

Odsjek za anglistiku
Filozofski fakultet
Sveučilište u Zagrebu

DIPLOMSKI RAD

Three Types of Detectives in Five British Novels

Smjer: književno-kulturološki studij anglistike
(s posebnim naglaskom na englesku književnost)

Kandidat: Lovorka Galić
Mentor: dr. sc. Vanja Polić, doc.
Ak. godina: 2016./2017.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Introduction to Detective Fiction and the Character of Detective	3
3. Private detectives	8
3.1. Sherlock Holmes and Hercule Poirot.....	8
3.2. Private Detectives as the Representatives of the Genre.....	17
2. Amateur Detectives	18
4.1. Amateur Clergy: Father Brown and Brother Cadfael	18
4.2. Amateur Detectives: Crime Solving as a Hobby.....	25
5. Police Detectives.....	26
5.1. Inspectors Morse and Lewis	26
5.2. Police Detective as Opposed to the Private/Amateur Detectives.....	31
6. Short Comparison of the Three Detective Types	32
Conclusion	33
Works Cited	35
Abstract.....	38
Key Words	38

1. Introduction

Crime fiction has always been one of the most popular genres of literature, for it has been drawing the readers into the world of murder, intrigues and solving mysteries for over a century. At the centre of these novels is the character of the detective, a person with an extraordinary talent for observation and deductive reasoning. The detectives can be classified in three distinct categories: private, amateur and police. The three categories may differ in characterizations and methods, but their objective stays the same: to catch the criminal. Each category has its prominent representatives and to find a pattern between them, this paper is analysing two representatives of each group. Private detectives are represented by Arthur Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes in *A Study in Scarlet* and Agatha Christie's Hercule Poirot in *The Mysterious Affair at Styles*. The following category, amateur detectives are represented by two priests, G. K. Chesterton's Father Brown in *The Secret of Father Brown* and Ellis Peters' Cadfael in *The Rose Rent*. The last category discussed in this paper are police detectives, with two representatives by the same author, Colin Dexter's detectives Morse and Lewis in *The Remorseful Day*.

After the introduction into the genre of crime fiction, the paper discusses each of the groups individually by analysing the origin of each character as well as its characterization. That is achieved by closely comparing the two representatives of each category. The comparison consists of: physical appearance and how it relates to their crime solving abilities, personal traits in relation to the plot, the detectives' approach to the crime and how they solve it, their relationship with their partners if they have them and their relationship with the official authorities, or in the case of police detectives, the relationship with their superior officers. At the end of each comparison, there is an analysis of the characteristics and importance of a certain group: the private category examines the detectives behind the popularity of the category; the amateur analyses the advantages and disadvantages of having an amateur looking into crimes; and the police studies police procedures and how the police approach is different to private and amateur. The aim of this paper is to debate whether there is a pattern when writing about detectives in each of the groups and to establish the function of a detective in his own group. Therefore, at the end of the paper there is a comparison of all the groups, in order to determine whether each of the categories stands on its own or there is a pattern that connects them.

2. Introduction to Detective Fiction and the Character of Detective

Since its origins in the nineteenth century, the story of crime and detection has had a single, fundamental impulse—to draw the reader into the realm of the unsafe, the taboo, the worlds of physical threat and metaphysical unease – Fiona Kelleghan (VIII).

The detective story was invented in 1842 by Edgar Allan Poe (Priestman 2), since his 1841 short story “Murders in the Rue Morgue” is considered to be the first modern detective story. When writing about his famous detective C. Auguste Dupin, Elizabeth Haynes points that Poe “had a profound effect on later authors although he appeared only in three stories” (xi). The genre of crime fiction that Poe created is detective fiction in which a crime is investigated by a detective. For that particular subgenre, it is typical that “the investigator reveals the name of the murderer in the penultimate chapter and explains the detection process in the last chapter” (Carl Malmgren 153), since its main goal is to engage the readers in the investigation process and keep them in the dark until the final scene. Heta Pyrhönen refers to detective fiction as “a narrative whose principal action concerns the attempt by an investigator to solve a crime and to bring a criminal to justice” (43), before adding that “the action sequence of the investigation structures the narrative, as it opens with the problem of crime and closes with its solution” (44). This points to the pattern of a detective story as being strict: the beginning, the middle and the end are clearly defined. The crime, most often a murder, is committed in the beginning, with the arrival of the detective as the introduction to the middle part. The middle part consists of the investigation, that is, finding clues and gathering information, and the finalization of the investigation marks the end.

The detective story consists of two plotlines; the first being the narrative of the crime and the second the narrative of the investigation. Ellen O’Gorman observes that the most important part of the detective story is the latter narrative since the reader’s interest is occupied with questioning, the scrutiny of clues, the act of investigation, and more importantly, the detective (21). What is more, in his essay “The Typology of Detective Fiction” Tzvetan Todorov explains that in the second narrative the characters learn, and not act, as well as that the genre is constructed in such way that no harm could ever come to the detective (44). The detectives are, however,

always in danger, and although the reader is aware that the detective will come to no harm, the element of excitement and worry for the detective is still present. Todorov adds that, for him, the most fitting description of detective fiction comes from Michael Butor's novel *The Passage of Time*. In the novel, one of the characters explains detective fiction in the following way:

all detective fiction is based on two murders of which the first, committed by the murderer, is merely the occasion for the second, in which he is the victim of the pure and un-punishable murderer, the detective, and that the narrative ... superimposes two temporal series: the days of investigation, and the days of the drama which led up to it (qtd. in Todorov 44).

In other words, Butor introduces the notion that the first murder is simply the trigger for the narrative, since the central story focuses on the investigation and bringing the murderer to justice. Todorov illustrates that the first story tells the readers what really happened, whereas the second serves as an explanation of how the reader "has come to know about it" (45). The reader focuses more on the investigation than the crime itself for he or she, just like the detective in the story, needs to pay attention to every detail in the attempt to figure out who has committed the crime.

One of the greatest contributions to the defining of the detective fiction comes from Ronald A. Knox. In the preface of the book *The Best Detective Stories of 1928-29*, Knox develops a rulebook for writing detective fiction:

1. the criminal must be mentioned early in the story but the reader must not be allowed to know his thoughts
2. the supernatural should not be present in the investigation
3. secret rooms and passages can be mentioned only once
4. undiscovered poisons and complicated devices should be avoided
5. a Chinese person should not be present in the story
6. detective cannot solve the case by accident, but he has to be guided by logic
7. the detective must not be the criminal, but the criminal can pretend he is a detective
8. all the clues should be known to the reader as they are discovered
9. if the detective has a companion who solves crimes with him, that companion's intelligence should be slightly lower than of the average reader;
10. twins, doubles and make-up artists should not be used without a proper reason (Allen 2).

These rules can be compared to S.S. Van Dine's twenty rules "to which any self-respecting author of detective fiction must conform" (qtd. in Todorov 49). Van Dine's rules have often been reproduced and modified, however Todorov summarizes them in the eight following points:

1. The novel must have at most one detective and one criminal, and at least one victim (a corpse)
2. The culprit must not be a professional criminal, must not be the detective, must kill for personal reasons.
3. Love has no place in detective fiction.
4. The culprit must have a certain importance:
 - (a) In life: not be a butler or a chambermaid
 - (b) In the book: must be one of the main characters
5. Everything must be explained rationally; the fantastic is not admitted.
6. There is no place for descriptions nor for psychological analyses.
7. With regard to information about the story, the following homology must be observed:
"author: reader = criminal: detective."
8. Banal situations and solutions must be avoided (Todorov 49).

Both Knox and Van Dine focus on prescribing rules for the investigation process and the criminal. They both agree that the criminal cannot be the detective him/herself and should be a character known to the reader. They both rely on logic and reject the possibility of supernatural forces or accidents interfering with the investigation. Moreover, while Knox fixates on simplifying the investigation process and making it transparent by dismissing secret passages and the possibility of banal characters such as twins or makeup artists, Van Dine values the use of the intellect without affecting factors such as love or psychological processing, thus focusing only on the mind and the reason. It is relevant to mention when analysing Van Dine's rules that Todorov observed that the first four rules (specifically rules one to four a) refer to the first narrative, while the second half refers to the investigation (49). The rules that Knox and Van Dine prescribed allow the reader to better understand the story and possibly beat the detective to the solution. However, the solution itself must not be confusing and complicated nor too simple.

The detective is the main focus of the attention in a detective story and according to Allen, he or she needs to possess at least two of the following qualities: "He must be able to find clues to the identity of the murderer, and he must be able to connect those clues in such a way as to

reveal the criminal” (7). Allen also adds that the detective’s purpose is to “find the murderer and, by finding the guilty person, return society to stability” (7), since once the murderer is caught and removed from the society, that same society will begin to approach its former peaceful state (Grella 44). In a way, the detective is given a task to recreate the former state of society, exposing and banishing those who pose as a threat to its stability. The said detectives can be classified in three categories: private investigators who are experienced in solving crimes professionally, but do not belong to the official authorities; gifted amateurs, who often get accidentally involved in crime solving; and a member of the police force who prefers to solve the crime individually. Their approaches may vary, but their objective is clear: “in nearly every case the search ends up focusing on the person responsible for the crime, usually murder, which propels the narrative” (Malmgren 152). Each type of detective has his or her own method which can vary from standard police procedures to using disguises or acting coy to gain people’s trust. However, they are tied together by their objective to catch the person responsible for the disruption of the society.

Detectives are people who use their experience and intelligence to work out the crimes that seem unsolvable. They are required to gain suspects’ trust and probe into their lives in order to expose past sins and other secrets valuable to the investigation and which may point them in the right direction. They generally cooperate with the official authorities, solving the case before them and refusing to take the credit. Given that the detectives are members of the police force, they conduct an individual investigation and share the information once they are certain they have solved the case. Interestingly, the reader is required to completely trust the detective since his or her qualities and quirks assure the reader that the person responsible for the crime will be brought to justice (Goldman 267). In addition, Britta Martens claims that “the readers’ guesses can be compared to those of the detective, and eventually the one true story is revealed through the detective’s embedded narrative, which explains the mystery when the detective is invested with the textual power of the narrative voice” (204), meaning that from the genre’s point of view, the detective is the only character who can be trusted since he is an infallible character whose sole goal is to seek out the truth.

A character is necessary to the narrative insomuch that Todorov distinguishes two narrative categories: plot-centred or apsihological, and character-centred, or psychological

narratives (qtd. in Chatman 113). Detective fiction belongs to the plot-centred narrative, meaning the focus is neither on the layers of a character nor on their personal growth. In these narratives, it is not important who is experiencing, but the very act of experiencing. For this reason, plot-centred narratives usually consist of what E.M. Forster calls 'flat characters'. Forster distinguishes flat from round characters, by describing flat as being "endowed with a single trait – or very few," while round "possess a variety of traits" (qtd. in Chatman 131). This does not mean that the flat characters, in this case detectives, are not capable of making an impact. In fact, Forster believes that since the flat character has a clear direction, it is easier to remember him or her (131). Moreover, these few traits that the characters have are clearly and well structured, making the characters, as well as their personalities, memorable (for example, Holmes' vast knowledge or Cadfael's skill as a medicine man).

While analysing detective fiction, it is relevant to discuss its relationship with literary critics. According to Laura Marcus, their relationship is complex since "on one hand, detective fiction, like other genre fictions, is seen as a popular and lesser subset of high or 'proper' literature" (245), meaning that the genre is not taken seriously. Because of its reputation as popular literature, the use of flat characters and its seemingly simple structure, detective fiction is considered to belong to lowbrow literature. While it may belong to popular literature, Chesterton sees this as being "the earliest and only form of popular literature in which is expressed some sense of the poetry of modern life" (qtd. in Cavander and Jurik 7). Furthermore, Marcus adds that the detective fiction,

with its complex double narrative in which an absent story, that of a crime is gradually reconstructed in the second story (the investigation), its uses of suspense, and its power to give aesthetic shape to most brute of matters, has been seen as paradigmatic of literary narrative itself (245).

It also offers a "straightforward appeal to the intellect" (249), contrary to the claim that the genre consists of merely stereotyped cardboard characters and a clichéd narrative. Albeit it is argued that detective fiction possesses a simple structure, referring to the fact that it consists of three very clear parts: crime, investigation and resolution, the genre has indeed shown complexity when it comes to the plot structure. There have been, for example, cases where there was no crime at all, where the crime has not happened yet or where all the suspects were guilty, thus

proving that a simple pattern does not equal a simple plot structure. Moreover, the genre has shown various narrative techniques such as the aforementioned primary and secondary level of narration, distancing the genre from the trivial and moving it closer to the serious literature. These techniques mixed with suspense and mystery as well as engaging the readers themselves in the deduction process points to how detective fiction has helped to shape modern literature as well as film and television industry. In the words of G.K. Chesterton: “detective fiction should be regarded as the modern equivalent of epic literature and the detective as knight-errant actually embodies a principle of order” (Ascari 159), meaning it should not only be seen as entertaining or trivial but as a serious genre.

3. Private detectives

3.1. Sherlock Holmes and Hercule Poirot

Private detective has been the most popular type of detective, owing that success to the most prominent investigators in British literature, Sherlock Holmes and Hercule Poirot. Holmes, described by Knight as “the most famous character in English literature” (*Crime Fiction* 55), was created by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and introduced in 1887 in *A Study in Scarlet*. Holmes is based on “a former teacher at the Edinburgh Infirmary, Dr Joseph Bell, who gave demonstrations of diagnostic deduction from which Holmes’s analytic genius is clearly extrapolated” (Scaggs 14-15). Doyle also added elements of his predecessors Poe, Gaboriau¹ and Vidocq², that is, of the characters Dupin and Lecoq as well as of the life of Eugene Francois Vidocq, to create the eccentric genius that is the character of Sherlock Holmes. Moreover, there is even a direct mention of detectives Dupin and Lecoq in *A Study in Scarlet*. By mentioning the said characters Doyle acknowledges and honours his predecessors, yet making it clear that his detective is superior. Like Doyle, Agatha Christie was inspired by previous works of detective fiction. In her autobiography, Christie claims Holmes influenced her to write her own stories (*An Autobiography* 1256). Therefore, in the first Hercule Poirot novel *The Mysterious Affair at Styles*, written in 1920,

¹ Émile Gaboriau was a French novelist and one of the pioneers of detective fiction. His first detective novel, *L’Affaire Lerouge* (1865) introduced an amateur detective named Monsieur Lecoq, who was based on Eugene Francois Vidocq and became the hero of Gaboriau’s later novels.

² Eugene Francois Vidocq (1775-1857) was a French former criminal and the head of the first private detective agency, thus considered to be the first private investigator

there is a mention of Holmes at the beginning of the novel in which Hastings declares he has always wished to be a detective like Holmes rather than the Scotland Yard-type (*The Mysterious Affair*, Christie 9). Christie did not wish to mirror Doyle's creation, but rather to make her own. In her own words, she decided to settle

on a Belgian detective. (...) He should have been an inspector, so that he would have a certain knowledge of crime. (...) I could see him as a tidy little man, always arranging things, liking things in pairs, liking things square instead of round. And he should be very brainy—he should have little grey cells of the mind— that was a good phrase (...) (*An Autobiography* 1266-1267).

She decided he ought to have a police background and few uncommon traits which would make him more memorable. Christie wished to give him a grand name, similar to the effect that Holmes' had. Thus, she named her "little man" Hercule, and after much consideration added Poirot, a name that comes from a colloquial French word *poireau* which means a fool.

The first novel about Sherlock Holmes, *A Study in Scarlet*, introduces Holmes through the eyes of John Watson, who being Holmes' friend and associate, as well as serving as a narrator, gives an insight into Holmes' life as a person and a detective. Holmes, a consulting detective with peculiar habits and extraordinary talent for observation and storing knowledge, brings Watson into the heart of the crime scene and astonishes him with his skills when he manages to describe a murderer by connecting the height of the criminal and the height of the words written on a wall. He displays an array of detective skills throughout the novel, racing against two Scotland Yard inspectors and ultimately victoriously catching the real culprit.

Similarly, in the first Hercule Poirot novel *The Mysterious Affair at Styles*, Poirot's Captain Arthur Hastings gives his recount of an unusual murder of a family friend that Poirot has solved. The plot is an infallible part of the character of Poirot, therefore, Poirot is introduced early in the novel through Hasting's story of an odd but celebrated Belgian inspector. The character, however, joins the narrative later, when a murder occurs. In order to solve the case, he recruits Hastings as well as the family members, yet throughout the story Poirot is unwilling to reveal the culprit insomuch as he provides the murderer, the victim's husband, with an alibi. Poirot enjoys being the smartest one in the room, so at the end of the novel gathers the suspects and he takes his time explaining how he came to know the killer. After declaring that Mr. Inglethorp and family's friend Miss Howard are the culprits, Poirot explains one last piece of his brilliance: at the

time of the first trial he deemed necessary to defend Mr. Inglethorp for there was not enough evidence to convict him and if acquitted he could not be tried for the same crime again.

Before analysing their detective skills, it is relevant to discuss the detectives' physical appearances and characteristics since they are necessary for understanding the characters. Holmes is described by his companion John Watson as over six feet tall, though seeming taller; with sharp and piercing eyes; and thin, hawk-like nose which gives the impression of alertness and decision, giving Holmes an air of an intimidating and serious person. His hands, moreover, possess a delicacy of touch despite various chemical or ink stains (Doyle, 8) and he is "frequently depicted on his hands and knees, with a magnifying glass in hand, looking for trace evidence, footprints, and fingerprints" (Dauncey 167). Whereas Holmes is presented as a masculine English detective, Hercule Poirot is, on the other hand, presented as "clearly the reverse of the masculine and English Sherlock Holmes" (*Crime Fiction*, Knight 90). He is portrayed as being hardly more than five feet tall, with an egg-shaped head always perched a little on the side as well as stiff and military moustaches. The neatness of his attire is astonishing, which causes Hastings to believe that "a speck of dust would have caused him more pain than a bullet wound" (*The Mysterious Affair*, Christie 20) since he spends a great deal of time on orderliness.

As little as it is known about their physical appearance, even less is known about their lives. Interestingly, apart from living with Watson in London at 221 B Baker Street since the start of the first novel, Holmes has begun working as a consulting detective in his twenties and continued into his sixties (Heller 207) and has a brother who works in the government. Poirot's life is equally a mystery. He is a prominent retired Belgian inspector, who fled from war in his homeland and for whom Hastings claims that "as a detective, his flair had been extraordinary, and he had achieved triumphs by unravelling some of the most baffling cases of the day" (*The Mysterious Affair*, Christie 19), similarly to the triumphs he achieved in England. His Belgian heritage gives him the power to criticize the English way of life, using it as "an affront to English masculinity in his neatness, fussiness, demands for fine food and central heating" ("From Agatha," Rowland 63), highlighting it in order to show that the English need a foreigner to solve their problems.

In contrast, there is much to be said about the detectives' personalities. Holmes is highly intelligent, generally considered to be eccentric, arrogant, and even elitist, often showing off his brilliance in front of other characters. Nevertheless, he is essentially moral, in touch with ordinary people and occasionally shows his human side when it comes to the outcome of some of his cases. Similarly, Poirot is also regarded to be somewhat eccentric. He is described as "narcissistic, emotive, feline, apparently irrational, eccentric, quixotic, obsessed with the domestic, and socially 'other' in that he is a Belgian. ... He is a feminine hero" (Munt qtd. in Makinen 419). Poirot loves to be in the centre of attention and his otherness provides him exactly that. Moreover, his feminine characteristics like attention to detail, neatness and empathy are the reason he solves crimes faster and better than Scotland Yard inspectors, who do not share these traits.

Apart from solving crimes, Holmes enjoys playing the violin, studying chemistry and using cocaine, preferring to spend his days either at the chemical laboratory and taking long walks or on a sofa without saying a word (Doyle 8). Moreover, Watson has composed a list of Holmes' knowledge and abilities, observing that Holmes has no interest in literature, astronomy, philosophy and politics, and a limited knowledge of geology and botany, but shows profound, although self-taught expertise in anatomy, chemistry, law and crime. In addition, Holmes insists on being ignorant about anything that does not involve science and his profession. Other than ratiocination, his most praised skill is the one of disguise, and there is no other detective as skilled as him. Julian Symons observes that just in the first novels, Holmes disguises himself variously as "a drunken-looking groom and a Nonconformist clergyman. He can be tall, thin old man, an elderly deformed man able to take a foot off his stature for hours on end" (Symons 70). Upon introducing Sherlock to Watson, their mutual acquaintance describes Holmes as a "walking calendar of crime" (Doyle 7), with the word "calendar" meaning "a list or directory and admiring Holmes's encyclopaedic knowledge of criminal biography" (Worthington 13). Furthermore, his profession is a vital part of him as a character. Martin A. Kayman states that it is not only who he is, but also "what he knows, how he thinks. (...) he is a unique creation, whose professional standing is validated by no other institutions than himself – and his readers" (49), his interests and his profession completing him as a character. Likewise, Poirot exhibits a vast knowledge on most subjects, always proving his companion and the police wrong. However, unlike Holmes, he

is sympathetic toward his friends, victims and their families and frequently shows his human side. An infallible part of his personality and charm are his repeated phrases that vary from “Mon ami” and “little grey cells” to calling himself “Papa Poirot”, something one can hardly imagine Holmes doing. As Makinen writes, “Poirot’s overweening pride in his success, his concern for his immaculate appearance, even to physical discomfort, (...) they always remain because they are a necessity of his characterization” (421), meaning that his traits and quirks represent who he is as a character and are, in a way, his tools for his success.

Specific to the two detectives is the fact that they both have a companion who helps them solve the mysteries. These partners are civilians, with no knowledge on how to solve a crime and are slightly less intelligent than an average reader, in accordance with Knox’s rule concerning companion’s intelligence. There are many similarities between Holmes’ companion doctor John Watson and Poirot’s Captain Arthur Hastings. The two of them have been wounded in war and been sent home, they are “unable to dissemble and hence cannot always be trusted with the truth, both are highly susceptible to female beauty, both see what their more astute friends observe, yet neither can correctly interpret the evidence before him” (Rosenblum 157). They are intellectually inferior to their partners so they serve to show the readers that they should not be challenged by the detective’s intelligence but allow themselves to be guided by it towards the solution. Moreover, as aforementioned, the partners act as narrators and thus serve as recorders, not only of the narrative but also of detective’s behaviour and skills, embodying the social and ideological norms of the period (Scaggs 12). The partners complement the detectives, rather than simply functioning as their companions by contributing to the investigation whether by using Watson’s medical skills or Hastings’ ability to gain people’s trust. Both Sherlock and Poirot show respect to their partner’s opinion, frequently asking for their sentiments on the cases or sharing private thoughts with them, therefore validating them as a valuable part of the investigation despite their apparent lack in analytical detective skills. What they lack perhaps in intelligence, these partners make up in other useful knowledge that helps the detectives guide their investigation to the resolution.

With all these similarities, however, there are slight differences as well. Hastings is depicted as a comic character, in contrast to a more serious Watson; moreover, Watson would

never (as Hastings did in *The Mysterious Affair at Styles*) propose to a woman he hardly knew. Interestingly, Hastings' double act with his "more intelligent detecting friend is a comically bathetic repetition of the national defeat of English pride and aggression" ("From Agatha," Rowland 63). Hastings is a stereotypical Englishman, which seems to work perfectly as a contrast to a stereotypically foreign detective. His Englishness serves as a possibility to ridicule the flaws of the English society: their polished exteriors and idyllic lives that are used as a facade to cover up violent murders. More importantly the contrast between Hastings and Poirot gives a possibility to comment on the English way of life from both the inside and outside the English society.

Since both Holmes and Poirot belong to the sphere of private investigators, they need to cooperate with the official authorities, mainly the inspectors from Scotland Yard. Holmes is mostly in contact with Inspector Lestrade, much less with Lestrade's rival, Inspector Gregson, while Poirot works with Detective Inspector James Japp whom he met while solving the same case. Lestrade and Gregson, described by Holmes as "quick and energetic, but conventional – shockingly so" (Doyle 13), consider Holmes "an unofficial personage" (Doyle 13) who is only useful when a case seems unsolvable. Moreover, while they keep coming back for his help, Holmes does not receive any official recognition from them, nor does he ask for it. Nevertheless, it is necessary to mention that in Lestrade's case, Holmes' help and opinion is somewhat appreciated and he treats Holmes more as an advisor than a pest. Albeit described as a "Lestrade-type Scotland Yard detective" (*An Autobiography* Affair, Christie 1397), Inspector Japp's relationship with Poirot is much different. He trusts and values Poirot to the point that he is willing to discard all the evidence he has against a suspect simply because Poirot tells him to. However, as is the case with Holmes, Poirot does not receive nor wish to take any credit for his part in solving the crime. While it may sometimes seem that the authorities do not appreciate the private detectives, their help is often required in terms of seeing cases from a different angle and steering the police toward right clues. It is relevant to mention that even with the detectives' help, they are usually on the wrong track. For example, In *A Study in Scarlet*, both Gregson and Lestrade decide to solve the case independently, but Gregson's suspect is proven to be innocent, and Lestrade's was murdered, which eventually results in Holmes solving the case for them, and

in *The Mysterious Affair at Styles*, Japp arrests an innocent man. These Scotland Yard inspectors are written as red herrings for the readers, serving to discount the wrong theories the reader might have. In a way, they represent the reader since they are following similar thought processes and methods.

The detective's fashion in which he solves the crime more quickly and efficiently than an average reader or a fictional police officer has been intriguing the readers for decades. Sherlock Holmes and Hercule Poirot each have their own methods when it comes to solving puzzles, which are based on the use of ratiocination. Holmes' method, according to Scaggs is "a scientific approach rooted in a Victorian faith in the accumulation and cataloguing of data, and rational and logical analysis based on this scientific foundation" (24). The key of his method lies in observation. By observing the people and the surroundings, he collects data, combines it with the pre-existent knowledge and connects them into a solution. For example, at the beginning of *A Study in Scarlet*, Holmes is aware that Watson is a doctor recently returned from Afghanistan. He explains his deduction in the following manner: "from long habit the train of thoughts ran so swiftly through my mind that I arrived at the conclusion without being conscious of intermediate steps" (Doyle 11), clarifying that Watson looks like a medical type with tanned face, and arm injury and has the air of a military man. Interestingly, Poirot's method does not differ much from Holmes' as they both use observation as the basis of their investigation. Scaggs claims that the impulse "to recover and reinstate the sort of order that existed in the past is a direct response to the disruption in the present caused by the crime of murder" (28) and adds that it is significant that Poirot's method consists of the observing "and ordering of facts, because order, as Knight observes, is 'the overt method and the covert purpose of the analysis'" ("The Golden Age" 28). He relies upon his intellect, "the little grey cells" as he calls it, to unfold the motive, the means, and most importantly the culprit of a crime. In *The Mysterious Affair at Styles*, Poirot notices details such as hidden feelings between the members of the household, the way the victim left large space between her words when writing, the fireplace being lit up in the middle of the summer or Miss Howard's distinct manly voice; all in order to gather the data in his head and, much like Holmes, use it to solve the mystery.

There is, however, a slight contrast in their methods. Holmes is described as “discovering marks which were entirely invisible to the uncomprehending Watson; collecting trace evidence; measuring the distance between prints; and observing blood smears and footprints” (Dauncey 169). This can be seen from the example of John Rance, the first police officer to arrive at the crime scene. Despite a large number of footprints on the pathway, many of which ruined, Holmes managed to decipher the exact spot where Rance stood. It is relevant to mention that Holmes knew Rance’s version of the story because he deduced the exact scenario of the officer’s arrival to the crime scene, knew every detail as if he himself was there, thus only needing Rance to confirm his theory. Dauncey explains that “while Holmes’s expertise often renders eye-witness accounts unnecessary (or, at least, only necessary in so far as they consolidate his expertise and the importance of material evidence), his position is, paradoxically, presented as being analogous to that of an eye-witness” (170). He is able, simply by observing a crime scene, to re-enact the crime events in his mind, while making the eye-witnesses redundant. Interestingly, Holmes also tends to “stray from the letter of the law, he never violates its spirit” while investigating (Symmons 532), he only bends the law so that he can re-establish the social order. In fact, Britta Martins notices that he sometimes lets the criminals go instead of handing them to the police, if he concludes they no longer pose a threat to society (213). In contrast to Holmes, Poirot cares little about footprints, since a number of people passed through the crime scene, and more about, for instance, the number of coffee cups present in the house. Stephen Knight claims that “Poirot’s claim on rational and psychological mastery is a Holmes-like front for a simpler method; but here it is not male clerical-style observation, but the types of knowledge that are classically, and stereotypically, female” (*Crime Fiction* 91), meaning that Poirot prefers to distinguish important evidence from the unimportant. Moreover, Poirot believes that exactly the separation of important facts is the key to a successful investigation, saying that “those of importance we will put on one side; those of no importance, pouf! (...) We examine. We search. And that little curious fact, that possibly paltry little detail that will not tally, we put it here” (*The Mysterious Affair*, Christie 33). He, unlike Holmes who considers every piece of information relevant to the case, ignores the details he deems unnecessary, thus creating a clearer path toward the solution.

Observation is not the only method the detectives apply in the investigation process. Holmes frequently uses his art of disguise, such as wearing an ulster and a cravat to disguise himself, while chasing a suspect. Moreover, it is revealed that he also gathers information from the Arab street urchins, so-called “the Baker Street division of the detective police force” (Doyle 24). Since merely the sight of a police officer repels people from sharing information, Holmes believes that these youngsters are able to go everywhere as well as hear everything (Doyle 24). Similarly, Poirot also relies on his allies, mainly someone like a member of the family (in the novel he gives Lawrence the task of finding the missing coffee cup) or a member of the household (Miss Howard is assigned to be Poirot’s eyes and ears). Household members are too able to provide the investigator with the information that is supposed to be hidden.

Interestingly, while all the discovered clues are known to the reader as Knox prescribed, both detectives keep the identity of the murderer hidden until the very end. Holmes, for instance, “is given the irritating but essential characteristic of refusing to reveal what he knows until he has completed his solution, sometimes waiting until the criminal is caught” (Heller 532), adding to the suspense and finally surprising the reader with the revelation. In *A Study in Scarlet*, Holmes therefore reveals the murderer after luring him into trap, however his identity clashes with Knox’s first rule since the character only appears in the last chapter of the novel. In a similar fashion, Poirot does not reveal his suspicions until the very end. His preferred method is to round up all those involved with the case, including the murderers themselves and calling out each character one by one, until he gets to the murderer, all the while explaining how and why the crime is committed. It is relevant to mention that in *The Mysterious Affair at Styles*, the murderer is the same person suspected from the start of the book. Despite Mr. Inglethorp being suspected by the police and the family members, the reader is induced to cross him off the list of suspects as Poirot provides him with an alibi. However, the reason behind Poirot’s investment in Inglethorp’s alibi is another confirmation of Poirot’s brilliance: at the time of the first hearing, there was no clear evidence against him; therefore, if acquitted, Inglethorp could not have been tried for the same crime the second time.

3.2. Private Detectives as the Representatives of the Genre

Sherlock Holmes and Hercule Poirot are considered the exemplary private detectives. Accordingly, private detectives are seen as the prototype of a detective. The reason for their popularity may lie in the fact that they belong neither to the amateur nor police sphere, but somewhere in-between. Private detectives are required to know the law and follow certain moral codes, but when it comes to the investigation process, they are given more liberty and trust than their police associates. Furthermore, private investigators are placed between the criminal and the police: although as detectives they stand for law and order, they often apply illegal methods, their skills thus resembling more the ones of a criminal than the police (Pyrhönen 51). The detectives bend the law “in order to reassert a world of equality and justice” (Gregoriou 55), not out of personal pleasure. Additionally, while private detectives are at liberty to conduct investigations as they please, they possess professional knowledge (Poirot is a former police inspector, while Holmes is a self-taught detective) which gives them certain credibility.

Further reason for the popularity of this detective type might lie in their two most prominent representatives. Both Holmes and Poirot are known for their detection skills as well as their personal quirks; Poirot’s sharp sense for details or Holmes’ vast knowledge on certain subjects give a unique spin on their investigation processes. Holmes mostly owes his success to his way of life, lack of intimacy and emotional detachment from his cases (“The ‘Classical’ Model,” Rowland 120), since the readers enjoy following adventures of someone who solves crimes just for the thrill and, at least superficially, does not get emotionally involved. His character serves as a model for further generations of detective characters, and is therefore considered the archetypal detective whose influence can still be seen in modern crime fiction. On the other hand, the success of Hercule Poirot as a character lies in part in Christie’s writing. Stephen Knight observes that “it is more appropriate to talk about Christie’s ‘world’ than about her heroes’ adventures, since she is far less interested in her detectives than [her] predecessors such as Doyle or Chesterton” (“The Golden Age” 153). In other words, in Poirot’s case the focus is on the plot rather than on the detective, while for Holmes, the detective is placed in the centre. Moreover, it is hard to talk about Poirot without mentioning a stereotyped group of suspects, strange murders or small details that lead to the solution of a mystery. Interestingly, Scaggs

claims that Poirot, much like the characters around him is “merely a collection of surface details: vain, fussy, fastidious, and Belgian, with a French accent suggested by repeated key phrases such as ‘Mon ami’” (21), which makes him still memorable and popular today.

Both Holmes and Poirot are constructed in such a way that they are different from flesh and blood readers, since the reader seldom possesses the detective’s knowledge or superior reason, therefore he or she is not able to notice important clues or duplicate the investigator’s conclusions (Grella 31). These detectives, like their cases, might be fictions, but their ideologies are very realistic, in the sense that their moral codes and beliefs can be used in the reader’s world. Additionally, since the readers enjoy matching their intellect against the detective because they know the general rules: a murder in an isolated place in England, the summon of the authority which cannot find any clues, the arrival of the eccentric, intelligent and unofficial investigator who connects the evidence and in a dramatic final scene names the murderer (Grella 30-31), the novel turns into the game of wits the readers are ready to play over and over again.

2. Amateur Detectives

4.1. Amateur Clergy: Father Brown and Brother Cadfael

Amateur detectives are ordinary people without professional training or experience in solving crimes. Their professions vary from shopkeepers and students to librarians or even local old ladies, thus distancing themselves from other types of investigators. What is more, they all possess high intelligence and excellent skills of observation. One of the most appealing professions, in terms of crime fiction, is the clergy, represented by its two most prominent members, G.K. Chesterton’s Father Brown and Ellis Peters’ Cadfael. The two clergymen have inspired a great number of writers, with Brown becoming “the spiritual father of an estimated 140-odd fictional” (Brunsdale 72) characters ranging from detective clergy, clergy wives, ex-clergy, monks, nuns, ex-nuns, two rabbis, a rabbi’s widow, a clerk of a Quaker meeting, two Buddhists, two choirmaster/organists and even a few witches (Brunsdale 72). In fact, the character of Father Brown from the beginning of the twentieth century served as a template for

the medieval brother Cadfael, who in turn inspired many writers to situate their crime fiction in the Middle Ages.³

Father Brown is an English Roman Catholic priest based on a real-life priest Father John O'Connor, whom Chesterton knew. The priest and the writer became lifelong friends, with O'Connor receiving Chesterton into the Roman Catholic Church and serving as a model for Father Brown (Waibel 143). Chesterton was intrigued by O'Connor's knowledge of human nature, and concluded that people believe priests to be somehow disconnected from what they consider the real world and have a better insight into the nature of evil. Chesterton therefore decided to create a "fictional priest-sleuth, one who outwardly appeared innocent, even naive, but whose profound understanding of the psychology of evil would give him a definite edge over the criminal – and over the average detective" (Waibel 144). With these traits, along with excellent deduction skills, Father Brown became one of the most known amateur detectives in the history of crime fiction. As a contrast to the twentieth century Father Brown, the Cadfael novels depict "fictional characters 'interwoven into and shaped by' a 'turbulent background' of the twelfth century" (McCaw 93), in the centre of which is Brother Cadfael, a Welsh Benedictine living in an English monastery. According to Peters herself, she came up with the idea of a monk detective while devising a plot for a murder mystery from the true story of Shrewsbury Abbey in the twelfth century. She wished to create the high medieval equivalent of a detective, an observer and agent of justice in the centre of action (*A Rare Benedictine*, Peters, Introduction). Cadfael's name, Cadfael ap Meilyr ap Dafydd, is a rare Welsh name mentioned only once in a historical book Peters found. It belonged to "Saint Cadog, a contemporary and rival of Saint David, a powerful saint in Glamorgan," (*A Rare Benedictine*, Peters, Introduction) who was christened as Cadfael. Additionally, it is no accident that Cadfael is portrayed as a Benedictine. Contrary to the earlier monastic orders, Benedictines lived in a community. The Benedictine abbey "gives Cadfael the safe haven from which to unravel the mysteries in *The Chronicles*" (emphasis in the original, Kaller 4) since it allows him to move freely within the abbey as well as the community. As a Benedictine

³ For example, Umberto Eco could have been aware of the character of Cadfael while writing his novel *The Name of the Rose* which was published three years after the first Cadfael novel *A Morbid Taste for Bones* (Wunderlich, 391).

monk, he is able to be a part of community and solve mysteries and still carry out his duties at the abbey.

The last Father Brown book, *The Secret of Father Brown*, is a collection of short stories published in 1935. It opens with a prologue in which Brown, while visiting his friend in Spain, reveals his crime solving method. His confession shocks his friend's guest for Brown explains that in order to find the culprit he mentally becomes the murderer. The first story in the collection used as an exemplary story for the analysis of the character is called "The Mirror of the Magistrate". After two detectives, one police and one private, are unable to solve the murder of a prominent magistrate, Father Brown steps in to clear his friend's name and by combining rationality with observation he unravels the mystery. Noticing traces of a violent crime, like a broken mirror in the house, Brown is able to free a suspected poet and connect the evidence with the prosecutor himself: the victim's friend and his lookalike.

Brown's clergy colleague, Brother Cadfael, is given a task to solve the murder of a young monk and the disappearance of a wealthy widow Judith Perle in the 1986 novel *The Rose Rent*. In order to find the culprits to both crimes, Cadfael teams up with sheriff Beringar and employs the help of Sister Magdalen to retrieve a boot. He displays his detective skills that lead him to the murderer, such as pouring wax into footprints at the crime scene, retracing the victim's steps to get to the place where she was captured and deducting that the murderer has switched his boots to cover his traces. Led by intuition and the evidence he collected, Cadfael announces that Judith's cousin murdered the young monk and his servant and attempted to take his cousin's life so that he could inherit her wealth.

The books, however, do not provide much information about either Father Brown or Brother Cadfael. Little is known about Brown other than he was a priest in Essex, now working in London and that, much like Father John O'Connor, he wears a black habit and a black hat, often seen carrying a shabby umbrella and some brown parcels from which he might have gotten his name. Although Brown is created as an opposite to Sherlock Holmes with his humorous appearance and eccentric personality, when it comes to detective skills, they are considered equals. Symmons observes that while it might be strange "to class a man who (...) does not know the right end of his return ticket among the Supermen of detection, (...) Father Brown belongs

among them through the knowledge given to him by God” (83). Brown’s devotion is his greatest strength since, for him, his use of reason and detective skills are a gift from God. Cadfael, on the other hand, is a Welshman in his sixties who has spent a decade and a half in the Mideast, first as a Crusader, then as captain of a fishing boat. (Browne 227). After experiencing war and becoming a father (unbeknown to him), he resolves to retire to a serene life at the monastery of Shrewsbury Abbey and take up gardening. Unlike Brown who has been a priest for the most of his life, Cadfael came to the cloister life late and combines his worldly experiences and the understanding of the human nature that he gained through his youth with the moral insight he acquired in the years he has spent as a monk. His early life sets him apart from the other monks, likewise, his spiritual side sets him apart from the other residents of the town. Moreover, it is relevant to mention that like Poirot before him, Cadfael is a foreigner in the English territory hence he is able to see the political games of the time differently and observe the English society as an outsider, similarly highlighting the fact that a foreigner is saving the English from social disorder.

Despite the fact that they are required to remain relatively static figures since the genre demands it (Wunderlich 396), Brown and Cadfael use the flatness of their characters to highlight their skills. Cadfael’s biography, as well as Brown’s, is “complete with his first appearance, and he remains – literally in all cases – an ageless person without further, personal development” (Wunderlich 396), hence he never strays away too far from his characteristics no matter how unusual his actions may seem. In turn, Brown challenges “the reader’s assumptions about the efficacy and moral rightness of the ‘scientific’ investigation of crimes and put in its place the spiritual – intuitive knowledge of a Catholic priest” (Horsley 30), meaning that he uses his personal beliefs and knowledge he gained as a priest as instruments in the crime solving game. On the other hand, Cadfael’s most memorable trait is his love of gardening. At the abbey, he has specialized in herbs from which he makes medicine and ointments and therefore becomes “the equivalent of a medieval physician, one whose services are in demand by the religious and secular communities alike” (Vickers 12). He provides both the monks and the townspeople with medicine, for example, Judih Perle visits Cadfael at the beginning of the book to make her an ointment for her rash like he had done several years earlier. His medical specialization allows him

to come and go from the abbey as he pleases, as well as enter people's homes freely and to ask many questions. Likewise, it is relevant to mention that it gives him additional authority for he is not only a Benedictine but also a medicine man, a position highly regarded in the community, and is therefore able to make people open up to him easily. What is more, Cadfael's garden can be seen as "a living symbol of the hero himself as well as of the human world around him" (Tyler 515), meaning that Cadfael can distinguish, as a true gardener, harmful and poisonous plants or people from the harmless and healing ones; nurturing the people from the community in the same way as he nurtures and grows the plants in his garden.

The detectives' quirks and traits are best shown when working with other people. Unlike the private detectives from the previous chapter, neither Cadfael nor Father Brown have a full-time partner to help them solve crime. What is more, Father Brown usually does not have any companions, opting to work with the police instead. In "The Mirror of the Magistrate", he joins a private and a professional police detective at the crime scene, and again at the court, taking over the investigation and solving the crime quicker by noticing details that the detectives have missed. In a similar manner, Cadfael, although often accompanied by a young assistant, solves the murder of a monk and the disappearance of Judith Perle on his own. However, his most significant ally is sheriff Hugh Beringar with whom he maintains a professional relationship as well as friendship. Beringar trusts Cadfael's judgements completely and supports him as "the police would support the private detective" (Wunderlich 390). If Cadfael represents spiritual authority, then Beringar represents the worldly one. There is no rivalry between them, nor does the sheriff want to take credit for Cadfael's work. What is more, they listen to each other's ideas and complement each other's investigation methods, proving that the spiritual and worldly can coexist in a crime novel world. However, it is relevant to mention that Brown, unlike Cadfael, does not work with the police closely, but rather enjoys explaining his theories and observations to them. In the short story, the two detectives simply stand astonished listening to Brown as he makes his remarks about the physical appearance of the murderer after noticing that the prosecutor looks differently without his court wig. The detectives serve as witnesses to Brown's brilliance.

It is not surprising that the detectives are left astonished since Brown, “the archetypal 'unimpressive' detective” (*Detective Fiction*, Priestman 124), has a very impressive investigation method. As explained in the prologue of *The Secret of Father Brown*, he does not rely on divine inspiration but his own mind, thus following both Van Dine’s and Knox’s rules that state that the fantastic is not permitted but everything must be rationally explained. His method, as well as Cadfael’s is based on observation and ratiocination. However, since Cawletti claims that the genre plays to reader’s pleasure of observing the detective’s work through investigation (qtd. in Cavender and Jurik 11), both detectives have different approaches to the cases: Brown uses religious exercise whereas Cadfael relies on science. Brown’s method is “based on a moral identification with the criminal, an encounter with one’s own capacity for evil that he calls ‘a religious exercise’” (Kayman 54) which explains why Brown claims that he is the one who killed all those people (Chesterton 542). Although Brown does not physically murder anyone, he tries to get inside the murderer’s mind by projecting each crime to a single detail. What is more, Brown often uses this method to eliminate suspects by concluding they are incapable of the crime being investigated for his method is based on the belief that a particular person is only capable of committing a particular crime. On the other hand, Cadfael uses his herbs and clever medieval methods of collecting evidence as an alternative to modern technology. Anthony Hopkins observes that the biggest problem for a medieval detective is the lack of “paraphernalia of modernity that always takes all the fun out of figuring out who done it, that always threatens to overwhelm the real detective skills and faculties – observation, intuition, intelligence, and reason” (43). Therefore, Cadfael combines the two, as in *The Rose Rent* where he is able to preserve the murderer’s footprint by using a warm wax thus being able to use the same footprint to compare it with a boot found on a drowned man.

As aforementioned, the strength of both detectives lies in observation. What is more, Waibel claims that Father Brown possesses “an unusually keen sense of observation, but, unlike Sherlock Holmes, he does not apply it to the facts discoverable by an oversized magnifying glass” (144). Instead, Brown observes people and their behaviour. For instance, he notices that Brown’s friend entered the garden over the garden wall, which is a relevant clue since the murderer broke the glass and pots at the entrance, meaning that his friend is innocent. Furthermore, he also

deduces that the poet, found at the crime scene, is innocent by the type of poem he was writing. Brown's method of detection is "aimed at discovering the truth behind the appearance of things" (Waibel 145), meaning that just like Brown himself, there is more to crimes than meets the eye. Similarly, Cadfael "acts on the premise that reality is rationally constructed and can thus be worked out by means of analytical deduction" (Wunderlich 394). However, it is relevant to mention that Cadfael's focus is on the material evidence such as the placement of the murder weapon rather than people's behaviour. He tends to reconstruct the crime through his ability to combine observation and interpretation (Wunderlich, 394) and is therefore able to retrace Judith's steps to the place where she was kidnapped, taking into account the distance between the bridge and abbey gatehouse and the probability of townspeople hearing her screams, finally concluding that "the person involved, man or woman, would have to be someone known to her" (*The Rose Rent*, Peters 80). Furthermore, because of Cadfael's combination of worldly and spiritual methods, his adventures are more than mysteries, they are more obviously stories about moral dilemmas more so than other crime fiction stories for they focus more on the morality than on the crime itself.

Since both detectives are involved with morality and spirituality, it is necessary to talk about the balance between their detective and spiritual life. While the detectives are indeed members of the clergy, their approach to their faith is very much different. For Father Brown, his faith is what defines him as a person and a detective. As a priest, he has heard numerous confessions and therefore has a greater sense of evil than other people. This sense, as he mentions in the prologue, allows him to identify with the criminal and ultimately reveal his or her identity. That is not to say that his spirituality is responsible for his excellent detective skills, but that it is merely a device in the makeup of his character. While Cadfael could be associated "with G. K. Chesterton's Father Brown, who is characterized by an unshakeable faith in God" (Wunderlich 393), he is neither as religious nor as devoted as Brown. Hopkins argues that "he is not driven to prayer, contemplation, and the perfection of the soul" (44), in addition to lying, cheating and stealing⁴ when necessary, but never without a good reason behind it. Because of his worldly experiences he may not be as devoted as other monks in the abbey, but spirituality is

⁴ In *The Rose Rent* he uses the term 'borrow' when asking Sister Magdalen to steal two left boots.

beyond doubt an important part of his life. When talking to Judith about becoming a nun, he clearly states that religious life is not something that should be looked to as a hiding-place from one's life, but should be something one runs to with passion (The Rose Rent, Peters 17-18). Moreover, Cadfael loves his Benedictine way of life since it allows him to nurture both his spiritual and worldly life.

In addition to devotion, both detectives nurture the connection between spirituality and reason. Father Brown is offended at the thought that he possesses superhuman powers for he believes that “credulity in the mystical is a consequence of contemporary materialism and lack of belief in God, while Roman Catholicism is on the side of common sense” (Kayman 55). For him, reason is closely connected to faith, and a true Catholic is always guided by common sense. What is more, Peters herself claims that “it is, it ought to be, it must be, a morality. If it strays from the side of the angels, provokes total despair, wilfully destroys—without pressing need in the plot—the innocent and the good, takes pleasure in evil, that is unforgivable sin. I use the word deliberately and gravely” (qtd. in Tyler 516), indicating that both stories about Cadfael, as well as Father Brown, are moral stories with a deep religious meaning.

4.2. Amateur Detectives: Crime Solving as a Hobby

The reason behind the popularity and importance of amateur detectives lies in their relatedness to the readers. Like the readers, amateur detectives are ordinary people with regular jobs, the only difference being that they get involved in a crime investigation, whether on purpose or by accident. Their occupations, or in the case of Father Brown and Cadfael, a calling, differentiate amateurs from other types of detectives and add their own spin to the story, ultimately being the factor that helps the detectives solve the case. Moreover, when it comes to the clergy detectives, Charmaine Allen Mosby claims that “the training in theology and counselling that members of the clergy receive helps them to see the weaknesses and strengths of their parishioners” (2136), meaning that the clergy possesses an exceptional insight in analysing other people. Interestingly the readers are able to identify with the clergy detectives for two reasons: the readers that are unfamiliar with a particular religion connect with them on the basis of similar morality and beliefs, furthermore, the readers of the same religion have a shared insight which assists them in solving the case.

Since the genre requires them to relate to the readers, the amateur detectives possess “primarily positive qualities, along with enough quirks and character flaws to make them believably human” (Mosby 2141) in addition to keen powers of observation, imagination and deduction without any formal training (2134). In other words, these detectives are in a way similar to the private detectives save that the private ones are portrayed as emotionally detached from their environment. Moreover, it is relevant to mention that the amateurs are usually a large part of a community, always socially acceptable and able to comprehend the code of the society they investigate, therefore always triumphing over the banal ways of the official authorities (Grella 34). They are thus often invited to investigate because of their status within the community.

As with private detectives, the stories about amateurs provide a known pattern in the game of wits: while performing their daily activities, the amateur detectives, who have no professional training in solving crimes, either stumble upon a crime like Cadfael or get involved later to clear an acquaintance’s name like Father Brown. After solving the mystery, for what they were uniquely qualified to unravel, they provide the authorities with the answers, expecting no credit or compensation for their work. Neither of the two mentioned detectives deal with crime solving out of amusement or obligation, but rather out of duty to their community and their loved ones, to restore their society as it once was. Moreover, the tone of the stories is often optimistic: cases are resolved, the villains are not evil but damaged, and the detectives show the reader the positive sides of human nature.

5. Police Detectives

5.1. Inspectors Morse and Lewis

The police novel, as its name suggests, concentrates upon a crime investigation from the point of view of the police, separating itself from the other detective stories by applying a considerable amount of realism. What is more, unlike private and amateur detectives who use unconventional methods, police detectives are trained in solving crimes. Interestingly, Lee Horsley notes that there are two types of police detectives: an official investigative team and an individual investigator (179). While the individual investigators work with a team, they often conduct independent investigations and solve the mystery before their team, thus resembling

other detective types in terms of independence and intelligence. Such detectives are inspectors Morse and Lewis from Colin Dexter's late twentieth century police novels. These crime narratives emphasize a perfect postcard Oxford where crime is simply a fiendishly devised crossword that Morse needs to solve (Messent 177). However, it is relevant to mention that having two detectives in one narrative dismisses Van Dine's first rule about having at most one detective in a novel. The series' main character Endeavour Morse is a senior officer at the Criminal Investigation Department in Oxford. He gets his name from a real life person, Jeremy Morse, who was Dexter's rival in writing crossword clues. Coincidentally, it is also a nod to the Morse code, pointing "towards this world of encryption, in which the truth can be unearthed from the most unlikely messages given a sufficient hold on precise linguistic rules" ("Post-War," Priestman 181). His first name, Endeavour, means 'to try and make an effort', thus his full name literalises him as a person who solves mysteries. His partner, Sergeant (later promoted to Inspector) Robert Lewis is named after another of Dexter's rivals, Mrs. B. Lewis, and is Welsh, unlike Morse who is English.

As it was the case with the previous detective types, there is not much information about Morse other than he is "a brilliant, Eton-educated, curmudgeonly bachelor with a love for classical music, especially that of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and Richard Wagner, and for solving crossword puzzles" (Paradowski 496). Moreover, Scaggs claims that his love for classical music allows him to achieve cultural distance from an everyday person (91), indicating that since the nature of his job is grim, classical music provides him detachment from that world. Furthermore, he indulges in smoking, drinking beer and scotch and affairs with women connected to his cases. In contrast, Lewis, a "'target, scapegoat, and sounding-board' for Morse" (Paradowski 496), comes from a working class-family and is not as well educated as Morse as seen from the scene where he is unable to help his son with his French. However, what he lacks in education he makes up in his passionate and polite personality. While Morse is a Holmes-like character, eccentric as well as ego-centric, believing he is superior to others and not taking interest in any of his cases, Lewis prides himself in his reliability and enthusiasm for work. Nonetheless, it is relevant to mention that although Morse seems cold, there is a compassionate side to him, known only to Lewis and their superior, Superintendent Strange. Interestingly, both Morse and Lewis are portrayed differently throughout the book series: in the early novels Morse is described as "slim,

grey-eyed, and dark-haired,” and in the later, including *The Remorseful Day*, he is depicted as “paunchy, blue-eyed, and white-haired” (Paradowski 496), while Lewis changed from being portrayed as a grandfather to being described as being younger than Morse.⁵

The Remorseful Day, published in 1999, is the last novel about Inspector Morse and his assistant Sergeant Lewis. Morse, faced with a dilemma whether to take on a case of a murdered nurse with whom he flirted in the prologue of the novel is also dealing with serious health issues, resulting in his death at the end of the novel. After Lewis takes charge of the case, Morse decides to conduct his own investigation and races with Lewis in a competition to get to the killer first. This has a great influence on their relationship since up to that point Lewis was considered as always being one step behind his partner; here he suspects his partner is involved in the crime. As the novel progresses, Morse’s health deteriorates and he dies, leaving Lewis a letter in which he lays all his evidence to his partner, leaving one last piece of his brilliance.

The central theme of the novels is Morse’s and Lewis’ relationship. It is in many ways similar to that of Sherlock and Watson as they depend on each other both in personal and professional life. Paradowski claims that “like Holmes, Morse is an eccentric bachelor,” and “like Watson, Sergeant Lewis is less intelligent than the master sleuth, but the Morse-Lewis relationship tends to be more acrimonious than that of Doyle’s pair” (439). In other words, the detective duo often quarrels and disagrees with one another, but there is a mutual respect which can be seen from Lewis’ conversation with Strange when Lewis is left speechless and gratified upon learning Morse enjoys working with him. The power of their relationship is much different from the other detectives and their assistants since both characters are qualified policemen. What is more, Lewis takes over the case and the station from Morse and proves he is his match which other helpers do not do. That being said, although considered as his partner’s equal, Lewis is still man under authority, that authority being Morse, which leaves Lewis of the opinion that while his thinking processes are not much slower, he is always one step behind: “in almost all previous cases he’s usually reached first base only to find that Morse was already sprinting off to the second base, and so on” (Dexter 132). Morse on the other hand, is often condescending to

⁵ A younger actor named Kevin Whately was cast to portray Lewis in the TV series about the two detectives, prompting Dexter to change the character’s age and appearance.

Lewis, considering himself more intelligent and a more suitable candidate for solving crime. Nevertheless, he respects his partner's opinion, often depending on Lewis to keep him in check since Lewis does not approve of Morse's drinking habits. Moreover, Morse's last words were about Lewis, wishing to thank him. It is relevant to mention that while it seems that Morse is a stronger and more independent character, when it comes to his relationship with Lewis, it turns out that it is the other way round. In fact, the two characters balance each other so well that they are unable to solve the case alone, as can be seen from Morse's thoughts:

Lewis would know, of course; and it was at times like these that Morse needed Lewis's cautious 30 mph approach to life, if not to any stretch of road in front of him. Two heads were better than one, even though one of them was Lewis's. Yet what a cruel thought that was! and so unworthy... (Dexter 203).

Their strength as detectives lies in the power of their relationship, for they complete each other both as friends and professional investigators.

Their connection is not the only relationship relevant to solving crimes. Police detectives work in teams and cannot officially have an independent investigation, which means they are responsible for their own team and need to answer to a higher authority. This authority, in the case of Morse and Lewis, is the Chief Superintendent Strange. Strange is very critical of Morse's behaviour, namely his time spent in pubs, therefore he often relies on Lewis to check up on him. Nevertheless, whenever there is an unsolvable case he turns to the two detectives, supporting their methods as well as opinions. What is more, Strange's function is not only that of an authority, but also as a mediator between the two detectives, offering his friendship as well as guidance.

As much as the detectives work closely, their crime solving methods, just like their personalities, are quite different. What is more, they compete to get to the solution of the mystery first. They both follow the same suspect, although Morse does that independently from the police, only to lose him at a bus stop. The relevance of the scene is to show that although refusing to be a part of the official investigation, Morse still needs to keep an eye on Lewis and create the air that he is still in control by giving a piece of information Lewis missed. From the beginning of the novel it is clear that Lewis is more dedicated to the case. Unlike Morse who often ignores the police files and testimonies claiming that he himself does not know what he has been

doing the previous night (Dexter 71), Lewis devotes much of his time to preparations, reading articles and studying the collected evidence. Lewis's theory concerning what an investigation should look like is the following: there is an investigation revolving around confirmed suspicion, clues are pursued, suspects targeted, alibis checked, motives and responses to questioning analysed (Dexter 70). When convinced his suspicions are correct, the detective brings a formal charge and deals with further questioning in the hopes that the arrested suspect is guilty. It is relevant to mention that while Lewis did not solve the crime entirely on his own (he finds Morse's letter explaining who the killer is), his belief in the police procedure ultimately leads him to the correct answer, proving to himself that his detective skills are equal to those of Morse. However, his partner has a different approach to crime. Paradowski observes that "unlike the traditional puzzle-solving detective, Morse rarely discovers clues in a straightforward fashion" (440), adding that the clues "are scrambled, and he manages to use them in specious but false explanations, so that when the reader finally learns the truth, it is usually a surprise" (440). In other words, while he does get to the correct solution, in the process Morse often misidentifies the murderer, keeping the reader in suspense.

Morse is known for his rational approach to the case, which not only benefits him, but his partner too. While figuring out where the missing suspect went, he explains to Lewis that there is always "some wholly explicable, wholly logical causation for any chain of events, in any situation" (Dexter 95) and adds that when he reaches a dead end, the only thing Lewis can do is ask himself where the link broke. By following the advice Morse has been giving him, Lewis develops a theory that the key of solving a mystery is not only intelligence, but "the knack of prospective thinking, of looking ahead and asking oneself the right questions, as well as the wrong questions, about what was likely to happen in the future; and then of coming up with the answers, be they right or not" (Dexter 166). Morse's rational approach corresponds to Lewis' theory since Lewis has observed that while investigating, Morse seems to ask the right questions which result in right answers. According to Morse, this is called 'Socratic dialects'. Therefore, in order to find the correct answers, Lewis visualizes himself sitting across from Morse, with Morse asking him questions about the case: "'You've got to find the car, haven't you?' 'The car that dumped the body?' (...) 'Where do you hide a corpse?' 'On the battle-field.' 'And where do you

hide a car? In a car park.” (Dexter 167-169). This method not only enables Lewis to find the evidence he is looking for, but also to sharpen his detective skills. Similarly, Morse uses his rationality as a game, but in the form of crosswords. Much like doing crosswords, one puts a word in one slot, knows which word comes in the next one, sometimes one misses the word but in the end, everything falls into place. His approach to crime is the same: Morse collects pieces of the puzzle, sometimes misses the right conclusion but in the end the big picture reveals itself to him and the right man is punished.

The success of both characters reflects their influence in literature and in society. While neither of them is the first fictional police detective, their importance lies in the way they have helped to shape the genre. The novels about Morse and Lewis sparked high interest in police procedures thanks to their crime solving methods, dynamic relationship and more importantly the positive manner in which they portrayed police detectives. What is more, in a poll, Dexter’s fellow mystery writers chose Morse as their favourite male detective, ahead of, among others, Sherlock Holmes (Paradowski 496). The detective duo has not only inspired many television shows about police work, but also a whole series of police novels including those of Laura Principal, Inspector Rebus, Harpur and Iles, helping the police detective genre to reach wider audience.

5.2. Police Detective as Opposed to the Private/Amateur Detectives

Unlike private and amateur detectives, police detectives give an air of authenticity and credibility by following scientific methods and the law. Peter Robinson explains that “it goes back to what Ed McBain once said about calling the cops if you find a body, not the ... little old lady across the street. Some sense of realism or credibility, I guess” (quoted in Messent 175). Furthermore, police detectives do not need to wear disguises nor lie and sneak without permission; they are the official authority and all of their investigations are more-or-less within the law. That being said, the detectives are aware that “the system they represent can be flawed, with its own forms of corruption, moral fault – lines and large – scale injustices” (Messent 180), therefore they stand at the core of the authority of law and moral codes.

Interestingly, they are the most realistic detectives since the crime solving is a part of their daily job. They are “assigned their cases to investigate and do not have the luxury of

choosing the cases they find most appealing or rewarding” (Blaha 2092). In other words, they do not take a case out of interest or hobby, but because they are obliged to. Moreover, they are often pressured to solve the case within a certain time period, considering they have other cases pending. It is relevant to mention that the police detectives are not shown in a favourable light in the narratives about private and amateur detectives, since they always rely on the skills of other detectives and are unable to solve a case on their own. Therefore, police novels show another side of police investigators for they are given characteristics the readers prefer in detectives: high intelligence, relying on arguments more than on physical action, good observing skills, moral values and preferring to work alone (Blaha 2084) as seen in the characterization of Morse and Lewis. Albeit the police detectives may seem much different from the other detective types, their general traits are much similar. In addition, considering that the readers have a certain idea of what a police detective is like, the fictional detectives need to conform to this image while other types of detectives have a certain liberty of character in terms of quirks and habits. Morse and Lewis, for instance, are thus characterized as everyday people, with all their problems, fears, vices and strengths.

Conforming to the rules of the genre, Morse and Lewis both conduct independent investigations, rejecting the help from their team. The police detectives resemble other two detective types analysed in this paper in many ways. With the exception of the relationship between partners and following the police procedure, their individuality and the knack for seeing evidence from a different angle give the readers more than enough reasons to keep coming back to play the game of wits.

6. Short Comparison of the Three Detective Types

The three detective types and their respective representatives may at first differ in both personality and the way in which they investigate, however, there are more similarities than differences. They follow a certain pattern when it comes to the characterization: they are seen as eccentrics, having at least one trait that makes them stand out from the other characters. What is more, their detection method is based on “a penetrating observation, highly developed logical powers, wide knowledge, and a brilliantly synthetic imagination” meaning that “the detective story, unlike most kinds of popular literature, prizes intellectual gifts above all others”

(Grella 36). In other words, while their approaches may vary, they all use ratiocination as their basis. Nevertheless, there are also some discrepancies between the types. While amateurs and the police look like regular people, private investigators possess distinctive physical features such as Holmes' hawk-like nose. Moreover, all types save amateurs rely on their partners when it comes to solving crime and it is necessary to add that the police investigators are the only detective type who strictly follow the law.

Conclusion

Since detective fiction has fascinated the readers for over a century, it is no wonder that its infallible part, the character of detective, has been equally intriguing. They are attracted to the detective's odd personality as well as his or her intelligence and singular way of solving cases. What is more, it is because of these detective skills that the reader is motivated to compete with the detective in the game of who will identify the criminal first. There are three types of investigators based on the level of professional expertise: private, amateur and police detectives; and this paper has proven that these three types have distinct characteristics as well as follow the same character pattern.

Private investigators, represented by the characters of Sherlock Holmes and Hercule Poirot, choose to go around the law, using their respective quirks such as attention to detail or the art of disguise to unravel the unsolvable mysteries. Albeit their methods differ, they are connected by their unusual appearance, professional training, less-intelligent assistants and vast knowledge on all subjects concerning crime solving. Amateur detectives, on the other hand, use the knowledge they have gained through their professions. In the case of Father Brown and Brother Cadfael, their calling as priests gains them access and trust from other characters, enabling them to solve the cases more quickly and efficiently. They both combine worldliness with spirituality in order to catch the culprit and restore order in the world as they know it. Moreover, the two clergymen possess approachability, both to the other characters and the readers, which induces the readers to identify with the detectives. Police detectives, having undergone official training, follow certain police procedures and stay strictly within the law. Both Morse and Lewis act as the official authority and thus have access to the evidence other detectives do not. They are able to be a part of the police force and at the same time at liberty

to conduct independent investigation with the basis of their crime solving method being the knack to ask the right questions.

Detective fiction narratives of all three detective types follow the same premise: a crime has been committed; a detective is called; he partners up with an associate and begins to investigate; the investigator collects the evidence, questions suspects and witnesses and keeps most of his or hers conclusions to himself/herself; he solves the crime before the authorities do (or if the detective is a police officer, he or she solves the case quicker than the rest of the team); at the end of the novel the investigator reveals the identity of the murderer. Moreover, the detectives themselves also follow certain patterns. In all cases the official authorities depend on the detectives to solve the unsolvable crimes. Similarly, the analysed detectives, with an exception of Father Brown, rely on their partners to give them a different perspective on the case. Throughout the paper, it is clear that while each detective has a unique personality, the basis of their crime solving method lies in ratiocination and observation. What is more, the analysed detectives use reason as well as their training or the lack of it as tools of solving the puzzling mysteries. Each representative gives credibility to its category, and it is because of the shared and individual traits that the readers are willing to race the detectives to the solution.

Works Cited

- Allen, L.D.. *Detective in Fiction*. Lincoln, Nebraska. Cliffs Notes. 1978. PDF
- Ascari, M.. *A Counter-History of Crime Fiction: Supernatural, Gothic, Sensational*. New York. Palgrave Macmillan. 2007. PDF
- Blaha, F.G.. "Police Procedurals". Rollyson. pp. 2083-2092
- Browne, R.B.. "Historical Crime and Detection." Rzepka, Horsley. pp. 222-232
- Brusndale, M.M.. *Icons of Mystery and Crime Detection: From Sleuths to Superheroes*. Santa Barbara, California. Greenwood. 2010. PDF
- Cavender, G., Jurik, N.. *The Appeal of the Crime Genre*. Oxford. Oxford University Press. 2015. PDF
- Chatman, S. *Story and Discourse*. Ithaca. Cornell University Press. 1978. PDF
- Chesterton, G.K.. *The Complete Father Brown Stories*. London. Penguin Classics. 2012 PDF
- Christie, A.. *The Mysterious Affair at Styles*. New York. Clue Publishing. 2015. PDF
- Christie, A.. *An Autobiography*. London. Harper Collins. 1977. PDF
- Dauncey, S.. "Crime, Forensics and Modern Science." Rzepka, Horsley. pp. 164-174
- Dexter, C.. *The Remorseful Day*. London. Macmillan. 2000 Print
- Doyle, A.C.. *A Study in Scarlet*. Vancouver. AD Books. 2011. PDF
- Goldman, A.H.. "The Appeal of the Mystery." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 69, No. 3 (SUMMER 2011), pp. 261-272, Wiley <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23883662> Accessed 1 March 2016
- Gregoriou, C.. *Deviance in Contemporary Crime Fiction*. New York. Palgrave Macmillan. 2007. PDF
- Grella, G.. "Murder and Manners: The Formal Detective Novel." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Autumn, 1970), pp. 30-48, Duke University Press www.jstor.org/stable/1345250 Accessed 5 June 2017
- Hardesty, S. M.. "Little Grey Cells." *The English Journal*, Vol. 72, No. 5 (Sep., 1983), pp. 37-40. National Council of Teachers of English, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/817330>
- Haynes, E.. *Crime Writers: A Research Guide*. ABC-CLIO, LLC. Santa Barbara, California. 2011.
- Heller, T.. "Sir Arthur Conan Doyle." Rollyson. pp. 529-534
- Hodgson, J.A.. "Arthur Conan Doyle (1859 – 1930)." Rzepka, Horsley. pp. 390-402
- Hopkins, A.. "The Moral World of Brother Cadfael." Kaller. pp. 39-53
- Kaller, A. editor. *Cordially Yours, Brother Cadfael*. Bowling Green. Bowling Green University Press. 1998. PDF
- Kayman, M.A.. "The Short Story from Poe to Chesterton." Priestman. pp. 41-58
- Kelleghan, F., editor. *100 Masters of Mystery and Detective Fiction*. Pasadena, California. Salem Press. 2001. PDF
- Knight, S.. "The Golden Age." Priestman. pp. 77-93

- *Crime Fiction 1800-2000*. New York. Palgrave Macmillan. 2004
- Malmgren, C.. "The Pursuit of Crime: Characters in Crime Fiction." Rzepka, Horsley. pp. 152-163
- Makinen, M.. "Agatha Christie (1890 – 1976)." Rzepka, Horsley. pp. 415-426
- Marcus, L.. "Detection and Literary Fiction." Priestman. pp. 246-267
- Martens, B.. "Dramatic Monologue, Detective Fiction, and the Search for Meaning." *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, Vol. 66, No. 2 (September 2011), pp. 195-218. University of California Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/ncl.2011.66.2.195> Accessed 1 March 2016
- Mcaw, N.. *Adapting Detective Fiction*. London. Continuum International Publication Group. 2011. PDF
- Messent, P.. "The Police Novel." Rzepka, Horsley. pp. 175-186
- O’Gorman, E.. "Detective Fiction and Historical Narrative." *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (Apr., 1999), pp. 19-26, Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association. www.jstor.org/stable/643033 Accessed 5 June 2017
- Mosby, C.A.. "Amateur Sleuths." Rollyson. pp. 2133-2142
- Paradowski, R.J.. "Colin Dexter." Rollyson. pp. 469-499
- Peters, E.. *The Rose Rent*. London. Macmillan London. 1986
- *A Rare Benedictine*. Introduction. London. Macmillan London. 1988
- Priestman, M., editor. *The Cambridge Companion to Crime Fiction*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. 2003
- "Introduction: Crime Fiction and Detective Fiction." Priestman. pp. 1-6
- "Post-war British Crime Fiction." Priestman. pp. 173-189
- *Detective Fiction and Literature: The Figure on the Carpet*. New York. Palgrave Macmillan. 1991. PDF
- Pyrhönen, H.. "Criticism and Theory." Rzepka, Horsley. pp. 43-56
- Rollyson, C.E., editor. *Critical Survey of Mystery and Detective Fiction*. Pasadena, California. Salem Press. 2008. pp. 2133-2142. PDF
- Rosenblum, J.. "Agatha Christie." Kelleghan. pp. 154-163
- Rowland, S.. "The " Classical " Model of the Golden Age." Rzepka, Horsley. pp. 117-127
- *From Agatha Christie to Ruth Rendell: British Woman Writers in Detective and crime fiction*. New York. Palgrave. 2001. PDF
- Rzepka, C.J., and Horsley, L., editors. *A Companion to Crime Fiction*. Chichester. Wiley-Blackwell. 2010. PDF
- Singer, E.A.. "The Whodunit as Riddle: Block Elements in Agatha Christie." *Western Folklore*, Vol. 43, No. 3 (Jul., 1984), pp. 157-171. Western States Folklore Society <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1499897> Accessed 1 March 2016
- Scaggs, J. *Crime Fiction*. New York. Routledge. 2005 Print

- Symons, J.. *Bloody Murder: From the Detective Story to the Crime Novel*. New York. Mysterious Press. 1993 Print
- Todorov, T.. "The Typology of Detective Fiction." *The Poetics of Prose*. Oxford. Blackwell. 1997 PDF
- Tyler, E.T.. "Ellis Peters." Kelleghan. pp. 511-518
- Vickers, A.M.. "The Role of Religion in The Cadfael Series." Kaller. pp. 11-27
- Waibel, P.R.. "G. K. Chesterton." Kelleghan. pp. 141-148
- Worthington, H.. "From The Newgate Calendar to Sherlock Holmes." Rzepka, Horsley. pp. 13-27
- Wunderlich, W.. "Monastic Thrillers: Detecting Postmodernity in the Middle Ages." *Comparative Literature Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (1995), pp. 382-400. Penn State University Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40247010> Accessed 1 March 2016

Abstract

The paper focused on the analysis of three detective types: private, amateur and police, and their respective representatives. The aim was to prove that each type has its own traits as well as sharing general ones with the other two. Representatives for the categories are Sherlock Holmes in *A Study in Scarlet* and Hercule Poirot in *The Mysterious Affair at Styles* for private detectives, Father Brown in *The Secret of Father Brown* and Brother Cadfael in *The Rose Rent* for amateur detectives, and Morse and Lewis in *The Remorseful Day* for the police detectives. Each category is analysed individually, with the detectives being compared based on their appearance and personal traits with regard to how these are connected to their crime solving abilities; relationships with their partners if they have any; their relationship with the official authority or in the case of police detectives, with their superiors; and their crime solving methods. Furthermore, the paper studies the traits and the importance of each type as opposed to the other two categories, it explains the reason behind the popularity of private investigators, analyses the advantages and disadvantages of amateur detectives and answers whether the police procedure is indeed the most efficient method. Along with examining patterns of each category, the types are analysed together to discover whether all three types are based on the same or a similar pattern. This is done by comparing the categories' similarities and differences, taking into consideration their personal traits as well as the basis for their crime solving methods. The paper proves two important arguments: each detective type has its own recognizable traits and stands on its own as an individual category; and while the categories differentiate, all the representatives share certain personal as well as professional traits.

Key Words

crime fiction, detective, private detective, amateur detective, police detective