuristic gaze. I will then move on to the oppositional and the question of guilt. The second section discusses the question of privacy and introduces the panopticon gaze as an alternative to the voyeuristic, especially in connection with the narrator.

2.1 The voyeuristic and the oppositional

Hawthorn states that work such as Mulvey's "opens up important perspectives for literary criticism" (159) and I largely accept Mulvey's theory regarding the voyeuristic gaze. In the case of Albert Hitchcock, Mulvey argues for the power of subjecting someone else to a voyeuristic gaze (Visual 120) and how the gaze of the spectator becomes 'uneasy' in such a voyeuristic situation (Visual 121). She further describes how in *Vertigo* the policeman Scottie has chosen an occupation in which he can easily engage in pursuit and investigation (Visual 121). This confirms the fact that a policeman (or -woman) can definitely possess a voyeuristic gaze and is in a position to be able to take certain liberties. Still, Scottie is definitely different from the detectives in James's novels because he is sadistic and does take pleasure from being in control of the gaze. Also the unease referred to in this context emerges from the notion of being discovered, revealed as a bearer of the voyeuristic gaze.

While all of the above is relevant for this study, certainly the voyeuristic gaze is not exclusively male. Keeping in mind the element of control that is present in this kind of gaze, gender can but must not necessarily be crucial to who is asserting power over whom. According to Mary Ann Doane, what is required for voyeurism is a certain distance or gap between the spectator and the image (qtd. in Stacey 119), but she claims that it is the female spectator that in herself is the image. However, nowadays men are increasingly represented as objects of the gaze and Suzanne Moore (1988) maintains that the distance created between image (male) and viewer (female) thus enables a space for the female spectator (54–55). As Shelagh Young (1988) emphasizes, it is important to recall that there is no concrete boundary between a female and a feminist gaze (188), that is to say that the gaze is rather negotiated in terms of constructed gender than determined by biology.

Presumably the voyeuristic gaze is not ultimately gender-related as Mulvey would have it. Also consider what happens when the distance between viewer and viewed is compromised. This is what occurs when the police detectives investigate: they are put face to face with the 'object' of the gaze. Again, the gaze is negotiated between shifting positions. Ultimately, a voyeuristic gaze, as determined by this particular situation, cannot be strictly pleasurable when we are moving outside the context of Hollywood cinema. While Mulvey claims that the bearer of the voyeuristic gaze will acertain the guilt of the object, a self-aware viewer will simultaneously feel ashamed (or uneasy) about his or her own activity. This is the exact scenario depicted in Willemen's theory of the fourth gaze mentioned earlier. Being caught in the act, the voyeur ends up as the object of an oppositional gaze which serves to fire the guilt right back where it came from. According to Willemen, the function of this fourth gaze is to constitute "the viewer as visible subject" (216). The viewer is made aware of his or her own voyeurism and has to confront it, "producing a sense of shame at being caught in the act of voyeurism" (216). Willemen continues: "The scopic drive has thus been turned back upon the subject [...] and has been reversed into its opposite (looking at/being looked at). This can, quite understandably, be accompanied by a change from voyeuristic pleasure to unpleasure combined with a refusal to acknowledge one's unstable position in the viewing process." (216–17). The power of the fourth gaze lies in its denial of binaries and reversal of viewing positions. It also renders the voyeur visible, which is

the case with the detectives, and makes it impossible for the voyeur to take pleasure in looking. Hence the feeling of shame or guilt. In this study, Willemen's concept has been combined with the idea of an 'oppositional gaze' (see below).

Seth Blazer (2006) argues for the existence of different kinds of voyeurism. Moreover, he is of the opinion that it is appropriate to cross out the word "sexual" in the definition of the term, which will then merely read: "one who seeks stimulation by visual means" (379). Blazer is mainly concerned with the rising popularity of "reality" TV and introduces Clay Calvert's term "mediated voyeurism" (380). This type of voyeurism refers to the viewers (or readers) of entertainment or information that is provided at "the expense of another's privacy" (380). Although mediated voyeurism applies to the readers of crime fiction rather than the characters in such novels, it is significant that this kind of voyeurism is a non-sexual invasion of privacy. This is the crucial adjustment I have made to Mulvey's definition, and Blazer's discussion supports the hypothesis that voyeurism can be motivated by other factors than (sexual) pleasure. In fact, what Blazer implies to be the function of "real" TV is that it utilizes "others for the study of the self" (386). In the Introduction I outline how police work is a source of self-discovery for Kate Miskin and Francis Benton-Smith. In general, voyeurism can thus be seen as pursuit of knowledge: firstly for solving the case, and secondly for understanding the world and oneself.

A significant aspect of the gaze is that it always operates in asymmetrical power structures (Visser 280). While Mulvey sees the positions within such a (gendered) structure as fixed, I maintain that staying in control of the gaze is a continuous negotiation (see Gledhill above). This means that the person objectified can resist the gaze by opposing it. As mentioned earlier, by an 'oppositional gaze' hooks means the gaze of a black (female) spectator directed back at the source of oppression or repression (208). She states that this type of gaze is usually concerned with race rather than gender (209), which indicates that the power of the gaze can be asserted at many different levels. In this case, of course, the voyeur is the colonizer (220), but the same opposition functions within whichever dominant order there is to oppose.

In another context, Michel Foucault insists that the deployment of power is always engaged by both dominant and dominated (qtd. in Young 182). His distinction between two kinds of subjects might prove a useful complement to Mulvey's binary of subject

and object. First, one can be the physical or mental subject to someone else's control. Second, being a subject can mean being connected "to one's own identity by a consciousness or self-knowledge" (183). Applying this to the issue of the voyeuristic and the oppositional gaze, the voyeur's attempt at keeping the first of these subject positions is flouted by the would-be object defying the control with a critical, oppositional gaze. Thus, being looked back at the voyeur must return to a position of self-awareness (consciousness), which will generate a feeling of psychological guilt.

The oppositional gaze has certain qualities in common with what Beth Newman (1990) calls the threat of the Medusa. Newman argues for the existence of this kind of gaze in *Wuthering Heights* where the voyeuristic narrators are challenged by a woman who returns the look (461): "Like so many real-life voyeurs [...] Lockwood cannot enjoy looking once his look is detected" (451). In fact, Newman claims, the threat of the Medusa is inherent in the sight of someone else's look. When the (male) spectator is made aware that the other resists being reduced to a mere object, the defiance in the oppositional gaze unsettles both the pleasure in looking and the (former) subject's dominance (451). Thus the narrator's attempt to defend himself from the Medusa by objectifying a woman (Catherine) is unsuccessful as the gaze in itself opens up a space for resisting the voyeuristic control (458). This is certainly of importance for the oppositional gaze as a site for resistance.

Another point that Newman makes is that being able to look undisturbedly is a means of avoiding castration anxiety by returning to the pleasurable feeling of wholeness that is characteristic of the mirror stage (452). When the look is returned, however, and the subject is made an object of the gaze, the control is lost in the process. According to Newman, the result of this is that the spectator is emasculated (452). As I have mentioned, the detectives in my material are of both genders and I therefore refrain from dealing with the oppositional gaze as a threat of castration other than on a symbolic level. Still, Newman's argument is relevant here if seen in terms of disempowerment. If an oppositional gaze is a way of actively resisting being reduced to an object of the detectives' gaze, it can certainly function to destabilize and disempower the detectives. Also note David Couzens Hoy's (1981) comment on the two different ways to consider power. Power can be exercised by agents or it can be "a result of structural factors within systems" (Power 127). Foucault, for one, is certainly interested

in the way power is exercised, but he does not believe that those who exercise it possess it (Power 134). Either way, the power relation between detective and suspect is far from stable.

Having dealt with the nature of the overtly oppositional as a potential source of (not pleasure but) guilt, a discussion of this concept is in order. Guilt is not an easily defined feeling, but here it implies the opposite of pleasure, not of innocence, which might otherwise be a likely path in this context. Further, it is seen as a psychological phenomenon rather than a socio-cultural one, even though the distinction is not clear-cut. According to Freud, guilt stems from the totemism of killing the father, and ultimately from the repression of the two fundamental wishes of the Oedipus complex (Parkin-Gounelas 98). Certainly the fathers in James's two novels are killed, but that the guilt of the detectives would be a result of a hidden triumph at this rebellion seems unnecessarily morbid. A more fruitful aspect is the idea that repetition leads to a release of guilt and anxiety (109). A police investigation, and a crime novel, is inherently a repetition of earlier investigations. This could be one explanation for the detectives' choice of occupation, but it still does not give a sufficient reason for the guilt they actually feel.

Lacan also connects guilt to the Oedipus complex, which he describes as a movement from a two-sided relationship to a three-sided one (Parkin-Gounelas 217). The child's relationship with the mother is then expanded to include the father, and it is the father who introduces guilt. This means guilt as such is a byproduct of the Oedipal. An attempt to apply this to the relationship between detective and suspect introduces a third party, namely the murder victim. The main murder victims in *A Taste for Death* and *The Lighthouse* are literally father figures or patriarchs. This way the fact that the murdered father is hovering in the background could be what introduces guilt. Peter Brooks (1984) argues that a narrative can be secondary in its attachment to another's story, "seeking there its authority; it retraces another's path, repeats a journey already undertaken" (245). Both novels deal with the "obituaries" of the father figure, "transmitting to the younger protagonist something of the authority necessary to view the meaning of their own lives retrospectively" (246). The detectives are retracing the path of the murder victim, borrowing his authority to solve the case. This is the psychoanalytic side of the voyeuristic scenario.

In addition, in both James's novels Dalgliesh has his double in the main murder victim. Berowne is a distant acquaintance and his appearance (for instance his height) and personality is often compared to Dalgliesh's both by himself and others. In *The Lighthouse* the discussion of creative writing connects Dalgliesh with Oliver. Mäntymäki discusses the importance of the male detectives' so-called significant others, which include murderers, victims and desirable women (274–330). All these characters can, according to Mäntymäki, serve to embody the detective in different ways. In James's novels, the murderers do not play any other part than that of any of the suspects until fairly late in the narrative; that is, their perspectives are not given until the case is solved. Also, since the murderers actually enjoy the attention they are being paid, the detectives do not feel in the least guilty about exposing them to a voyeuristic gaze. Therefore the murderers cannot be considered as doubles for the detectives. In *The Lighthouse* Dalgliesh has a fiancée, Emma, whose perspective is occasionally given, but the nature of the crime scene as being set on an island conveniently enough does not introduce Emma in flesh and blood until the very end. Kate too has a lover (though not the same one) in both novels, but their status as objects of desire does not seem to be a source of guilt for her. She is a modern woman in charge of her own sexuality and the relationships very much depend on her ability to find the time and commitment for them.

The murder victim is thus both a double and a significant other for Dalgliesh. The murdered father figure as the "third party" becomes one main reason why the detectives feel guilty about their voyeuristic gaze. It may also prove helpful to see the interrogations of the suspects as a form of transference. This implies that it is the suspects that are releasing their guilt by retelling their traumatic experiences to the police detectives. The detectives are in a way functioning as Father confessors, patiently listening to the "sins" of the suspects. Seen in this light, the detectives are definitely masochistic and not sadistic. Keeping in mind that in James's fiction murder affects everyone involved, guilt can simply be seen as the effect of murder on the detectives. Foucault (1980) maintains that "power is only exercised at a cost" (*Power/Knowledge* 154). He mainly discusses the economic and political cost, the latter meaning how to deal with revolt or resistance, but why not add a personal cost?

This is the framework for voyeurism versus the overtly oppositional. As a special case of the oppositional, the averted gaze can often be seen as a sign of submission. In his “Notes on ‘The Gaze’”, Daniel Chandler (2000/2002) comments that the averted gaze is a “noticeable avoidance of the gaze of another”. This is an option that must be taken into account since the reasons for averting one’s gaze may also include deception, which is certainly a kind of opposition. Scott Donaldson (2003), concentrating on the averted gaze in Hemingway’s stories, finds a number of reasons for this unwillingness among characters to actually look straight at one another. One reason is “fabricating the truth” (132), a motive which might very well be found among the suspects in crime fiction. In general, Donaldson sees the averted gaze as a means of hiding your true feelings. This includes the feeling of loss and sorrow at losing someone near to you (132–33). Often the lack of eye contact is also an indicator of an underlying conflict (134). It is clear that the averted gaze is a significant option for resistance in the interaction detective–suspect. Strong emotions abound in a murder investigation, including that of defiance or outright antagonism.

Visser provides an entirely different version of an oppositional gaze which is feminist/female. In her analysis of Faulkner’s *Light in August*, Visser finds that the character Lena is successful in opposing and resisting the controlling male gaze by avoiding it (281). However, her averted gaze is not in the least antagonistic, but works to maintain her integrity. Visser claims that Lena transgresses the boundaries of the supervisory society by appropriating a stance that is “the opposite of the gaze: modesty, friendliness, and the desire for non-mastery, for freedom” (281). The function of this (female) gaze is to eliminate the binaries of subject and object, active and passive (282), and her resistance virtually becomes a “manifestation of freedom” (Couzens Hoy, Power 139). Whether or not this kind of feminist averted gaze is represented in James’s novels remains to be seen, but the fact that Lena succeeds in flouting the controlling gaze where overtly aggressive characters do not may be of importance when dealing with the struggle for power between detective and suspect.

A different oppositional gaze, again, will lead to an experience of the uncanny, “a sense of unfamiliarity which appears at the heart of the familiar, or else a sense of familiarity which appears at the very heart of the unfamiliar” (Bennett and Royle 35). Lacan describes his experience of a sardine can floating in the sea as a “split between

the eye and the gaze" (Parkin-Gounelas 16). The uncanny realization here lies in the fact that the viewer is illuminated by the objects seen; thus outside objects may serve to disrupt simple divisions into subject(ive) seer and object(ive) seen (17). Newman touches upon this subject when she states that "The dead, like women, must not seem to look back, lest they take us with them" (460). Even if the murder victim cannot actually see, there is definitely something uncanny about a dead body, the sight of which has an inevitable impact on everyone involved. Dani Cavallaro (1998) observes the obscurity of the corpse: "It is both a body and not a body, a person and not a person. It is an object that we cannot name for it lacks the body's essence, life, yet it still retains the external appearance of a body." (41). This in-betweenness is unnerving and certainly indebted to a mix of the familiar and the unfamiliar. Apart from the (dead) body viewed and remembered, the murder weapon is another item that can be placed in this subcategory due to its latent power. Mäntymäki states that a detective's gun signals danger and uncontrollability (190), and that it can also function to question the detective's masculinity (197). A murder weapon, though, is often an ordinary item that has fallen into the "wrong" hands and has thus become dangerous. It is the unexpected usage the murderer has made of this item that makes it uncanny, and the realization that so little is required to take someone's life.

2.2 The panopticon gaze, the narrator and privacy

Since the focus of this thesis lies on the gaze as an instrument of power and control, and on an invasion of privacy, Foucault's idea of surveillance can be seen as an alternative to voyeurism. This theme is presented in his work *Discipline and Punish* (1975), although how human beings become subjects and treat each other as objects is something Foucault returns to throughout his production (Couzens Hoy, *Foucault* 4). The gaze is one aspect of this power relation and the central concept adopted here is the architectural device which represents an ideal form of power, namely the Panopticon.

I have built my argument of the voyeuristic versus the oppositional around the invasion of privacy, and this requires a discussion of what is private. When do the detectives cross the line and enter the private sphere? This question can be dealt with in

terms of liminality or transgression. Peter Messent (2000) describes liminality as "the concept of the threshold, the area between two spaces" (23). He further points to the dual nature of such a border area as posing a threat but also as containing a promise of illumination due to the "possibility of crossover and transgression associated with it" (23). Below I will discuss how the narrator is invading privacy by rendering the thoughts of characters "visible". A police detective is also able to take liberties that other people cannot, something that has been implied all along with their gaze being described as voyeurism. This element of intrusion can be seen at a physical and a psychological level. Obviously, the murder victim is physically exposed to intrusion. His or her body is scrutinized, pockets searched, and fingernails studied for eventual fragments of skin or fabric originating from the murderer. The items found on the body are put into evidence bags, the whole crime scene is photographed and finally the body itself is dissected at the post-mortem. In this regard the victim is also exposed to what Foucault calls a medical or clinical gaze. In *The Birth of the Clinic* he writes that, while life keeps the body intact and protects its interior from a penetrating gaze, death will reveal the body in a way that crosses "the oldest imaginary values of the Western world" (qtd. in Jay 182). He continues: "Nineteenth-century medicine was haunted by that absolute eye that cadaverizes life and rediscovers in the corpse the frail, broken nervure of life." (qtd. in Jay 182). The postmortem is thus a very strong invasion of privacy that is even reminiscent of the act of violence performed by the murderer. Further, all of the victim's belongings need to be searched in case they provide important clues. Dalgliesh himself is represented as thinking about this degrading treatment in *The Murder Room* (2003), the novel preceding *The Lighthouse*:

> It had always been a part of his job which he found difficult, the total lack of privacy for the victim. Murder stripped away more than life itself. The body was parcelled, labelled, dissected; address books, diaries, confidential letters, every part of the victim's life was sought out and scrutinized. Alien hands moved among the clothes, picked up and examined the small possessions, recorded and labelled for public view the sad detritus of sometimes pathetic lives. (446–47)

Just before this passage, Kate has found some sheets stained with semen and concluded that the murdered young woman was "on the pill" (446), which might explain

Dalgliesh's point about the difference between private and public. There is also a connection here between "private parts and private papers" (Bernard Yeazell 124), since the body is juxtaposed with "address books, diaries, confidential letters" within the very same sentence. Ruth Bernard Yeazell (2001) concludes her discussion of the privacy of women in a selection of novels from *Pamela* to *Nice Work* with a remark that literature makes us sensitive to how the privacy of the mind is often valued more than that of the body (140). The quote above shows how this can apply even to a dead body. The element of intrusion is also very clear in this passage, introducing a pair of "alien hands" which, apart from belonging to an outsider, is a way of establishing anonymity and therefore implying voyeurism or even panopticism. Also significant is the unobtrusiveness of the narrator through whom Dalgliesh's thoughts are conveyed. The beginning of the passage refers to Dalgliesh in third person, but his mind is entirely available for the gaze of the narrator (see chapter 3). The murder victim, being dead, cannot put up resistance to being searched and gazed at.

To be able to actually search a suspect's house the police need a warrant and, eventually, a murderer may be arrested. As regards the other suspects, their privacy is invaded less tangibly. Often they are interviewed in their own homes, and referring to liminality as a threshold suggests that the invasion of privacy starts when the police detectives step over it. It is useful to think of a room or a house as a kind of personal territory, an extension of the self. The detectives can look around at the items and furnishings and might infer something about the person(s) living there. Apart from this, the interviews themselves are, again, transgressive at a psychological level. Usually, the suspects are required to provide an alibi which means giving an account of where they were and what they were doing at the time the murder is assumed to have been committed. This is reminiscent of a parent interrogating a child about his or her whereabouts the evening before.

Since a successful alibi depends on mutuality, all kinds of personal relations can come to light when providing an alibi, such as having an affair, to pick a frequently used example. Another thing the suspects have to account for is their relation to the murder victim, who is often a controversial and disliked figure. The emotional content of these matters certainly indicates a psychological invasion of the privacy of the suspects. Blazer states that privacy "can be taken unknowingly [...] or be given up freely" (380).

He also maintains that in situations when we feel unsafe, it is more likely that we will agree to "relinquish certain freedoms" (383). A murder investigation produces an ambivalent situation. On the one hand, some of the suspects may be intimidated more by the presence of a murderer among the people nearest to them than by the presence of the police. In fact, Foucault claims, it is the fear of the criminal which makes the control of the police tolerable in the first place: "If we accept the presence in our midst of these uniformed men [and women], who have the exclusive right to carry arms, who demand our papers, who come and prowl on our doorsteps, how would any of this be possible if there were no criminals?" (*Power/Knowledge* 47). This is in line with what I said about the authority of the police being inseparable from the existence of a murderer. On the other hand, most suspects tend to have something to hide (another means of making the plot interesting). A character may also hold a grudge towards the murder victim and think he or she only got what they deserved, or they may be protecting someone else. Usually, very few characters rely more on the police than on the other suspects, meaning that it is unlikely that they are more co-operative than they have to be.

An invasion of privacy can be both physical and psychological at the same time, which is very much the case with the incarcerating Panopticon. Winston and Mellerski declare that the police procedural revolves around "a dominant Western symbol of social control: the policeman" (qtd. in Scaggs 85). The police procedural, Scaggs claims, can be seen as a textual Panopticon (89), implying a device for universal surveillance. The Panopticon originates from philosopher Jeremy Bentham and was intended as an architectural structure for controlling and regulating prisoners or any other part of the population that required surveillance (Foucault, *Discipline* 200). It consists of a surveillance tower with a surrounding outer building divided into separate cells. The point about this structure is that the inmates are able to see the tower, but not the inside of it. Therefore they "could never know when they were being watched" (Amey 26). Foucault asserts that the power of the Panopticon is visible but unverifiable. "Visible: the inmate will constantly have before his eyes the tall outline of the central tower from which he is spied upon. Unverifiable: the inmate must never know whether he is being looked at at any one moment; but he must be sure that he may always be so." (*Discipline* 201).

What is relevant is that the inmates are always seen without seeing, while the observer is always seeing without being seen (Foucault, *Discipline* 202). The latter of these positions is also the ideal for voyeurism, so the distinction is not entirely clear-cut. Moreover, Foucault claims that the motive of the observer is of no importance. Two options he provides are "the thirst for knowledge of a philosopher who wishes to visit this museum of human nature, or the perversity of those who take pleasure in spying and punishing" (*Discipline* 202). Again, pleasure is opposed to a "thirst for knowledge", and it goes without saying that the detectives belong to the first group of Foucault's imaginary observers.

Two more aspects of the Panopticon have been implied in the above: its use of internalization and normalization. Foucault asserts that a person who is constantly visible and knows it "inscribes in himself the power relation in which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection" (*Discipline* 202–203). Foucault himself points to the similarity between the Panopticon and a laboratory experiment, only that "the animal has been replaced by man" (*Discipline* 203). The Panopticon is a device for observing and altering people's behaviour and it does this by means of the gaze, by making the inmates control themselves. Thus, according to Foucault, the Panopticon can be used to define power relations that we confront in everyday life in our disciplinary society. He sees the Panopticon as a mechanism where an ideal form of power is represented (*Discipline* 205). Martin Jay (1986) also maintains that the Panopticon is where the "normalizing function of the gaze" is most obvious (191). While guilt and innocence are produced in connection with the law, discipline leads to a distinction between normality and abnormality (Walzer 61). A parallel can be drawn to the detective story in that it "conceives plot as a condition of deviance and abnormality" (Brooks 139). Foucault sees discipline in general as counter-law, as something which introduces asymmetries and excludes reciprocities (*Discipline* 222). This "infiltration" of the law has its side-effects: "Criminals are more and more treated as 'cases' to be 'rehabilitated' and brought back to normal." (Taylor 75). The Panopticon is thus an effective mechanism for self-regulation which prevents its inmates from stepping outside what is "normal".

Finally, Foucault sees the Panopticon as the opposite of the sovereign power. In an interview he said that even though the Panopticon certainly implies different positions,

power cannot be assigned to any one person. The mechanism becomes a machinery in which everyone, both the controllers and the controlled, is caught. Bentham thus attaches a strong and, according to Foucault, somewhat archaic, importance to the gaze and invisibility is equalled with power (*Power/Knowledge* 156, 160).

The panopticon gaze has been used as a wider concept that implies a (usually) invisible or impersonal watcher/regulator. A typical example is George Orwell's totalitarian regime in *1984* where cameras record your every move. Kamila Kinyon (2001) explains how an exposure to the panopticon gaze takes away the privacy of the characters in Milan Kundera's *The Unbearable Lightness of Being* (243). One important point about this gaze, though, is that it is imaginary and a result of fiction (244). Usually, the panopticon gaze does not derive from an actual person (although it occasionally does just that), but it is a symbol of totalitarian power not to be fended off or located easily. Since the panopticon gaze makes it difficult to allow for an oppositional one, voyeurism seems to be better suited to describing the gaze of the detectives. The all-seeing, all-knowing gaze of the narrator who relates the inner thoughts of all the characters in James's novels, however, could certainly be said to represent the Panopticon.

Before turning to the question of whether the narrator is actually omniscient, let us consider the way that the Panopticon has been appropriated in the forerunner of Orwell's dystopic narrative, Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*. Michael Amey (2005) describes how the demands for collectivism in this imaginary society are a means of avoiding resistance (23). The One State in this novel bases its surveillance on a completely transparent architecture (24), and from this it follows that everyone ends up watching everyone else. In a literal sense, power is gained through transparency (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 154). Amey states: "there is no clear distinction between those who watch and those being watched" (27). Although it is true that the numbered people in *We* cannot take a bath in private, Amey draws attention to the fact that this does not mean they have nothing to hide. Far from it: the numbers take care to conceal their "subversive thoughts" (25).

The blurred border between watcher and watched is precisely what occurs when the detectives interview the suspects. Since the detectives are present in person, they are in no way superior, in that the suspect can always return the gaze at will. Secondly, what

distinguishes an omniscient narrator from the panopticon gaze is that the former actually *can* see the inner thoughts of the characters. Yet, the narrator cannot know everything because then the murderer would be revealed right at the beginning, which is not the case in James's novels (nor in most crime fiction). The narrator's omniscience is limited to one of the two stories that, according to Tzvetan Todorov (1966), are always present in the so-called whodunit: "the story of the crime and the story of the investigation" (159). According to Todorov, the story of the crime is absent (160) since it cannot be directly reported. This means that the narrator can only know everything that goes on during the investigation, which is a significant limitation of his or her knowledge. Consequently, the narrator can represent the gaze of the detectives without limitation and that of the suspects with some limitation (for instance it cannot be told straight-away if a suspect is lying about something that significantly contributes to solving the case). The gaze of the murderer is not represented at all apart from treating him or her as any of the suspects until the very end, where the story of the murder fuses with that of the investigation, often involving a confession of some sort. From this it follows that the gaze of the narrator is mostly an indirect way of presenting the perspective of the police detectives.

In this chapter, the central concepts of the voyeuristic and oppositional gaze as well as guilt have been defined and discussed. The issue of privacy has been treated in terms of liminality or transgression. Foucault's ideas of the Panopticon have been introduced as an alternative view to the voyeuristic, but they prove to be more fruitful for the gaze of the narrator than the (direct) gaze of the detectives. Next, I will conduct an analysis of the gaze in James's fiction, beginning with the narrator as mediator.

3 THE PANOPTICON GAZE OF THE NARRATOR IN THE TWO NOVELS

The narratives in *A Taste for Death* and *The Lighthouse* are given in the third person and therefore always involve the narrator, who remains anonymous in both novels. According to Brooks (1984) the preterite tense in itself implies a narrator (198), although in James none is named. Brooks also comments on the use of quotation marks. In the case of Marlow in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, all of his comments are within quotation marks to signify that what he says is reported through the first narrator (239, n 2). Similarly in James, the lines of all the characters are presented within inverted commas.[2] Since there is no dramatized narrator, nor any direct reference to the author, there is no distinction between the implied author and the narrator; the narrative is filtered through a "center of consciousness", which Wayne C. Booth (1983) aptly describes as a polished mirror or a camera eye (151, 153).

Regarding distance there is still a certain difference between implied author and narrator, at least in terms of knowledge. As discussed above, the genre of crime fiction demands that "the privilege of an inside view to characters whose minds would reveal too much" must be refused (Booth 254). Booth indicates that an inside view will temporarily turn the character into a narrator (164). Even though the first narrator is reliable, deception therefore becomes possible. Also the distance between the narrator and the characters in itself implies a panopticon gaze.

The gaze of the narrator is at its most panoptic when it enters the head of a character to provide an inside view. Booth stresses the artificial nature of such narration, as the knowledge of the characters, and the authority with which this knowledge is presented, would otherwise be impossible to obtain about anyone but ourselves (3). Thus the author is obtrusive when employing inside views (17). This can happen in two ways: the narrator can render the thoughts and memories of a character, or get "behind" that character's gaze, thus mediating his or her gaze indirectly. The first of these options is, as stated above, limited to the story of the investigation. It may also provide background material in the characterization, but it cannot reveal directly things that are crucial to solving the case. Booth refers to this technique as a "double vision": the reader sees things through the eyes of the character, while maintaining the author's moral vision

2 I have adopted Brooks's rule of simplicity and eliminated the original inverted commas.

(280). Another limitation to the panopticon gaze of the narrator is that, although it is able to observe, it is not able to control. The narrator is not able to alter the behaviour of the characters, but is in control in the sense that he or she selects what is to be reported to the reader and in what way. Since the gaze of the detectives will be discussed in a chapter of its own, here I will concentrate on how the narrator represents other characters in situations where they are not in opposition to the detectives.

3.1 Outside looking in: thoughts and memories

The panopticon gaze of the narrator can describe the mental state of a character with great accuracy. In *The Lighthouse* Doctor Yelland is one of the visitors to the island and he has come to be relieved from his life at a laboratory which is constantly attacked by the animal liberation movement:

> The solitude had been a revelation. He had never realised that to be completely alone could be so satisfying and healing. On the first visit he had wondered whether he would be able to endure it, but although the solitude compelled introspection, it was liberating rather than painful. He had returned to the traumas of his professional life changed in ways he could not explain. (53)

The narrator is certainly panoptic in this passage, since Yelland's thoughts and feelings are reported as they occur in his own mind. Of course, there is no way of telling whether the actual word choice belongs to Yelland or the narrator, and this points to the narrator's power to select. In this short example the narrator is also moving away from the present into past events, describing what Yelland felt the last time he visited the island. The narrator even knows when the character lacks words to describe his feelings.

In the next example, the doctor, Guy Staveley is worried about what his wife is doing when she leaves the island unaccompanied by him:

> He wasn't asking what use she made of her nursing skills when she returned alone to their empty London flat. How empty was it? What about Tim and Maxie and Kurt, names she occasionally mentioned without explanation and

> apparently without guilt. [....] there were questions which, fearing her answer, he did not dare to ask. Whom did she go with, who paid, who saw her back to the flat, who spent the night in her bed? He found it strange that she didn't intuit the force of his need to know, and his fear of knowing. (67)

As in the former example, the narrator here reveals Staveley's innermost fear: that his wife is being unfaithful. The difference is that Staveley is in the same room as his wife, whereas Yelland was alone in his cottage, and thus the narrator conveys the tension between husband and wife, a tension which is otherwise only acknowledged by Staveley himself.

The narrator is present at the most disturbing of times. In *A Taste for Death* Lady Ursula, Berowne's mother, is described as being "pregnant with grief" (59): "It seemed to her that her mind was like an overfilled glass which only she could hold steady. One jerk, one shudder, one small loss of control and it would spill over into a chaos so terrible that it could only end in death." (59). Significantly, Lady Ursula's mind is compared to a glass and, similar to the architecture in *We*, it is indeed transparent to the gaze of the panoptic narrator. In her attempt to keep up appearances she might be able to fool visitors expressing their condolences, but the narrator provides an account of how the old Lady truly feels at having outlived both her sons (61).

The narrator, as the Panopticon, can see without being seen and, in a certain respect, the narrator is also internalized, since no one (usually not even the reader) is aware of his or her existence. Memories are of importance for several reasons: they are just as private as thoughts and feelings, and they can enhance certain aspects of the actual event while leaving others in the background. When the narrator conveys the memories of a character we are thus faced with a third-hand account of an event, as the character might not recall it objectively in the first place. Memories are hence a result of the "inner eye" of the mind.

Often memories function to introduce the past life of a character, giving them a more in-depth portrayal. For Berowne's daughter Sarah, the setting brings back a memory of her dead father:

> She closed her eyes and let the tramp of their [the crowd's] feet engulf her. And, suddenly, she was in another station, another crowd. But then she had

> been six years old and the station had been Victoria. [...] For a moment she and her father had been parted. He had paused to greet an acquaintance and she had momentarily slipped his hand and run to look at the brightly coloured poster of a seaside town. Looking round she saw with panic that he was no longer there. [...] They could have been parted only for seconds, but the terror had been so dreadful that, recalling it now, eighteen years later, she felt the same loss, the same engulfing terror, the same absolute despair. But suddenly he had been there, striding towards her, [...] smiling, her father, her safety, her god. (141)

As can be seen from this example, the character's memories and her gaze is at times merged through the narrator. Sarah closes her eyes and is transported down a memorial lane, pointing to the significance of an inner vision. The narrator takes us back to Sarah's childhood, a technique which is applied to several characters, including the detectives. A panopticon gaze reveals the stressful moment, even conveying what attracted the little girl's attention away from her father. The feeling of loss is a natural link to the story of the present, where Sarah has indeed lost her father. Also this passage strengthens my argument that the victim as father figure is a central theme in these novels. Shortly after this passage, when Sarah has opened her eyes, she has a hallucination where she mistakes a complete stranger for her father. That memories can be so overwhelming is an issue at stake also when characters recall (or even imagine) the dead body.

Obviously, the memorial aspect of the gaze is of importance when dealing with who discovered the body. In *A Taste for Death* it is an elderly woman, Miss Wharton, and a young boy, Darren. While Darren actually finds the experience exciting, Miss Wharton is momentarily incapacitated by the horror of what she has seen. Keeping her eyes tightly shut, Miss Wharton still cannot erase the image: "Brightly lit as on a stage, she saw the bodies still, more garish, more brightly lit than when they has first met her horrified eyes." (10). In her memory, Berowne's body is staring back up at her. That Miss Wharton closes her eyes in a sense makes her gaze an averted one, only in this instance it does not help her escape what she has seen and the narrator, once again, takes up a position inside her mind. The way the murder was committed has a similar effect on several characters, emphasizing how red reminds them of blood. Miss Wharton has a sensation of drowning in it and that "blood splashed in bright globules against the

retinas of her closed eyes" (11). It is also significant that the memory is even more vivid and terrifying than the actual sight, the fluorescent light seemingly making it impossible not to notice all the details.

In *The Lighthouse*, it is Maycroft who is the first to set eyes on the dangling body of Oliver. Maycroft has lost track of time and it seems to him that the past hours have been "a series of vivid scenes, unlinked, each as instantaneous and indelible as a photograph" (81). The permanence of these memories indicates an analogue to the "eye" of a camera. Again, what Maycroft recalls most vividly is the body, "the stretched neck and the pathetically drooped naked feet – which his brain told him hadn't been naked" (82). His memories, being so terrifying, are playing tricks on him, since Oliver did have his shoes on. The body also comes to him "as if floodlit" (82), another enhancement of his mind as the body emerges from the gradually lifting mist. In these descriptions of the remembered body, the narrator is reporting actual images from the character's mind, employing words that suit her gaze rather than that of the character. Therefore it proves difficult to draw the line between (implied) author and narrator.

In this section, the way the narrator sees and presents the innermost thoughts and memories of the characters has been discussed. The panopticism of the narrator is related to that of the implied author, because no embodied narrator, in fiction or otherwise, can be allowed to read other people's minds. The panopticon gaze of the narrator can function still more directly, conveying what a character is looking at.

3.2 Mediating a character's gaze

During the investigation the narrator often mediates the gaze of the detectives, but in order to tell a coherent story, the panoptic narrator needs to be present at times when the detectives are not, for instance before and when the body is discovered. In *The Lighthouse*, the narrator even mediates the gaze of the victim before he is killed. To draw a distinction between this type of panopticism and the one above, you can say that the mediated gaze occurs when the narrator gazes on the outside world from inside (the character), whereas the gaze on thoughts and memories moves in the opposite direction, from the outside in. Hence the degree of internalization is paradoxically greater in the

latter case, which is also more reminiscent of the unseen watchers in the original Panopticon.

A mediated gaze can function to describe the scenery, or the looks and actions of other characters. Naturally, this gaze is often mixed with a memorial one, where a character describes what he or she has seen previously, but these memories are not always reliable and therefore they have been treated separately. Occasionally, it can also prove difficult to distinguish whether or not the gaze is mediated, or if the narrator is adopting a "camera view" (see below), especially since these two perspectives tend to co-exist.

In *The Lighthouse*, the elderly Emily Holcombe (the last survivor of the family who used to own the island) is looking out of her window to watch the sea, but she also notices that Oliver is standing outside. This mutual staring is rendered from Emily's perspective and thus Oliver is described as the narrator mediates her gaze: "He would have looked like an anathematising Old Testament prophet except for the disconcerting stillness. His eyes were fixed on the cottage with a concentrated desire that she felt went beyond the rational reason he put forward for wanting the place [...]" (30). In this passage the narrator is clearly looking through the eyes of a character in order to describe what she sees. What is more, this panopticism allows the narrator to convey an oppositional gaze, but, of course, such a gaze can never be directed at the narrator, only at the character through whose eyes the narrator is gazing.

The mediated gaze is also useful for describing a setting, as when Miss Wharton visits Scotland Yard: "[...] she found herself facing an ordinary reception desk with a couple of young women on duty. The hall was very busy with an air of purposeful but relaxed activity." (*A Taste for Death* 418). In brief, the panopticon gaze of the narrator can convey the perspective of any character by getting behind his or her eyes.

There is also a third option, where the narrator is present just as a camera is in a film. This means the narrator can observe two or more characters in interaction without necessarily being inside their heads in any of the two ways I have outlined. In *A Taste for Death*, Dalgliesh and Kate are interviewing Lampart, and the conversation is reported through the narrator as dialogue with shorter comments, rather like stage directions, in between:

> Suddenly he [Lampart] got to his feet and began restlessly pacing. Then he turned to Dalgliesh.
>
> 'I've given some thought to this business of Paul Berowne. Man is an animal and he lives most at ease with himself and the world when he remembers that. Admittedly he's the cleverest and most dangerous of animals, but he's still an animal. [...] Berowne wasn't [satisfied and happy]. God knows what unattainable intangibles he thought he'd a right to. Eternal life, probably.'
>
> Dalgliesh said:
>
> 'So you believe the probability is that he killed himself?'
>
> 'I haven't enough evidence. But let's say that if you finally decided it was suicide, then I for one won't be surprised.' (210)

In this passage the narrator refrains from mediating the characters' thoughts, feelings and gaze, but in James often all of these options are represented to give a whole range of perspectives on the same event.

It certainly seems useful to regard the gaze of the narrator as a panopticon one. The only time in these novels that the narrator is not occupying the role of mediator is in the dialogues. When a character "speaks" directly, the point of view is strictly his or hers, but often even dialogues are mixed with narrative comments such as "he said". It seems to be an inescapable element of a third person narrative that the narrator is panoptic. There is no doubt that the narrator is always seeing but never seen, but in terms of surveillance, and recalling Blazer, here the privacy of the characters is taken unknowingly, whereas with the detectives the character has a choice. The narrator is also largely internalized, since he or she escapes awareness and moves inside characters. As mentioned earlier, the narrator is limited to the story of the investigation. The narrator is also unable to expose "false" clues that have been planted to divert the reader, but apart from that, the gaze of the narrator is ever-present and hence panoptic.

4 THE VOYEURISTIC AND THE OPPOSITIONAL GAZE IN THE TWO NOVELS

In the following section I will analyse the gaze of the detectives. The hypothesis is that this gaze is voyeuristic in Mulvey's sense of the word, but as the detectives are in an occupational role, their gaze is non-sexual and causes them to feel guilt instead of pleasure. The gaze is seen as an instrument of control and a means of invading privacy. I will discuss how the victim as father figure becomes a significant other for Dalgliesh. The novels are third person narratives and the narrator is always there to mediate the gaze of the detectives. Hence wherever there is a voyeuristic gaze there tends also to be a panopticon one, and there is a clear parallel between narration and detection. Since I have already discussed the role of the narrator, the focus here will lie on the gaze of the detective, whether mediated or not. In section 5.2 different types of the oppositional gaze are analysed. Starting with other characters, they can defy the gaze of the detectives or avert their own gaze. I will also discuss the uncanny gaze of the victim and the way inanimate objects, such as the murder weapon, seem to blur the borders between watcher and watched.

4.1 The voyeuristic detective

Since they have been trained to notice everything, the detectives literally have an occupational gaze. The voyeuristic gaze is devised to take in and register every detail of its object, whether another person or for instance a room. The detectives are further trained to scrutinize without other people taking offense, so their gaze is also an elusive one. In *The Lighthouse* Kate and Benton interview Emily Holcombe in her cottage and Kate is described as "resisting the temptation to display any unseemly curiosity by letting her eyes wander" (172). All the same, she succeeds in noticing the number of window panes, the rugs, the oil paintings and the leather-bound volumes. In *A Taste for Death*, Dalgliesh "couldn't help noticing the details" (119), as if it had become a (bad) habit to do so. Indeed other characters point out that they cannot remember details that the police ask them to provide (*A Taste for Death* 58, 113), further stressing that it is the detectives' job to notice the smallest of things.

When a suspect is interviewed in his or her own home, the detectives certainly cross the physical limit of what is private. It is their task to infer things about the occupant according to how a room has been furnished. In *A Taste for Death* Dalgliesh is represented as thinking it is odd

> [...] that a man morbidly sensitive about his own privacy should have chosen a job that *required* him to invade almost daily the privacy of others. But people's living-space, and the personal possessions with which they surrounded themselves, were inevitably fascinating to a detective, an affirmation of identity, intriguing both in themselves and as a *betrayal* of character, interests, obsessions. (240–241, italics mine)

In this passage it is stressed that invading privacy is a part of Dalgliesh's job, but that it does hold a certain fascination, suggesting that he does get some reward from his occupation. It also points to the fact that, by being able to enter other people's homes, the detectives are able to draw conclusions about the person(s) living there. The element of voyeurism is evident, since even if Dalgliesh is visibly present, he can, and does, protect himself against a similar invasion. The word 'betrayal' is significant. Although the suspects themselves may resist being controlled by a voyeuristic gaze, their home will automatically put things on display. True enough, any incriminating items can be disposed of, but the room can hardly be stripped to such an extent that this in itself evokes suspicion.

The detective often comments, through the narrator, on whether a room gives the impression of being private or not. In *The Lighthouse* Mrs Burbridge, the housekeeper, has a nameplate on her door as if to signal "her right to privacy" (214). Dalgliesh thinks that her quarters present "a more personal domain than any he had expected to find on Combe" (214). The paragraph that follows describes in great detail the sentimental mementoes Mrs Burbridge's family has accumulated over the years and generations. That Kate is able to focus on the evidence even when concerned about a grieving suspect supports the claim that gender is not the only dimension to determine the voyeuristic gaze. Garrod is right in guessing that she takes the opportunity to snoop around when, fetching Sarah a glass of water in the kitchen, she looks in the waste bin to check the date on the food packet they claim to have shared on the night of the murder (*A Taste for Death* 250). Going through other people's garbage is a strong violation of

privacy, even for a police detective, and it enhances the element of voyeurism that Kate goes about this inspection unnoticed. Gender is no constraint on her actions when an opportunity presents itself.

If there are rooms that seem to be extensions of the inhabitants personality, it can also be of significance that a room is strictly impersonal. In *A Taste for Death* this is the case with the murder victim. Dalgliesh is described as follows: "Again he had the sense that he was in a museum, that Berowne had sat in this richly ornamented cell like a stranger." (130). Protecting one's privacy with a carefulness verging on paranoia is something Dalgliesh has in common with Berowne, and I will soon return to other aspects of this doubling. It is also important to consider the continual references to murder and the destruction of privacy that it inevitably entails:

> Murder destroyed privacy, laid bare with brutal thoroughness all the petty contrivances of the dead life. Dalgliesh would rummage through Berowne's past as thoroughly as he rummages through a victim's cupboards and files. The *victim's privacy was the first to go*, but no one intimately concerned with murder was left unscathed. The victim had at least escaped beyond earthbound considerations of dignity, embarrassment, reputation. But for the living, to be part of *a murder investigation* was to be *contaminated by a process* which would leave few of their lives unchanged. (*A Taste for Death* 290–291, italics mine.)

It is clear that Dalgliesh sees the whole investigation as a destructive process which will leave its mark on everyone involved. A similar view is held by John Massingham, who claims murder is a cancer (304), emphasizing the idea of infection and disease. Murder initiates an investigation, and therefore the need for a voyeuristic gaze. Returning to the privacy of the victim, every area of his or her life must be scrutinized. The detectives are allowed to search pockets (40), look in drawers (277) and read diaries. These physical violations of privacy are, naturally, mostly visible regarding the victim, and the post-mortem finally resounds with the initial act of violence, the murder.

The systematic treatment of internal organs suggests an objectification of the dead body, and even though the detectives are not required to be present at the autopsy, their voyeurism is justified by the pursuit of knowledge. Nunn and Biressi comment on the way a body is read like a clue. Detective work and narration in itself are connected to the detectives' task of decoding the body and reconstructing its story. Thus displayed, the

body becomes objectified and its "passivity and its frequent positioning as an eroticised object in the field of vision" figures it as "feminine". (196) Significantly, the victims are male in both of the novels under study, and there is a strong emphasis on the emotional side of police work. When Berowne's body is dissected in *A Taste for Death*, Kate and Massingham are afraid to meet Dalgliesh's eyes because he was acquainted with the victim, but Dalgliesh has got used to detachment, suggesting he does see the body as an object rather than a person (220). However, he feels the need to wash his hands together with the pathologist "from a fastidiousness which he would have found difficult to explain" (221). Police work, it seems, is dirty also at a more symbolic level. Dalgliesh finds the first examination of the victim more disturbing than the actual autopsy, where a clinical gaze is justified (see Foucault, section 2.2). One reason for this is that he is well aware of the objectifying process that takes place with a dead body:

> The body [...] yet had an inalienable dignity because it had once been a man. But he knew, none better, how quickly this spurious humanity would drain away. Even before the pathologist had finished at the scene and the head was wrapped, the hands mittened in their plastic bags, even before Doc Kynaston got to work with his scalpels, the corpse would be an exhibit [...], tagged, documented, dehumanized, invoking only interest, curiosity or disgust. (*A Taste for Death* 34)

In the case of a dead body it is clear that voyeurism requires distance, and yet this very distance is what causes Dalgliesh to feel ill at ease. He is represented as thinking that, since he knew and liked Berowne, the latter surely "deserves better of me than to gaze at him with my policeman's eyes" (34). His gaze can be described as "frank, unabashed (but far from erotic)", and it is also true that he sides with the victims and their families rather than with law enforcement (Nunn and Biressi 200). No doubt Dalgliesh is aware that his occupational gaze is objectifying and therefore voyeuristic, but here he makes himself step out of that detachment to gaze with the eyes of a friend. As will become clear in section 4.2.2 on the oppositional gaze, in James's novels suspects often make a distinction between the police and their own friends, as a means of resisting control. While still at the scene of crime, Dalgliesh wonders why "Watching this violation of the body's orifices, preliminaries to the scientific brutality to follow, had always made him feel uncomfortably like *a voyeur*." (76, italics mine). He thinks it

might be “because the body was so recently dead” and states that were he superstitious, he might think the spirit was still hovering around (76). This connection between voyeurism and the uncanny will be analysed in section 4.2.3.

In *The Lighthouse* the body has already been moved when the police arrive, but again Dalgliesh is given to ponder “the absoluteness of death” (103): “No animal was ever as dead as a man. Was it that so much more had been lost with that final stiffening, not only the animal passions and the urges of the flesh, but the whole encompassing life of the human mind?” (104). It is self-evident that once the soul has left the body, when a human can no longer think or move, he or she becomes an object of sorts. Being murdered inevitably means being exposed to a non-sexual voyeuristic gaze.

So far I have discussed how a room, as an extension of its occupant, and the dead body are viewed by the voyeuristic gaze of the detectives. The suspects are similarly given looks of scrutiny, since during interviews it may be crucial how a person reacts to a certain question. In *A Taste for Death*, Kate is the one sent to break the news of Berowne’s death to his family. Although she is often described as tactful, she sees herself as “a traitor to grief, watching and listening” (36). Indeed the intrusion into grief and bereavement is a significant element of voyeurism, perhaps the one that makes the detectives feel most guilty. The detectives occasionally acknowledge this feeling of guilt or shame. In *The Lighthouse*, Kate is represented as thinking: “It had always worried her that someone had to die before she could experience this half-guilty exhilaration,” and a few lines later: “But she knew the root of the small sprig of shame. Although they had never spoken of it she suspected AD felt the same. With this jigsaw the pieces were the broken lives of men and women.” (18). If Kate had not found her job exciting she would not have chosen it, but while laying out the puzzle she is disturbed by the way that murder destroys so much more than the life of the victim. In this novel it is also made clear that being the member of a team fills a gap in Kate’s life, that the meetings provide her with a domesticity she had never experienced in her childhood (185). In a sense, the murder squad is the family she never had.

In both novels, the suspects are interviewed separately, but in *The Lighthouse*, Dalgliesh first opts for a control that functions through group pressure, the kind of machinery which is typical of the panopticon gaze (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 156). He is represented as thinking the suspects “might be more confiding later in private, but

it was here together that their relationships were most likely to be revealed" (130). Compared to Amey's discussion above, this scenario strikes a similar note of transparency. Everyone is able to observe everyone else, but the narrator significantly refrains from providing the thoughts of anyone but the detectives, so that any "subversive thoughts" on behalf on the suspects go undetected. What Dalgliesh has established is a collective control, since if any of the suspects were to lie about their doings, another suspect might challenge the account. The detectives themselves are certainly not making the suspects feel more relaxed and are able to observe any strange behaviour. Just the simple fact of how the suspects have placed themselves in the room, and next to whom, can reveal relationships that might prove important. That Emily Holcombe and her butler Roughtwood have chosen not to appear at all (128) suggests they do not feel obliged to obey the police.

Apart from this gathering of suspects, the case for voyeurism in observing the suspects is stronger than that of panopticism for the simple reason that the detectives are always visible themselves. In *The Lighthouse* Dalgliesh has been briefed on the suspects beforehand, and this information helps him notice things that might not be visible to an untrained eye. In the mirrored lift he is able to see Maycroft and Dr Staveley "reflected into infinity" (100) and is also able to infer that life has dealt mildly with the former, that this family solicitor has avoided rather than won his battles. He observes that while Staveley must be younger than Maycroft, it is he who looks older: "He [Dalgliesh] had seen on the faces of the chronically ill Staveley's look of patient endurance unlit by hope." (100). However, Dalgliesh also knows that Staveley is not physically ill, and that what weighs him down is the child who died because of a wrong diagnosis. From this it can be seen how voyeurism is a mixture of background knowledge and careful observation, both of which are granted by the detectives' occupation.

One reason for the scrutiny of suspects is that it coincides with the narrator's need to characterize. Thus, while the detectives are giving a detailed description of a suspect, the reader is able to visualize the character. Often the eyes of a character are described (implying an oppositional gaze straight away), even their colour. You might argue that it would require more than one look to be certain of the colour of another person's eyes, which also varies depending on the light. Sometimes when the narrator is mediating the gaze of the detectives, the word choice is also more likely to stem from the narrator, as

when Dalgliesh notes that Barbara Berowne is wearing “a grey cashmere cardigan” and has her hair fastened “with a tortoiseshell clamp” (*A Taste for Death* 119). These are hardly the kind of exact terms about women’s clothing that a man who owns only one (although well-tailored) suit himself would use.

Barbara Berowne is significant because she is used to being the object of a male gaze. Dalgliesh is represented as thinking: “It would have given him pleasure to sit unnoticed and look at her as he might a picture, to note with dispassionate admiration, the delicate perfectly curved arch above the slanting eyes [...]” (118). A clear parallel can be drawn with Mulvey’s male spectator, since what Dalgliesh would require to be able to observe Barbara unnoticed is distance. She is compared to a picture, which further implies voyeurism, but although Dalgliesh recognizes her as a beautiful woman, the pleasure he takes in her is non-sexual. To him her beauty is simply “too perfect” (119), and he regards her with the same admiration as he might a work of art. At the same time, he is careful not to stereotype her, and hence diminishes the distance: “Nothing in police work was more dangerous than to make superficial judgements about human beings.” (119).

More importantly, as mentioned earlier, the detectives need to scrutinize the suspects to get down to their personalities, and to judge whether their grief is genuine or their evidence truthful. This will be further discussed in the next section, but one example follows. Miss Matlock is the overworked servant in the Berowne household, and, unwittingly, an accomplice to the murderer. Confronted with questions about the evidence, Dalgliesh observes that she is first taken by surprise, then becomes disconcerted: “He was too experienced and she too poor an actress for him to be deceived.” (134). In a way, the fact that suspects can and do try to oppose or deceive the detectives causes a voyeuristic gaze, since the detectives must be extra attentive to their responses.

To explain why the voyeuristic gaze makes the detectives feel guilt instead of pleasure, it is useful to see the victims as doubles, and significant others, to Dalgliesh. While Dalgliesh is reminiscent of Berowne’s appearance and personality, he is linked to Oliver mainly through his writing. Drawing on Lacan’s theories, the father figure as the third party is what introduces guilt, and both victims can definitely be seen as patriarchal

figures. In both novels, there are discussions about the degree of emotional exploitation required from a skilled policeman, a theme that parallels the behaviour of Oliver.

Both victims have "some wealth and authority", a characteristic of so-called golden age writing (Knight 87). Oliver's profession is relevant, since a subsidiary theme in the novel is the nature of creative writing and its similarities with police work. Both occupations have a voyeuristic element and Oliver is often described as having taken advantage of the people he observed around him, exploiting their attributes to create fictional characters. Significantly, Dalgliesh is himself a poet and although he is not as selfish and sadistic as Oliver, the connection between his writing and his job is strongly dependent on the gaze.

Not only are the (major) victims in both novels patriarchal figures, but the murderers share similar qualities too. Dominic Swayne in *A Taste for Death* is the brother of Berowne's second wife Barbara, a beautiful but simple-minded woman. Swayne has his tragic childhood in common with Dan Padgett, Oliver's illegitimate and unacknowledged son. In Freudian terms, this suggests the kind of totemism connected with the son's wish to take his father's place, only to make the dead father stronger than the living one ever was (Parkin-Gounelas 98). This is an important point, considering how the dead "father figure" seems to haunt the narratives of the novels.

Throughout *A Taste of Death*, Dalgliesh himself, Kate, and some of the suspects or witnesses comment on the likeness between him and Berowne. The fact that Berowne is the first victim that Dalgliesh was acquainted with further suggests a personal involvement, and Dalgliesh is frustrated that his colleagues should treat him extra carefully, although he is certainly affected by the fact. Interviewing Berowne's lover, Dalgliesh is suddenly taken with resentment against the late politician, who has not arranged for her to be told about his death but left her to learn about it on the news, but then Dalgliesh's anger subsides into self-disgust: "He thought: Isn't that how I might have behaved? We're alike even in this." (293). The thought has struck Kate too, and she is secretly irritated that Dalgliesh would also be capable of causing such grief "for a woman unwise enough to love him" (370). There are strong indications that this similarity between the two men is something less tangible than physical appearance. However, both also are (or were) exceptionally tall. In Berowne's room at the

constituency, Dalgliesh sits down at his desk and notes that the chair "was comfortable, fitting his long limbs as if made for him" (277).

The most obvious difference between Dalgliesh and his double is that the former is striving to stay strictly rooted in rationality, while the latter dies suspiciously after some sort of religious experience (76). Perhaps this is the reason why Dalgliesh is also unwilling to acknowledge the likeness between them. A witness comments: "You're very like him, Commander. I don't mean your features. He was fair and you're so dark. But you are like him; the way you sit, your hands, the way you walk, even your voice a little." (408). Dalgliesh's reaction is to get to his feet, and he wants to leave so fast that they nearly miss a very important fact about Berowne's whereabouts the day he died. This suggests he is disconcerted by the witness's comment and also shows him step slightly out of character, since Dalgliesh is usually very careful to control himself.

Because of a shared interest in architecture, the parallel between Dalgliesh and Berowne is clear and shows that the main victim in this novel is a significant other to Dalgliesh. Berowne, like Dalgliesh, had lost his faith in politics, saying that, while police work is less hypocritical than most jobs, all a politician deals with is humbug. He concludes: "The most we can hope for is that we don't actually believe it." (28). Berowne's criticism of political power also fits the general pattern in the novels (see section 4.2.1). According to his colleagues, it almost seemed to be an obsession of his to try to explain to others "the limits of government power, any government" (278). Like Dalgliesh, he was part of a system he did not believe in. Finally, Berowne is linked to Dalgliesh through privacy. I have shown how the privacy of the murder victim is the first invaded by a murder investigation, but Berowne's house, work place and belongings give next to nothing away. Dalgliesh is also scrupulous about his own privacy. Massingham comments that he thinks Dalgliesh only needs "his poetry, his job and his privacy. And probably in that order." (322).

It is part of a detective's job to witness grief and already in *A Taste for Death*, it is mentioned how the detectives are required to exploit the emotional state of the suspects. During an interview, Dalgliesh is represented as thinking: "Other people's tears, other people's grief were inseparable from a murder inquiry. He had learned not to show surprise or embarrassment." (247). Silverman and Creed's case for masochism is confirmed by such comments. Significantly, Berowne's lover says Berowne was easy

(for some women) to talk to (360), a quality Dalgliesh certainly possesses. Lady Ursula is handicapped and aging, and although Dalgliesh notices that the interview is exhausting her he "controlled his compassion as she was controlling her grief. There were questions he still needed to ask and it wouldn't be the first time he had taken advantage of tiredness and grief." (112). It is a technique, a strategy, just as the suspects agree on how to tackle the police even before they arrive. If you catch a suspect unawares or in a weak moment, it is more likely you will learn things of importance. With the people who are not really suspects, but who knew the victim well, like Berowne's lover, the exploitation and voyeurism become sources of guilt.

> Watching her, Dalgliesh knew what he was doing and the more fastidious part of his mind was repelled by it. She was alone, unacknowledged, denied the simple need to share her grief, to talk about her lover. And it was that need which he was about to exploit. He sometimes thought bitterly that exploitation was at the heart of successful detection, particularly with murder. (294)

The emotional exploitation is intimately linked with the voyeuristic gaze in this passage, and Dalgliesh's aversion to his own activity shows awareness of both ingredients (see Willemen). His bitterness is even clearer when he returns from a visit to the grandparents of Theresa Nolan (Lady Ursula's nurse, who committed suicide). He goes by himself because he thinks that if he has to intrude on their grief, at least he can try and "make it as easy as possible for them" (325). After the visit he thinks that there is simply "too much pain in this job. To think I used to congratulate myself, God help me, that people found it easy to confide in me." (334). He wonders what good would come of it if he resigned, telling himself "that enough is enough, twenty years of using people's weakness against them, twenty years of careful non-involvement" (334). It apparently disturbs Dalgliesh that he has to distance himself from the grief he witnesses, and that he must also exploit is to be able to do his job. This is one of the most disconcerting aspects of the detective's occupational voyeurism.

In *A Taste for Death* it is also suggested that being a man is sometimes in itself a kind of intrusion. This sensation occurs to Dalgliesh when in the company of Kate and a female suspect or witness: "Suddenly he [Dalgliesh] felt that he shouldn't be there, that he was redundant as a detective and a man. They would both get on better without his

male, destructive presence." (291). Dalgliesh all of a sudden feels as if he were the only outsider, although Kate is just as alien as he is. Being a male police officer makes him voyeuristic in a double sense, which is perfectly in line with Mulvey's theory. Kate sees Massingham at a similar disadvantage due to his separate seating on a high chair, "a male intruder into comfortable female domesticity" (307). It is consistent with the discussion of the gendered criticism of authority that women are described as allies. This allegiance, as mentioned earlier, is still just a part of the occupational role Kate is playing. It is also a sign of the "healthy" rivalry between her and her male colleagues, siding with the other women.

The theme of exploitation is central in making Oliver a significant other to Dalgliesh in *The Lighthouse*. The fact that the detectives intrude on privacy and grief is here taken to another level, since Dalgliesh, just like Oliver with his novels, uses his experience to produce poetry. Dalgliesh asks himself if it was not "in the rich soil of a murder investigation, in the fascination of the gradual unveiling of truth, in shared exertion and the prospect of danger, and in the pitiableness of desperate and broken lives that his poetry put out its shoots?" (11). The above is in itself a reason for Dalgliesh's feelings of guilt, that he needs to be a detective to be able to be a writer. In brief, he channels his experience as a detective into creative writing. Still, it is not only the voyeurism with regard to other people's private lives that is mentioned, but also the united efforts of the team, which is also essential to Kate. It is clear from this example that the detectives' job requires them to walk a fine line between getting too emotionally involved and thus brought down by guilt, and too detached and thus voyeuristic or even sadistic, like Scottie in Mulvey's discussion. In *A Taste for Death*, Dalgliesh makes the distinction clear to Kate after their interview with Lampart. He asks Kate whether she enjoyed the interview and she readily admits she "liked the sense of being in control" (212–13). Dalgliesh says he did not intend the question as criticism, that "No one joins the police without getting some enjoyment out of exercising power. No one joins the murder squad who hasn't a taste for death. The danger begins when the pleasure becomes an end in itself. That's when it's time to think about another job." (213). In the juxtaposition between Dalgliesh and his significant other this is the ultimate difference: that Dalgliesh knows how to respect the people he meets in his job, while Oliver was, if not sadistic then at least, a selfish and arrogant person.

The element of emotional exploitation in a murder investigation discussed above is similar to the techniques of Oliver on the hunt for traits in a new character or for a certain experience. His ex-wife questions him on his motives for being present at the birth of their child Miranda and maintains: “You have to listen, and watch and observe. It’s only when you’ve got the physical details right that you can produce all that psychological insight, all that humanity.” (34). Oliver indeed has written about childbirth and the impression is that his whole life has been a voyeuristic research for material to include in his next novel. What is more, he seldom seems to notice how he exploits and “suck[s] the life out of other people” (34). Dennis Tremlett, Miranda’s secret lover and Oliver’s co-editor and secretary, comes closest to being the son Oliver never had in terms of devotion and, later on, grief. Even he comments that Oliver is “a conduit” who can merely describe without being able to feel any compassion for other people (52).

A couple of the residents on Combe are in particular described as having been Oliver’s “victims”. The young girl Millie saw her walks with Oliver as a sign of friendship, whereas the less naïve recognized his actual motive. Dalgliesh thinks to himself that what Oliver needed from her was her conversation: “He would know what she [a fictional Millie] felt and what she thought. What he needed to know was how she put those thoughts into words.” (167). Dalgliesh is familiar with the mechanisms of literary creation, although poetry is usually more abstract in nature and does not necessarily involve characters at all.

At times Oliver’s experiments step far out of line. Dr Yelland confronts Oliver at a dinner with the fact that the latter has been asking around at his laboratory, already the target of rampant animal liberation activists, but Oliver does not even lift his eyes from the plate (61). Yelland lives a life of constant threat and fears that the new book will only add fuel to the fire. Oliver’s unabashed exploitation is, however, at its most extreme with Adrian Boyde. The former priest suffered not only from lack of faith but also drank heavily. According to Jo Staveley, Oliver would not settle for just observing any drunkard in the street, but “He needed someone who was trying to fight his demons. He wanted time and privacy to control the situation and watch every minute of it. And I suppose it was important to have his victim available at short notice” (192). Hence Oliver destroyed everything Adrian had achieved in one blow.

Dalgliesh and Oliver do not only have their writing in common; their occupations both have strong elements of the voyeuristic gaze and emotional exploitation. Given the position of Berowne and Oliver as the murdered patriarchs, seeing the victims as significant others to Dalgliesh is one explanation for his feelings of guilt. In this section I have also discussed how the voyeuristic gaze of the detectives is professionally trained to notice details. I have analysed the gaze as an intrusion on privacy and grief to illustrate the nature of this non-sexual voyeurism. In the following section I will analyse the different types of the oppositional gaze in the novels.

4.2 The oppositional gaze

If the voyeuristic gaze of the detectives is a means of control, the oppositional gaze is a form of resistance to being controlled. By returning the gaze the suspects can disturb the binaries of watcher and watched, making the detectives feel guilty as they are caught in the act. As mentioned earlier, an averted gaze can also imply resistance, either because a character has something to hide, or because they do not accept the terms of the male gaze altogether. The question of who is in control of the gaze is a matter of constant negotiation between the detectives and the suspects. The following section provides a framework for the oppositional gaze, and helps explain the detectives' feelings of guilt in the discourse of power relations. In sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 the gaze of the suspects and the uncanny gaze are analysed respectively.

4.2.1 Criticism of authority

Munt comments on one of the major themes in James being "the effects of murder upon all concerned" (23), an observation of great significance when dealing with the reciprocal nature of the gaze, since there would not be a voyeuristic gaze in the first place if a murder had not been committed. The authority and control in the gaze of the detectives are, in a sense, "borrowed" from the act of violence (see also Brooks, section 2.1, on retracing the patriarch). Another hallmark of James's writing is that she is at her

most transgressive at the level of form (hence the elements of realism) and this results in a rejection of the detective hero's function as a redemptive force (Munt 24–25). Hence the very authority of state power is questioned in the novels, placing the emphasis on the dismal reality of murder: humans taking life and death into their own hands.

As Lucy Hughes-Hallett (2005) maintains, "the form [of the crime novel] suggests that every crime has a punishment, every mystery a solution and every story an ending. The mood [of the novel] [...] persistently subverts that optimism. *The Lighthouse* [italics mine] presents a world in which pain is far too pervasive to be eradicated by a single arrest." (online). Such a mood is prevalent in many of James's novels and the detectives themselves sometimes seem to wonder whether they really have the right to judge other people. Murder is also depicted as a vicious circle where there is never a final victim. James's novels contain criticism both towards and by authority. This has implications for voyeurism in that the suspects' mistrust and the detectives' self-critique further promote the guilt the detectives feel, since these attitudes hardly serve to justify the invasiveness of the police.

In this context, criticism of authority means an attitude expressed by an authority figure. The novels in this study offer a range of such attitudes, which are often visible as ironic comments or thoughts. At times they can be pinpointed to a certain character, while at other times they seem to originate with the narrator. This criticism is of importance for the discussion of an oppositional gaze, and also for the gaze as a source of guilt for the detectives. The characters can ally themselves before the police arrive and explicitly choose a strategy with which to handle the situation. That the detectives themselves doubt authority (their own or that of their superiors) indicates that they have less faith in the establishment than could be expected. Another aspect of this criticism is that it tends to be gendered. Powerful women are doubtful of powerful men, and vice versa.

Right at the beginning of *The Lighthouse*, Dalgliesh muses on the nature of murder: "[...] unnatural death always provoked a peculiar unease, an uncomfortable realisation that there were still some things that might not be susceptible to bureaucratic control" (3). He speaks first of all for himself, but the thought strikes him as he looks at the people assembled for a top-secret emergency meeting. Clearly, Dalgliesh is well aware of the limitations of his own power and that of the whole establishment. From his

further thoughts on the subject, it is also evident that he prefers hands-on experience to paperwork: “The plans [for a new detective force] would be bedevilled with politics; top-level policing always had been. [...] He saw himself in danger of becoming one more bureaucrat, a committee member, adviser, co-ordinator – not a detective.” (11). Politics, it seems, does not lie close to Dalgliesh’s heart and he is critical of the titles others want him to assume. This kind of power does not appeal to him at all.

Dalgliesh does not refrain from direct criticism of authority, although he keeps it to himself. He thinks that the secret service, like the monarchy, had “lost some of that half-ecclesiastical patina of authority”, and a few lines down that “To surrender mystique had its disadvantages; an organisation came to be regarded as any other bureaucracy, staffed by the same fallible human beings and liable to the same cock-ups.” (5). Three references to bureaucracy in the same chapter insist on Dalgliesh’s pessimistic attitude towards it. He also states that the police are as fallible as anyone else and just as likely to err. From this it follows that Dalgliesh is no admirer of the system he is himself part of. In *A Taste for Death* he explicitly thinks of himself as a “policeman disillusioned with policing” (28). This criticism is a contributing factor to the detectives’ experience of being guilty of voyeurism.

Kate Miskin displays a similar attitude in wondering what her job is doing to her. She is aware that policing is only “done with the consent of the policed, even presumably in those areas where the police had always been seen as the enemy and had now been elevated into convenient stereotypes of oppression” (*A Taste for Death* 218–19). She continues by stating her own credo, which is that, even if hypocrisy is at times politically necessary, you yourself do not have to believe it. Just like Dalgliesh, Kate has never had any illusions about her job. She knows the name of the game and although she is aware of the relative powerlessness of the police, she keeps a straight face. (218)

A murder investigation tends to create alliances where there would usually be none. The suspects in these novels negotiate what strategy is best to meet the police with even before the latter arrive. Intelligent characters realize they should ascertain where the loyalties of their peers lie. Thus, in *A Taste for Death*, Lady Ursula has called Doctor Lampart to a private meeting to discuss his affair with her daughter-in-law: “My son was murdered, and that means that there are certain facts the police will make it their business to discover.” (63). Lady Ursula seems well aware that the police are bound to

discover other secrets than that of the murderer, and she negotiates with Lampart over his telling as much of the truth as is necessary. Lampart himself has his doubts about police authority, knowing them to "combine a macho enthusiasm for selective violence with a rigid adherence to middle-class morality" (64). His strong suggestion of hypocrisy is more ironic, but otherwise in line with Kate's self-criticism. Lampart further comments that the police "may be out of touch with social reality" (64), but that they should not be so out of touch as to mistake him for a murderer. Lampart thinks that the police are aloof and, perhaps, too political to be of any use. His distrust in their abilities is certainly stronger than that of Lady Ursula, who asks him not to underestimate them.

A similar conversation takes place in *The Lighthouse* where Emily Holcombe asserts that she, Maycroft and Dr Staveley together should decide how to "play it" (84). She refers to the arrival of the police as an invasion, which is partly a result of their living on an island, but also indicates that she sees the situation as "us" against "them". Maycroft, who is in charge of executive matters on the island but often questions his own authority, readily admits that the police "have authority I lack" (85). This supports the idea that criticism of authority usually originates from another authority figure, while those in subordinate positions revert to other means of resistance. At the end of this meeting, Emily decides that the police should not be met by more than two people, and certainly not by her, since they do not wish to encourage their visitors' self-importance. "They're hardly the most distinguished people we've welcomed on Combe." (91). Her attitude is not merely critical but also arrogant.

Ivor Garrod, Sarah Berowne's Marxist boyfriend in *A Taste for Death*, is even more straightforward in expressing his disapproval, but he prudently waits until the detectives are no longer present. He accuses Sarah, as a typical middle-class liberal, of seeing them as allies and claims that in himself, Dalgliesh has a "very satisfactory suspect from his point of view, just what the Establishment are hoping for. Then he can get down to the business of fabricating the evidence." (256). Garrod's strategy for dealing with the police is simply to "tell them nothing" (256), and his unwillingness to co-operate is clearly a result of his mistrust regarding them. He is of the opinion that, for the detectives, the end justifies the means in a murder investigation, and as can be seen from section 4.1, he is right in one respect.

A final form of criticism of authority is gendered in nature. Men are occasionally dismissive of the authority of women, as in the beginning of *The Lighthouse* when an old eccentric comments on Miss Holcombe's academic education at Oxford: "She'll either be an ally or a perfect nuisance. If I know anything about academic women it will be the latter." (10). More often, though, it is women who are critical of men of authority. Emily's thoughts on the subject are sardonic enough when, thinking about Oliver, she states that "she had never considered that major talent, even genius, entitled a man to be more selfish and self-indulgent than was common in the majority of his sex" (27). Emily is holding a grudge because Oliver attempts to drive her out of her cottage, but her resentment goes deeper and seems to reflect an overall attitude towards the opposite sex.

Lady Ursula is more reserved, but her thoughts on Lampart have a ring of the same sarcasm: "Scrape away the carefully acquired patina of professional success, prestige, orthodox good manners, and the real man was there; ambitious, a little vulgar, sensitive only when sensivity paid." (*A Taste for Death* 61). Although Lady Ursula recognizes this as her own prejudice speaking, the attitude is unmistakably based on a gendered mistrust of authority.

As a woman police officer, Kate receives a special treatment in double meaning. Already in *A Taste for Death* Kate's relationship with her colleagues as a female police officer is of some importance, and this theme is developed further in the more recent novel. This relationship is another instance of gendered criticism. In particular John Massingham has difficulties holding back his resentment at Kate's position in the squad, while Dalgliesh thinks it self-evident that a woman detective belongs there (16). Massingham is basically a macho character with an "instinct" to protect women "in moments of high danger" (101). He has learnt to respect Kate, but it is obvious that his knowledge of her competence is far from an acknowledgment of the same.

This section has provided a general discussion of how authority is questioned in the novels under study. Such attitudes are of importance for constructing an opposition to voyeurism and as an additional explanation to the detectives' feelings of guilt. In the following sections of the analysis I will cover the function of the gaze in the interaction between detective and suspect, victim, or evidence.

4.2.2 Suspects: the overt and the averted gaze

As with a critical attitude to authority, an overtly oppositional gaze often originates from another authority figure. Lady Ursula in *A Taste for Death* meets and holds Dalgliesh's gaze at the outset (107), and she confronts him head on with a personal affront: "to be a poet and a policemen seems to me eccentric, even perverse" (108). Her allusion to voyeurism is not subtle. Her ironic comment that she does not question her "servants about their private lives" (111) further serves to convey her disapproval of the police, whose job it is to do precisely that. However, as the interview proceeds, Dalgliesh manages to get in control. After Dalgliesh has produced Berowne's diary, which turns out to be a vital piece of evidence, Lady Ursula looks down at it and Dalgliesh "had a sense that she was unwilling to meet his eyes" (113). This averted gaze is a sign of strong emotions, since Dalgliesh detects "resolution, appeal, defiance" when Lady Ursula looks up again (113). Lady Ursula is ready to play the game, but in this particular case she loses. There are indications that she is more willing to accept Kate, whom she refers to as tactful and considerate (108), but this is perhaps less because she is a woman and more because she is only taking notes and does not pose an actual threat. Dalgliesh is aware that Lady Ursula is as attentive to him as he is of her, and he knows that to her it is he who is the enemy (115).

Lady Ursula has an ally in her driver, who can look Dalgliesh straight in the eye and lie (149). Halliwell is ex-military, and Dalgliesh's technique of letting Massingham do the questioning does not affect him. He is described as having "an odd and disconcerting trick of fixing his dark eyes intently on the questioner as if it were he who was the interrogator" (146). The element of negotiating control is evident in Halliwell's oppositional gaze. He also makes it clear that his private life is none of the detectives' business, and when Massingham is pressing him to give the name and address of the woman he visited the day after the murder, he responds by asking Dalgliesh if he is married. Turning back to Massingham he says: "And if that question was none of my business, neither are my wife and daughter any of yours." (149–50). Halliwell's interest in law indicates he knows just how much information he is obliged to provide, but his loyalty to the family is so strong he does not hesitate to lie to the police. His opposition is more related to class than to gender.

Emily Holcombe and her butler Roughtwood constitute a similar pair in *The Lighthouse*. Kate and Benton conduct the first interview with them, but Emily does not take them seriously and says she prefers to talk to Dalgliesh next time (177). Later when Kate is in charge of the investigation and requests that everyone write down their doings during the evening of the second murder, Emily responds with outright ridicule: “We’ll look like a bunch of over-mature university students tackling their final exam papers. Will Sergeant Benton-Smith be invigilating?” (271). Unlike Lady Ursula, who seems to appreciate Kate’s tact and competence, Emily Holcombe has no intention of being controlled more than is necessary. Roughtwood also shows open antagonism towards Dalgliesh: “their eyes met. Roughtwood was looking at him with no attempt to conceal his resentment. He escorted Dalgliesh to the door of the cottage as if he were a prisoner under escort” (241). The seniority, class, and their status on the island certainly places the two of them above the detectives, in their own opinion.

In the case of Miss Matlock in *A Taste for Death*, the opposition is due to her romantic interest in the murderer. Although she relies on Lady Ursula to support her, it is clear the family has never respected her, nor she them. On her first meeting with Dalgliesh, Miss Matlock looks at him “as if a momentary lapse of concentration might cause him to spring at her” (130). Her wariness is strongly linked with voyeurism, which is even more evident when she lets the police in later the same evening: “She was wearing a long dressing gown in flowered nylon, strained across the breast, the belt double-knotted as if she were afraid they would tear it off.” (142). Although the narrator is mediating the gaze of the detectives in this passage, it seems that they detect some non-verbal signals that convey Miss Matlock’s disgust. Her eyes are described as tired and resentful (142), and this is a good example of how the interaction between the detectives and a suspect is what constitutes voyeurism. Dalgliesh and Massingham are certainly not interested in stripping Miss Matlock of her dressing gown, but her oppositional attitude and gaze suggest that they are voyeuristic enough to do so.

Male suspects often put up resistance when they are questioned by Kate. Swayne, the murderer in *A Taste for Death*, looks at her “as if signalling a sexual invitation” (128), a rudeness that gets physical enough when he breaks into her home and keeps her grandmother hostage (480). Even the innocent are disconcerted by her authority. Lampart receives Dalgliesh with a “confident gaze”, which bears the “unmistakable

imprint of success" (197). Having his gaze under control, Lampart's contempt is still audible in his voice (199). When being questioned about his affair with Barbara Berowne, he looks out of the window to gain time before he answers. He tells the detectives that Berowne himself had a lover, and asks them if they have already discovered the fact: "Or haven't you grubbed out that piece of dirt yet?" (200). His choice of words suggests that the police, like disreputable reporters, are interested in personal matters in an improper way, which implies a kind of voyeurism. Lampart is also one of several characters who refer to themselves as "victims" of the police (201), drawing a parallel between the murder itself and the consequent investigation. At the end of the interview, Dalgliesh allows Kate to ask a few questions and Lampart loses what is left of his temper. He frowns at the thought that a woman is "licensed to question him" (208) and turns an over-attentive but wary gaze on her. The way in which he replies is by now sarcastic and openly resentful, as if he has the right to put himself above Kate merely because she is female.

Jago, the boatman in *The Lighthouse*, is also uncooperative towards Kate. At the group questioning she simply asks him where he went with the launch on the morning when the body was discovered, but Jago "looked at her as if the question had been incomprehensible" (132) and gives her a curt reply. Later on, Kate asks him about his sister, who hanged herself, an obviously disturbing subject which might otherwise lead to an averted gaze, but Jago gives her "a look of such black intensity that for a second Kate thought he might strike her" (249). His eyes are fixed on Kate in clear opposition (250), a dislike which might not have been as intense had she been a man, since he is also a homosexual.

The negotiation between detective and suspect can also be seen in terms of distance, not physical as much as psychological. It is part of the resistance the suspects put up that they try to create a larger gap between themselves and the police, to make sure the detectives know they are unwelcome. As mentioned earlier, distance is a condition for voyeurism, and thus the suspects help create a situation where the detectives feel guilty about their activities. A common strategy is to refer to a binary of "you detectives" and "us suspects", to point out that the detectives are not friends of the suspects. Barbara Berowne in *A Taste for Death* has chosen to have the family lawyer present, and the latter speaks for her when he says he is there as her "friend as well as her lawyer" (118),

the implication being that Dalgliesh is only there as a policeman. Barbara's gaze at Dalgliesh is curious at first, but then becomes "almost lifeless", seemingly because she has had "a lifetime of seeing the effect of her gaze" (118). A senior detective is apparently not worth more than a casual glance, and Barbara gives an impression of indifference towards the entire interview.

Berowne's lover Miss Washburn is not an actual suspect, but still makes it clear that she will receive the detectives only because she has no one else to talk to: "I can hear someone speak his name, even if it's only a policeman." (290). She sees the police as intruders into Berowne's privacy, the one thing she has lived to preserve: "You say, 'What about the victim?' But what about your victims? I expect you'll catch Paul's murderer. You usually do, don't you? Does it ever occur to you to count the cost?" (299–300). As with Lampart, Miss Washburn refers to herself as a victim, and in a sense she is right, except that she is barking up the wrong tree. It is the murderer who is responsible for this victimization, since murder affects everyone involved. This is what Kate hints at when she states that "with murder there never was a final victim" (509).

In *The Lighthouse*, Maycroft uses the same technique of distancing himself from the police. Dalgliesh interviews him briefly about the discovery of the body and he comments that when they found Oliver they did not look in his pockets, since it "would have seemed crassly inappropriate" (99). This direct reference to a police search in itself questions their authority to go through another person's belongings. Dalgliesh wonders whether Miranda Oliver mentioned any note and Maycroft says he did not wish to ask her. "I'd gone to tell her that her father was dead. I was there as a friend, not as a policeman." (99). Maycroft soon realizes he has spoken his mind and flushes, but in his view the detectives are clearly outsiders, to be treated with respect but not welcomed. When Dalgliesh and Kate are going to interview Millie, Maycroft also requests that the housekeeper attend since "It might be helpful to have a woman present, I mean other than a police officer." (160). Since Kate is biased by her occupation, she does not qualify as an "ordinary" woman. Kate sums the situation up at the end of the novel when, for a few days, the detectives remain on the island as guests due to the quarantine: "The police, like rat-catchers, were accepted as necessary adjuncts to society, required to be immediately available when needed, occasionally praised but seldom consorting with

those not privy to their dangerous expertise, surrounded always by a faint penumbra of wariness and suspicion." (316).

From the above it is clear that the distance between detective and suspect is usually created by the suspects themselves, since it is in the detectives' interest to win the suspects' confidence. Indeed Dalgliesh is careful not to stereotype people (e.g. Jo Staveley 133), partly because making superficial judgments endangers objectivity, but also because stereotyping is a means of distancing oneself from other people. An overtly oppositional gaze occasionally constitutes voyeurism, and introduces guilt since this voyeurism is detected and resisted.

I have already commented on the averted gaze in passing, and it seems it is mostly employed to conceal strong emotions, or when a suspect is not telling the truth. Both options are valid in the insecure gaze of Dennis Tremlett in *The Lighthouse*. When Kate asks him when he last spoke to Oliver, Tremlett is "blinking as if to hold back his tears" and has to make an effort to be able to meet her eyes (142). Indeed Tremlett is grieving Oliver's death more obviously than Miranda, and he even says, once she has left the room, that the years he worked for Oliver were the best of his life (147). The relationship between him and Oliver, if not exactly that of father and son, might be described as one of mentor and apprentice. When Tremlett tells a white lie about why Oliver had ordered the launch for the following day, he looks at Miranda and she at him, suggesting that they have agreed beforehand how to answer certain questions (143), and Dalgliesh can "sense a change" in their response (144). The averted gaze of Tremlett indicates all the explanations Donaldson provides: he tries to hide his grief, fabricates some of the truth, and also often avoids looking at his fiancée, which suggests an underlying conflict in their relationship. Miranda is more like Halliwell in that she lies without compunction and is "frankly antagonistic" (146).

In the case of Maycroft, his averted gaze is at times a sign of submission. Dalgliesh allows him to be present at several of the interviews, mostly for practical reasons; he does not think it fair to throw Maycroft out of his own office. When Maycroft gives his opinion on one of the guests he does not look up at Dalgliesh (158–59), underlining that he knows he is the lesser authority on the subject. This is one of the few examples of submission or humility, which is not a very frequent strategy. Mrs Plunkett, the cook, keeps herself occupied in the kitchen during most of the interview and Kate is unwilling

to speak to her back (204). This is usually a sign of politeness but the police, of course, are especially careful to watch facial expressions. Dalgliesh gets the feeling Mrs Plunkett is chatting away because she wishes to "avoid the more direct confrontation of again sitting opposite himself and Kate at the scrubbed wooden table and meeting their eyes" (204). Mrs Plunkett does not have anything to hide from the police and gives them plenty of information about the other islanders. Perhaps she looks away due to an initial nervousness and a slight feeling that she is betraying her fellow employers.

In general, an overtly oppositional gaze is more frequently employed by the suspects than an averted one. When they do avert their gaze it is usually because they wish to hide their true feelings or because they are about to lie, or both. Sometimes they look away as a sign of submission, but more often to show defeat as the detectives manage to maintain control of the gaze. In a sense, the averted gaze is a way of maintaining integrity, but even so the suspects do not succeed in resisting the gaze of the detectives and so disempower them in the manner described by Visser and Newman. Seeing the police as intruders usually leads to one of two stances: defense or (counter-)attack.

4.2.3 The uncanny gaze

Suspects are certainly in a position to negotiate control of the gaze, but the voyeuristic gaze of the detectives can also be returned by inanimate objects and by dead bodies, upsetting the binary between subject and object and leading to an experience of the uncanny. As mentioned in section 2.2, the objectification of the victim is strong during a murder investigation, and the victim cannot put up any active resistance to this voyeurism. The position of the victim as significant other to Dalgliesh, in addition to that of the former patriarch, may however lead to an imagined oppositional gaze. In fact, violent death means that attention is paid even to the otherwise marginalized, such as the unlucky tramp found side by side with Berowne in the vestry. Thus all bodies, not just the main murder victim, when viewed or sometimes remembered or even imagined, have the uncanny power to implore and return an accusing gaze at the detectives. Bennett and Royle (2004) describe literature as the discourse of the uncanny, and stress that the uncanny is a construction of human perception (35). As a feature of the

unconscious, the uncanniness of the double is significant for the imagined oppositional gaze. Animism is also an appropriate term for providing the inanimate or lifeless with attributes of life and spirit, and the oppositional gaze of the victim has the same ability to move inside one's head as the ghost (Bennett and Royle 36, 134). The uncanny gaze disrupts boundaries on a psychological level, which makes its opposition to voyeurism even more tangible to the detectives.

In *The Lighthouse* Emily Holcombe describes to Dalgliesh her own "repugnance to see a corpse mishandled" and adds that "You, of course, get used to it." Dalgliesh simply answers: "No, Miss Holcombe, we don't get used to it." (235). Indeed, how could you get used to seeing dead bodies and still be able to do the detective's job? The detective must get right into the life (and death) of the victim; total detachment will not do. At the crime scene in *A Taste for Death*, Dalgliesh is looking down at the man he once knew. Berowne's body is described, including his facial expression: "the half-open mouth fixed in a rictus between a smile and a sneer; the dead eyes seeming as he watched to shrink into their sockets" (35). Although the eyes are dead, Dalgliesh imagines that they are moving as if the body is still looking at something. According to Lacan, this happens because, even when you are looking at an inanimate object, in a sense it sees you because you are illuminated by it. A dead body is still partly human; it still has eyes, and, significantly in crime fiction, those eyes tend to be still open.

Berowne acquires the status of a ghost in Dalgliesh's mind. When he is escorted through the house by Lady Ursula, he "for a moment had the illusion that it was the dead man, not his mother, who stood at his side" (115). There is no rational explanation for this experience, only the remembered invitation Berowne made that Dalgliesh come and look at his house one day (79). Moreover, when Dalgliesh first sets eyes on Sarah Berowne, it strikes him that "The family resemblance was almost uncanny. She stood framed against the light from her flat as a frail feminine shadow of her father. Here were the same wide spaced grey eyes, the same droop of the eyelid [...]" (240). The focus on the eyes in this passage suggests that to Dalgliesh, at least momentarily, it is Berowne himself who looks at him through his daughter's gaze, haunting him by means of the living.

The personal loss of her grandmother also makes Kate face the oppositional gaze of the victim. Already while alive her grandmother has been a large source of guilt for

Kate, whose social aspirations are an impediment to having her only close relative move in with her. When her grandmother is mugged, however, Kate understands she has no choice but to take her on. She makes the important discovery that "I can't make the law the basis of my personal morality", not "if I'm to live at ease with myself" (478). On returning from shopping, Kate finds Swayne has broken into her flat, the place she even keeps "inviolate from colleagues in the police" (170), and is keeping her grandmother hostage (480). Kate manages to get her boyfriend to call the police, but Swayne cracks the code and she is forced to attack him. The struggle ends with Swayne shooting her grandmother, after he significantly jabs his thumbs into Kate's eyes so that she is momentarily blinded. Dalgliesh tries to make Kate fix her eyes on him, but as she turns she sees her grandmother: "The sunken eyes were still fixed in that glazed extremity of fear. The hair still hung in its multi-coloured strands. [...] But nothing else was there. Nothing. The bottom of her face had been shot away." (500). Since only the forehead remains, the oppositional gaze is emphasized in a ghastly manner: "In that second in which she could bear to look it seemed to Kate that the rigid figure fixed on her a glance of sad, reproachful astonishment." (500). Again, this uncanny gaze is a result of the life which has so recently left the body, and of Kate's own imagination. There is no doubt that this last view of her grandmother causes Kate a great deal of pain and guilt, especially since Swayne seems to have caught her unwillingness to host the aging woman and asks her if she should not be thankful that he has freed her of the burden (501).

Kate identifies with another imagined body, namely that of Theresa Nolan. Miss Washburn takes her to the park where the body was found and "For one extraordinary moment it seemed to her [Kate] that she entered into that death, was mysteriously one with that lonely dying girl under the far tree" (359). Kate is disturbed by the force of this empathy since she is usually "able to distance emotion", and she wonders: "why should an imagined death be more distressing than a body actually seen?" (360). The answer lies in the experience of the uncanny, the solitude of the park suddenly tainted by the stillness of death. Kate's inner gaze has witnessed enough suicides to know what to imagine.

In *The Lighthouse* Oliver's body has been moved to a sickroom, and Dalgliesh observes that the face he has often seen in photographs is now changed: "The glazed

eyes were half-open, giving him a look of sly malevolence" (102). Again, the eyes are "glazed" but open, allowing for the oppositional gaze to convey a facial expression. The association is one of artificial eyes fastened on stuffed animals, looking without seeing. The trail of failure is distinct in this novel too, with the death of Adrian Boyde. It is Dalgliesh himself who discovers Boyde's body in the primitive chapel, in itself an intertextual reference to the earlier novel. A cope Mrs Burbridge has been preparing for a retiring priest has been thrown over the body, which at first only leaves a disembodied hand visible, "as if beckoning him forward" (253). The detective's job requires a closer look and once the cope has been removed, a similar description to that of Kate's grandmother is provided: "The lower part of Boyde's face had been smashed to a pulp, the right eye invisible under a swollen carapace of congealing blood. The left had disappeared." (254). Here the eyes are not actually able to oppose the detective, but attention is still paid to where they should have been. Dalgliesh is disconcertingly aware of that, even though he had no power to arrest anyone to prevent further deaths, "Boyde should not have died." (255).

That the body has been covered in the first place implies that the murderer has not been able to look at what he has done, to confront the "gaze" of his own victim. Dalgliesh has caught SARS from one of the other visitors, (yet it is he who, in a feverish stupor, solves the case while Kate and Benton are responsible for the practical action) and when Kate continues examining the body after he has been taken to the sickroom, she shares his outrage over this unnecessary death, a fact enhanced by her unwillingness to look up at Benton (257). She is represented as thinking that she has seen this before: "killers, often first-time murderers, [were] possessed by horror and disbelief at the enormity of what they had done, striking out in a frenzy as if by destroying the face they could obliterate the deed itself." (257). As can be seen from the above, the oppositional gaze of the victim is at times most upsetting to the detectives, bringing feelings of guilt and failure in its wake. There is no doubt that this type of voyeurism is non-sexual and unpleasurable. Since the uncanny is closely connected to imagination, an oppositional gaze does not even require that the eyes of the victim are actually there to oppose the voyeuristic gaze; indeed it can be even more disturbing if they are not.

Objects certainly do not have eyes as such, but can still return an uncanny gaze. Most notably this happens with murder weapons and houses. The murder weapons in *A*

Taste for Death are orthodox, a razor and a gun, and do not attract the detectives' gaze as such. The only mention of their power comes from Swayne, who sees the gun as his talisman (444), a sign of his own invincibility and his wish to replace Berowne. In *The Lighthouse*, however, both murder weapons are empowered objects and therefore possess an uncanny "gaze". The rope used to dangle Oliver from the top of the lighthouse is observed by Dalgliesh: "The loosely coiled blue-and-red-veined rope, the small dangling noose, seemed to Dalgliesh's eyes to have subtly changed into an object portentous with latent power. This was a reaction he had experienced before when contemplating a murder weapon: the ordinariness of steel, wood and rope and their terrible power." (123). The familiar has become unfamiliar through the deed committed with the murder weapon, and its power is that claimed by the murderer, to end another human's life. The object Padgett uses to kill Boyde is even more modest: "a heavy stone but small enough to be held in the hand, a tool of death" (281). The uncanny nature of these objects is evident, and their oppositional gaze is, by extension, that of the murderer through his act of violence.

Houses, deserted or inhabited, are potential sources of uncanniness and have such a function in *A Taste for Death*. Berowne's house is in possession of an oppositional gaze on Dalgliesh's first visit to it, and in his mind it is linked to the crime scene:

> As he stood contemplating it [the house], as if hesitant to violate its calm, there was a moment of extraordinary silence in which even the muted roar of the traffic in the avenue was stilled and in which it seemed to him that the two images, the shining façade of the house and that dusty blood-bolted room in Paddington, were held suspended out of time, then fused so that the stones were blood splattered, the caryatids tipped red. (103)

The horror in this passage is gothic, the silence uncanny and the blood an unpleasant reminder of the end of Berowne's life. The emphasis on images again refers to the detective's inner vision, the oppositional gaze being a creation of his own mind. Also the house is represented as the territory of the victim, both of whom must be "violated". The resistance put up by Berowne's house is thus metaphorical in the same way as the oppositional gaze emanating from his body. At the same time, the house appears deserted and Dalgliesh "had no sense that they were being watched" (103). Leaving the house later the same evening, Dalgliesh again "looked back at the elegant façade of the

house, at the windows like dead eyes" (137). A parallel can be drawn to the victim, whose eyes are virtually dead, but more generally a house does have multiple eyes that allow the inhabitants to observe the outside world. This is also true in this case, since Lady Ursula watches them leave from a window on the top floor (137).

Similarly, the courtyard Kate and Benton must cross to get to where the cleaning lady lives is "watched by several pairs of carefully incurious but wary eyes" (305). This neighbourly curiosity from behind the curtains is in itself a kind of voyeurism, since the watchers are safely distanced and impersonalized. In terms of the gaze, houses provide a double opposition; even an empty house can lead to an uncanny feeling of being watched, and within its walls there may be one or several individuals looking out on you.

In this section different types of the oppositional gaze to the detectives' voyeurism have been analysed. The suspects often adopt an overtly oppositional gaze and question the detectives' authority to resist being controlled by them; an averted gaze is usually a sign of strong emotions or deception. Any victim, not merely the ones that serve as significant others for Dalgliesh, can return an uncanny gaze at the detectives, as can murder weapons and houses. Consequently, the opposition to voyeurism is very strong and the effect of this opposition is to upset the binary of subject and object, challenge the authority of the detectives and make them feel guilty about their non-sexual voyeurism. The final remarks on the findings of this study are provided in the following chapter.

5 CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this study was to analyse occupational voyeurism in the gaze of the police detective. The hypothesis was that this voyeurism is non-sexual in nature, and a source of psychological guilt. Different types of oppositional gaze were analysed to show how the gaze can be a site for resistance and an object of negotiation. As the novels are third person narratives, the gaze of the narrator is important as mediator of the characters' gaze. Therefore the narrator was treated separately.

The material in this study consisted of two widely-separated crime novels by P. D. James: *A Taste for Death* (1986) and *The Lighthouse* (2005). The novels belong to the sub-genre called the police procedural and focus on detection as team work. Both novels feature Adam Dalgliesh and Kate Miskin, which is significant for comparability, and for the issue of a gendered gaze.

The method derived from film theory, starting with Laura Mulvey's essay on Hollywood cinema from 1975, and her idea of voyeurism was appropriated and modified for the gaze of the detectives. The most significant adjustment made to her argument was that this occupational voyeurism is non-sexual (see Blazer) and certainly can be adopted by women too. Mulvey is also limited in the way she emphasizes gender as the sole power structure operating the gaze, while this study explored other dimensions as well. The control of the gaze must further be thought of as a continuous negotiation rather than one of fixed positions. The unpleasant nature of some sights in the detectives' job speaks for masochism rather than sadism and, finally, the detective is also visible to the would-be object of their gaze, which means the condition of distance is not fulfilled spatially.

The hypothesis was shown to be correct, since the gaze of the detectives is certainly voyeuristic in its invasion of privacy. Suspects, rooms and bodies are all scrutinized to the least detail, and the detectives must intrude on grief and exploit the emotional state of the suspects to get the information they need. Gender does not seem to be of any importance since Kate can gaze in just the same way as her male colleagues. The invasion of privacy is physical only with the victim, whose body and belongings are carefully searched. With the suspects, privacy was discussed as a matter of liminality, of stepping over the threshold. The invasion is physical only in the sense that the detectives

enter the private domain of the suspects, looking around at their homes. Otherwise the invasion is psychological; the questions that must be answered concern the private matters of the suspects. The resistance that suspects put up to this intrusion is certainly on a psychological level, emphasizing the alien nature of the police.

The oppositional gaze was discussed through Paul Willemen's idea of a fourth gaze directed back at the voyeur, making the latter feel ashamed about his or her own activity. The overtly oppositional gaze was also discussed by Beth Newman, who states that the threat to the voyeur lies in the confrontation with someone else's gaze. The averted gaze was commented on by Scott Donaldson, making a case for hiding strong emotions and lying as the reasons for this choice. Finally, the uncanny gaze of an inanimate object was based on Jaques Lacan's gaze theory.

The analysis showed that an overtly oppositional gaze was the most frequent option among the suspects. Often such a gaze originated from another authority figure whose critical attitude towards the police was at times expressed directly. Gender was an aspect of the interaction between detective and suspect, as female suspects/witnesses put up more resistance to Dalgliesh and male ones to Kate, but generation and class tend to override gender on this point. An averted gaze was seldom a sign of submission, but may signal that the detective has got the upper hand by distressing the suspect, who is hiding his or her emotions or intentions. Finally, an uncanny gaze can emanate from a victim's body, a house or a murder weapon. In this case, the oppositional gaze is a product of the detective's own imagination, but that does not mean it is less distressing.

Throughout the analysis, I argued that the voyeurism of the detective was non-sexual and led to feelings of psychological guilt. There were multiple reasons for this sensation. Clearly, an oppositional gaze made the detectives feel guilty; the way the suspects returned the gaze implied everything from hatred to sexual insinuation. The main victim was also of crucial importance to Dalgliesh. The murdered patriarch acquired the status of his significant other, Berowne through acquaintance and mental brotherhood, Oliver through writing and exploitation. Lacanian theory assigns to the father the power to establish guilt, and in the interaction between detective and suspect/evidence, the murder victim is always present as a third party. In addition, both novels conclude on a note of failure, the investigation ends with catching the murderer, but the cost includes

the life of an innocent bystander, who happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time, stressing the limits of the detective's power.

In terms of the gaze, the narrator was analysed with Michel Foucault's theory of the Panopticon. The Panopticon is an architectural device for visible but unverifiable surveillance, and a panopticon gaze has been employed in many literary works. The role of the narrator was of significance as mediator of the characters' gaze, thoughts and memories. The gaze of the narrator can operate from three different perspectives: moving from the outside in when reporting the thoughts of a character, moving inside out when looking directly through the character's gaze, and finally providing a "camera" view recording the events between several characters in a certain location. However, since the narrator is omniscient only regarding the story of the investigation, the only characters that can be mediated without limitation are the detectives.

This study has demonstrated that it is possible to apply the theory of the gaze to literature, even though the conditions are not the same as in film. Crime fiction is particularly apt for studying resistance and an oppositional gaze, but to be able to generalize the results, further research within the same genre is needed. This study is limited to the selection of two works by a single, female author and in future studies it might prove fruitful to compare several authors, female, male or both, to get more reliable information on the functions of the gaze within the genre of crime fiction. Alternatively, a comparative study can focus on novels from several genres or sub-genres. Also, in novels with a first person narrative, the gaze of the narrator can have an entirely different role, and might be of significance for a voyeuristic gaze.

WORKS CITED

Primary sources

James, P. D. *The Lighthouse*. London: Faber and Faber, 2005.

---. *A Taste for Death*. 1986. London: Penguin Books, 1990.

Secondary sources

Amey, Michael D. "Living Under the Bell Jar: Surveillance and Resistance in Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*." *Critical Survey* 17.1 (2005): 22–39. 8 Nov. 2006 <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/>.

Bennett, Andrew, and Nicholas Royle. *An Introduction to Literature, Criticism and Theory*. 3rd ed. Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2004.

Berger, John. *Ways of Seeing*. London: BBC and Penguin Books, 1972.

Bernard Yeazell, Ruth. "Sexuality, Shame, and Privacy in the English Novel." *Social Research* 68.1 (2001): 119–144. 13 Nov. 2006 <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/>.

Blazer, Seth M. "Rear Window Ethics: Domestic Privacy versus Public Responsibility in the Evolution of Voyeurism." *Midwest Quarterly* 47.4 (2006): 379–392. 13 Nov. 2006 <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/>.

Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Brooks, Peter. *Reading for the Plot. Design and Intention in Narrative*. 1984. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1992.

Cavallaro, Dani. *The Body for Beginners*. New York: Writers and Readers, 1998.

Chandler, Daniel. "Notes on 'The Gaze'." July 2000/June 2002. 25 Sept. 2006 <http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/gaze/gaze01.html>.

Couzens Hoy, David, ed. *Foucault. A Critical Reader*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

---. Introduction. *Foucault. A Critical Reader*. Ed. David Couzens Hoy. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1986. 1–25.

---. “Power, Repression, Progress: Foucault, Lukes, and the Frankfurt School.” 1981. Rpt. in *Foucault. A Critical Reader*. Ed. David Couzens Hoy. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1986. 123–147.

Creed, Barbara. *The Monstrous-Feminine. Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Docker, John. *Postmodernism and Popular Culture. A Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Donaldson, Scott. “The Averted Gaze in Hemingway’s Fiction.” *Sewanee Review* 111.1 (2003): 128–151. 6 Nov. 2006 <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/>.

Easthope, Antony, ed. *Contemporary Film Theory*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education, 1999.

---. Introduction. *Contemporary Film Theory*. Ed. Antony Easthope. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education, 1999. 1–23.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*. 1975. Trans. Alan Sheridan. London: Penguin, 1991.

---. *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. Ed. Colin Gordon. Trans. Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, Kate Soper. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Freud, Sigmund. “Fetishism.” 1953–74. Trans. James Strachey. Rpt. in *Contemporary Film Theory*. Ed. Antony Easthope. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education, 1999. 27–32.

Gamman, Lorraine. “Watching the Detectives. The Enigma of the Female Gaze.” *The Female Gaze. Women as Viewers of Popular Culture*. Ed. Lorraine Gamman and Margaret Marshment. London: The Women’s Press, 1988. 8–26.

Gamman, Lorraine, and Margaret Marshment. *The Female Gaze. Women as Viewers of Popular Culture*. London: The Women’s Press, 1988.

Gledhill, Christine. “Pleasurable Negotiations.” 1988. Rpt. in *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture. A Reader.* 2nd ed. Ed. John Storey. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall, 1998. 236–249.

Hawthorn, Jeremy. *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*. 4th ed. London: Arnold, 2000.

hooks, bell. “The Oppositional Gaze: Black Female Spectators.” 1992. Rpt. in *Feminist Postcolonial Theory. A Reader*. Eds. Renia Lewis and Sarah Mills. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2003. 207–222.

Hughes-Hallett, Lucy. “The Lighthouse by PD James.” Rev. of *The Lighthouse*, by P. D. James. *Times online* 9 Oct. 2005. 28 Nov. 2006 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/printFriendly/0,,1-20630-1811046-20630,00.html>.

James, P. D. *The Murder Room*. 2003. London: Penguin Books, 2004.

Jay, Martin. “In the Empire of the Gaze: Foucault and the Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-century French Thought.” *Foucault. A Critical Reader*. Ed. David Couzens Hoy. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1986. 175–204.

Kinyon, Kamila. “The Panopticon Gaze in Kundera’s *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*.” *Critique* 42.3 (2001): 243–251. 6 Nov. 2006 <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/>.

Knight, Stephen. *Crime Fiction, 1800–2000. Detection, Death, Diversity.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge, 1998.

McCracken, Scott. *Pulp. Reading popular fiction*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998.

MacKinnon, Kenneth. “Curiously Fetishism Can Be Fun.” Rev. of *Fetishism and Curiosity*, by Laura Mulvey. *Film-Philosophy* Feb. 2001. 28 Sept. 2006 <http://www.film-philosophy.com/vol5-2001/n4mackinnon>.

Maxfield, James F. “The Unfinished Detective: The Work of P. D. James.” *Critique* 28.4 (1987): 211–223. 21 Feb. 2007 <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/>.

Messent, Peter. “American Gothic: Liminality in Thomas Harris’s Hannibal Lecter Novels.” *Journal of American and Comparative Cultures* 23.4 (2000): 23–35. 8 Nov. 2006 <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/>.

Mills, Sarah. “Gender and Colonial Space.” 1996. Rpt. in *Feminist Postcolonial Theory. A Reader*. Eds. Renia Lewis and Sarah Mills. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2003. 692–716.

Moore, Suzanne. “Here’s Looking at You, Kid!” *The Female Gaze. Women as Viewers of Popular Culture*. Ed. Lorraine Gamman and Margaret Marshment. London: The Women’s Press, 1988. 44–59.

Mulvey, Laura. “Afterthoughts on ‘Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema’ inspired by King Vidor’s *Duel in the Sun*”. 1981. Rpt. in *Contemporary Film Theory*. Ed. Anthony Easthope. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education, 1999. 124–134.

---. “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema”. 1975. Rpt. in *Contemporary Film Theory*. Ed. Anthony Easthope. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education, 1999. 111–124.

Munt, Sally R. *Murder by the Book? Feminism and the crime novel*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Mäntymäki, Tiina. *Hard & Soft. The Male Detective's Body in Contemporary European Crime Fiction*. Linköping, Sweden: Linköping University, Department of Language and Culture, 2004.

Newman, Beth. "'The Situation of the Looker-On': Gender, Narration, and Gaze in *Wuthering Heights*." *Feminisms. An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism.* 1990. Ed. Robyn R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers UP, 1997. 449–466.

Nunn, Heather, and Anita Biressi. "*Silent Witness*: Detection, Femininity, and the Post-mortem Body." *Feminist Media Studies* 3.2 (2003): 193–206. 5 Mar. 2007 <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/>.

Parkin-Gounelas, Ruth. *Literature and Psychoanalysis*. *Intertextual Readings.* London: Palgrave, 2001.

Picker, Leonard. "*PW* Talks with P. D. James. Not an Action Hero." *Publishers Weekly* 14 Nov. 2005: 47–47. 21 Feb. 2007 <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/>.

Rzepka, Charles J. *Detective Fiction*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2005.

Scaggs, John. *Crime Fiction*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Stacey, Jackie. "Desperately Seeking Difference." *The Female Gaze. Women as Viewers of Popular Culture*. Ed. Lorraine Gamman and Margaret Marshment. London: The Women's Press, 1988. 112–129.

Tasker, Yvonne. "Feminist Crime Writing: The Politics of Genre." *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture. A Reader.* 2nd ed. Ed. John Storey. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall, 1998. 328–332.

Taylor, Charles. "Foucault on Freedom and Truth." 1984. Rpt. in *Foucault. A Critical Reader*. Ed. David Couzens Hoy. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1986. 69–102.

Todorov, Tzvetan. "The Typology of Detective Fiction." 1966. *Modern Criticism and Theory. A Reader*. Ed. David Lodge. London: Longman, 1988. 157–165.

Vice, Sue, ed. *Psychoanalytic Criticism. A Reader*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1996.

Visser, Irene. "Reading Pleasure: *Light in August* and the theory of the gendered gaze." *Journal of Gender Studies* 6.3 (1997): 277–287. 8 Nov. 2006 <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/>.

Walzer, Michael. "The Politics of Michel Foucault." 1982. Rpt. in *Foucault. A Critical Reader*. Ed. David Couzens Hoy. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1986. 51–68.

Willemen, Paul. "Voyeurism, The Look, and Dwoskin." 1976. Rpt. in *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology. A Film Theory Reader*. Ed. Philip Rosen. New York: Columbia UP, 1986. 210–218.

Young, Shelagh. "Feminism and the Politics of Power. Whose Gaze is it Anyway?" *The Female Gaze. Women as Viewers of Popular Culture*. Ed. Lorraine Gamman and Margaret Marshment. London: The Women's Press, 1988. 173–188.