



Ca' Foscari
University
of Venice

Master's Degree
in Translation and
Interpreting

Final Thesis

**The Italian
Dubbing of
Mindhunter:
Characterisation
and Speech
Registers**

Supervisor

Prof. Giuseppe De Bonis

Assistant supervisor

Prof. Maria Elisa Fina

Graduand

Lina Girbu

Matriculation Number 902708

Academic Year

2025 / 2026

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	5
INTRODUCTION.....	6
CHAPTER 1 – AUDIOVISUAL TRANSLATION	8
1.1 Definition of Audiovisual Translation	8
1.2 Film Dialogue and Prefabricated Orality.....	9
1.3 Main Modes of Audiovisual Translation	11
1.4 Linguistic Features and Constraints of Dubbing	14
CHAPTER 2 – <i>MINDHUNTER</i> : OVERVIEW AND ITALIAN DUBBING	19
2.1 Multidimensional Approach and Analytical Categories for Dubbing	19
2.2 Register, Tone, and Pragmatic Adaptation	21
2.3 Overview of the First Season	22
2.4 Italian Dubbing of <i>Mindhunter</i>	24
CHAPTER 3 – ANALYSIS OF THE ITALIAN DUBBING OF <i>MINDHUNTER</i>	26
3.1 Holden Ford: Technical Discourse and Interaction	27
3.1.1 Procedural Control in Crisis Discourse	28
3.1.2 Pedagogical Authority in Institutional Discourse.....	30
3.1.3 Forensic Reasoning in Evidential Discourse	31
3.1.4 Adaptive Negotiation in Interview Discourse	32
3.2 Bill Tench: Regulatory Discourse and Interactional Control	36
3.2.1 Pragmatic Framing in Institutional Interaction.....	37
3.2.2 Procedural Control and Interrogative Escalation	39
3.2.3 Ethical Limits of Procedural Discourse	41
3.3 Wendy Carr: Epistemic Mediation	43
3.3.1 Constructing Profiling: Discursive and Translational Reshaping	44
3.3.2 Institutional Pressure and Epistemic Reconfiguration.....	47
3.3.3 Discursive Destabilisation and Negotiated Visibility	50
3.4 Concluding Remarks	54
CHAPTER 4 – DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	55
4.1 From Negotiation to Stability in Profiling Discourse.....	55

4.2 Systematisation of Specialised and Forensic Discourse	56
4.3 Interactional Reconfiguration and Pragmatic Regulation.....	57
4.4 Synthesis and Final Remarks.....	58
CONCLUSIONS.....	60
REFERENCES.....	62
ONLINE SOURCES	63
APPENDIX: DIALOGUE TRANSCRIPTS.....	64

ABSTRACT

The worldwide distribution of television series on streaming platforms has made audiovisual translation, especially dubbing, crucial for reaching diverse audiences. Dialogue-driven series are particularly challenging, especially when featuring specialised terminology and nuanced character interactions.

This work examines the audiovisual translation strategies used in the Italian dubbing of the first season of *Mindhunter* (Mindhunter [TV series], 2017-2019), a Netflix series. The study analyses dialogue, specialised and technical terminology, and character registers through a selection of scenes, which portray the early development of criminal profiling within the FBI and the interactions between the main characters and serial killers. It focuses on how these elements are rendered in Italian and how such choices shape meaning, tone, and narrative tension. It also explores the challenges of translating complex dialogue, highlighting the strategies employed to maintain equivalence, convey pragmatic meaning, and reflect register variation, to ensure clarity, accuracy, and naturalness in the Italian dubbing.

Ultimately, this research provides insights into the interplay between translation, storytelling, and audience perception in contemporary television series, proposing a framework to guide future studies and practical approaches in audiovisual translation.

Keywords: audiovisual translation, dubbing, Italian dubbing, dialogue analysis, specialised terminology, character registers, criminal profiling.

INTRODUCTION

Mindhunter is an American psychological crime thriller television series aired on Netflix. Created by Joe Penhall, the show features David Fincher as producer and occasional director, widely recognised for his expertise in psychological thrillers (*Mindhunter* [TV series], 2017-2019). The show is based on the 1995 true-crime book *Mindhunter: Inside the FBI's Elite Serial Crime Unit* by John E. Douglas and Mark Olshaker (Douglas & Olshaker, 1995). The series premiered on October 13, 2017, and ran for two seasons. It focuses on the early development of the FBI's criminal profiling unit in the 1970s and explores how investigators first began to define the concept of the serial killer as a distinct category. Rather than focusing solely on individual crimes, the series examines the methods and reasoning behind understanding patterns of behaviour, psychological traits, and recurring motives.

The main characters—Holden Ford, Bill Tench, and Wendy Carr—are based on real-life investigators John E. Douglas, Robert Ressler, and Ann Wolbert Burgess, whose work laid the foundation for modern criminal profiling (Douglas & Olshaker, 1995). Their interactions with notorious offenders, including Edmund Kemper, Jerome Brudos, and Richard Speck reveal the intricate interplay between situational factors, personality, and extreme behaviour. *Mindhunter* blends procedural investigation with character-driven dialogues and reconstructed interviews that create a deliberate rhythm of suspense, tension, and analytical depth. The first season is praised for its deep exploration of criminal psychology, while the second season expands the investigative landscape.

The primary aim of this thesis is to offer a comprehensive analysis of the Italian dubbing of the first season of *Mindhunter*, focusing on how linguistic choices contribute to character construction through discourse and how different speech registers are represented and reconfigured in translation. It examines how formal, informal, technical, and colloquial language are adapted into Italian, and how these adaptations shape the audience's perception of FBI investigators and the serial killers they interview. Rather than treating characterisation as a static outcome, the study explores how it emerges through interactional patterns and discursive choices, and how dubbing may reshape the narrative and psychological effects of the original dialogue.

From a methodological perspective, the research is based on a selection of representative scenes from the first season, chosen for their relevance to character interaction, discourse construction, and investigative reasoning. Each scene is examined in terms of dialogue structure, register variation, specialised terminology, and pragmatic strategies, with attention to how these elements contribute to coherence, interactional dynamics, and institutional realism in the Italian version. The study also considers how translators negotiate cultural and linguistic differences, ensuring that meaning, tone, and emotional intensity are preserved for Italian-speaking audiences, while also shaping the organisation of discourse itself. Beyond characterisation, the analysis further explores how dubbing contributes to the structuring of dialogue and the emergence of analytical categories, particularly in relation to investigative reasoning and psychological interpretation, thereby extending audiovisual translation beyond purely representational dimensions.

By combining a linguistic and pragmatic approach, this study demonstrates how audiovisual translation functions as an active element of storytelling rather than a mere technical transfer of words. It also examines how dubbing choices influence characterisation, narrative tension, and psychological complexity. Ultimately, this thesis contributes to the field of audiovisual translation by highlighting the challenges of translating a dialogue-driven and psychologically complex series such as *Mindhunter*.

The work is structured as follows: the first chapter outlines the theoretical framework of audiovisual translation and dubbing, including characterisation, narrative tension, psychological complexity, pragmatic adaptation, and the translation of specialised language, with a brief example focusing on the representation of female speech through the character of Wendy. The second chapter provides a detailed presentation of *Mindhunter* and its Italian dubbing, contextualising the series and its characters. The third chapter presents a critical analysis of selected scenes, examining how linguistic choices affect character portrayal, interactional dynamics, and the epistemic organisation of discourse, with particular attention to register variation and the emergence of analytical categories within dialogue. The fourth chapter synthesises the results and highlights key findings, while the concluding chapter reflects on the broader implications of audiovisual translation for storytelling in contemporary television series.

CHAPTER 1 – AUDIOVISUAL TRANSLATION

1.1 Definition of Audiovisual Translation

Audiovisual translation (AVT) has only recently emerged as a field of growing scholarly and sociocultural interest. The term was initially a source of confusion, as early studies in the field used expressions such as “film translation” and “screen translation”, definitions that are still in use today. The first, common at a time when television had not yet reached widespread popularity, focuses on the product itself — namely the film dialogue conveyed through translation. The second refers to the medium through which the products were distributed. Subsequently, the expression “language transfer” emerged to emphasize the verbal component of the audiovisual works, which must be integrated with non-verbal elements such as sound and image. This led to the need for a more comprehensive term “audiovisual translation” or AVT, now widely adopted as an umbrella concept used to refer to all content characterised by a multi-semiotic dimension that requires translation (Perego, 2024).

The current definition refers to all forms of linguistic transfer aimed at translating audiovisual works. These products are multimodal and multimedial, as they communicate simultaneously through verbal and non-verbal signs of acoustic and visual channels (Taylor, 2013). Audiovisual texts thus constitute a distinct type of text, whose overall coherence emerges from the integration of multiple semiotic components. Sound, image, and language interact to form a complex, multi-code structure, whose translation requires specialised skills and a thorough understanding of the original material. Through this multi-layered interaction, audiovisual texts can reach audiences beyond those for whom they were originally intended, demonstrating both the challenges and the potential of AVT as a field of study (González, 2009; Poyatos, 2002; Chaume, 2004).

The methods of linguistic transfer and adaptation are numerous and varied (Perego, 2024). With the spread of new technologies and media, AVT has expanded to include innovative forms aimed at audiences with sensory or cognitive difficulties. Depending on how the original dialogues are rendered and how their translated and

adapted versions are presented, different forms of AVT can be distinguished. These include widely used methods, such as dubbing, subtitling, and voice-over, as well as less familiar or more specialised solutions, including audio description for visually impaired or blind audiences, intralingual subtitling for the deaf or hard of hearing, surtitling, free commentary, and respeaking. Other forms, such as multilingual production, are also part of the AVT landscape, although they are less commonly addressed in the contexts explored in this thesis.

Today, audiovisual translation has reached a well-established position within Translation Studies. Nevertheless, some practitioners still hesitate to consider practices such as subtitling and dubbing as fully-fledged forms of translation, mainly because of the synchrony constraints that often require complex strategies of adaptation and textual rewriting. AVT does not differ substantially from other traditional forms of translation, as it can still be understood as a process of transforming a source text into a target text, although it is shaped by constraints that differ from those governing written translation (Perego, 2024).

1.2 Film Dialogue and Prefabricated Orality

The spoken film language, both in its original and translated form, constitutes an adapted, prefabricated speech, designed to simulate authentic speech. It allows only limited use of dialects, local expressions, and colloquial tones, relying on a consistent repertoire of linguistic codes and registers (Perego, 2024). Film dialogue has often been described as a form of prefabricated orality, that is a scripted discourse designed to imitate features of spontaneous speech while remaining functional to the narrative structure (Baños-Piñero & Chaume, 2009).

As observed by Pavesi (2014), film translation differs from other types of translation due to its linguistic constraints: the translator must render a simulated spoken discourse in another language while preserving the illusion of authenticity. This requires the recreation of natural-sounding dialogue that respects characterisation, stylistic variation, and the narrative function of speech. At the same time, culture-specific references, multilingual exchanges, and wordplay must be adapted, maintaining coherence with the audiovisual context.

Cinematic dialogue represents the full range of conversational interactions in a fictionalised yet plausible form. Realistic dialogue enhances audience engagement by fostering the impression of immediacy and authenticity. At the same time, it is condensed and structured to convey narrative information efficiently, clarify relationships, and advance the plot. Unlike everyday speech, which may be fragmented or implicit, cinematic dialogue is carefully designed to be comprehensible to a wide audience (Rossi, 2006).

Furthermore, cinematic language favours a relatively neutral and homogeneous register, reducing variation across geographical, social, and stylistic dimensions (Rossi, 2006). Clear enunciation, deliberate pacing, and strategic pauses ensure that the verbal message is easily understood. Elements typical of spontaneous speech, such as interjections, reformulations, incomplete sentences, and discourse markers, are generally limited. Repetition is typically employed strategically, for example, as verbal refrains that highlight character traits or emphasize key narrative moments (Pavesi, 2014).

Dialogue also functions as a tool for characterisation, contributing to the construction of social identity, personality traits, and interpersonal relationships. Linguistic markers such as dialects, accents, and idiolects can indicate geographical origin, social class, or individual traits, complementing visual cues such as appearance, clothing, and gestures (Pavesi, 2014). Research on contemporary English-language cinema, as summarised by Pavesi (2014) citing Taylor (1999), shows that film dialogue often incorporates elements of natural conversation, including slang, vocatives, swear words, and linguistic humour. Features such as overlapping speech, hesitations, interruptions, and syntactic irregularities may also appear to strengthen the illusion of spontaneity. In contrast, Italian film dialogue tends to display more normalization and simplification, with shorter, more regular utterances, and a more controlled turn-taking system (Rossi, 2006).

Dialogue operates in close synergy with visual and acoustic elements to convey meaning and emotion. Gestures, facial expressions, and body language contribute to the audience's perception of characters. Lighting, music, and ambient sounds further shape the perception of the scene. For example, a character's tone of voice may reinforce or contrast with their facial expression, while background music can amplify tension or

irony. This multimodal interaction ensures that the narrative is both engaging and clear, and any misalignment between speech, image, and sound can disrupt audience perception or cause misunderstandings. Translators must be aware that a line of dialogue interacts with visual cues and sound design, meaning that literal translations may not always preserve the intended effect. Understanding how dialogue, image, and sound combine is therefore essential for producing translations that maintain narrative integrity and audience immersion (Chaume, 2004).

Finally, while the dialogue is designed to simulate realism, it allows room for creativity, wit, and stylistic elaboration. Memorable lines, wordplay, and rhetorical effects are often crafted for aesthetic and entertainment purposes, illustrating how cinematic dialogue balances the illusion of spontaneity with the constraints and artistic goals of audiovisual storytelling (Pavesi, 2005).

1.3 Main Modes of Audiovisual Translation

As noted earlier, audiovisual translation encompasses a variety of modes, each designed to transfer the verbal component of a work while integrating it with visual and acoustic elements (Perego, 2024). In this section, the main modes of AVT are briefly presented, providing a general overview before focusing specifically on dubbing in the following subsection.

Subtitling is one of the most widely used modes of audiovisual translation and consists in the written rendering of spoken dialogue, typically displayed at the bottom of the screen, allowing viewers to follow the narrative while still having access the original audio. Subtitles can be classified as intralingual, when spoken language is rendered in written form within the same language (often for the hearing-impaired or for language learning purposes), interlingual, when dialogue is translated into another language, or bilingual, when two languages are displayed simultaneously. From a technical perspective, subtitling can be produced offline with careful post-production editing. It can also be done online in real time during live broadcasts, often using respeaking techniques supported by speech recognition software.

As noted by Szarkowska and Jankowska (2025), due to spatial and temporal constraints, subtitles must remain concise and are frequently subject to reduction

strategies such as condensation and omission to ensure readability. As a result, subtitling entails a process of reformulation rather than direct translation, where meaning is preserved while adapting to technical limitations. Moreover, the subtitler must consider not only linguistic constraints but also various technical and situational factors, such as actors' gestures and movements, visual cues, plot development, and the overall *mise-en-scène*. Since these elements are fixed and cannot be altered through translation, they remain fully accessible to the viewer. Consequently, the translator's choices must align with what is visually and contextually evident on screen, limiting the degree to which personal interpretative intervention can be applied (Perego, 2024). Furthermore, the written nature of subtitles tends to neutralise oral features, such as hesitations, repetitions, and dialectal variation, potentially affecting the representation of characterisation. Historically, subtitling developed from the intertitles of silent cinema and has evolved alongside technological innovation, particularly with the rise of television and digital streaming platforms, which have enhanced accessibility through features such as closed captions and multilingual support (Jankowska & Szarkowska, 2025).

Surtitling, derived from subtitling, is used mainly in theatre and opera. Like subtitles, it condenses spoken language and is subject to time and space constraints. Unlike subtitles, however, surtitles must follow live performances, adapting to actors' changes in real time, and are typically displayed on a panel above the stage. This can make it challenging for the audience to simultaneously follow the performers and read the text. While some see surtitles as a potential distraction, others consider them essential for understanding the performance (Mele Scorcio, 2018).

Dubbing involves replacing the original dialogue with a translation performed by actors in the target language. This mode allows viewers to focus entirely on the visual dimension without the need to read subtitles, but it also introduces specific technical constraints, such as lip-sync and precise timing (Chaume, 2014). While dubbing presents unique challenges in rendering linguistic features, speech patterns, and cultural references, a more detailed discussion of these aspects and the strategies employed to address them will be provided in the following section dedicated to this mode of audiovisual translation.

Voice-over is a technique in which a translation is spoken over the original soundtrack, allowing the audience to hear both versions simultaneously, though the original audio is typically reduced in volume to give prominence to the target-language voice. According to Matamala (2019), voice-over can be seen as an intermediate mode between dubbing and subtitling. The translated text is delivered orally, like in dubbing, but often undergoes condensation and simplification, similar to the process used in subtitling. Unlike dubbing, voice-over does not require precise lip synchronisation, which makes it technically simpler and less costly, and it is usually performed by non-professional speakers rather than trained voice actors. Narration and commentary are techniques often employed in documentaries or educational content. They allow the translator or narrator to provide additional context, explain visual elements, or guide the audience's understanding of the audiovisual material (Matamala, 2019).

Audio description (AD) involves a voice-over that conveys visual information, providing viewers who are blind or visually impaired with details about what is happening on screen. This narration allows the audience to supplement the information available through the original soundtrack with a verbal representation of the most significant visual elements. The main challenge of AD lies in addressing the diverse needs of its audience. Decisions about which visual components to describe depend on factors such as the timing of their occurrence, the degree of visual impairment, and whether the viewer was born blind or lost sight later in life. Striking the right balance is crucial to avoid descriptions that are either excessively detailed or too sparse. AD is now widely used not only to make dynamic media such as films and other audiovisual content accessible but also in static arts and museum contexts, providing greater inclusivity across a range of cultural experiences (Perego, 2024). This overview highlights the diversity of AVT methods and sets the stage for a more detailed examination of dubbing, its technical constraints, and strategies for translation and adaptation in the following section.

1.4 Linguistic Features and Constraints of Dubbing

Building on the concept of film as a multimodal form of communication, in which meaning emerges from the interaction of verbal, visual, and acoustic elements, language plays a central role in the audience's interpretation of audiovisual products. Film dialogue, while designed to appear spontaneous, is carefully crafted to fulfil specific narrative and communicative functions (Rossi, 2006). The verbal component thus becomes a key carrier of meaning, particularly regarding characterisation and plot development.

Within this framework, audiovisual translation operates in a semiotically complex environment. As highlighted by Pavesi (2014), film translation occupies a distinctive position within translation studies, since it requires reformulating, through a different verbal code, meanings that are not conveyed exclusively through language but emerge from the interplay of multiple semiotic resources. While the translator can intervene on the verbal component, other elements—such as actors' performances, gestures, settings, and sound—are fixed and must be respected. Consequently, translated dialogue must be constructed in close relation to these pre-existing features, remaining coherent with the audiovisual context in which it is embedded (Pavesi, 2014).

In this sense, as Chaume (2014) observes, audiovisual texts rely on dual communication channels, in which verbal and visual elements must be effectively integrated to produce situations that are both credible and coherent. The translator's task extends beyond transferring linguistic content to reproducing the overall meaning of the audiovisual product. This process has often been described as a form of constrained translation (Chaume, 2014), since the verbal text is shaped by a range of pre-determined non-verbal elements, as well as by the sociocultural and communicative context represented on screen.

The immutability of the visual and contextual framework imposes constraints at multiple levels, from the sociolinguistic setting of the narrative to characters' behavioural, prosodic, and kinesic features (Poyatos, 2002). These elements contribute to what Chaume (2014) defines as "iconic constraints", which significantly limit both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of translated dialogue. Consequently, the verbal

component cannot be manipulated in isolation but must always be considered in relation to the broader semiotic system of the film.

Among these constraints, synchronisation plays a particularly significant role in dubbing. It requires correspondence between the physical movements associated with speech production and the acoustic structure of the translated message (Chaume, 2014). As Pavesi (2014) builds on the synchronisation model proposed by Herbst (1994), synchronisation can be divided into two categories: articulatory synchrony, concerning lip and mouth movements, and paralinguistic or kinetic synchrony, which encompasses gestures, facial expressions, and other non-verbal cues. Articulatory synchrony is generally the most restrictive, as mismatches between lip movements and dialogue are immediately noticeable to the viewer. By contrast, paralinguistic synchrony allows for greater flexibility. Variations in intonation, rhythm, and gesture can still be perceived as natural, even when not perfectly aligned with the original performance (Pavesi, 2014).

However, not all types of synchronisation carry the same weight in contemporary dubbing practice. The degree to which these constraints are respected depends largely on culturally specific conventions of realism, which vary across contexts and influence both production strategies and audience expectations. Furthermore, audiovisual communication involves multiple layers, including verbal, paralinguistic, and kinesic dimensions (Poyatos, 2002). In dubbing, these levels require the coordinated contribution of various professionals: translators and dialogue writers handle the verbal adaptation, while dubbing directors and voice actors render paralinguistic features, such as intonation, rhythm, and voice quality. These elements are essential for conveying meaning at both a syntactic and pragmatic level, and they may also influence translation choices, particularly in cases where verbal expressions are closely linked to visual cues or wordplay (Pavesi, 2014).

For general audiences, audiovisual translation is primarily limited to dubbing and subtitling, a distinction historically dividing European countries into dubbing-oriented and subtitling-oriented markets. While modern technologies allow greater flexibility, audiences still tend to prefer the modes they are most familiar with. Smaller countries, often with limited production resources, modest budgets, and multilingual populations—such as Belgium, Switzerland, the Scandinavian countries, and the Netherlands—have traditionally favoured subtitling. Larger, monolingual countries, such as Germany,

France, Spain, and Italy, by contrast, have relied predominantly on dubbing, as the higher costs of this practice are justified only when the potential audience is sufficiently large. These differences are influenced also by cultural habits and expectations regarding realism and accessibility of audiovisual content (Perego, 2024).

Historical and cultural factors have also shaped these preferences. In several European countries, such as France, Germany, Spain, and Italy, protectionist measures and linguistic nationalism contributed to the dominance of dubbing, particularly after the First World War, as a means of safeguarding local film industries against foreign influence. In the Italian context these policies were particularly strict: under Fascist rule, foreign-language dialogue was banned and subtitling was considered unacceptable, leading to the institutionalisation of dubbing as the only authorised form of linguistic mediation. Over time, the Italian dubbing industry became highly professional, producing films that balanced linguistic adaptation with paralinguistic fidelity. Today, alongside dubbed versions, films in their original languages—usually English—are increasingly available with subtitles, reflecting technological developments and evolving audience preferences (Ranzato & Zanotti, 2018).

Dubbing is a mode of audiovisual translation in which the original dialogue is replaced by a target-language version performed by voice actors. Its aim is to recreate the original performance as faithfully as possible, considering linguistic content, timing, lip synchrony, voice quality, and characterisation. Beyond the verbal dimension, dubbing involves a complex interaction of semiotic, performative, and technical elements, requiring collaboration among translators, dialogue writers, directors, and voice actors to produce a coherent and natural final product (Chaume, 2014). Despite its aim to recreate the original performance, dubbing inevitably entails a degree of semiotic loss. No form of audiovisual translation can fully preserve the semiotic integrity of the original work, as the process requires the complete replacement of the original voices and their unique paralinguistic features. Elements such as regional accents, social variations, and specific intonations are lost in the transition, creating a reconstructed version of the original text that inevitably introduces a layer of artificiality to the viewing experience (Pavesi, 2014).

This artificiality is further reflected in the specific linguistic characteristics of the dubbed product. Several studies have identified a phenomenon known as “dubbese” (or

*doppiaggese*¹ in Italian), a term used to describe a variety of language typically associated with dubbing, often marked by artificial formality and a levelling of sociolinguistic variation, whereby different social and regional voices tend to converge into a uniform standard. This results in a relatively homogeneous language characterised by recurring lexical patterns, formulaic expressions, and a certain degree of repetitive phraseology. While "dubbese" is often perceived negatively, it can also be understood as a functional feature of translated dialogue. It reflects a tendency to rely on recognizable and conventional structures, rather than reproducing the unpredictability of authentic conversational speech.

The quality of a dubbed product can be evaluated in terms of "transparency", or its ability to appear natural and coherent within the target culture (Pavesi, 2014). This mode involves several specific challenges: achieving synchronisation with lip movements, preserving stylistic variation and register, and adapting culture-bound references. Technical constraints, such as timing and line duration, further limit the range of possible solutions, requiring professional expertise to maintain narrative coherence and character integrity. In some cases, constraints may even necessitate deviations from the source text to produce solutions that are functionally equivalent at a higher textual level (Perego, 2024).

Within these constraints, adaptation highlights the relative freedom of dialogue writers in selecting solutions appropriate for the target language while considering audience needs and expectations. This often results in neutralisation, whereby cultural references and linguistic variation present in the source text are levelled or simplified. Culture-specific elements may be rendered through general terms, descriptive expressions, or omitted altogether to preserve immediacy and comprehensibility. Such losses can be compensated through explicitation strategies, ensuring essential information is transmitted (Baker, 2018) (Perego, 2024).

Finally, audiovisual translation is characterised by a constant tension between domestication and foreignisation (Venuti, 2008). While adaptation tends to bring the text closer to the target culture, the visual dimension continuously exposes the viewer to elements of cultural otherness. This results in a hybrid experience, in which familiar

¹Doppiaggese: https://www.treccani.it/magazine/lingua_italiana/speciali/doppiaggio/Rossi.html, (last access: March 24th, 2026).

and unfamiliar elements coexist, both in the translated text and in the audience's perception (Perego, 2024). This delicate balance between technical precision and narrative fluidity provides the necessary context for the structured analytical framework used to examine the sophisticated dialogue of a series like *Mindhunter*.

CHAPTER 2 – MINDHUNTER: OVERVIEW AND ITALIAN DUBBING

2.1 Multidimensional Approach and Analytical Categories for Dubbing

Audiovisual translation can be described as a multimodal process in which verbal, visual, and acoustic elements interact to construct meaning and characterisation (Chaume, 2014; Pavesi, 2014). These semiotic resources converge in dubbing to shape narrative coherence, character portrayal, and audience perception. On this basis, the present section introduces the analytical model adopted in this study, designed to account for the interplay of linguistic, paralinguistic, and visual factors in the Italian dubbing of *Mindhunter*.

The framework is structured around three interrelated dimensions. The linguistic dimension concerns the translation and adaptation of the script, the management of speech registers, and the rendering of culture-specific references. In a dialogue-driven series like *Mindhunter*, this dimension is essential for maintaining both narrative flow and consistent characterisation. For instance, the precise terminology used by FBI agents during interviews must be conveyed accurately while maintaining natural spoken Italian. The paralinguistic (or prosodic) and acoustic dimension includes vocal performance elements such as intonation, tone, rhythm, speech rate, pauses, and emotional expression, as well as voice quality and its integration with the original soundtrack and ambient soundscape. These features significantly contribute to the construction of meaning, as even subtle variations in vocal intensity or timing can influence the perception of psychological tension and interpersonal dynamics between characters. The visual and kinetic (video) dimension refers to the physical and synchronisation constraints imposed by the audiovisual medium. These include lip synchronisation (articulatory synchrony), isochrony (timing and duration of utterances), and alignment between speech, gestures, and on-screen actions. Non-verbal elements such as sighs, hesitations, facial expressions, and body movements must be coordinated with the

dubbed dialogue to preserve credibility and coherence within the audiovisual frame (Chaume, 2014).

The interaction of these dimensions is analysed through a set of analytical categories that distinguish between textual and non-textual parameters. Textual parameters refer to linguistic aspects such as lexical selection, syntactic organisation, register, and overall adherence to the source-text meaning, with attention to both accuracy and naturalness of spoken discourse. Non-textual parameters, by contrast, include performative and technical aspects such as lip synchronisation, prosodic alignment, emotional expressivity, and coherence between voice and character embodiment (Perego, 2024).

A key theoretical reference for this study is the multimodal model of dubbing developed by Bosseaux (2015), which conceptualises audiovisual translation as the result of the interaction between linguistic, visual, and aural elements. Rather than focusing exclusively on textual fidelity, this perspective places particular emphasis on characterisation and performance, examining how vocal delivery, sound, and visual context contribute to the construction of meaning in dubbed products. In this sense, dubbing is understood as a process of deconstruction and reconstruction, in which characters are reshaped through the interplay of translated dialogue, voice acting, and audiovisual alignment (Bosseaux, 2015).

Chaume (2014) complements this perspective by identifying the technical and semiotic constraints governing dubbing, including lip synchronisation, isochrony, and alignment between speech and visual action. The integration of these constraints allows the analysis to account for both performative and practical limitations influencing translation choices. This approach demonstrates how linguistic adaptation, vocal performance, and visual synchronisation collectively shape character coherence and audience reception. Within this framework, the linguistic and paralinguistic dimensions are particularly relevant, as they directly shape characterisation and audience perception. The following section therefore focuses on register, tone, and pragmatic adaptation in dubbing.

2.2 Register, Tone, and Pragmatic Adaptation

According to Chaume (2014), register, tone, and pragmatic adaptation play a central role in dubbing, as they contribute to the construction of character identity and narrative meaning. These features interact with both linguistic and paralinguistic dimensions, shaping audience perception beyond purely lexical correspondence. While "dubbese" is often associated with neutralisation and formulaic patterns, careful attention to register and tone ensures that the socio-pragmatic profile of each character is preserved (Chaume, 2014).

In this respect, the distinction between technical and colloquial registers is crucial in audiovisual translation, as it directly influences both situational meaning and the construction of character identity. Juliane House's (2015) model describes register through three interrelated dimensions: field, referring to the type of activity and thematic content; tenor, encompassing the relationships between participants; and mode, which considers the communication channel and the degree of planning in the discourse (House, 2015). Although developed for general language use, these principles guide dubbing strategies by highlighting how register affects character perception.

Technical register typically occurs within specialised contexts, marked by dense terminology, referential precision, nominalisations, and complex syntactic structures. On the dimension of tenor, it signals institutional or hierarchical relationships, constructing an impression of expertise and authority (Baker, 2018). Colloquial register, by contrast, is associated with informal interpersonal contexts, featuring shorter sentences, frequent discourse markers, ellipses, repetitions, and other characteristics of spontaneous speech. It reduces social distance and conveys familiarity or proximity, shaping the way audiences perceive the dynamics between characters (Pavesi, 2014).

Rendering register effectively in dubbing requires balancing equivalence and performative constraints. Technical terms must remain precise while sounding natural in spoken form, avoiding overly literal or written constructions that would disrupt the actor's delivery (Olohan, 2009). Colloquial expressions must preserve spontaneity and fluidity without introducing markers absent in the original, which could unintentionally alter a character's identity (Chaume, 2014). From a pragmatic perspective, register carries social values and attitudes: technical language signals authority and professionalism, while informal language can convey irony, solidarity, or aggression.

Maintaining these connotations is essential to achieving a functionally equivalent communicative effect for the target audience (House, 2015).

Prosodic and paralinguistic features such as voice quality, pitch variation, speech rate, and temporal modulation are as crucial as lexical and syntactic choices in shaping character portrayal and narrative effect (Chaume, 2014). Bosseaux (2015) highlights the performative potential of the voice, showing how vocal delivery interacts with visual and narrative elements to communicate affective and social meaning, reinforcing plausibility in dubbed performances. Empirical research demonstrates that dubbed dialogue often follows prefabricated tonal patterns, distinct from spontaneous speech, influencing perceived orality and character identity (Sánchez-Mompeán, 2020).

These tonal structures, together with prosodic timing, pitch modulation, and voice quality, interact with lexical and syntactic choices to convey narrative tension, social roles, and psychological states. In *Mindhunter*, the killers' calm, measured delivery contrasts with the agents' precise technical dialogue, illustrating how prosodic cues and paralinguistic features reinforce narrative meaning, suspense, and audience perception.

The interplay of register, tone, and paralinguistic cues demonstrates that textual parameters (lexical and syntactic choices) and non-textual parameters (prosodic, paralinguistic, and temporal features) must be carefully balanced. Attending to both levels allows translators to preserve the multilayered communicative effect of the original performance, ensuring coherence across verbal, vocal, and visual channels (Bosseaux, 2018; Chaume, 2014; Sánchez-Mompeán, 2020).

2.3 Overview of the First Season

The first season of *Mindhunter*² follows the early development of the FBI's Behavioural Science Unit during the late 1970s, focusing on the pioneering efforts to define and understand the phenomenon of serial killing (Douglas & Olshaker, 1995). The narrative alternates between procedural investigations and in-depth interviews with notorious criminals, while it also explores the personal and professional challenges faced by the protagonists. The series emphasises the analytical process behind criminal profiling,

² IMDB, *Mindhunter*, <https://www.imdb.com/it/title/tt5290382/>, (last access: March 8th, 2026).

rather than merely recounting individual crimes, offering a nuanced exploration of psychological patterns, motivations, and behavioural traits.

The main storyline revolves around Holden Ford and Bill Tench, whose collaboration structures much of the narrative progression. Holden Ford is portrayed as a young and ambitious agent involved in the development of new investigative approaches. The series places emphasis on his role in engaging with interviews and theoretical discussions that contribute to the formation of early profiling models. Bill Tench represents a more experienced and procedurally oriented perspective, associated with established investigative practices within the Bureau. The interaction between these two perspectives provides a structural contrast that supports the development of the narrative.

Introduced midway through the season is Wendy Carr, a psychologist and researcher, who contributes to the development of theoretical frameworks and supports the institutionalisation of profiling practices within the FBI. Her role is primarily linked to the academic and methodological consolidation of profiling practices, particularly through research and analytical work supporting the unit's objectives. Her presence also introduces a significant female perspective within a predominantly male environment, reflecting both historical realities of the FBI and narrative considerations regarding character diversity and relational dynamics.

Throughout the season, the series juxtaposes the personal lives of the investigators with their professional interactions. This approach provides insight into their motivations, fears, and ethical considerations. For instance, Holden's curiosity and drive occasionally lead to tension with Tench, whose pragmatism and focus on established procedures act as a stabilizing force. Wendy often mediates between these two approaches, reinforcing her role as a figure of balance and scientific authority. The series also carefully reconstructs interviews with serial killers such as Edmund Kemper and Jerry Brudos, emphasizing conversational nuance, psychological probing, and the subtle management of tension³— all of which provide fertile ground for studying linguistic registers and their translation in the Italian dubbing (Pavesi, 2014). By offering this detailed view of the first season's plot and character dynamics, the analysis can

³ Mondoserie, *Mindhunter*, <https://www.mondoserie.it/Mindhunter/>, (last access: March 8th, 2026).

contextualize the subsequent exploration of dialogue, register modulation, and pragmatic adaptation, establishing a foundation for understanding how these elements contribute to the construction of character identity and narrative tension.

2.4 Italian Dubbing of *Mindhunter*

The Italian dubbing of *Mindhunter* constitutes the practical realisation of audiovisual translation within a structured, collaborative workflow. Rather than addressing theoretical categories in abstract terms, this section focuses on how translation strategies take shape within production practices, where linguistic choices, timing constraints, and performance demands continuously interact (Chaume, 2014; Pavesi, 2014).

In the Italian dubbing industry, work unfolds across interconnected stages, typically involving translation, dialogue adaptation, dubbing direction, and voice performance. The initial translation provides a first rendering of the source dialogue, which is subsequently reshaped by the adaptor to meet synchronisation constraints and conform to the norms of spoken Italian. At a later stage, the dubbing director coordinates interpretative choices and timing, while dubbing actors complete the process through vocal performance. In this case, the Italian version was produced by PUMAS due under the direction of Francesco Venditti and Luigi Morville, with dialogue adaptation by Silvia Bossi, Edoardo Margheriti, Vera De Mori, and Fiamma Izzo⁴.

In this context, adaptation operates primarily at the lexical and pragmatic level. Technical vocabulary related to criminal profiling and psychological analysis is generally preserved in meaning but often reworked to sound natural in spoken Italian. Rather than mechanically reproducing source structures, the translation prioritises communicative function, ensuring that specialised content remains clear without compromising fluency. This approach aligns with pragmatic equivalence as described by House (2015), where meaning is evaluated in terms of its effect within the target context rather than through formal correspondence.

⁴ Doppiaggio *Mindhunter*, <https://www.antoniogenna.net/doppiaggio/telefilm/mindhunter.htm>, (last access: April 7th, 2026).

Rhythm and timing are central to the shaping of dubbed dialogue. Utterances are frequently adjusted not only for linguistic reasons, but also to comply with synchronisation constraints such as lip movement and duration. This often entails restructuring sentences or redistributing pauses. In a series where silence and hesitation contribute to tension and psychological depth, these temporal features become particularly significant. As Chaume (2014) points out, synchronisation constraints can influence the internal organisation of dialogue, affecting both form and delivery.

Register variation constitutes another key dimension of the Italian adaptation. Rather than functioning as fixed character traits, speech styles emerge through specific linguistic choices and delivery patterns. Holden Ford's dialogue tends to retain a technical and analytical orientation, reflected in structured syntax and precise terminology, even when slight simplification is introduced for oral naturalness. Bill Tench's speech, by contrast, is rendered in a more direct and pragmatic manner, with shorter turns and reduced syntactic complexity, contributing to a sense of immediacy and procedural clarity. The contrast between these registers is not rigidly categorised but becomes perceptible through rhythm and pausing, which signal shifts in interactional stance and conversational balance. Wendy Carr's speech occupies an intermediate position, combining technical accuracy with pragmatic mitigation. In Italian, her dialogue maintains a controlled register while incorporating natural phrasing that avoids excessive formalisation. Subtle variations in tone and pacing allow her communicative function to emerge through performance, in line with Bosseaux's (2015) view of voice as a key component of audiovisual character construction.

The Italian dubbing of *Mindhunter* illustrates how translation operates not as a linear transfer, but as a layered negotiation among linguistic, temporal, and performative constraints. Meaning is reconstructed through the interplay of lexical choices, rhythm, and vocal delivery, with the aim of preserving the communicative effect of the original dialogue within the target language system (Chaume, 2014; Pavesi, 2014). This perspective provides the basis for the following chapter, which focuses on the analysis of selected scenes from the first season. Chapter 3 examines how these strategies operate across different character interactions, highlighting how register, rhythm, and pragmatic choices contribute to the construction of identity and narrative tension in concrete conversational contexts.

CHAPTER 3 – ANALYSIS

OF THE ITALIAN DUBBING OF *MINDHUNTER*

This chapter presents the qualitative analysis of selected scenes from the first season of *Mindhunter*. The selection of the corpus was guided by specific analytical and structural needs of the study, with particular attention to scenes in which the dubbed dialogue showed translational complexity, pragmatic tension, or features relevant to the analysis of Italian dubbing. Priority was given to excerpts where conversational dynamics, register variation, or institutional discourse were especially significant for the purposes of this research.

The corpus was also organised to allow a comparative analysis of the three main investigative characters—Holden Ford, Bill Tench, and Wendy Carr—each of whom presents distinct discursive and interactional profiles. The serial killers are only briefly mentioned and not analysed in detail, as their linguistic construction falls outside the focus of the study, which is centred on professional communication and investigative discourse.

From a methodological point of view, the English dialogues were reconstructed using available online transcripts⁵, while the Italian dubbed version was initially obtained through downloadable subtitle files accessed via a subtitle platform⁶. These files did not include speaker attribution and required further processing to be usable for analysis. The relevant scenes were first identified through timestamp selection and then extracted and organised into a parallel structure alongside the English transcripts. The two versions were subsequently aligned manually, with particular attention to synchronising utterances and ensuring correspondence between spoken dialogue and subtitle segments. Speaker identification and minor adjustments to the segmentation were added during repeated viewing of the episodes, in order to improve accuracy and

⁵ Scripts *Mindhunter*, <https://transcripts.foreverdreaming.org/viewforum.php?f=1367>, (last access: June 7th, 2026).

⁶ Subtitles *Mindhunter*, <https://my-subs.co/showlistsubtitles-2154-mindhunter>, (last access: June 7th, 2026).

consistency across the dataset. This resulted in a carefully constructed bilingual corpus suitable for close comparative analysis of dubbing strategies.

3.1 Holden Ford: Technical Discourse and Interaction

This section examines Holden Ford's speech as a central discursive mechanism within *Mindhunter*, focusing on the construction of a technical and analytical register that underpins investigative practice throughout the series. Rather than treating Holden's language as a purely character-bound feature, it is approached as a structured discourse that organises institutional communication and shapes the interpretation of criminal material. Across different communicative settings, this discursive orientation functions as a stabilising framework through which information is classified, interpreted, and operationalised within the investigative context.

Holden Ford's speech is consistently marked by a neutral and analytically detached stance, through which he frames interaction as a process of structured interpretation rather than emotional engagement. His technical and analytical register operates as a baseline for investigative discourse within the series. It is characterised by specialised terminology, controlled syntactic patterns, and a tendency towards abstract and classificatory formulations. These features contribute to a mode of expression in which behaviour is systematically reframed in psychological and analytical terms, shifting language from mere reporting to a form of cognitive organisation of experience.

In interview contexts, Holden's questions are carefully constructed to regulate informational flow and maintain epistemic control over the interactional rhythm. They are typically measured and precise, as in "*Can you describe what you felt in that moment, and why it compelled you to act?*". In the Italian dubbed version, these utterances are largely preserved in their structural organisation, with minor adjustments that enhance naturalness in spoken Italian without weakening their analytical orientation.

This register plays a crucial role in shaping interactional asymmetries. Technical and psychological terminology functions as a marker of epistemic authority, positioning Holden as the primary agent of interpretation and categorisation. At the same time, his discourse occasionally shifts into more informal or humorous phrasing, particularly in exchanges with colleagues. These shifts do not constitute a separate register, but rather

functional modulations within the same epistemic and interactional framework. For instance, in a conversation with Tench, he remarks: *"You know, Bill, I think Kemper might enjoy my company more than his own reflection."* In the dubbed version, such lines are rendered in a way that preserves their pragmatic function, maintaining the balance between humour, characterisation, and narrative coherence.

From an audiovisual translation perspective, one of the main challenges lies in preserving the density and analytical precision of this register within the constraints of dubbing, particularly in terms of rhythm, synchronisation, and prosodic organisation. This often requires local syntactic adjustments that do not significantly affect the conceptual structure of the discourse but may result in pragmatic compression and reduced incremental emphasis. The Italian version succeeds in maintaining the analytical orientation of Holden's speech, even when naturalisation strategies slightly modify its surface form. This section therefore establishes Holden's discourse as a structured interpretative framework rather than a purely character-bound mode of speech, whose relevance lies in its function as a cognitive and institutional system of interpretation.

3.1.1 Procedural Control in Crisis Discourse

The opening hostage negotiation in Episode 1 introduces Holden Ford's reliance on a procedural and technical register that is immediately tested in real-time interaction. The exchange unfolds through a gradual build-up in procedural intensity, with short informational turns establishing a controlled interactional rhythm. Holden adopts a neutral, inquisitive stance, approaching the negotiation with analytical curiosity that distances his discourse from the emotional volatility of the situation. From his initial identification, *"Agent Ford, FBI. Special Agent Holden Ford"*, he positions himself within an institutional framework before shifting into structured information gathering, *"Five people still in there?"*. In the Italian dubbing, this opening remains intact but appears more compressed, *"Agente Ford, FBI. Agente speciale Holden Ford"* and *"Cinque ostaggi?"*, where the reduction from an interrogative structure to an elliptical nominal form increases syntactic compression and accelerates the transition into action.

As the situation unfolds, Holden approaches the crisis through procedural containment. He manages external variables, *"Keep the snipers. Back out the perimeter."*

Get rid of those reporters” and reframes the behaviour of Miller, the hostage-taker, through a quasi-diagnostic lens, *“He’s clearly having an episode. We need to keep him calm and wear him down”*. This produces a form of conversational asymmetry, where Miller’s emotional immediacy is reprocessed through institutional categorisation. The Italian version tightens this framing into a more definitive assessment, *“È chiaramente fuori di senno. Va tenuto calmo e va fatto crollare”*, removing hedging and compressing the interactional rhythm into a more linear progression.

What becomes more visible at the level of interaction is Holden’s attempt to maintain control through conditional and mediated responses. When Miller repeatedly demands his wife, Holden responds through negotiation logic, *“If I can get them to back off...”*, introducing a conditional projection that remains open-ended in the original version. In Italian, *“Se li faccio allontanare da qui...”*, the structure becomes more linear and less adaptive, reducing temporal openness and producing a smoother but less reactive communicative flow. Even empathy markers are slightly reframed. *“I understand your frustration”* becomes *“comprendo la tua frustrazione”*, which, while semantically equivalent, introduces greater pragmatic formality and reduces conversational immediacy, reinforcing Holden’s cognitively mediated stance.

A crucial moment of abstraction appears when Holden reformulates Miller’s demand into general psychological terms: *“Not being able to communicate with a trusted loved one.”* In English, this already marks a shift from situational urgency toward abstraction; in Italian, *“Non essere in grado di comunicare con la persona che si ama”*, the formulation becomes further generalised, increasing epistemic abstraction and widening the gap between participant experience and investigative framing.

The aftermath, structured through the intervention of Shepard, Holden’s superior officer, repositions the event within institutional evaluation. Shepard assesses success through procedural outcomes, *“You did everything by the book”*, prioritising absence of casualties as the primary metric of effectiveness. Holden’s response, *“If I did everything by the book, it begs the question...”*, introduces tension between procedural adequacy and communicative failure. With *“mi sorge una domanda”*, this challenge is mitigated, softening the confrontation and reframing it as reflective rather than oppositional. Across the sequence, the Italian dubbing preserves the structure of Holden’s technical register but tends to smooth its pragmatic friction, reducing

interactional unpredictability and stabilising conversational flow, whereas in the original version procedural control is constantly negotiated against situational pressure.

3.1.2 Pedagogical Authority in Institutional Discourse

In the Quantico training sequences, Holden Ford's technical register is not only used but performed as a form of institutional knowledge. Holden maintains a consistently neutral and analytically detached stance, presenting negotiation not as emotional engagement but as a controlled cognitive process. In his classroom lectures, negotiation is framed as a structured communicative process centred on de-escalation and controlled interaction. This is evident in his rhythmic sequencing of instructions, *"We must establish communication. Non-threatening communication. Ascertain demands, concede nothing, reject nothing"*, where prosodic repetition functions as a way of stabilising procedural logic in real time. In Italian, the structure is preserved but the rhythm becomes more compact, *"Dobbiamo stabilire una comunicazione. Una comunicazione non-minacciosa. Verificate le richieste. Non concedete, non rifiutate"*, reducing the incremental emphasis and compressing the instructional rhythm.

A similar shift appears in his emphasis on listening as a technique rather than a passive act, *"just listen. Listen to what he has to say"*. *"Ascoltate e basta"* becomes a more fixed instruction, losing some of its processual and sequential quality. What is originally presented as an active interpretive stance becomes a more static directive.

This difference becomes clearer when Holden acknowledges uncertainty as part of the method, *"that's because you are buying time"*. This reflects an awareness of negotiation as temporally extended and strategically ambiguous. In Italian, the idea is more direct and less reflective, *"state solo prendendo tempo"*, which reduces the sense that uncertainty is an inherent component of the process.

The role-playing exercise further highlights this pedagogical framing. Holden asks students to construct possible openings and outcomes, *"Think of an opening salvo, then think where it could lead"*, encouraging exploratory thinking. In Italian, *"Pensate alla vostra prima mossa e a dove potrebbe condurvi"*, the content remains stable, but the phrasing feels more bounded, slightly reducing the openness implied in the English version.

Shepard's intervention reintroduces institutional framing from above, reinforcing an asymmetry between pedagogical authority and evaluative supervision. His scepticism, *"it seems very theatrical to me"* is sharper in English, where the critique carries stronger evaluative force. With *"mi sembrano troppo teatrali"*, the judgment becomes less pointed, softening the institutional resistance to Holden's method. The Italian dubbing maintains the semantic core of the training sequences but tends to regularise their pragmatic rhythm, resulting in a more stabilised version of Holden's register in which methodological uncertainty is less visible and procedural clarity is more pronounced.

3.1.3 Forensic Reasoning in Evidential Discourse

In the interaction with a local detective, Holden's technical register is exposed to a communicative environment grounded in material evidence and shaped by an explicit corporeal and forensic linguistic style. This produces a strong epistemic asymmetry between institutional interpretation and evidential immediacy. The crime scene description is deliberately unfiltered in English, *"broomstick perforated her rectum"*, *"made the boy watch"*, generating a discourse that is bodily explicit and resistant to abstraction. In the Italian dubbing, this brutality is preserved, *"perforato il retto"*, but partially re-framed through a more clinical register, which maintains descriptive precision while slightly reducing the visceral intensity of the original formulation.

Within this context, Holden's discourse moves away from description and toward inferential abstraction. While the detective remains anchored in forensic materiality, he consistently reinterprets evidence through hypothesis formation, *"It must have been premeditated"*, *"He had gloves, he cleaned up after himself"*. In Italian, this becomes more assertive, *"Dev'essere stato premeditato con cura"*, reflecting a reduction of inferential hedging and a shift from exploratory reasoning toward a more conclusive epistemic stance. This shift becomes more visible when Holden engages in symbolic interpretation of material elements *"The broom may mean something"*. In English, the formulation retains epistemic openness and interpretive risk; in Italian, *"la scopa potrebbe avere un significato"*, uncertainty is partially stabilised, reducing the degree of interpretive volatility that characterises Holden's original inferential move.

The breakdown of epistemic alignment becomes explicit when Holden acknowledges the limits of interpretive access, *“we don’t understand it”*. This functions as a moment of exposure and methodological limitation; the Italian line, *“non sappiamo niente in più di lei”*, is more categorical, transforming an ongoing interpretive process into a more finalised statement of ignorance. The interaction escalates into overt rejection when Holden’s epistemic positioning is challenged, *“How fucking dare you?”/ “Come cazzo ti permetti?”*. The Italian preserves the aggressive force but concentrates it into a more punctuated moment of rupture, rather than sustaining the continuous escalation of the English original. Across the sequence, the Italian dubbing preserves the semantic structure of the dialogue but reorganises its pragmatic texture. Explicit language is not removed but redistributed. Instead of forming a continuous layer of crude expressivity, it emerges in sharper points of escalation. This produces a different perception of Holden’s epistemic positioning, less immersed in linguistic brutality and more distanced from it through a smoother syntactic and interpretive framework, resulting in a reduction of interactional friction.

3.1.4 Adaptive Negotiation in Interview Discourse

Across the interviews with serial killers Ed Kemper, Jerry Brudos, and Richard Speck, Holden’s investigative discourse does not evolve through discrete case studies but through a progressive reconfiguration of what counts as stable interactional control. What begins as a controlled procedural exchange gradually becomes a space where classification, register, and conversational alignment are renegotiated under pragmatic pressure, while audiovisual translation intermittently reshapes the perceived intensity of these shifts.

The encounters with Ed Kemper establish the initial point of this continuum, where Holden’s discourse begins to operate under conditions of controlled interactional asymmetry. From the outset, he adopts a neutral procedural register grounded in the aims of the Behavioral Science Unit, *“I’m an instructor working out of the Behavioral Science Unit at Quantico...”/ “Sono un istruttore dell’Unità di scienze comportamentali a Quantico...”*, yet this stance is almost immediately destabilised by Kemper’s unusually calm and socially fluent conversational style. Kemper’s speech is striking for its flatness.

Even when addressing violence or self-description, his delivery remains measured, continuous, and affectively unmarked. Statements such as *"It's a beautiful drive, but it's long"* / *"È un bel viaggio, ma è lungo"* or *"I'm just an extremely accomplished murderer"* are not intensified by prosody, but rather by its absence. The effect is that brutality emerges through linguistic normality rather than emotional emphasis. In the Italian dubbing, this effect is partially reoriented. His speech becomes more prosodically marked, with increased variation in intonation and emphasis, particularly in self-reflexive passages concerning his identity or *"vocation"*. The result is a less neutral and more interpretively guided performance, in which emotional framing is more explicitly signalled than in the original.

Within this setting, Holden's responses begin to shift at the level of turn design rather than explicit strategy. While still maintaining institutional orientation in topic selection, he increasingly adopts a conversational rhythm, visible in reactive turns. For instance, his reaction to Kemper's familiarity with police culture, *"Really? What kind of insights?"* / *"Davvero? Che tipo di intuizioni?"* or his casual engagement with Kemper's media references, *"Huge fan. I got a lot of my insights right there"* / *"Ho preso molte delle mie intuizioni da lì"*, signals a shift away from strictly interrogative control towards conversational participation. Holden increasingly responds with short, reactive turns rather than structured prompts, *"Right, sure"* / *"Sì, certo"*, allowing the interaction to resemble informal dialogue rather than institutional questioning. This is particularly visible when Kemper dominates the explanatory space with long narrative sequences, while Holden primarily sustains the flow rather than directing it.

A key aspect of this phase is Kemper's lexical bluntness. His references to violence and corporeality, *"butchering people is hard work"* / *"massacrare la gente è un lavoro duro"*, or *"the entire fucked-upness of it"* / *"tutta la perversione della cosa"*, introduce a register grounded in materiality and labour-like normalisation. Violence is not euphemised but embedded in everyday semantic categories. Holden does not resist this register. Instead, he begins to accommodate it within his own investigative language. The term *"sequence killers,"* initially introduced by Holden as an attempt to structure violent behaviour through temporal ordering, *"one right after another, at regular intervals"* / *"una vittima dopo l'altra, a intervalli regolari"*, is not rejected by Kemper but taken up and recontextualised within his speculative reasoning about the existence of

similar offenders. The interaction thus stabilises the category not through institutional imposition, but through conversational circulation. This circulation is made possible by Kemper's readiness to engage with classification itself, which is evident when he moves fluidly between self-description, "*an extremely accomplished murderer*"/ "*un omicida estremamente abile*", and meta-commentary on typologies of killing. Holden's classificatory vocabulary is therefore not simply applied to Kemper but gradually reshaped through Kemper's own participation in its conceptual space.

These initial interviews do not produce an immediate transformation of Holden's investigative stance. They introduce a first, barely perceptible shift in which procedural discourse begins to circulate within a more fluid interactional space, where classification, register, and conversational alignment start to overlap. It is precisely this partial relaxation of interactional boundaries that prepares the ground for a subsequent encounter in which Holden's procedural stability is tested in a different way, not through epistemic absorption, but through resistance to conversational control.

That same lexical openness, however, does not reappear in the encounter with Brudos. What shifts here is not vocabulary but stability: Brudos attempts to reshape the interaction through informal requests and pragmatic diversion, "*Can I get something to drink?*"/ "*Posso avere da bere*"; "*cigarettes and a pizza*"/ "*sigarette e una pizza*", which momentarily shift the interaction toward a more colloquial register. These requests, however, are not taken up and remain locally contained, and Brudos' turns tend to remain minimal, limiting the development of extended narrative sequences. Unlike Kemper, he does not establish a stable conversational symmetry. The interaction remains structurally controlled by Holden's procedural frame. Holden reasserts institutional boundaries through a bureaucratic register, "*we are conducting interviews with people who've been convicted of violent crimes*"/ "*intervistiamo persone condannate per crimini violenti*", maintaining linear interrogative progression even when Brudos oscillates between denial and partial admission regarding his first victim. Brudos introduces instability at the level of narrative consistency, yet Holden does not shift his analytical posture or adopt the killer's lexical or pragmatic framing. The interaction remains asymmetrical, with institutional language holding its structure even when confronted with evasive or contradictory testimony.

Here, the Italian dubbing contributes to a slight regularisation of interactional tension: interruptions and shifts in tone are marginally smoothed, producing a more linear syntactic flow. At the same time, Holden's consistent use of formal address *Lei* maintains a clear institutional distance, especially in contrast with Tench's more informal *tu*, reinforcing internal FBI hierarchy at the level of sociolinguistic choice. What emerges from this phase is not transformation but containment. The instability introduced in the previous encounter is held in suspension rather than developed further.

This containment becomes visible as a limit in the subsequent interaction with Richard Speck. The encounter represents the most extreme form of pragmatic escalation, where disruption is driven by Speck's aggressive verbal style and the erosion of Holden's procedural containment. While Holden initially maintains a neutral institutional register, "*We're conducting interviews with people who've been convicted of violent crimes*" / "*Stiamo intervistando persone condannate per crimini violenti*", this frame is immediately rejected through explicit lexical aggression and refusal of institutional legitimacy, "*I ain't talking to the motherfucking FBI!*" / "*Non ci parlo con quelle merde dell'FBI*". Here instability becomes interactional and overt. Holden's register itself shifts when his questioning becomes evaluative and morally charged, "*What gave you the right to take eight ripe cunts out of the world?*" / "*Chi ti ha dato il diritto di togliere otto belle fighe dal mondo?*", marking a departure from analytical containment. Procedural language gives way to explicit ethical positioning. This is reinforced by increasingly provocative questioning, "*How the hell did you even fuck eight women the same night?*", further distancing Holden from his initial epistemic stance. Speck's discourse, however, introduces a paradoxical form of structure within violence. His account of the crimes remains sequential and temporally ordered, "*I put one in the bedroom, one in the closet*", suggesting that breakdown does not occur at the level of narrative form, but at the level of its normalisation.

In translation, lexical aggression is largely preserved, while the absence of Speck's original Southern accent, an important marker of sociolectal identity, is not reproduced in Italian, resulting in a partial flattening of social indexing. What remains is a more uniform surface of aggression, where intensity is carried primarily through vulgar lexis and turn disruption rather than prosodic variation. At this stage, Holden's discourse is no longer simply adapting to interactional pressure, but it is being reshaped by it.

Procedural neutrality becomes increasingly difficult to sustain under high-intensity interaction.

Across the interview corpus, Holden Ford emerges less as a stable institutional voice than as a position continuously reconfigured by interaction. His investigative role is not pre-formed but progressively assembled through exposure to conversational pressure. What begins as procedural containment gradually becomes a more adaptive and situational form of analysis, where the boundaries between observation and participation are no longer entirely stable. Within this trajectory, audiovisual translation does not alter the direction of change. It contributes to how it is perceived: through modulation of register, prosody, and sociolinguistic markers, it redistributes the intensity of interaction rather than simply transmitting it.

3.2 Bill Tench: Regulatory Discourse and Interactional Control

Bill Tench's discourse is characterised by the regulation of communicative risk. Across investigative encounters, institutional negotiations, and interpersonal exchanges, his linguistic behaviour works to contain speculative escalation and redirect interaction towards operationally manageable outcomes. Rather than expanding interpretive possibilities, Tench recurrently narrows epistemic scope through procedural reframing, mitigation, and contextual grounding. His discourse therefore functions as a stabilising and corrective force, particularly when communicative trajectories exceed institutional or interpersonal limits.

This regulatory role is especially visible in epistemic positioning. In contrast to Holden Ford's tendency towards speculative inference and interpretive acceleration, Tench foregrounds uncertainty, feasibility, and contextual validity, preventing hypotheses from stabilising prematurely into authoritative knowledge. At the same time, Tench's discourse is shaped by a persistent tension between professional regulation and interpersonal exposure. Unlike institutional discourse grounded in abstraction and detachment, his communicative behaviour reflects sustained proximity to violence, bureaucratic negotiation, and investigative repetition.

This pressure emerges less through explicit emotional expression than through interactional compression, as reduced elaboration, restrained evaluation, directive

simplification, and conversational economy progressively transform speech into an instrument of containment. Tench's communicative role is further defined by his ability to adapt across heterogeneous interactional contexts. His discourse varies according to institutional hierarchy, investigative setting, and interlocutor configuration, moving across local police departments, FBI structures, interview situations, and intra-team negotiation while maintaining a consistent regulatory function. The following sections examine how these functions emerge across different interactional configurations, with particular attention to interrogative management, epistemic containment, ethical positioning, and their transformation in the Italian dubbed version.

3.2.1 Pragmatic Framing in Institutional Interaction

Bill Tench's discourse in English is characterised by pragmatic flexibility. Institutional authority, colloquial interaction, and ironic detachment coexist in a communicative style that is constantly reconfigured by context and interlocutor. His speech relies on local adjustments of register and interactional alignment, often requiring interlocutors to infer relational meaning pragmatically.

One relevant aspect concerns interpersonal distance. In English, Tench's interaction with Holden is structured through the neutral pronoun "you", allowing rapid movement between professional hierarchy and informal camaraderie. This indeterminacy enables him to alternate between evaluative commentary, irony, and conversational alignment without stabilising a fixed relational frame. In the Italian dubbing of the opening interaction, the systematic use of the formal "Lei" introduces a persistent layer of institutional distance. This grammatical choice contrasts with Tench's colloquial and frequently irreverent tone and establishes a divergence between grammatical formality and pragmatic informality that reduces relational mobility.

A comparable dynamic is also visible in Tench's evaluative and idiomatic language. His description of the institutional environment as "*the country club*" functions as an ironic metaphor associated with elitism, exclusivity, and internal rigidity. The conversational hedge "*you know*" further softens the utterance and invites shared recognition rather than explicit explanation. In the Italian adaptation, the metaphor is

retained, but the surrounding discourse becomes more explicit, limiting inferential openness and socio-pragmatic density.

The same tendency is observable in Tench's use of the label "*blue flamer*". In English, the expression functions as informal institutional slang, classifying Holden through a shared socio-professional category. Its compact morphological structure reinforces this classificatory force, presenting Holden as a recognisable behavioural type within an internal taxonomy of the group. In Italian, "*fiamma blu*", acquires a more metaphorical reading, weakening its function as a stable social label and its role as a marker of institutional identity.

This dynamic is also evident in Tench's use of hyperbole and epistemic framing. Expressions such as "*a million cops out there*" and "*a distillation of what we teach here*", construct an oral and expansive discourse in which knowledge is presented as something continuously refined through practice and circulation. The Italian version attenuates both hyperbolic force and procedural texture through neutral formulations such as "*moltissimi poliziotti*" and "*un concentrato di ciò che insegniamo qui*", producing a more static and descriptive representation of knowledge and diminishing its practice-oriented dimension.

This reduction of interpretive flexibility becomes clearer in a subsequent interaction, when Tench shifts from collaborative discussion to corrective intervention. Holden frames their case as an "*anomaly*" that exceeds current understanding, pushing the conversation towards theoretical abstraction. Tench interrupts this expansion with the remark: "*If we understood it, we'd be aberrant too.*" The corrective move intensifies through a layered devaluation of Holden's epistemic position: "*a little college education, some experience on the street, some insight, a lot of horseshit.*" The sequence brings together elements of partial legitimacy only to negate them in the final evaluative turn. Rather than directly refuting Holden's argument, the utterance shifts the focus onto his credibility as a speaker.

The interaction then moves abruptly from epistemic disagreement to personal territory: "*Do you have a girlfriend?*". This move functions as a pragmatic reset, dissolving the ongoing interpretive frame. The exchange is finally displaced outside the institutional domain through a closing directive: "*you find a pay phone, and you tell it to your girlfriend.*" The Italian line is similarly rendered, "*trova un telefono e raccontalo a*

lei", with a smoother transition from epistemic disagreement to personal reframing, attenuating the pragmatic discontinuity of the exchange.

These sequences highlight a recurrent feature of Tench's discourse, namely the regulation of interpretive expansion through alternating moves of alignment and corrective closure. In the dubbed version, however, this pattern is partially reconfigured. Increased syntactic explicitness, reduced idiomatic density, and the introduction of formal address structures contribute to a more sequential and explicitly signposted communicative organisation, with reduced reliance on pragmatic inference and interactional tightening.

3.2.2 Procedural Control and Interrogative Escalation

The Beverly Jean interrogation sequence marks an intensification of Bill Tench's interrogative discourse. Earlier interactions relied on subtle control of interpretive space; here, the interrogation develops through staged escalation. Tench progressively narrows the range of acceptable explanations through temporal, causal, and moral questioning, shifting from pragmatic regulation to more coercive forms of epistemic control.

In the initial interrogation of Benjamin, Beverly Jean's fiancé, the interaction develops along two interconnected dimensions, with Tench maintaining a controlled and increasingly focused interrogative trajectory, while Holden introduces a direct and sometimes intrusive expansion that accelerates the shift towards personal and intimate topics. Holden initiates a direct probe into the paternal figure, "*What was your father like?*", opening a line of inquiry that moves the interaction towards family background. By contrast, Tench guides the exchange towards relational dynamics between Benjamin and Beverly Jean through mitigated and normalising interventions, "*It's normal, for a young couple*". In English, the escalation unfolds through incremental steps, from general relational framing, "*You and Beverly Jean ever fight?*", to behavioural specification, "*What'd you fight about?*", "*Like what?*", and then towards engagement and domestic planning, "*Any nerves around the engagement?*", "*You got this place for her? Did she like it?*", "*When was that gonna be?*". Tench is the main agent of step-by-step constriction, while Holden intermittently redirects the interaction by formulating

the sexual frame, *"Your first sexual experience?"*, thereby making explicit what had remained only implicitly constructed. Whereas Tench closes the escalation with procedural containment, *"We'll keep it private"*. The Italian dubbing preserves the overall trajectory but reduces inferential continuity. Transitions between relational and intimate domains become explicitly marked, disrupting the gradual accumulation of intimacy that structures the English version. As a result, the interrogation appears as a sequence of thematically separated informational steps, weakening conversational drift and epistemic depth.

Later, in the interrogation of the main suspect, Frank, Tench assumes a more pronounced role in enforcing causal coherence and stabilising the suspect's narrative reconstruction. The exchange evolves from gradual disclosure to repeated demands for explanatory consistency, as Tench constrains the range of acceptable causal accounts. He pressures Frank to articulate temporal and motivational coherence through questions such as *"How'd you land yourself in Warren State Psychiatric Hospital?"* and *"Why not go to court, tell them what you told us?"*, shifting the interaction towards continuous verification of narrative plausibility under institutional scrutiny. The English version builds coercion through incremental tightening of causal expectations, whereas the dubbed version renders each epistemic demand more immediately legible through formulations such as *"Come sei finito all'ospedale psichiatrico di Warren?"* and *"Perché non andare in giudizio con la tua versione?"*, adopting a more direct tone, occasionally bordering on aggression. This reduces the accumulation of pressure across turns, leading to a more stabilised and structured form of questioning.

The escalation reaches its peak in Tench's framing of violence, where interrogative structures shift from eliciting information to imposing moral intelligibility. Accusations such as *"You raped her in front of Benjamin?"* / *"L'hai stuprata davanti a Benjamin?"* and *"Why fuck your brother-in-law's girlfriend?"* / *"Perché scoparti la ragazza di tuo cognato?"*, function as presuppositional forms that embed guilt, closing the narrative negotiation. The semantic force is preserved in Italian, while pragmatic pressure is partially regularised through a more linear syntactic organisation. This coercive configuration is reinforced by Tench's rapid re-framing of possible motivations, where interpretive space is narrowed rather than explored. Holden's speculative intervention, *"Maybe show him how to do it?"* / *"Forse per insegnargli come si fa?"*, is

reabsorbed into Tench's corrective logic, *"Maybe to mess with him?" / "Forse soltanto per provocarlo?"*, which reframes the interaction in terms of humiliation and relational antagonism. In Italian, the passage between competing hypotheses is smoother, reducing the sense of interpretive collision. Frank's refusal, *"Fuck you." / "Vaffanculo."*, marks the collapse of interactional cooperation, after which Tench resorts to explicit moral sentencing: *"I hope they fry your ass in the fucking chair." / "Spero che ti friggano su quella sedia del cazzo."*

The final dialogue between Holden and Tench consolidates this regulatory trajectory in epistemic terms. Tench's reasoning is explicitly probabilistic and pattern-based: *"I hate that fuck Frank, but it's always the boyfriend." / "Odio quello stronzo di Frank, ma è sempre il fidanzato."* Here, investigative judgement is framed as operational inference rather than evidential certainty, grounded in recurring behavioural patterns. The Italian version also compresses colloquial aggression, shifting from a fragmented and visceral insult construction to a more compact formulation. The following line, *"When you're lost, you play the odds"*, conveys a sense of epistemic disorientation managed through probabilistic reasoning, whereas the Italian *"Nel dubbio, devi scommettere"* redirects the emphasis towards a more directive and procedural stance. Holden resists this closure by reintroducing testimonial ambiguity, *"I'm not so sure... I believed him." / "Non mi convince... Gli ho creduto."*, thereby reopening interpretive space against probabilistic stabilisation. Tench ultimately rejects the reliability of the interactional field itself, *"They're messing with us." / "Ci prendono per il culo."*, reframing uncertainty as manipulation. The sequence closes with institutional fatigue, *"I am sick and tired of this shithole." / "Sono stufo marcio di questo merdaio."* The pragmatic force of his evaluative stance is thereby recalibrated, resulting in a more contained expression of affective intensity.

3.2.3 Ethical Limits of Procedural Discourse

Profiling logic within Tench's discourse is subject to ethical and contextual restrictions. These are not presented as abstract principles, but through situations that require negotiation between analytical detachment, institutional procedure, and personal implication. An initial tension emerges when interpretive claims are discussed in terms

of methodological legitimacy. In this context, Tench aligns with institutional correction, reinforcing procedural discipline and containing speculative escalation, *"She's right, Holden."* His intervention stabilises the exchange as long as the discussion remains within an abstract analytical frame.

This dynamic is reframed once speculative interpretation is relocated within a personal register through the hypothetical scenario involving family vulnerability, *"What if some guy were tickling Brian's feet?"* At this point, the issue is no longer the plausibility of the analogy, but the legitimacy of transferring profiling logic into the private sphere. Tench's response, *"Don't bring my kid into this."/ "Non mettere in mezzo mio figlio."*, immediately interrupts the analogy and establishes a defensive boundary. The Italian dubbing preserves the abruptness and oral immediacy of the original exchange, a tendency also evident in the following line, *"Do not use my family as an example."*, which is characterised by prosodic segmentation that isolates each lexical unit, producing a controlled prohibition. By contrast, the Italian version *"Non devi usare la mia famiglia come esempio."*, renders the prohibition overtly deontic through the insertion of *"devi"*, reorienting the utterance from an impersonal formulation to an interpersonal injunction.

This pattern can also be observed when professional discourse becomes exposed to institutional visibility and public circulation. Here, the issue is not the coherence of analytical interpretation, but the risk of transforming investigative practice into a simplified narrative detached from its operational context. Tench attempts to regulate this exposure by resisting forms of recontextualization that turn professional discourse into a publicly consumable narrative.

This pragmatic reorganisation is evident when extreme criminality is mobilised as an epistemic resource. In the original dialogue, evaluative positioning develops incrementally across turns: *"That excuse is wearing thin."*, *"I don't like the language, and I know at least one person who won't either."*, *"It was disgusting. I don't want to be part of it."*, where refusal is constructed gradually through successive tightening of stance. In Italian, the same trajectory is realised in a compact and explicit evaluative form: *"Questa scusa ormai ci va stretta."*, *"Non mi piace questo linguaggio e conosco almeno un'altra persona a cui non piace."*, *"È stato disgustoso e non voglio farne parte."* Evaluation no

longer develops incrementally through interaction but is instead condensed into a moral stance, with reduced gradation and a stronger sense of normative certainty.

Across these scenes, the Italian dubbing reshapes the pragmatic organisation of Tench's discourse. Evaluative and normative positions are expressed with increased directness, while hesitation, progressive stance construction, and procedural restraint become less perceptible in interactional terms. Tench's authority is reconfigured from procedural containment grounded in regulation and negotiation towards explicit and interpersonal control.

3.3 Wendy Carr: Epistemic Mediation

Unlike Holden Ford and Bill Tench, whose communicative styles emerge directly from investigative procedure and field interaction, Wendy Carr introduces an academic and research-oriented framework into the investigative environment of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As a psychologist and consultant, her contribution is grounded in the organisation and interpretation of behavioural data. Her work involves collecting interview material, identifying recurring patterns, and developing a specialised terminology that transforms isolated case evidence into coherent behavioural classifications. Wendy thus occupies a mediating position between investigative practice and academic knowledge production, shaping the conceptual framework through which behavioural data becomes intelligible.

Her discourse is characterised by cognitive precision and systematic attention to categorisation. She frequently reworks the contributions of other speakers through technical vocabulary and methodological framing, aligning them with the procedural logic of scientific research. Hypotheses are refined, observations are reformulated, and behavioural material is organised into structured conceptual configurations. Her contribution consistently foregrounds epistemic control and interpretive organisation, particularly in relation to interview methodology and profiling practices. At the same time, the series progressively complicates this position. Sustained exposure to FBI investigative culture and violent material gradually undermines this academic distance, generating tension between her professional identity and her role within the Bureau.

Detachment gives way to hesitation, reduced conversational initiative, and moments of withdrawal, suggesting a partial erosion of interpretive control in emotionally and institutionally charged contexts.

This tension also extends into her private life and social interactions. As a lesbian woman navigating the cultural and institutional climate of the late 1970s, Wendy often adopts forms of linguistic self-regulation that shape her conversational positioning and public self-presentation. In informal environments, her authoritative stance is reduced, and she appears more observational and less integrated into the conversational flow, producing a fragmentation of her role across academic, institutional, and personal contexts.

In translational terms, the Italian dubbing partially standardises the specificity of Wendy's discourse. The original English performance is characterised by restrained vocal modulation and interactional subtlety, where meaning often emerges through hesitation and controlled tone. In the Italian adaptation, these features are reorganised into more explicit communicative patterns, with a controlled vocal register that nonetheless foregrounds clearer pragmatic definition and stronger emotional marking, particularly in moments of methodological disagreement or ideological tension. As a result, Wendy's Italian portrayal projects greater discursive stability and interpersonal assertiveness, reducing the uncertainty and subtlety of the original performance.

3.3.1 Constructing Profiling: Discursive and Translational Reshaping

In the early investigative encounters, Wendy Carr progressively contributes to the development of criminal profiling as a structured system of classification and terminology. From her first interaction with the FBI unit, she helps shape the conceptual framework through which behavioural data is interpreted and organised, occupying a mediating position between investigative reasoning and academic modelling. In the initial meeting scene, this is already visible in the reformulation of the investigative project as a research design. Wendy insists on placing the work on a "*more formal footing*" and on developing a structured questionnaire targeting behavioural and

biographical variables, followed by a process of *“contrast, compare, and publish”*. The Italian version presents the research process as a sequence of discrete operational steps: *“ovviamente dovete metterlo su un piano più formale... con un questionario specifico... poi confrontare, comparare e pubblicarlo”*.

A similar pattern emerges in Wendy’s treatment of violent behaviour as an object of interpretation. The English reconstruction presents a continuous inferential flow *“imagine what it takes to bludgeon someone to death. The lust for control, the feeling of arousal... How could you possibly get that from an ordinary police report?”*, where meaning is built progressively through a continuous chain of clauses. In the Italian version, this flow is reconfigured through a clear re-segmentation into shorter, prosodically autonomous units: *“immaginate cosa significa colpire qualcuno fino a ucciderlo... la brama di controllo, il senso di eccitazione... come si può capire tutto questo da un semplice rapporto di polizia.”* This restructuring redistributes the inferential load across discrete segments, improving oral clarity and synchronisation while attenuating the gradual buildup of meaning in the source dialogue.

A further development concerns the construction of a shared classificatory vocabulary. In the Rissell discussion, the initial term *“trigger”* is explicitly dismissed as *“troppo banale”* and replaced with *“agenti stressori”*. The shift goes beyond simple lexical substitution, as it is embedded within a justificatory move that reframes stress as *“più interiore, più pertinente al nostro tema”*, linking the choice of terminology to the construction of a shared analytical framework. A comparable mechanism is visible in Wendy’s formulation *“let’s make that our term of art”*, where scientific vocabulary is negotiated as an emergent outcome of interaction. The line, *“inseriamolo nella nostra terminologia”*, preserves the consolidating function but repositions it as immediate incorporation into an already available conceptual structure, thereby reducing the sense that terminology is being co-constructed in real time.

This pattern also applies to culturally embedded expressions such as *“Dear John letter”*, where a culturally specific meaning of romantic breakup is encoded. The Italian *“lettera per lasciarlo”*, replaces this layered idiomatic form with an explicit paraphrase, privileging semantic accessibility over cultural compression. A similar mechanism appears in the exhortation *“be scientists”*, which functions as a temporary redistribution of conversational roles and an invitation to adopt a shared analytical stance. The Italian

“comportatevi da scienziati” instead reinforces directive framing, with reduced interactional openness.

A progressive structuring of discourse is visible in Wendy’s taxonomic reasoning. In articulating the need for a comprehensive classificatory framework, she maintains the sense of an evolving model grounded in abstraction. The formulation, *“frame an overall taxonomy, except I don’t know where to start”*, retains uncertainty as an intrinsic component of knowledge-in-information, while the Italian version attenuates this hesitation, allowing taxonomy to appear as a linear construction. Classificatory distinctions move through successive stages of reduction: *“systematic/anti-systematic”* becomes *“sistematico/antisistematico”*, before converging on the binary *“organised/disorganised”*, explicitly framed as *“più facile da capire per comuni agenti di pattuglia”*. This progression prioritises operational usability and functional clarity over conceptual openness.

A significant development can be observed in the negotiation of offender classification. The differentiation between cases such as Kemper and Speck activates a broader reorganisation of homicidal behaviour into oppositional categories, ranging from controlled, tool-based, repetitive violence, *“corde, coltelli e sacchi nel bagagliaio”*, to opportunistic and situational killing, where victims are encountered *“per caso”*. In Italian, this binary between organised and contingent violence is immediately legible.

The transition through competing labels such as *“sequence killer”*, *“spree”*, and ultimately *“serial killer”* retains in English a sense of gradual convergence, where terminology emerges through successive refinement within a collaborative exchange between Wendy, Holden, and Tench. This same progression, moving through *“assassino sequenziale”* and *“compulsivo”*, is resolved with *“serial killer”* as a final terminological label, rather than emerging through a gradual process of negotiation among speakers. The process remains open-ended, a sense reinforced by Wendy’s remark: *“let’s see if it sticks”*, which frames the label as collectively produced and dependent on subsequent validation in use over time. In contrast, the evaluative dimension of *“Vediamo se si adatta.”*, introduces a criterion of adequacy, shifting validation to present compatibility.

These sequences show how Wendy’s discourse functions as a site of knowledge construction, where language actively shapes the conceptual architecture of criminal profiling. The English version foregrounds emergence, hesitation, and ongoing

adjustment, with categories remaining partially formed. The Italian dubbing, by contrast, reorganises these processes into more structured configurations, reducing ambiguity and foregrounding methodological coherence. The difference lies in the degree of discursive structuring applied.

3.3.2 Institutional Pressure and Epistemic Reconfiguration

The exchange with the District Attorney in the Beverly Jean case initially exposes the limits of Wendy's assumption that behavioural terminology can function transparently across institutional contexts. At the outset, her discourse is shaped by the expectation of an interlocutor capable of engaging with behavioural interpretation through a shared interpretative lens. Her reliance on specialised terminology and classificatory distinctions presupposes not only comprehension, but also a shared way of approaching interpretation as a structured practice. This is evident in her formulation, *"it is acutely obvious that... the anger was triggered by stressors"*, rendered as *"è più che evidente... la rabbia è stata innescata da stressori"*, where the lexical choice implies familiarity with technical vocabulary that is not yet negotiated in the interaction.

The assumption is gradually destabilised through the DA's interruptions, which transform condensed classificatory categories into sites of explicit clarification. The immediate response: *"'Stressors'?" / "stressori?"*, disrupts the flow, forcing Wendy to rephrase it in accessible terms, *"...dramatic life events. Things that pushed both their buttons" / "...eventi drammatici che hanno premuto l'interruttore a entrambi"*. A similar pattern appears in *"situationally motivated sexual assaults" / "aggressioni situazionali di natura sessuale"*, interrupted again by the DA's intervention, exposing the opacity of her classificatory language in the juridical frame. The DA's insistence on evidential mapping, *"Who killed her?" / "Chi l'ha uccisa?"*, shifts Wendy's conclusions from an analytical framework to a demand for direct attribution of responsibility.

She reasserts a distinction between the production of analytical knowledge and its institutional comprehension, stating: *"I'm just here to provide you with intelligent, accurate analysis" / "Sono qui per fornirle un'analisi accurata e intelligente"*, followed by: *"it isn't my job to make the jury understand anything" / "non è compito mio far in modo*

che la giuria capisca". The reference to the "jury", while preserved in the Italian dubbing, activates a culturally specific legal frame typical of the US adversarial system, which has no direct functional equivalent in the Italian procedural context. Its retention contributes to maintaining the institutional setting of the source discourse, even as the surrounding dialogue is naturalised for Italian pragmatic norms, thereby preserving a marker of legal epistemic authority within a partially domesticated interactional structure. This distinction, however, begins to weaken under institutional pressure, as accessibility is reframed as a condition of validity, *"If a jury can't understand your analysis, then it's no use to anybody"*. By the end of the exchange, Wendy's explanatory mode moves into sequential causal narration. Abstract categories are replaced by linear reconstructions of action, *"Benjamin knocked her out because he felt rejected... Frank comes over and takes advantage... so they kill her"*, rendered in Italian as *"Benjamin l'aggredisce perché si sente respinto... Frank arriva e la stupra... quindi la uccidono"*. In Italian the narrative is further segmented, *"E allora la pugnolano ancora. E poi portano il cadavere alla discarica"*, reinforcing chronological clarity over condensed interpretation.

The post-Brudos exchange introduces a different tension inside the investigative team, as Wendy's methodological stance comes into conflict with competing models of communicative access to criminal subjects. Her insistence on separating scientific work from strategic interaction emerges in *"this is a scientific study, not a locker room hazing"*, a formulation that evokes a ritualised form of masculine group behaviour. This is reconfigured in the dubbed version, *"è uno studio scientifico, non nonnismo da spogliatoio"*, into a direct and locally recognisable expression, reducing the cultural specificity of *"hazing"* while preserving Wendy's criticism of group-based masculine behaviour.

Tench's framing this conception of communication as coded interaction, introduced by: *"Let me explain"*, which functions as a cooperative clarification. The Italian line, *"Forse non capisci, Wendy"*, repositions the opening as a corrective, asymmetrical stance, introducing a potential epistemic gap between interlocutors. Wendy's critique: *"you threw our questionnaire right out the window" / "avete buttato il nostro questionario dalla finestra"*, retains its accusatory force, while losing some of its idiomatic impact in the Italian version. Her claim *"that interview was personal" / "quell'intervista era sul personale"*, is reframed as a more content-oriented descriptive

statement. In a following line, “...as long as you establish rapport”/ “... per stabilire un rapporto”, the Italian rendering replaces the conditional framing of “as long as” with a final construction introduced by “per”, weakening the strategic constraint and reducing the pragmatic specificity of “rapport”.

The post-Speck discussion marks the peak of this escalation, as methodological disagreement develops into a breakdown in shared analytical framing. Wendy frames the questionnaire as “a framework for substantive input”/ “una struttura per nozioni sostanziali”, positioning it as a structured methodological device whose validity depends on consistent application within an ongoing and still-expanding research process. The Italian rendering of “input” generalises its technical specificity, slightly softening the questionnaire’s procedural status as an operational tool. Holden’s resistance is met by Wendy’s counterclaim, “you haven’t let it work”/ “non l’hai lasciato funzionare”, which reframes the issue in terms of implementation rather than design, implying that the methodological framework has not been properly activated in practice. The scaling-up of the project, “we have at least 40 convicts to interview...”, extends the questionnaire into an open-ended investigative system rather than a bounded procedure. Wendy’s concern that “if our tactics blow back on us, the whole thing could be jeopardised”/ “se le tue tecniche ci si rivoltano contro, mettono a rischio l’intero programma”, highlights the fragility of methodological validity, dependent on institutional embedding and the stability of early-stage implementation.

This fragility extends beyond discourse into its perceptual dimension. In the English performance, Wendy’s authority is produced through vocal restraint, controlled prosody, and a consistently low pitch, with analytical competence conveyed through containment and tonal subtlety. Even in moments of heightened conflict, intensity remains compressed within a professional register, and her responses are delivered almost “through the teeth”. The Italian version loosens this vocal economy, with greater articulatory openness and clearer enunciation, making emotional cues more accessible. As a result, while Wendy remains formally controlled, frustration and anger become more audible, and her stance is expressed in a less contained manner.

3.3.3 Discursive Destabilisation and Negotiated Visibility

The dialogue between Wendy and her partner follows immediately after the District Attorney meeting in the Beverly Jean case, where the interpretative frame of “buzzwords” is carried over into a domestic setting, recontextualising the opposition between behavioural expertise and communicative simplification beyond the institutional encounter. Wendy’s complaint, formulated as “*qualche parola a effetto da ripetere*”, downplays the specificity of specialised terminology and frames discourse as surface-level communication.

Wendy’s self-positioning undergoes successive reformulations that increase the sense of strain. The line “*I’m having a really hard time juggling my research and everything back here*” is rendered as “*Sta diventando molto dura per me conciliare la mia ricerca con tutta la mia vita qui*”. While the English formulation preserves a dynamic distribution between competing domains through “juggling”, the Italian version condenses the utterance into a more compact expression of constraint, where “conciliare” and the scalar intensifier “molto dura” foreground pressure rather than negotiation. This sense of division is maintained in “*I’m torn*”/ “*sono divisa*”, where both versions present Wendy’s position as structurally split between roles.

The partner’s reference to Wendy’s upcoming university evaluation and the risk of losing her academic position introduces an external evaluative pressure that repositions her FBI involvement as potentially misaligned with expected career progression. This is reflected in Wendy’s initial alignment, “*Yeah, you needn’t remind me.*”/ “*Non devi ricordarmelo.*”, followed by a stronger rejection, “*Waste my time? Do you think that I’m wasting my time?*”/ “*Sprecare tempo? Pensi che stia spreando il mio tempo?*”, which shifts the exchange from acknowledgement to explicit contestation of value.

The introduction of a more secure academic trajectory by her partner is met by Wendy’s disclosure, “*They’ve offered me a full-time position.*”/ “*Mi hanno offerto un posto a tempo pieno.*” The statement redirects the conversation away from evaluative pressure and allows Wendy to reassert her professional commitment. The partner’s reaction introduces doubt regarding the credibility of the claim, while Wendy’s final turn, “*Why would you say that?*”/ “*Perché non dovrei?*”, inverts the burden of justification and

temporarily places the partner in a defensive position. Negotiation of concealment emerges when reputational risk is explicitly articulated through *"reflect badly on you"/ "metterti in cattiva luce"*. The discussion moves beyond institutional evaluation to the management of information within the relationship, with concealment presented as a constraint affecting both partners. The exchange remains unresolved, leaving the tension between professional and personal commitments intact.

The following dialogue with Bill Tench prompts Wendy to revisit her earlier position on methodological objectivity in a self-critical register. *"What I was saying yesterday about remaining objective... it's bullshit. It's very hard."/ "Quello che ho detto ieri riguardo al restare obiettivi... avevi ragione. Sono stronzate. È troppo difficile."* The isolated formulation, *"Sono stronzate"*, marks a break with her earlier methodological stance through an abrupt lexical shift that disrupts the continuity of the academic register and introduces a colloquial self-assessment. This indicates a temporary suspension of analytical distance, as methodological positioning gives way to the acknowledgement of experiential difficulty linked to prolonged exposure to violent material and investigative constraints. Wendy's stance is partially realigned within the investigative team, moving closer to Tench's cumulative fatigue, while Holden remains comparatively insulated from this type of experiential and emotional accumulation.

Despite this moment of analytical instability, Wendy returns to an interpretation of offenders: *"These people are extremely damaged, and they know how to cause damage"/ "Sono persone squilibrate e sanno come creare squilibri."* The English formulation maintains a dynamic relation between condition and action through the repetition of *"damaged / damage"*. In Italian, *"squilibrare"* recasts this relation as a more stable characteristic, presenting psychological impairment as an attribute of the individual rather than as a condition reflected through behaviour. This return to analytical language does not restore the previous level of control. The interpretative register remains available, but is now embedded in cumulative strain, where analytical distance is no longer fully insulated from experiential and institutional pressures.

The encounter with Georgia's District Attorney marks the beginning of a progressive destabilisation of Wendy's epistemic positioning, as her explanatory framework is immediately subjected to interactional constraint. She opens with a procedural formulation of methodological intent: *"This involves establishing an element*

of trust so that they offer information to us voluntarily."/ "Questo comporta instaurare un minimo di fiducia perché ci offrano informazioni volontariamente", which closely preserves Wendy's methodological register and its emphasis on trust-building. This is followed by repeated interruptions that prevent the full development of her explanatory model.

Wendy's first attempt to connect behavioural analysis to juridical outcome is syntactically suspended: *"So if he's convicted and executed, then..."/ "Se lui sarà condannato e giustiziato, allora..."*. The incompleteness of the turn interrupts the development of a causal chain between profiling and legal consequence before it reaches full articulation. A similar disruption affects her attempt to delimit disciplinary scope: *"I'm not arguing prosecution strategies. I'm simply..."/ "Non discuto di strategie processuali. Voglio solamente..."*, again left unfinished through interruption. Across these exchanges, Wendy's explanations fail to reach completion and are fragmented into shorter segments due to external interruption.

Within this interactional dynamic, Wendy attempts to reintroduce a rational-legal framing through containment-based reasoning: *"There's no reason to kill people when we have the wherewithal to lock them up..."/ "Non c'è motivo di ucciderli, quando abbiamo i mezzi per metterli sottochiave..."* The rendering of *"lock them up"* as *"metterli sottochiave"* introduces a concrete lexicalisation, shifting the emphasis toward material confinement and reducing institutional abstraction. The argument preserves a preventive logic grounded in incarceration while distinguishing between behavioural explanation and punitive decision-making.

This distinction is rearticulated through a self-repair move that re-establishes the referential frame of her work: *"Not the FBI, our work in Behavioral Science..."/ "Non l'FBI, ma il lavoro di Scienze comportamentali..."*. The Italian version slightly generalises the institutional reference, softening the explicit FBI anchoring in favour of a more generic disciplinary label. The utterance functions as a re-anchoring move, restoring disciplinary specificity and resisting the reclassification of behavioural analysis within a political register.

Wendy's teleological framing is rearticulated through a preventive formulation: *"If it's compromised, I'm afraid we won't be able to achieve our ultimate goal, which is to hopefully prevent this type of crime from being committed."/ "Se fosse compromesso,*

temo che non potremmo raggiungere il nostro obiettivo, che dovrebbe essere di evitare che questo tipo di crimini venga commesso." Here, "our ultimate goal" becomes "*il nostro obiettivo*", reducing scalar emphasis, while the modal hedge in "*hopefully prevent*" is rephrased into a less hedged preventive expression. The legal term "*life without the possibility of parole*" is rendered as "*ergastolo senza libertà sulla parola*", maintaining referential equivalence but dispersing the compact formulaic structure of the original juridical expression.

The post-confrontation reflection with Holden condenses the instability emerging from the previous encounter with the District Attorney. Wendy opens with the reduced formulation "*A reasonable conversation*" / "*Ragionevolezza*", where the dubbing compresses the formulation into a nominal category. The utterance accentuates rationality as an abstract evaluative category within institutional discourse.

A similar reflection concerns the temporal dimension of Wendy's work: "*I had hoped that we could complete our research before seeing it used to this end.*" / "*Avevo sperato di poter completare la ricerca prima di vederla usare così.*" The Italian dubbing reorients the formulation around the immediacy of "*vederla usare così*", shifting emphasis from future-oriented completion to the experience of use in the present. It foregrounds a disruption in methodological sequencing, as research is drawn into institutional application before the completion of its intended trajectory.

Holden reframes this position by questioning the possibility of maintaining a separation between research activity and institutional deployment in contexts shaped by capital punishment. Wendy's response, "*I wouldn't have to be in meetings like the one we had.*" / "*Non dovrei partecipare a incontri come questo*", locates the strain in compulsory exposure to juridical and political settings that reconfigure behavioural analysis in non-disciplinary terms. The Italian rendering slightly generalises the formulation. The exchange closes with Wendy's brief acknowledgement, "*Evidently not.*", which marks the end of the negotiation and consolidates the institutional constraints within which her methodological stance now operates.

Across the sequence, Wendy's discourse preserves a methodological orientation, while its stability is progressively reconfigured across institutional, interpersonal, and juridical contexts, with coherence emerging from the sequential environments in which it is negotiated. This process involves tendencies toward lexical compression and

nominalisation, alongside a partial reduction in socio-cultural specificity, which do not alter the propositional content of Wendy's discourse but affect its discursive organisation, privileging linear intelligibility over the more fragmented and contingent articulation of the original performance.

3.4 Concluding Remarks

This chapter has demonstrated that the Italian dubbed version of *Mindhunter* preserves the core informational and narrative functions of the original dialogues, while systematically modifying their linguistic realisation at multiple levels. The transformations affect syntactic organisation, pragmatic patterns, sociolinguistic markers, and paralinguistic features, ultimately producing a more linear and highly regulated form of spoken interaction.

These changes have a clear impact on characterisation. Holden Ford's investigative stance appears stable, marked by reduced hedging and a shift toward compact and assertive formulations. Bill Tench's discourse shows decreased idiomatic density and ambiguity, with evaluative and rule-governed meanings expressed in a direct manner. Wendy Carr maintains her analytical orientation, although the reduction of hesitation and gradual conceptual development results in a more immediate and structured expression of expertise. In the interviews with serial killers, propositional content remains largely unchanged, while sociolectal variation and prosodic differentiation are reduced, making differences between speakers less pronounced.

The dubbing reorganises dialogue primarily at the level of conversational realisation, without altering the narrative architecture or the dramatic functions of the characters. By reshaping the linguistic and paralinguistic resources through which these functions are conveyed, it provides the empirical foundation for the interpretative discussion developed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 4 – DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This chapter interprets the main findings of the analysis conducted in Chapter 3 in light of the theoretical framework outlined in Chapters 1 and 2. Focusing on how these choices reshape institutional authority, character representation, and investigative discourse, the analysis examines the broader implications of the translation strategies adopted in the Italian version of *Mindhunter* rather than summarising individual observations.

The analysis, grounded in Chaume's (2014) model of constrained translation and Pavesi's (2014) work on prefabricated orality and dubbing norms, shows that the Italian version systematically transforms the original dialogue—characterised by epistemic uncertainty, negotiation, and stylistic variation—into a more stable and coherent communicative configuration marked by increased certainty, and reduced stylistic variation. This shift reflects typical tendencies of Italian audiovisual translation, including naturalisation and the emergence of a functional “dubbese”, which prioritises clarity and register consistency over conversational fluidity and interactional unpredictability.

Within this framework, characters are not treated as fully autonomous sociolinguistic individuals, but as discursive positions operating within a relatively homogeneous structured language system shaped by translational conventions. Their differences thus emerge as internal variations within a unified communicative style rather than as distinct idiolects.

The following sections explore two central dimensions — the systematisation of technical and forensic language, and the reconfiguration of conversational dynamics — in order to assess how these translational choices affect the representation of investigative reasoning and psychological tension in the series.

4.1 From Negotiation to Stability in Profiling Discourse

This section examines how the dubbing transforms investigative reasoning in *Mindhunter* from a negotiated, emergent process into a consistent and regulated form

of discourse. In the original series, profiling develops as an open practice characterised by uncertainty, provisional inferences, and real-time negotiation among the characters. In the Italian version, this dynamic undergoes systematic reconfiguration.

Drawing on Chaume's (2014) model of constrained translation and House's (2015) register theory, the Italian adaptation consistently reduces epistemic hedging and expressions of uncertainty, which are replaced by assertive, syntactically compact formulations. Moments of inferential openness are often absorbed into definitive statements, presenting interpretations as already resolved rather than collaboratively constructed in interaction. Consequently, investigative knowledge appears as an established form of competence.

This transformation influences the viewer's perception by presenting the investigative process as methodical and authoritative, while reducing its psychological rawness and sense of uncertainty. Such a shift is particularly significant in *Mindhunter*, a series whose distinctive power lies precisely in the slow, tentative construction of criminal profiling as a new form of knowledge. In this sense, the dubbing goes beyond the translation of dialogue and linguistically enacts the very process of institutionalisation that the series dramatises on the narrative level.

4.2 Systematisation of Specialised and Forensic Discourse

A second major tendency concerns the treatment of specialised and forensic language. While the original dialogue often presents technical terms and categories in an exploratory and hybrid manner, emerging gradually through discussion, the Italian version consistently moves towards standardisation, explicitation, and greater register consistency.

Drawing on Pavesi's (2014) observations on "dubbese" and Chaume's (2014) analysis of constrained translation, the adaptation incorporates profiling terminology into a codified and recognisable classificatory framework. Terms and categories that surface tentatively in the source text are rendered with greater taxonomic precision. In this respect, the adaptation meta-discursively mirrors the central narrative project of the series by linguistically stabilising the vocabulary of criminal profiling, thereby enacting

the same process of formalisation that the characters pursue within the story. This choice contributes to the establishment of a standardised tone in the investigative vocabulary from the outset.

Technical lexicon tends to shift towards clinical, psychological, or administrative registers, creating a recognisable “professional voice” for the investigators that maintains a high degree of consistency across different contexts. The same pattern appears in forensic descriptions. Violent acts and bodily injuries are reframed through a detached, anatomically oriented register that emphasises analytical precision over sensory or emotional impact. The body is thus constructed primarily as an object of examination rather than a site of horror or suffering.

Paraphrase, explicitation, and mild domestication likewise shape the adaptation of culturally specific and idiomatic expressions, reflecting the need for immediate accessibility in audiovisual reception. These strategies produce a homogeneous, functionally transparent domain-specific lexicon. While this consolidation strengthens the formal tone of the series and improves overall comprehensibility, it also leads to a partial reduction in the linguistic richness of the original. In this sense, the systematisation of forensic discourse illustrates a typical trade-off in Italian audiovisual translation, where enhanced functional efficiency and coherence are achieved at the expense of stylistic variation and dialogic vitality in the source text.

4.3 Interactional Reconfiguration and Pragmatic Regulation

A further important dimension concerns the reconfiguration of conversational dynamics. While the original dialogue in *Mindhunter* relies heavily on implicit pragmatic cues, fluid turn-taking, and context-dependent relational negotiation, the Italian version tends to impose a structured and overtly regulated exchange framework.

This structuring operates across interdependent levels. The consistent use of the formal pronoun “Lei” in professional exchanges establishes a clear hierarchical distance, in contrast with the flexibility of the English “you”. This grammatical anchoring reduces the possibility of rapid shifts between authority and informality, thereby setting a fixed relational baseline. Overlaps, hesitations, self-repairs, and abrupt interruptions — typical

of spontaneous interaction — are markedly reduced, resulting in smoother, more linear exchanges that require less co-construction from the participants. At the same time, the neutralisation or attenuation of sociolectal features further limits the linguistic resources available for individual and social positioning.

Through these interconnected changes, the adaptation mirrors, at a discursive level, the process of formalisation at the heart of the series. Just as the characters strive to transform uncertain psychological intuitions and fluid interpersonal negotiations into disciplined practice, the Italian version regulates exchange structure, turning potentially ambiguous or chaotic exchanges into controlled and predictable forms of dialogic performance. Consequently, conflict and interpersonal tension are conveyed through direct verbal cues and stabilised turn structures rather than through gradual accumulation, rendering them immediately accessible but less dependent on subtle tonal negotiation. Characters' identities thus emerge predominantly through narrative role and propositional content rather than through marked linguistic variation. These strategies are consistent with Pavesi's (2014) notion of prefabricated orality, which highlights the tendency towards greater conversational structuring in dubbed dialogue compared to spontaneous conversation.

4.4 Synthesis and Final Remarks

The findings discussed in this chapter point to a coherent pattern of discursive reorganisation, namely a shift from negotiated and epistemically fluid dialogue towards a communicative style characterised by institutional regulation and greater discursive consistency. This reorganisation leaves the narrative structure and the core dramatic functions of the characters untouched yet profoundly reconfigures the linguistic and interactional resources through which investigative expertise and psychological tension take shape.

Specialised language and dialogue structuring operate as mutually reinforcing elements. While the systematisation of technical and forensic terminology forges a standardised voice, the stricter organisation of conversational flow and relational markers creates clearer hierarchical boundaries and more predictable discourse

patterns. These transformations contribute to a communicative environment in which control emerges through codified linguistic and interactional structuring.

The patterns observed here correspond to broader tendencies described by Chaume (2014) and Pavesi (2014), including naturalisation, register consistency, and the pursuit of functional clarity. Although this approach enhances comprehensibility and strengthens the perceived professionalism of the FBI unit, it also reduces linguistic variation and epistemic uncertainty, key features of the original series' distinctive atmosphere of intellectual and psychological unease.

In conclusion, the findings demonstrate that audiovisual translation functions as an active form of discursive mediation. Far from representing a neutral linguistic transfer, it plays a significant role in reshaping the conditions of intelligibility of complex professional and psychological narratives in contemporary television. The broader implications of these findings for the translation of dialogue-driven series will be explored in the concluding chapter.

CONCLUSIONS

This thesis has examined the Italian dubbed version of *Mindhunter* as a case study of audiovisual translation in a dialogue-driven and psychologically complex television series. Rather than viewing dubbing as a purely technical transfer of linguistic content, the study has approached it as an active mediating practice that participates in the construction of meaning, character portrayal, and the articulation of institutional knowledge.

From the perspective of audiovisual translation studies, the analysis has highlighted how dubbing operates at the intersection of technical constraints, target-language norms, and expectations of communicative naturalness. Consistent with previous research on dubbing and prefabricated orality (Chaume, 2014; Pavesi, 2014), the Italian version prioritises clarity, coherence, and register stability, while successfully preserving the core narrative and informational functions of the source text.

Mindhunter has proven particularly productive for this type of investigation due to its heavy reliance on conversational dynamics and investigative reasoning. The systematic reorganisation of discourse observed in the Italian dubbing — across interactional patterns, institutional relations, register variation, and epistemic construction — reveals a consistent tendency towards greater discursive stability and internal regulation. Far from being a mere linguistic transposition, the dubbing reshapes the communicative conditions through which expertise, authority, and institutional knowledge are performed.

Methodologically, the qualitative, scene-based analysis has enabled the identification of recurring translational patterns and their links to broader interactional and epistemic configurations. These findings align with and provide further empirical support for register-oriented approaches to translation (House, 2015), showing that translational choices affect not only lexical and semantic content but also the interactional and institutional dimensions of discourse.

The study is limited to the first season of the series and focuses exclusively on the Italian dubbing. Its findings do not seek to generalise across all audiovisual translation contexts but offer grounded interpretative insights into a highly representative case.

Issues of audience reception and the effects of dubbing on viewer perception fall outside the scope of this research.

Future studies could extend this analysis by comparing the two seasons of *Mindhunter*, contrasting dubbing with subtitling strategies, or examining other procedurally oriented series. Such research would help determine whether the patterns identified here represent broader tendencies in the audiovisual translation of institutional and professional discourse.

Ultimately, this thesis demonstrates that audiovisual translation constitutes a significant form of discursive mediation. By reshaping the linguistic and interactional resources of the original dialogue, dubbing actively reconfigures the ways in which meaning, authority, and expertise are articulated and perceived by the target audience, while preserving the fundamental narrative architecture of the source text.

REFERENCES

- Baker, M., 2018. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge.
- Baños-Piñero, R. & Chaume, F., 2009. Prefabricated orality: A challenge in audiovisual translation. in *TRAlinea Special Issue: The translation of dialects in multimedia*.
- Bosseaux, C., 2015. *Dubbing, Film and Performance: Uncanny Encounters*. Oxford: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Bosseaux, C., 2018. Investigating Dubbing: Learning from the Past, Looking to the Future. In: L. Pérez-González, ed. *The Routledge Handbook of Audiovisual Translation*. London: Routledge, pp. 48-63.
- Chaume, F., 2004. *Cine y traducción*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Chaume, F., 2014. *Audiovisual translation: Dubbing*. London: Routledge.
- Douglas, J. E. & Olshaker, M., 1995. *Mindhunter: Inside the FBI's elite serial crime unit*. New York: Scribner Book Company.
- González, L. P., 2009. Audiovisual translation. In: *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 2 ed. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 13-20.
- House, J., 2015. *Translation quality assessment: Past and Present*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jankowska, A. & Szarkowska, A., 2025. *Introducing Audiovisual Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kenny, D., 2009. Equivalence. In: M. Baker & G. Saldanha, eds. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 2 ed. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 96-99.
- Matamala, A., 2019. *Voice-over: Practice, research and future prospects*. In C. Millán & F. Bartrina (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of audiovisual translation* (pp. 64–81). Milton Park: Routledge.
- Mele Scorgia, A., 2018. *Surtitling and the audience: A love-hate relationship*. [Online] Available at: https://jostrans.soap2.ch/issue30/art_mele.pdf [Accessed 16 March 2026].
- Mindhunter [TV series]*. 2017-2019. [Film] Directed by D. Fincher, C. Theron, J. Donen, C. Chaffin. U.S.A.: Denver and Delilah, Jen X Productions, Panic Pictures.
- Olohan, M., 2009. Scientific and technical translation. In: M. Baker & G. Saldanha, eds. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 2 ed. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 246-249.
- Pavesi, M., 2014. *La traduzione filmica. Aspetti del parlato doppiato dall'inglese all'italiano*. Roma: Carocci.
- Perego, E., 2024. *La traduzione audiovisiva*. Roma: Carocci editore.
- Pérez González, L., 2009. Audiovisual translation. In: M. Baker & G. Saldanha, eds. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 2 ed. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 13-20.
- Poyatos, F., 2002. *Nonverbal Communication across Disciplines*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Poyatos, F., 2002. *Nonverbal Comunication Across Disciplines*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Ranzato, I. & Zanotti, S., 2018. *Linguistic and Cultural Representation in Audiovisual Translation*. London: Routledge.

Rossi, F., 2006. *Il linguaggio cinematografico*. Roma: ARACNE.

Sánchez-Mompeán, S., 2020. *Prefabricated orality at tone level: Bringing dubbing intonation into the spotlight*. [Online] Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333154116_Prefabricated_orality_at_tone_level_Bringing_dubbing_intonation_into_the_spotlight [Accessed 26 March 2026].

Taylor, C., 2013. *Multimodality and audiovisual translation*. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies* (Vol. 4, pp. 98–104). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Venuti, L., 2008. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Online Sources

https://www.treccani.it/magazine/lingua_italiana/speciali/doppiaggio/Rossi.html

<https://www.imdb.com/it/title/tt5290382/>

<https://www.mondoserie.it/mindhunter/>

<https://www.antoniogenna.net/doppiaggio/telefilm/mindhunter.htm>

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333154116_Prefabricated_orality_at_tone_level_Bringing_dubbing_intonation_into_the_spotlight

<https://transcripts.foreverdreaming.org/viewforum.php?f=1367>

<https://my-subtitles.co/showlistsubtitles-2154-mindhunter>

Appendix: Dialogue Transcripts

The transcripts included in the appendix were compiled from publicly available transcript repositories and subsequently checked and aligned against the original audiovisual material and the Italian dubbed version.

EPISODE 1

IN SHEPARD'S OFFICE S- You followed procedure. You did your job. You did everything by the book. He took hostages. He knew there'd be consequences. H- He thought he was invisible. S- You're not his shrink. You're not responsible for diagnosing him. That's not your remit. These things happen in real time, and we are the last responders. If an operation's gonna go south, this is not the worst outcome. Stay focused on what we do. H- If I did everything by the book, it begs the question... S- This place is pretty much the benchmark for excellence in law enforcement. In the rest of the world, hostage negotiation's on its way out. You think the Israelis bothered to negotiate at Entebbe last year? You didn't lose one hostage or bystander. That's how we measure success. And your courses are a big hit in the summer. I actually think you should be teaching more. H- You're putting me out to pasture. S- No. I'm putting you to work where it really counts. H- Despite what happened?! S- <u>Because</u> of what happened, Holden. It seasoned you. H- Thank you, sir... but I'd rather not. S- Well, this is awkward. I'd like you to sleep on it over the weekend... because you start full-time on Monday.	S- Hai seguito la procedura. Hai fatto tutto come da manuale. Aveva degli ostaggi, conosceva le conseguenze. H- Pensava di essere invisibile. S- Non eri il suo psichiatra. Non sei responsabile della sua diagnosi. Queste cose accadono in tempo reale, noi siamo gli ultimi a intervenire. Se un'operazione deve andare male, questo non è l'esito peggiore. Resta concentrato su ciò che facciamo. H- Se ho fatto tutto secondo manuale, mi sorge una domanda ... S- Holden, questo posto è il punto di riferimento per eccellenza per le forze dell'ordine. Nel resto del mondo la negoziazione sta finendo. pensi che gli israeliani abbiano negoziato a Entebbe l'anno scorso? Non hai perso un ostaggio né un passante. È così che misuriamo un successo. E i tuoi corsi estivi vanno molto bene. Infatti, pensavo che dovresti insegnare di più. H- Lei mi sta scaricando per caso?! S- No. Ti metto al lavoro dove conta davvero. H- Nonostante ciò che è successo. S- Perché è successo, Holden. Ti ha maturato. H- Grazie, signore, ma preferirei di no. S- Beh, questo è imbarazzante. Voglio che ci rifletti nel fine settimana. Perché inizierai a tempo pieno da lunedì.
---	---

HOLDEN IN CLASSROOM 2

H- Okay. So what are they doing wrong?

Student- They're making him mad.

H- They're making him scared.

S- So?

H- We Do Not Want Him Scared. We want him Calm. The guy is robbing a bank to pay for a sex change for his boyfriend. He wants a helicopter with a piano. But more than anything, he wants to talk to his wife. Complicated, right? Trust me on this. Always Expect Complicated.

PRACTICAL LESSON

H- Okay, I need you to concentrate. Think of an opening salvo, then think where it could lead. No right or wrong answers, just use your imagination and see where it takes you. Start whenever you like. Go ahead. Important not to talk to a divorced man about his children. Different tactic.

S-Excuse me. What is the point of this?

H-Great question. Psychologically preparing you for reality. And the reality is, you have to talk to them. Somebody demands the impossible, you can't just shoot him.

S-Then why have so much firearms training?

H- Well, because that is a tactical response for when all else fails.

S- But if local law enforcement can't shut something down, then it has required a tactical response.

H- Okay, but wouldn't you like to try something different? Or would you rather use firearms all the time?

S- I'd kind of rather use firearms.

H- Why?

H- Ok, cos'hanno fatto di sbagliato?

Student- Lo fanno arrabbiare.

H- Lo hanno spaventato.

S- Quindi?

H- Noi non vogliamo che lui si spaventi. Noi lo vogliamo Calmo. Quest'uomo sta rapinando una banca per pagare il cambio di sesso per il suo ragazzo. E vuole un elicottero sul tetto. Ma più di ogni altra cosa vuole parlare con sua moglie. Complicato, vero? Credetemi su questo. Aspettatevi Sempre Complicazioni.

H- Bene, ho bisogno che vi concentrate. Pensate alla vostra prima mossa e a dove potrebbe condurvi. Non ci sono risposte sbagliate. Usate la vostra immaginazione e vediamo dove vi porta. Iniziate quando volete. Avanti. È importante non parlare a un uomo divorziato dei suoi figli. Prova un'altra tattica.

S- Mi scusi, qual è lo scopo?

H- Ottima domanda. Prepararvi psicologicamente alla realtà. E la realtà è che dovrete parlarci. Qualcuno chiederà l'impossibile, non potrete solo sparargli.

S- Allora perché siamo armati?

H- Beh, perché la risposta armata è l'ultima risorsa quando tutto fallisce.

S- Se le forze dell'ordine non risolvono la cosa, allora serve una risposta armata.

H- Ok, ma non vi piacerebbe provare qualcosa di diverso? O preferireste usare le armi ogni volta?

S- Io preferisco le armi.

H- Perché?

S- È più sicuro?!

S- Seems safer?! SHEPARD INTERVENES SHEPARD- Holden, I enjoyed that immensely. What do you call that? H- It's just role-playing in a simulated hostage situation. S- Stimulated? H- Simulated. S- All that profanity, is that an academic thing? H- They're improvising. They're learning to create a dialogue. S- How is all that cursing creating a dialogue? H- It's not really about the cursing. S- I'm sure it's all quite modern and fashionable in academic circles, but it seems very theatrical to me. H- Well, in criminal psych, role-playing exercises are considered a valuable tool, with or without the cursing. S- I think we have enough exercises here at the Academy. If you're going to start implementing new ones, talk to somebody in the Behavioral Science Unit. H- They can help? S- They can go over the soundness of the psychology for you. That's their thing. H- Okay, good idea.	SHEPARD- Holden, mi sono divertito. Come si chiama? H- È solo un gioco di ruolo, una trattativa simulata di ostaggi. S- Stimolata? H- Simulata. S- E le imprecazioni...È roba da accademici? H- Improvvisavano, imparando a creare un dialogo. S- Imprecare serve a creare un dialogo? H- Non servivano le imprecazioni. S- Sono sicuro che siano metodi moderni e alla moda, ma a me sembrano troppo teatrali. H- In psicologia criminale, il gioco di ruolo è considerato uno strumento importante, con o senza imprecazioni. S- Abbiamo abbastanza esercizi, all'Accademia. Se vuoi introdurne di nuovi, parlane con Scienze Comportamentali. H- Pensa che aiuterebbe? S - Esaminano la validità delle teorie. È il loro campo. H- Ok, buona idea.
--	---

FIRST MEETING TENCH AND HOLDEN	
T- Holden, right? Holden Ford?	T- Holden, vero? Holden Ford?

H- Hi.	H - Salve.
T- Bill Tench. Behavioral Science.	T- Bill Tench. Scienze Comportamentali.
H- Oh, great to meet you.	H- Oh, piacere di conoscerLa.
T- You had a beer with Peter Rathman?	T- Ha preso una birra con Peter Rathman?
H- Interesting guy. I was kind of disturbed by what he said.	H- Persona interessante. Sono rimasto turbato dalle sue parole.
T- You were, huh? Can we sit?	T- Turbato? Ci sediamo?
H- Yes. Please.	H- Certo, prego.
T- Smoke?	T- Sigaretta?
H- Oh, uh... I don't smoke when I eat.	H- Non fumo quando mangio.
T- Want to go outside?	T- Andiamo fuori?
H- I don't smoke when I don't eat either. So did Shepard talk to you about my thing?	H- Non fumo neppure quando non mangio. Dunque, Shepard Le ha detto della mia idea?
T- He did his best.	T- Ha fatto del suo meglio.
H- What does that mean?	H- Cosa significa?
T- He can be pretty old school. I call this place "the country club," because, you know, it can be a little starchy sometimes.	T- Che è un po' della vecchia scuola. Io chiamo questo posto "il Country Club" perché, lo sa...a volte sono tutti troppo formali.
H- I hear that.	H- So cosa intende.
T- You went back to college, right? How old are you, 26, 27?	T- è tornato all'università, vero? Quanti anni ha 26, 27?
H- Twenty-nine.	H- Ventinove.
T- That's interesting. Lot of guys your age don't want to go back to school because they feel it undermines their authority.	T- Interessante. Molti suoi coetanei non vogliono tornare a scuola perché sentono minacciata la loro autorità.
H- I was hoping it would give me some authority.	H- Speravo che mi desse più autorità.
T- He's got you doing recruitment, right?	T- Le ha chiesto di fare reclutamento, vero?
H- Yeah, well, I'm there, so I might as well make myself useful.	H- Sì. Beh, già sono lì, quindi posso cercare di rendermi utile.
T- Most guys don't want to get stuck doing	

recruitment. They're busy working their way upwards.	T- Molti agenti non vogliono fare reclutamento. Sono occupati a farsi strada verso l'alto.
H- I guess I'm busy working my way sideways.	H- io sono occupato a farmi strada di lato.
T- You are what they call a "blue flamer." You know what that is?	T- Lei è ciò che chiamano una "fiamma blu". Lo sa cos'è?
H- No. What does that mean?	H- No, che significa?
T- You're so eager to do good, you have a big, blue flame shooting out of your asshole.	T- è così ansioso di fare bene, che ha una grossa fiamma blu che le esce dal culo.
H- Oh... is that bad?	H-oh...ed è un male?
T- Just take it slow. You'll get there in the end.	T-ci vada piano. Alla fine, ce la farà.
H- I'm just trying to be a better instructor.	H- Cerco solo di essere un istruttore migliore.
T- Right. Well, I was thinking about that. I started this thing a couple of years ago. I go on the road and give classes in various police departments from Buffalo, New York to San Diego, California. There's a million cops out there who want to know what we know. So I go to them, give them a distillation of what we teach here, and they tell me what they've been doing. They learn something, and I learn something firsthand by getting involved on their level. But it's a big job, you know? I'm up to my neck in local law enforcement.	T- Certo. Ci stavo giusto pensando...Ho iniziato questa cosa un paio di anni fa. Vado in giro e organizzo lezioni in vari distretti di polizia, da Buffalo, New York, fino a San Diego, California. Moltissimi poliziotti vogliono imparare ciò che sappiamo. Io vado da loro e offro un concentrato di ciò che insegniamo qui e loro mi dicono cosa fanno. Loro imparano qualcosa, e io imparo qualcosa facendomi coinvolgere al loro livello. Ma è lavoro difficile, sa? Mi ci ritrovo immerso fino al collo.
H- Would you want some help with that?	H- potrebbe servire il mio aiuto?
T- Maybe we could help each other.	T- Potremmo aiutarci a vicenda.

DETECTIVE WITH HOLDEN AND TENCH	
D- She was found cuffed and lashed to the bed. A broomstick perforated her rectum. Whoever it was made the boy watch, then did the same thing to him.	D-È stata trovata ammanettata e legata al letto. Una scopa le ha perforato il retto. L'assassino ha fatto guardare il bambino e poi gli ha fatto la stessa cosa.
T-How'd he get in?	T- Com'è entrato?
D- Bathroom window. We think that's how he came and went. There was no sign of forcible entry. No one heard a peep.	D-La finestra del bagno, pensiamo sia entrato da lì. Nessun segno di effrazione. Nessuno ha sentito nulla.
H- In a rooming house?	H- In una pensione?
D- My assumption is, he held a knife to the boy to	

keep her quiet, and vice versa.	D- Avrà minacciato il bimbo con un coltello per farla stare zitta e viceversa.
T- This falls clearly into the category of lust murder. By that I mean it's sexually motivated.	T- Ricade nella categoria degli omicidi per libidine. Intendo che è motivato sessualmente.
D-That cannot be about horny.	D- Quello non può essere causato dal sesso.
T- It's more about sexual gratification through the annihilation of another. Did you find semen?	T- È più una gratificazione sessuale tramite l'annientamento altrui. Tracce di sperma?
D- Found some on a throw cushion. It was blood type O. I know that's not much help.	D- Sì, su un cuscino. Sangue di tipo O, non che sia d'aiuto.
T- In the victims?	T- Niente nelle vittime?
D- No.	D- No.
T- He didn't rape them.	T- Non le ha violentate.
H- He could have problems with sex.	H- Forse ha problemi col sesso.
D- That'd be a good bet.	D- Probabile.
T- Could narrow things with your suspects.	T- Restringe il campo dei sospettati.
D- I don't have suspects. I don't have fingerprints, shoe prints, not so much as a single hair.	D- Non abbiamo sospettati. Non ci sono impronte né orme, neanche un capello.
H- Well... The fact that the killer left nothing behind is interesting. It must have been premeditated to a degree. He had gloves, he cleaned up after himself.	H-Beh... Il fatto che non abbia lasciato tracce È interessante. Dev'essere stato premeditato con cura. Aveva i guanti e dopo ha pulito tutto.
D- You think he was stalking her?	D- Pensate l'abbia seguita?
H- Or she just caught his eye.	H- O l'ha notata e basta.
D- What about the boy?	D - E perché il bimbo?
T- He was a witness.	T- Era un testimone.
D- There are more expedient ways to get rid of a witness.	D- Ci sono modi più facili per eliminare un testimone.
H- Why make the boy watch?	H- Perché farlo guardare?
D- And why sodomize him?	D- E sodomizzarlo?
H- That's a good point. Is this crime about the woman or about the child?	H- Questo è un buon quesito. Il crimine riguarda la donna o il bambino?
D- You're asking me?	D- Lo chiede a me?

H- I was just posing questions.	H- Stavo solo esponendo un quesito.
D- I get that.	D- So cosa intende.
H- The broomstick.	H- E la scopa?
D - Yeah?	D- Cosa?
H- Is it the same broomstick she used to sweep the church steps?	H- È la stessa scopa con cui la donna spazzava i gradini della chiesa?
D- What if it is?	D- Anche se lo fosse?
H- He might not be a congregant, maybe someone just passing through, but the church could be significant.	H- Forse non è uno dei fedeli. Forse è uno di passaggio, ma la chiesa potrebbe essere importante.
D- Could be?	D- Potrebbe?
H- With the idea of service. I think that there's a passage in Mark. Something about the "Son of Man."	H- Con il concetto di "servire". Credo ci sia un passaggio nel Vangelo di Marco. Qualcosa riguardo al "Figlio dell'Uomo".
D- I don't follow.	D- Non la seguo.
H- All I'm saying is, the broom may mean something.	H- Quello che sto dicendo è che la scopa potrebbe avere un significato.
D- What? (EXASPERATED)	D- E quale?
H- I don't know. It's hard to tell from just the photos.	H-Non lo so. Difficile dirlo dalle foto.
D- This woman was devoted to her child, tried hard, and some stranger came along and... Come on, Agent Ford, you got fancy methods. What does a broomstick in the ass of a dirt-poor single mom mean?	D- Questa donna adorava suo figlio, lavorava sodo. Poi è arrivato uno sconosciuto e... Agente Ford, lei ha degli strani metodi. Cosa significa una scopa infilata nel culo di una madre single?
H- I don't know.	H- Io non lo so.
D- You're kidding me.	D- Mi prende in giro.
H- I don't understand it. We can't help you with this.	H- Non riesco a capisco. Non possiamo aiutarla col caso.
T- We need more time to go over this.	T - Ci serve più tempo per analizzarlo.
H- We are in the dark here. We don't know any more than you do.	H- Noi siamo all'oscuro qui. Non sappiamo niente in più di lei.
	D- Come cazzo ti permette?

D- How fucking dare you? H- I'm sorry we wasted your time. T- Can I get these back to you?	H- Scusi se le ho fatto perdere tempo. T- Posso tenerle?
---	--

TENCH AND HOLDEN T- In the dark, huh? H- We are. I have studied everything we have. I've taken this ride here, listened to everything you've been kind enough to teach, but we're talking about something we don't understand in the slightest. T- I was trying to help you. If you don't like it, go back to your college kids and we'll forget about it. H- Ada and her son were killed for reasons we are simply not equipped to understand. It wasn't lust murder. It wasn't some random thrill killer who was born bad, and it wasn't a pantie thief who wanted to change things up. It was an aberration. T- Let me tell you something about aberrant behavior. It's fucking aberrant. If we understood it, we'd be aberrant too. Fortunately, it's not incumbent upon us to write a dissertation. H- Well, maybe we should. T- Why? H- Our job is to give him something he could not have figured out himself. T- I am sticking my neck out for you. H- No disrespect. At the moment, I don't think we can say anything to McGraw with any certainty. T- Let me ask you something. Where are you from? H- I was born in New York, but it's kind of a mixed bag. H- Okay. Well, that's what you are right now, a	T- "All'oscuro" hmm? H- Sì. Ho studiato quello che abbiamo da offrire. Ho fatto questo viaggio, ascoltando tutto quello che mi hai insegnato, ma continuo a pensare che parliamo di cose che non capiamo minimamente. T- Cercavo di aiutarti. Se non ti piace, tornatene al college di ragazzini e dimentichiamo tutto. H- Ada Jeffries e suo figlio sono stati uccisi per motivi che non riusciamo a comprendere. Non è un omicidio sessuale, non lo ha commesso un pluriomicida che "è nato cattivo" e non è stato un ladro di mutandine che voleva cambiare le cose. È stata un'anomalia. T- Lascia che ti dica una cosa sul "comportamento anomalo": è fottutamente anomalo. Se riuscissimo a capirlo, anche noi saremo anomali. Fortunatamente non spetta a noi scrivere una disertazione. H- Forse dovremmo. T- Perché? H- Il nostro compito è dargli risposte che non è riuscito a capire da solo. T- Io sto rischiando il collo per te. H- Senza offesa. Al momento non penso che saremo in grado di dire qualcosa a McGraw con qualche certezza. T- Ti chiedo una cosa: di dove sei? H- Sono nato a New York, ma è una specie di miscuglio.
---	--

mixed bag. A little college education, some experience on the street, some insight, a lot of horseshit. H- I agree with you. It's been one step forward, two steps back. T- Let me ask you something else. Do you have a girlfriend? H- I do now, Bill, as it happens. T- Okay. So next time you're a long way from home and you flip your shit, you find a pay phone, and you tell it to your girlfriend. Okay? How's that sound? H- It sounds okay, Bill.	T-beh, è proprio quello che sei adesso: un miscuglio. Un po' d'istruzione universitaria, un po' di esperienza sul campo, qualche intuizione e un sacco di stronzate. H- Sono d'accordo con te. Abbiamo fatto un passo avanti e due passi indietro. T- Ti chiedo un'altra cosa: ce l'hai una ragazza? H- Sì, guarda caso ce l'ho adesso. T- OK. La prossima volta che sarai lontano da casa e farai una stronzata, trova un telefono e raccontalo a lei. Okay? Come ti sembra? H- Mi sembra giusto, Bill.
---	--

EPISODE 2

ED KEMPER AND HOLDEN	
E- Holden, right?	E- Holden, giusto?
H- Edward.	H- Edward.
E- Edmund.	E- Edmund.
H- Oh, I'm sorry. I assumed that it was—	H- Mi dispiace. Credevo stesse per...
E- Are you tired?	E- Sei stanco?
H- How could you tell?	H- Sì, come l'hai capito?
E- It's a beautiful drive, but it's long. Edmund was my mom's idea, so you can call me Ed. (ED SHAKES HOLDEN'S HAND. HOLDEN SEAMS NERVOUS AND SURPRISED)	E- È un bel viaggio, ma è lungo. "Edmund" me l'ha messo mia madre quindi chiamarmi Ed.
H- Sure thing.	H- Naturalmente.
E- So how can I help?	E- Come posso aiutarti?
H- Okay. Um... I'm an instructor working out of the Behavioral Science Unit at Quantico, and I had this idea--	H- Ok, umm... Sono un istruttore dell'Unità di scienze comportamentali a Quantico e ho avuto questa idea...

(ED ASKS HOLDEN IF HE HAD BREAKFAST AND PROCEEDS IN ASKING A GUARD TO GET THEM BOTH SOME SANDWICHES. HOLDEN SEEMS MORE RELAXED) E- These guys are great. I've been here five years. We just clicked right off the bat. H- You like the guards? E- Well, they like me. I'm polite. H- You know, I heard that you used to drink at the Jury Room. E- You mean in Santa Cruz? Yeah, those are good guys. I applied to California Highway Patrol. My mom spoke to the cops to get my psychiatric record expunged. Turns out my record didn't bother them at all, I was just too tall. H- Too tall? I've heard of being too short, but... E- What? H- Nothing. It just seems... E- You think they lied to me? Well, cops like me because they can talk to me... more than they can talk to their own wives, some of them. H- Really? What do you talk about? E- You know, books, movies. I watch all the cop shows on TV. H- Do you know, uh... Joseph Wambaugh, Police Story? You ever watch that? E - Huge fan. I got a lot of my insights right there. H- Really? What kind of insights?(CURIOUS) E- Well, so, for example, with cops, I would not allow myself to walk into a trap because I knew exactly how their minds worked from watching Wambaugh. H- What kind of trap are you talking about?	E-Questi ragazzi sono grandiosi. Sono qui da cinque anni, ci siamo intesi da subito. H- Ti piacciono le guardie? E- E io piaccio a loro. Sono gentile. H- Sai... ho sentito che andavi a bere al Jury Room. E- A Santa Cruz? Sì. Quelli sono bravi ragazzi. Avevo fatto domanda per la Polizia Stradale. Mia madre parlò con gli sbirri per far omettere i miei precedenti psichiatrici. Ma a quanto pare il problema non era quello. È che sono troppo alto. H- Troppo alto? Ho sentito di gente troppo bassa, ma... E-Cosa? H-Niente. È che sembra... E- Credi che mi abbiano mentito? Agli sbirri piaccio perché possono parlare con me...più di quanto non parlino con le loro mogli. H- Davvero? E di che parlate? E- Di tutto. Libri, film... Io guardo tutte le serie poliziesche. H-Conosci...Sulle Strade della California di Wambaugh? L'hai mai visto? E- Lo adoro. Ho preso molte delle mie intuizioni da lì. H- Davvero? Che genere di intuizioni? E- Beh, ad esempio sui poliziotti. Non mi sarei mai permesso di cadere in trappola perché sapevo esattamente cosa pensavano grazie a Wambaugh. H- Di che genere di trappole parli? E- Un classico è parlare troppo dei crimini. Mostrare troppo interesse. Bisogna restare sul
--	---

E-The classic is talking too much about the crimes. Over-interest. You have to remain casual. They tried everything to trick me. I'm too savvy. I don't fucking talk, period. H- Really? That's interesting. E- So... you had this idea? H-Yes. Uh, yes. It's kind of, uh... Well, it's more of a research thing. E- Research. H- Just a series of interviews, chatting with... individuals not unlike yourself. E-We're just talking? I don't get to go someplace, do a bunch of tests? H- No. Yeah, no tests. Just right here. E- Why? H- Well, because I believe it could be useful. E- Talking about what? H- Well, I don't know. Your... behavior, I guess. If you want to, that is. We don't have to talk about anything at all if you don't want to. E- Why are you so tense? You're tense, right now. H- No, I'm not tense. E-Well, I'll be honest, I don't get many visitors. When I do, you think they want to talk about this shit? Fuck no. It's like if you worked at a slaughterhouse with livestock, real conversation stopper. H- Did you? E- No, I'm just saying... People who hunt other people for a vocation, all we want to talk about is what it's like. The shit that went down. The entire fucked-upness of it. It's not easy. Butchering people is hard work. Physically and mentally. I don't think people realize. You need to vent. What are you writing down?	vago. Le hanno provate tutte per farmela, ma sono troppo scaltro, cazzo. Non parlo e punto! H- Davvero? Interessante... E- Quindi... hai avuto quest' idea? H- Ah, sì. È una specie di...diciamo più che altro che è una ricerca. E- Ricerca. H- Una serie di colloqui, due chiacchiere con...individui non diversi da te. E- Parliamo e basta? Non devo fare dei test da qualche parte? H- No, sì...nessun test. solamente qui. E- Perché? H- Beh, perché credo che possa essere utile. E- Parlare a che proposito? H- Beh, non lo so...Del tuo...comportamento, immagino. se ti va intendo, insomma non dobbiamo parlare per forza, se non ne hai voglia. E- Perché sei così in tensione? Sei teso in questo momento. H- No, non sono teso. E- A dire il vero, non ricevo molte visite. E quando viene qualcuno, non vogliono parlare di questa merda. Cazzo, no. È come se lavorassi in un mattatoio col bestiame. Si ammutoliscono tutti. H- L'hai fatto? E- No, dico solo... Noi che diamo la caccia ad altri per vocazione e in realtà vogliamo solamente parlare di com'è, Di quello che successo, di tutta la perversione della cosa. Non è facile massacrare la gente, è un lavoro duro. fisicamente e mentalmente. Non credo che lo capiscano. Devi sfogarti. Che cosa stai scrivendo? H- Trovo molto interessante la parola che hai scelto, "vocazione".
---	--

H- Oh, I just think it's an interesting choice of words, "vocation." E-Well, what would you call it? A hobby? I'd say it's more than that. Look at the consequences. The stakes are very high. Is this helping? Are you getting what you came for? H- I think. E- Good. H- Can I-- Could I just ask you something? Do you believe that prison can help you? E- Are you kidding? H- You think you shouldn't be in prison? E- I think it's shutting the barn door after the horse has bolted, somewhat. H- What do you think the state should do with you instead? E- Well, Holden, a lobotomy's not out of the question. H- Lobotomy? E- Like Frances Farmer. I loved Frances Farmer. She was an actress. They lobotomized her in the '50s. She was very smart and intense... very misunderstood. She was a lot like me. H- You don't think you could benefit from psychiatry? E- I already did all that in the institution. It didn't take. For me, I think surgery might give me the best chance. H- And if surgery doesn't... take, in this modern society, what do we do with the Ed Kempers of the world? E- Well, isn't that your department? H- From your perspective. E- Death by torture? So what are you not telling me? Why do you keep looking at me like that?	E- E come la chiameresti? Hobby? Direi che è molto di più. guarda le conseguenze. La posta in gioco è molto alta. Ti sembra utile? Stai trovando quello che cercavi? H- Credo di sì. E- Bene. H- Senti, posso... farti una domanda? Credi che la prigione possa aiutarti? E- Stai scherzando? H- Tu Credi che non dovresti essere in prigione? E- penso che sia come chiudere la stalla dopo che i buoi sono già scappati. H- Cosa credi che dovrebbe farne lo stato di te? E- Beh, Holden, una lobotomia non sarebbe da escludere. Come Frances Farmer. Te la ricordi, Frances Farmer? adoravo Frances Farmer. Era un'attrice. L'hanno lobotomizzata negli anni '50. Era molto intelligente e intensa... molto incompresa. Mi somigliava molto. H- Non potresti trarne beneficio dalla psichiatria? E- è tutta roba che ho già fatto all'istituto. Non ha attaccato. Per me credo che la chirurgia darebbe risultati migliori. H- E se la chirurgia non... attacca, nella nostra società moderna che cosa dovremmo fare dei Ed Kemper del mondo? E- Questo non è il tuo campo? H- Dal tuo punto di vista. E- Morte per tortura? Cos'è che non mi stai dicendo? Perché stai continuando a guardarmi in questo modo? H- In che modo? E- Strano. Continui a guardarmi come se io fossi un esemplare raro.
---	--

H- Like what? E- Funny. You keep looking at me like I'm a specimen. H-Well, to be honest... It's just you seem like a nice, ordinary... It's difficult for me to square you with what you're in prison for. E- Oh. Well, sure. I was a regular guy most of my life, with a nice home, nice suburb. I had pets, I went to a good school. I was a thoughtful, educated, well brought up young person. There's no question about it. But... at the same time... I was living a vile, depraved, entirely parallel other life filled with debased violence and mayhem, and fear, and death. H- Well... it certainly seems to me like you had your own unusual... E- An unusual MO. Oh, sure. H- Well, I was gonna say...signature. E- An oeuvre , if you will. You could study it. You can spell oeuvre, can't you, Holden? You know, there's a lot more like me. H- Do you think so? People that kill in sequence like you did? E- Sequence? H- One right after another. At regular intervals. I've just been calling them... "sequence killers"... if you will. How many would you say? E- Well... it would be a guess, but I'd say right now... North America, more than 35. H- Thirty-five?! E- But you're never gonna find them if they don't want you to. Not even close. H- That can't be right! E- Well, Holden, I'm not an expert. I'm not an authority. I'm just an extremely accomplished murderer who spent my adult life successfully	H- Beh...a dire il vero, è che mi sembri gentile, normalissimo... È difficile per me rapportarti a quello per cui sei in prigione. E- Ah...ma certo. sono stato ragazzo qualunque per buona parte della vita, bella casa, bel quartiere. Ho avuto degli animali, fatto una buona scuola, ero premuroso, istruito, un giovane ben educato. Non c'è dubbio. Ma... Allo stesso tempo... Vivevo una vita completamente parallela, abietta e depravata, piena di immorale violenza, confusione, paura e morte. H- Wow... ho la netta impressione che avessi una tua insolita... E- Un modus operandi, ma certo. H- Beh, io stavo per dire...una firma. E- Un'opera omnia volendo. Potresti studiarla. Sai scrivere 'omnia', vero, Holden? Sai, Ce ne sono molti altri come me. H- Tu credi? Persone che uccidono in sequenza come te? E- Sequenza? H- Una vittima dopo l'altra. A intervalli regolari. Per ora io li chiamo..."assassini sequenziali" se vogliamo. Quanti credi che siano? E- Beh... È una supposizione, ma direi che al momento... in Nord America più di 35. H- Trentacinque? E- Ma non li troverai mai, se non vogliono farsi trovare. Neanche per sbaglio. H-Non può essere vero. E- Beh, Holden, non sono un esperto. Non sono un'autorità. Io Sono solo un omicida estremamente abile che ha passato la vita adulta eludendo con successo la cattura, finché non mi sono consegnato, perché disperavo di essere catturato. Quindi prendere o lasciare. Cosa vuoi da me? H- Non ne ho idea.
---	--

evading capture... until I gave myself up because I despaired of ever being caught. So take it or leave it. What do you want from me? H-I have no idea.	
---	--

SECOND INTERVIEW, HOLDEN AND ED	
H- Here's the thing. I spent five years as a brick agent and a couple of years at the academy. I'm squeaky clean. I'm Eliot Ness. I'm-- ED- You're Melvin Purvis, G-MAN. H- Exactly. And back then, no skirt in the FBI. No women, just men. Then I enroll in college, and suddenly, I am Warren fucking Beatty. Everything goes. Suddenly it's disco and poppers, and fern bars. I am up to my neck in chicks. ED- Pussy, pussy, pussy. I hear that. H- It turns out chicks do really dig a guy with a badge. ED- "Gas, grass, or ass. Nobody rides for free." H- Next thing I know, I'm with a 24-year-old that I met in a bar. No woman has ever been so into me in my entire life. ED- Don't brag. It's unbecoming. H- Oh, my God. I am so sorry. ED- I'm kidding. H- Man... the things she comes up with in the sack. K- You gotta love that young pussy. H- I do. I really fucking do. ED- You gotta make it with that young pussy real quick before it turns into Mom. H- Yeah. ED- So you were a virgin up until then, that's what you're saying?	H- Questo è il punto. Ho passato cinque anni come operativo e due anni all'Accademia. Sono senza macchia. Sono Eliot Ness. Sono... ED- Sei Melvin Purvis, G-MAN H- Esatto. E ai tempi, niente gonnelle nell'FBI. Niente donne, solo uomini. Poi mi iscrivo al college e di colpo divento Warren, del cazzo, Beatty. Mi riescono tutte. Via di discoteche e popper e locali da single. Sono pieno di femmine fino al collo. ED- Fica, fica, fica. Sì, approvo. H- Si scopre che le donne vanno davvero matte per gli uomini col distintivo. ED- "Benzina, erba o culo. Se vuoi un passaggio mi dai un assaggio." H- E mi ritrovo con una di 24enne conosciuta in un locale. Non ho mai avuto una donna così pazza di me. ED- Non vantarti, è sconveniente. H- Oh, mio Dio. Mi dispiace tanto. ED- Sto scherzando. H- Cavolo... Sapessi cosa s'inventa a letto. ED- Devi amare quella giovane fica. H- La amo, io la amo davvero cazzo. ED- Devi fartela subito con quella giovane fica, prima che si trasformi in sua madre. H- Già.

H- No, not at all.	ED- Quindi eri vergine prima di allora, mi stai dicendo questo?
ED -Oh, you go over like you're a virgin.	H- No, tutt'altro.
H- What?	ED- Oh, parli come se fossi vergine.
ED- What's wrong with that? I was a virgin for years.	H- Cosa?
H- Oh, no, there's nothing wrong with it, it's just I'm... not.	ED- Che c'è di male? sono stato vergine per anni.
ED- Uh-huh. This new girl, she take it up the ass?	H- No, non c'è niente di male, ma io... non lo sono.
H- We haven't really discussed it.	ED- Questa nuova ragazza lo prende nel culo?
ED- Ask her. An asshole will suck your cock right in, literally. It's like a hole that sucks. It's easy. But when you fuck somebody in the neck, it's entirely the opposite. It's nothing but resistance. It's really difficult. Let me. [MAKES A DIMOSTRATION ON HOLDEN'S NECK] You feel this? Feel it. It's all muscle. Cartilaginous. Is this interesting?	H- Non ne abbiamo parlato.
H- Oh, yeah.	ED- Chiediglielo. Un buco di culo ti risucchia tutto l'uccello, letteralmente. È come un buco che succhia. È facile. Ma quando fotti qualcuno in gola, è tutto il contrario. Senti solo resistenza, è difficile. Permetti? Lo senti questo? Senti. È tutto muscolo. Cartilagineo. È stato interessante?
ED- Because I can skip some of the detail.	H- Oh, sì.
H- No, I'm here for the detail.	ED- Perché posso risparmiarti qualche dettaglio.
ED- A major college campus. It's like a giant candy store, you know what I mean.	H- No, sono qui per i dettagli.
H- Right. Your, uh, your mom worked on campus at UCSC, right? Remind me again what she did.	ED- Un campus universitario è come un negozio di caramelle, non so se mi spiego?
ED- Administrative assistant. That's all she lived for, man, her work and her precious coeds, whom she mothered relentlessly.	H- Certo. Tua madre lavorava al campus della UCSC, vero? Mi ricordi cosa faceva?
H- Do you think that she neglected you for them?	ED- Assistente amministrativa. Viveva solo per il lavoro e le sue preziose studentesse, che coccolava senza tregua.
ED- Put it this way, she had a very violently outspoken position on men. She had a failed marriage with my father. I looked a lot like him, so...	H- Credi che ti trascurasse per loro?
H- You reminded her of him. Do you think you developed a dislike for young women as a result?	ED- Mettiamola così. Aveva una posizione violentemente esplicita sugli uomini. Il matrimonio con mio padre era fallito. Io gli somigliavo, quindi...
	H- Le ricordavi tuo padre. Puoi aver sviluppato un'antipatia per le giovani donne per questo?

ED- As far as she was concerned, I was never going to end up with one of those girls because I was a fuckup and an embarrassment. H- You were a failure in her eyes. ED- Look. My mother was a decent, upstanding, reasonable woman, but when it came to me, she had nothing but contempt, disappointment, and disdain. H- That must've been awful. ED- Well, here's the thing. Women are born with this little hole between their legs... which every man on earth just wants to stick something into. And they're weaker than men, so they learn strategies. They deploy their minds and their sex, and they intuitively learn to humiliate. H- Did your mother humiliate you? Ed?	ED- Sai, per come la vedeva lei, io non avrei mai potuto mettermi con una di quelle ragazze perché ero un'incapace, un motivo di imbarazzo. H- Eri un fallito ai suoi occhi. ED- Senti. Mia madre era una brava donna, onesta e ragionevole. Ma quando si trattava di me, non aveva altro che disprezzo, disappunto e disdegno. H- Dev'essere stato orribile. ED- Beh, il fatto è questo... Le donne nascono con questo buchetto in mezzo alle gambe... in cui ogni uomo al mondo ha tanta voglia di infilare qualcosa. Sono più deboli degli uomini, quindi imparano delle strategie. Impiegano la mente e il loro sesso e intuitivamente imparano a umiliare. H- Tua madre ti umiliava? Ed?
--	---

EPISODE 3

WENDY's OFFICE W- When you sent me your notes from the Kemper meetings, I was in a real rut with my new book. H - What's your book about? W - It's about white-collar criminals, men not so different to your Edmund Kemper. H- How do you think the men you study are similar to Edmund Kemper? W- Well, first of all, they're all psychopaths. I study captains of industry: IBM, MGM, Ford, Exxon, you name it. And sure, these men all have wives, kids, dogs, goldfish, but not because they stopped being psychopaths, but because they just had different leanings. T- But you think they have the same underlying personality traits? W- Well, Kemper shows a total lack of remorse, a	W- Quando ho letto gli appunti dei colloqui con Kemper, ero a un punto morto col mio libro. H- Di cosa parla il suo libro? W- Riguarda i criminali della finanza. Persone non molto diverse da Edmund Kemper. H- Perché crede che siano simili a Edmund Kemper? W- Beh, in primo luogo sono tutti psicopatici. Io studio capitani d'industria: IBM, MGM, Ford, Exxon, scelga lei. E certo, tutti loro hanno mogli, figli, cani, pesci rossi... non perché abbiano spesso di essere psicopatici, ma perché hanno diverse inclinazioni. T- Pensi che abbiano gli stessi tratti della personalità latenti?
---	---

lack of inner emotional structure, no ability to reflect on the experience of others. H - You saw this in my notes? W - It would've been clearer if you'd recorded and transcribe your interviews verbatim, but yeah. Although your project is obviously in the nascent stages, it already feels like a clear successor to <i>The Mask of Sanity</i>, which, as you know, is quite a compliment. H- Repeat that? The Mask of... T- So you're saying you don't think this, us interviewing these killers, is crazy? W- Just the opposite. I mean, crazy in the way that anyone with a truly new idea is crazy. But no. T- Wow, okay. (IMPRESSED) That's a relief. H- That hasn't really been the feedback we've gotten so far. Actually, this is the only feedback we've gotten so far. W- Well, these men are just sitting here, locked up. And we're too afraid of the morality of it to see the far-reaching value of their insights. H- Far-reaching in law enforcement? W- Into behavioral science, early detection, criminology, you name it. H- Oh, yes, yes. This is what I've been saying the whole time. T- Oh, have you? W- You need to put this on a more formal footing. It's gonna take a lot of time and energy to expand it into a larger project with a specific questionnaire. Their family histories, what their thoughts were on why they did it, when they were aroused during the killings, that sort of thing. Then contrast, compare, and publish. T- Publish? W- Well, you can't just circulate your findings	W- Kemper mostra una totale assenza di rimorso, mancanza di una struttura emotiva profonda, nessuna capacità di rispecchiarsi nelle esperienze altrui. H- L'ha capito dalle mie note? W- Sarebbe stato più chiaro se avesse registrato e trascritto le interviste integralmente, ma sì. Anche se il suo progetto è evidentemente a uno stadio iniziale, appare già come un chiaro successore de <i>The Mask of Sanity</i>, come saprà, è un bel complimento. H- Potrebbe ripeterlo? <i>The Mask of...</i> T- stai dicendo che non pensi che il nostro intervistare degli assassini sia folle? W- è proprio l'opposto. Voglio dire, è folle come lo è qualsiasi idea davvero innovativa al riguardo. T- Wow, bene. È un sollievo. H- Non è proprio il riscontro che abbiamo avuto finora. In realtà è l'unico riscontro che abbiamo avuto finora. W- Beh, quegli uomini sono seduti lì, rinchiusi. E noi temiamo che sarebbe immorale scoprire l'enorme portata e il valore delle loro opinioni. H- Vale anche per le forze dell'ordine? W- Per le scienze comportamentali, analisi preventive, criminologia. Scelga lei. H- Wow, sì, sì. È quello che ho sempre detto. T- Oh, davvero? W- Ovviamente dovette metterlo su un piano più formale. Ci vorranno molto tempo ed energia per espanderlo in un progetto più ampio con un questionario specifico. La loro storia familiare, qual è la loro opinione sul perché l'hanno fatto, se erano eccitati durante le uccisioni, questo genere di cose. Poi confrontare, comparare e pubblicarlo. T- Pubblicarlo?
---	--

within the FBI. I mean, maybe even turn it into a book. H- A book? (VERY SURPRISED) T- Whoa. We appreciate the vote of confidence, but we weren't allowed to send you those notes. We can't publicize what we're doing. W- Why not? T- Our department head gave us weekends only and an office in the basement. We still have students, we have Road School full-time. We can't just drop everything... W- Road School? T- We travel around the country and teach FBI techniques to cops. We're seeing Benjamin Miller in Bridgewater this afternoon. Road School is what gives us the freedom to go out and interview these guys. H- We can go bit by bit. Kemper and Miller and build out from there. Make a study in our free time, like you said. W- I didn't realize that this was so informal. H- We could make it formal. We can do that easily. And then a book. The successor to <i>The Mask</i> of... T- I guess I just wanted to get another set of eyes, See if you thought this was valuable from an academic standpoint. W- Have you shown your Kemper notes to your department head? H- No. W- Teaching police departments, can someone else do that? H - Anyone can, it's really not that hard. T - That is not true, and it's beside the point. Shepard doesn't even want us to talk about this. You really think he's going to say yes to a full-time academic study? Never mind a book?	W- Non potete tenere le vostre scoperte solo per l'FBI. Voglio dire, dovrete farne un libro. H- Un libro? T- ehi, apprezziamo la tua fiducia, ma non eravamo autorizzati a mandarti neanche quelle note. Non possiamo pubblicizzare in nessun modo quello che facciamo. W- Perché no? T- il dipartimento ci ha concesso solo i weekend e un ufficio nei sotterranei. Abbiamo gli studenti e i corsi esterni e non possiamo mollare tutto... W- Corsi esterni? T- Viaggiamo per il Paese a insegnare le tecniche dell'FBI ai poliziotti. Vedremo Benjamin Miller a Bridgewater, nel pomeriggio. I corsi esterni ci danno la libertà di intervistare queste persone. H- Ci muoviamo a piccoli passi. Kemper e Miller e sviluppare da lì uno studio nel nostro tempo libero. W- Non avevo capito che tutto questo non fosse ufficiale. H- Potremmo renderlo ufficiale. Potremmo farlo facilmente. Poi potremmo pubblicare un libro. Il successore di <i>The Mask</i>... T- Io volevo soltanto un'altra opinione, capire se a tuo avviso era pregevole da un punto di vista accademico. W- Avete mostrato le note su Kemper al capo sezione? H- No. W- Insegnare ai poliziotti, qualcun'altro può farlo? H- Chiunque può farlo, non è complicato. T- Questo non è vero e non è questo il punto. Shepard non vuole nemmeno che ne parliamo. Pensi che direbbe di sì a uno studio accademico a tempo pieno? Per non parlare di un libro.
--	--

H-You think people would be interested in this outside of law enforcement? W- I mean, imagine, like truly imagine what it takes to bludgeon someone to death. The lust for control, the feeling of arousal, the decision to rape the severed head of your victim, to humiliate her corpse. How could you possibly get that from an ordinary police report? You know why it took me nearly a decade to publish my book? Because narcissists don't go to the doctor. Psychopaths are convinced that there is nothing wrong with them. So these men are virtually impossible to study. Yet you have found a way to study them in near perfect laboratory conditions. That's what make this so exciting and potentially so far-reaching. T- It's not that I disagree. I've spent enough time with Holden that I know what it means when he gets that crazy look. I'm afraid it's just not feasible within the bureaucracy of the FBI. H- We've got weekends. We've got the evenings after Road School, an hour or so before Road School. We don't have to tell Shepard. W- Interviewing 40 men across the States is a full-time job. And if you want this to be a legitimate academic study, then you're looking at four, maybe five years. And compiling, analyzing the data. T - Right. Well... W- It's a shame. T- We have an interview with Miller in an hour and it's a bit of a drive. W- You know, this is really important work. If your boss won't let you do it, then you should talk to someone who has the freedom and resources to... T- We'll stick with it for now. It'll be slow going, but we're not ready to give up yet. W- Of course not. T- But it's good to get some encouragement, even if our hands are tied. Thank you.	H- Pensa che oltre le forze dell'ordine la gente sarebbe interessata? W- Beh, immaginate, immaginate davvero cosa ci vuole per pestare qualcuno fino al punto di farlo morire. La brama di controllo, il senso di eccitazione, la decisione di stuprare la testa mozzata della tua vittima, di profanare il suo cadavere. Come si può capire tutto questo da un semplice rapporto di polizia? Sapete perché mi ci sono voluti quasi 10 anni per pubblicare il mio libro? Perché i narcisisti non vanno dal medico. Gli psicopatici sono convinti di essere normali, sono persone virtualmente impossibili da studiare. Ma voi avete trovato il modo di farlo, come in una perfetta condizione di laboratorio. È questo lo rende così stimolante, potenzialmente di enorme interesse. T- Non è che non sia d'accordo. E ho passato abbastanza tempo con Holden da capire che significa quel lampo di follia nei suoi occhi. Ho paura che non sia fattibile data la burocrazia dell'FBI. H- Abbiamo i weekend. Abbiamo le serate e circa un'ora prima dei corsi esterni. Non dobbiamo dirlo a Shepard. W- Intervistare 40 detenuti è un lavoro a tempo pieno. Se volete che diventi un vero studio accademico legittimato, allora dovete calcolare quattro, forse cinque anni. Elaborare, analizzare i dati. T- Certo. Oh, beh... W- è un peccato. T- Dobbiamo vedere Miller fra un'ora, c'è molta strada da fare. W- Sapete, questo è un lavoro davvero importante. Se il vostro capo non ve lo permette, dovrete parlare con qualcuno che ha la libertà e le risorse... T- Penso che continueremo così, per ora. Avanzeremo piano, ma di sicuro non rinunceremo. W- Certo che no.
--	--

	T- È bello venire incoraggiati, anche se abbiamo le mani legate. Grazie.
--	--

EPISODE 4

WENDY, TENCH AND HOLDEN LISTENING TO MONTE'S TAPE H- Well, should we hear it again? WENDY- Eventually, yeah. Okay. So there are two triggers, one right after the other, for Rissell. Maybe trigger is the wrong word. Too facile. H- Also, in law enforcement, has more than one meaning. W- What about stresses? Stressors. Let's make that our term of art. Stress is more internal anyway. It's more appropriate to our focus. T- So, two stressors set Rissell off? H- Her letter, obviously. W- So, the girlfriend writes him a Dear John letter and he... H- Rissell cracks. But he doesn't call her or write back. W- No, he goes down there. T- Stalks her like a hunter. H- Not like a hunter. He doesn't kill the girlfriend; he only watches her with her new beau. Big difference. T- "Beau"? W- So what if Rissell doesn't mean to kill anyone at this point? He's still on track for rape, but it's this first victim's compliance that just kind of pushes him over the edge. T- He kills the first one because she likes it or pretends to?	H- Dobbiamo riascoltarlo? W- Prima o poi, sì. Ok, allora, ci sono due inneschi uno dopo l'altro, per Rissell. Anzi, forse 'innesco' è la parola sbagliata. Troppo banale. H- Ne ha più di un significato per la polizia. W- Che ne pensate dello' stress'? Agenti stressori. Inseriamolo nella nostra terminologia. Lo stress è comunque più interiore, più pertinente al nostro tema. T- Due agenti stressori hanno fatto scattare Rissell? H- La lettera di lei, è ovvio. W- La ragazza gli scrive una lettera per lasciarlo e lui... H- Rissell crolla. Ma non la chiama né le risponde. W- No, lui va fin là. T- La segue come un cacciatore. H- Non come un cacciatore. Non uccide la sua ragazza, va solo a osservarla con il suo nuovo bello. È diverso. T- "Bello"? W- Ok, e se Rissell non volesse ancora uccidere nessuno a questo punto? È sempre responsabile di stupro, ma è la compiacenza di questa prima vittima che gli fa oltrepassare il limite. T- Cioè uccide la prima perché a lei piace o così finge?
--	--

H- It's dominoes. Her compliance makes him angry. He throws her out of the car, she tries to escape. W- Where is it? He says, "The whole thing is just fucking chaos." T- He needed to reassert control. W- Exactly. Which means that the victim's behavior is also a stressor. I mean, it may be that they can't change the ultimate outcome, but they can affect when and how it happens. H- Exactly what I was thinking, which is why I asked the question. T- But... [sighs] H- But what? T- Isn't that just life? Your girlfriend dumps you? You're trying to be intimate with someone, and it goes wrong? Obviously, not that wrong, but it seems like Rissell just couldn't hack life. W- Well, what else is a criminal except somebody who can't function in society? If we want to be reductive, we can say these men can't handle normal stages of development... T- Why do I get the sense "reductive" is your worst insult? W- Not at all. I meant to say you were right. How would most men feel if they were being intimate with a woman and they sensed that she wasn't enjoying herself? Come on, be scientists. H- Disappointed. It would feel awful. W- Right. But when Rissell sensed that his victim was enjoying herself, it turned him into a murderer. So, yes, what happens to these men is normal, but the way that they process it is not. That's our goal, to dig into the why, like you did with Kemper. T- We're headed to Altoona for Road School. We'll try and see Rissell again when we get back, if he'll see us.	H- È una reazione a catena. La sua compiacenza lo fa infuriare. La butta fuori dall'auto e lei cerca di scappare. W- Dov'è? Lui dice: "Il resto è tutto un caos del cazzo." T- Doveva riaffermare il controllo. W- Esatto. Perciò anche il comportamento della vittima è un agente stressorio. Sì, è possibile che non cambino l'esito finale, ma gli stressori possono influire su quando e come accadrà. H- è esattamente quello che pensavo, ecco perché ho fatto la domanda. T- Ma... H- Ma cosa? T- Così è la vita, no? La fidanzata ti molla. Vuoi un rapporto intimo con una persona e ti va male. Certo non male così. Ma sembra che Rissell non riesca gestire la vita. W- Beh, che altro è criminale se non una persona che non si adatta alla società? E sì, se vogliamo essere riduttivi, diciamo che questi uomini non sanno gestire le fasi della vita... T- Perché sento che "riduttivo" è il tuo insulto peggiore? W- Nient' affatto. Stavo per dirti che hai ragione. Secondo voi, come si sente un uomo se durante un rapporto intimo con una donna si accorge che lei non è affatto soddisfatta? Comportatevi da scienziati. H- Deluso. Sarebbe una cosa tremenda. W- Giusto. Ma quando Rissell ha sentito che la sua vittima si stava divertendo, si è trasformato in un omicida. Quindi sì, quanto accade a questi uomini è normale, ma il modo in cui lo elaborano non lo è. Il nostro obiettivo è scavare nel perché, come è stato fatto con Kemper. T- Abbiamo dei corsi ad Altoona. Proveremo a tornare da Rissell, se vorrà vederci.
---	--

W- This is gonna take twice as long if you can't do the interviews full-time. What is it? A question of money, of institutional rigidity, scheduling, what? T- All of the above. W- You know, I've been in academia all my life, let me see what I can do.	W- Sai bene che ci vorrà il doppio del tempo, se non farete i colloqui a tempo pieno. Di che si tratta? È una questione di budget? Severità istituzionale? Orari? Che cosa? T- Le tre le cose insieme. W- Bill, sono nel mondo accademico da una vita, vediamo che posso fare.
AT OFFICE W- So you're in the middle of an ongoing investigation? H- A local detective asked for our help. What else could we do? W- Tell them you have more important things to do with your time. T- We've been consulting with local cops for years. No reason to change that now. W- My assumption is you're good at your job. Which means you're gonna be more focused on solving an actual crime than the theoretical work we're doing. H- And that's bad? W- It's not good or bad. We can't end crime, no matter what we do. But in the long run, I think that our project could have a deeper impact than solving a single murder. T- We can do both. It's not an issue. W- What jumped out when you were talking to Rissell? H- He seems aware of the trap of his childhood. How things might be different if he was allowed to stay with his dad. W- Kemper said something similar. T- They're both playing the victim, looking for sympathy. H- I think it's more complicated.	W- Così siete nel pieno di un'indagine investigativa? H- Un detective ci ha chiesto aiuto. Che potevamo fare? W- Dirgli che avete cose più importanti da portare avanti. T- Diamo una mano alla polizia da anni, perché cambiare le cose? W- io lo so che voi due siete bravi, è per questo siete più concentrati nel risolvere un crimine sul campo che non sul nostro lavoro teorico. H- Ed è un male? W- Non è questione di bene o male. Non possiamo porre fine al crimine comunque sia. Ma con il tempo, il nostro progetto potrebbe avere un impatto più profondo della soluzione di un singolo omicidio. T- Possiamo fare entrambe le cose. W- Cos'è saltato fuori parlando con Rissell? H- Sembra consapevole dei problemi infantili. Di come sarebbe stato diverso, se fosse rimasto col padre. W- Kemper disse qualcosa di simile, vero? T- Fanno entrambi la vittima, cercano compassione. H- Non è così semplice. W- Io credo che abbiate ragione tutti e due. È autocommiserazione senz'altro, e lo psicopatico sa

W- I think you're both right. I mean, it's self-pity, absolutely. And the psychopath understands how that plays to his audience. But the complicated part is that they actually believe it. They have to. I mean, if they admitted that they rape and murder for pleasure, it would destroy them. There's a tension. They need to be seen to have power over someone, and yet circumstance demands that they erase the only witness, which means they have to do the whole thing over again. It must be hell. T- So the self-pity angle works. You have sympathy for both of them. W- Yeah, of course. How else could I do my job? Do Kemper and Rissell have other common traits? H - Is that what you're doing with these cards, figuring out similarities? W- And differences. I've been going through their files. I'm trying to frame an overall taxonomy, except I don't know where to start. T- The crime scene. Kemper's like a general, planning his campaigns. But Rissell...Didn't intend to kill his first victim. All of his victims seem spontaneous. He just walks away when he's done. W- Kemper took photographs, and dissected the victims, and was very good at hiding the remains. So could we say "systematic" and "anti-systematic"? H- Maybe something a little less...Something even a beat cop could understand straight away. T- Like "organized" and "disorganized." W- Okay. Let's try it. What goes where? H-"High intelligence" would go under "organized." T- "Low intelligence": "disorganized."	come far colpo sul proprio pubblico. Ma la complicazione è che loro stessi lo credono. Devono crederlo. Se ammettessero di aver stuprato e ucciso per puro piacere, ne uscirebbero distrutti. C'è una tensione. Devono essere visti per avere potere su qualcuno. Eppure, le circostanze esigono di eliminare l'unico testimone, il che vuol dire che dovranno rifare tutto da capo. È un inferno. H- L'autocommiserazione funziona. Provi compassione per loro. W- Sì, certo, sennò come potrei farei il mio lavoro? Kemper e Rissell hanno altri tratti in comune? H- È questo che fai? Individui le somiglianze? W- E le differenze. Ho esaminato i loro fascicoli. Cerco d'impostare una tassonomia comprensiva, ma non so da dove cominciare. T- Dalla scena del crimine. Kemper è come un generale, pianifica tutto. Rissell...Non voleva uccidere la prima donna. Le sue vittime sembrano improvvisate, se ne va quando ha finito. W- Invece Kemper fotografava e sezionava le vittime ed era abile nel nascondere i resti. Perciò potremmo dire "sistematico" e "antisistematico"? H- O qualcosa di più facile... da capire per comuni agenti di pattuglia. T- Allora "organizzato" e "disorganizzato". W- Ok, proviamoci. Come li disponiamo? H- Beh..."Molto intelligente" va sotto "Organizzato". T- "Poco intelligente" e "Disorganizzato".
--	---

FIRST BENJAMIN'S INTERVIEW T- Thanks for meeting with us, Mr. Barnwright. I'm Bill Tench, this is Holden Ford. We're with the FBI. B- He told me you'll be helping with the case. H- We're sorry about your girlfriend. B- I still can't believe it. H- How long were you with her? B- Eighteen months. H- So this was pretty serious. B- We just got engaged. T- Big step. B- I knew she was it when I met her. H- How'd you know? B- Uh, we saw things the same way. H - And you're how old? B - Twenty-six. T- You play sports in high school? I'm guessing not the football team. Band? Debate? H- Then what did you do? B- Uh, I... nothing. P- Well, you're doing good now. Got your own place and everything. B- Got this place for Beverly Jean. H- She asked you to move? B- I wanted us to have some privacy. H- Where were you before? B- A few blocks over on Chestnut.	T- Grazie del suo tempo, signor Barnwright. Sono Bill Tench e lui è Holden Ford, FBI. B- Mi ha detto che collaborate al caso. H- Ci dispiace per la tua ragazza. B- Ancora non posso crederci. H- Da quanto stavate insieme? B - 18 mesi. H- Quindi era una cosa seria. B- Ci eravamo appena fidanzati. T- Grande passo. B- Sapevo che era lei quella giusta. H – Come lo sapevi? B- Vedevamo le cose allo stesso modo. H- Quanti anni hai? B - Ventisei. T- Facevi sport, al liceo? Immagino non giocassi a football. Banda musicale? [HANNO CANCELLATO 'DEBATE' NELL'AUDIO ITALIANO] H- Allora cosa facevi? B- Eh...IO...niente. P- Ma ora te la cavi bene. Hai una casa e tutto il resto. B- L'avevo presa per Beverly Jean. H- L'aveva chiesta lei? [DOMANDA COMPLETAMENTE DIVERSA IN INFLESE] B- Volevo che avessimo un po' di privacy. H- Dove abitavi prima?
--	---

H- With your family?	B- Non molto lontano, sulla Chestnut.
B- Uh, with my mom.	H- Con la tua famiglia?
T- It must have been hard on her, seeing you leave home.	B- Con mia mamma.
B- I think she was happy to see me move on. She loved Beverly Jean as much as I did.	T- Sarà stata dura per lei vederti andare via.
H -Was your mother a disciplinarian?	B- Penso fosse contenta che mi sistemassi. Lei amava Beverly Jean almeno quanto me.
B- You mean strict?	H- Tua madre era autoritaria?
H- Yeah. She crack the whip?	B- Vuol dire severa?
B- Uh...She just cried.	H- Sì. Ti ha mai punito? [FORMULAZIONE Più LEGGERA IN ITALIANO]
P- Well, I'm sure it was difficult raising two kids without a dad.	B- Uhh...No, lei piangeva.
B- Yeah, he split when I was ten.	P- Dev'essere difficile tirare su due figli senza un padre.
H - What was your father like?	B- Lui è sparito quando avevo 10 anni.
B- I don't much remember him.	H- E com'era tuo padre?
T- You and Beverly Jean ever fight? Perfectly normal for a young couple.	B- Non me lo ricordo.
B- Sometimes.	T- Tu e Beverly Jean litigavate? È normale, per una coppia giovane.
T- What'd you fight about?	B- è capitato.
B- Just stupid stuff.	T- Per cosa litigavate?
T- Like what?	B- Per cose stupide.
B- Like, uh... what movie to go to.	T- Ad esempio?
T - Any nerves around the engagement?	B- Tipo...che film andare a vedere.
B- No, sir.	T- Eravate nervosi per il fidanzamento?
T- You got this place for her? Did she like it?	B- Per niente.
B- She, uh...She wanted to make it pretty when she moved in.	T- Hai preso questa casa era per lei, le piaceva?
T- When was that gonna be?	B- Lei...l'avrebbe resa più carina venendo a viverci.
	T- Quando l'avrebbe fatto?

B- After the wedding. T- Traditional, huh? H - Was that for your mother? B- That was just to keep it proper. T- Was she saving herself for marriage? H- Well, maybe she didn't want to wait. Girls like fooling around just as much as boys. P- That's okay, Benjamin. We understand, that's... That's private. T- We'll keep it private. B- Uh, well... Beverly Jean was, uh, my...first, uh... H- Your first sexual experience? B- Yeah. But she was nice. I don't know what all this has to do with what happened to her... T- Listen, Benjamin. We're from a particular unit of the FBI. We investigate murders when there's a sexual angle. It may be unpleasant, but it's what we do. B- It's awful, what was done to her.	B- Dopo le nozze. T- Tradizionalista, no? H- Lo faceva per tua madre? B- No, solo per fare le cose per bene. T- Lei si conservava per il matrimonio? H- Beh, magari non voleva aspettare. Alle ragazze piace divertirsi come ai ragazzi. P- È tutto ok, Benjamin. Lo capiamo, è...è privato. T- E resterà privato. B- Ah, beh... Beverly Jean è stata la mia...La mia prima... H- La tua prima esperienza sessuale? B- Sì. Ma lei era dolce. Non lo so, ma che c'entra questo con ciò che le è successo? T- Ascolta, Benjamin. Noi siamo di un'Unità speciale dell'FBI. Indaghiamo su omicidi a sfondo sessuale. Può essere spiacevole, ma è il nostro lavoro. B- è orribile ciò che le hanno fatto.
---	--

WENDY AND HOLDEN IN THE CAR H- He lost it. I've never seen a guy cry like that. Bill was skeptical. W- But you believed him? H- It looked real. W-Well, how did it feel? I mean, were you moved? Did you want to comfort him? H - I wanted him to stop.	H- Era disperato. Non ho mai visto un uomo piangere così. Bill era scettico. W- Tu gli hai creduto? H - Sembrava vero. W- E come ti sei sentito? Eri commosso? Volevi confortarlo? H- Volevo che smettesse.
--	--

W- Why'd you want him to stop?	W- E perché lo volevi?
H- I don't know, maybe I'm just callous.	H- Non lo so. Forse sono insensibile.
W- Try a little harder, Holden.	W- Prova ad analizzarlo, Holden.
H- It felt wrong. Benjamin was blubbing like a baby, but it didn't seem vulnerable. It felt hostile.	H- Era strano. Benjamin frignava come un bambino, ma non sembrava vulnerabile. Sembrava ostile.
W- You know, psychopaths are extremely skilled at imitating human emotions. It's how they manipulate other people or how they gain power over their environment.	W- Sai, li psicopatici sono estremamente abili a imitare le emozioni umane. È così che manipolano la gente o acquistano potere sul loro ambiente.
H- How do they understand emotions if they don't have them?	H- Come capiscono le emozioni se non le provano?
W- Well, they have emotions. They just don't believe other people have them. Or more specifically, they don't believe that other people have interior lives.	W- Loro provano emozioni, ma pensano che gli altri non ne provino. O più specificatamente, non credono che abbiano delle dinamiche interiori.
H- How do we sniff them out?	H- E come li staniamo?
W- Well, it seems like you just did. Trust your instincts.	W- L'hai appena fatto. Fidati del tuo istinto.
H- The whole town sees Benjamin as this lost little puppy that needs protecting. Maybe my instincts are wrong.	H- L'intera città considera Benjamin un povero cucciolo a cui serve protezione. Forse il mio istinto si sbaglia.
W- Well, we're developing a methodology, so use it. Look at where the perpetrator went. Hair, breasts, vagina, all symbols of her sexual power. Disfiguring her reproductive organs was a way to neutralize her.	W- Beh, noi abbiamo sviluppato una metodologia, quindi usala. Guarda cos'ha attaccato l'assalitore. Capelli, seno, vagina, tutti simboli del suo potere sessuale. Sfigurare i suoi organi riproduttivi era un modo per neutralizzarla.
H- What about the hair on the ironing board? Was that some kind of display?	H- E i capelli sull'asse da stiro? Voleva esibirli?
W-Like a trophy. A way to assert his dominance.	W- Come un trofeo, un modo per asserire il suo predominio.
H- Benjamin is anything but assertive. Beverly's the first woman he slept with.	H- Benjamin non è il tipo dominante. Beverly era la sua prima ragazza.
W- How old is he?	W- Quanti anni ha?
H- Twenty-six.	H- Ventisei.
W- So that would give the relationship an extra significance.	W- Questo darebbe al loro rapporto un significato maggiore.
	H- Bill dice che lei stava con lui solo perché lo dominava sessualmente.

H- Bill thinks the only reason she was with him is because she has total sexual control over him. W- Well, what's her history? Was she a virgin, too? H-He was touchy about that. W- So then she had some experience, which could either excite or threaten him. H- In the photo, she looks like the girl next door. W- You really believe that a young, pretty girl can't be manipulative? Even if she was using sex to control him, and you have absolutely no evidence for this, then it would be what many women do to have an ounce of power in this world. H- Fine, but if it went too far, if something happened and Benjamin snapped, could feelings of impotence explain his rage? Could it explain him going back four days later to cut her up like you said, as an attempt to assert control? W- Possibly. But then wouldn't the rape already have accomplished that? H - Accomplish control? W- Exactly. In all the crimes we've studied, there's never been an example of a victim being raped then depersonalized. If the killer mutilates her after death, then he usually commits sexual acts after death as well. H- To make up for his sense of inadequacy while she was still alive. W- It's like there's two different presentations in this crime scene.	W- Lui cosa vi ha detto? Anche lei era vergine? H- Lui non voleva parlarne. W- Aveva avuto delle esperienze e questo lo eccitava o lo faceva sentire minacciato. H- Nella foto, sembra la ragazza della porta accanto. W- Davvero credi che una ragazzetta carina non possa essere una manipolatrice? Anche se utilizzava il sesso per controllarlo, e non abbiamo nessuna prova di questo, sarebbe in linea con quello che molte donne fanno per avere potere in questo mondo. H- Ma se si fosse spinta oltre? Se qualcosa avesse mandato Benjamin fuori di testa? Il senso d'impotenza spiegherebbe la furia e il fatto che sia tornato quattro giorni dopo per mutilarla, come forma di controllo? W- È possibile. Ma con lo stupro non l'aveva già ottenuto? H- Il controllo? W- Esattamente. In tutti i crimini studiati, non c'è mai stata una vittima stuprata e poi depersonalizzata. Se l'assassino le mutila dopo la morte, solitamente le stupra anche dopo la morte. H- Per supplire al senso di inadeguatezza quando era viva. W- è come se ci fossero due diverse visioni in questa scena del crimine.
--	---

INTERROGATION ROOM, HOLDEN, TENCH AND FRANK (THE SUSPECT) H- Beverly Jean Shaw was close with your family. We're simply looking for a little background. F- She wasn't that close.	H- Beverly Jean Shaw era intima della vostra famiglia, cerchiamo solo di conoscerla meglio. F- Non era così intima.
--	---

H- Well she was about to marry your brother-in-law. F- They hadn't set a date. I didn't spend a lot of time with him. H- You and Benjamin aren't close? F-What's this "close" shit? That's like women. H- Mrs. Barnwright said you looked out for him. F- Well, yeah, he's a shrimp. H- And he's your brother-in-law. So you would help him if he needed it. Did you fight a lot in high school? F- Like Popeye. T- How'd you land yourself in Warren State Psychiatric Hospital? F- It's probably in your fucking file. T- We want to hear your side. F-This girl freaked out on me, came after me with a wrench. I tried to get it, it swang back, hit her in the face. Then all this shit came raining down on me. T- Why'd she freak out? F- I was seeing some other girl, too. T- They sent you to a mental institution. F - That was bullshit. I had to go, it was part of the plea. H - You did a plea deal? T- Why not go to court, tell them what you told us? F- My lawyer said I'd never win against a sweet girl with a broken nose. There were other infractions, I was running around like a jackass back then. H- But no longer?	H- Ma stava per sposare tuo cognato. F- La data non era decisa. Non passavo molto tempo con loro. H- Non sei legato a Benjamin? F- Che vuol dire 'legato'? è roba da donne. [manca shit] H- La signora Barnwright dice che tu lo proteggevi. F - Beh,è uno fragile. [cambio modo di dire] H- Ed è tuo cognato. Quindi lo aiuteresti, se gli servisse. Facevi a pugni, al liceo? F- Come Popeye. T- Come sei finito all'ospedale psichiatrico di Warren? F- Sarà in quel cazzo di fascicolo. T- Vogliamo la tua versione. F- Quella ragazza ha dato di matto e mi inseguiva con una chiave inglese. L'ho afferrata e il contraccolpo l'ha presa in faccia. Poi ha iniziato a piovere merda. T- Perché ha dato di matto? F- Perché vedevo un'altra ragazza. T- Ti hanno mandato in un istituto. F- Era una puttanata. Erano i termini del patteggiamento. H- Hai fatto un accordo? T- Perché non andare in giudizio con la tua versione? F- Mi dissero che non avrei mai vinto contro una ragazzina col naso rotto. Poi c'erano altre infrazioni. Ero un balordo, allora. H- Ma ora non più?
--	---

F- I'm married now. Got a kid.	F- Ora sono sposato, ho un figlio.
T- Marriage and fatherhood don't make anger go away.	T- Matrimonio e paternità non fanno sparire la rabbia.
F- I wasn't angry, I was just...	F- Non ero arrabbiato, ero solo...
H- Misunderstood?	H- Un uomo incompreso?
F- Makes me sound like a pussy, but yeah.	F- Mi fa sembrare una fichetta, ma è così.
T- Want to tell us about the night Beverly Jean disappeared?	T- Ci vuoi parlare della sera in cui Beverly Jean è scomparsa?
F- I don't know. It was, uh... typical, I guess. Rose was still pregnant back then. Got her some dinner and watched TV.	F- Non lo so, era una serata normale. Rose era ancora incinta. Le presi la cena e guardammo la TV.
T- So you were home all night.	T- Sei stato a casa tutta la sera? [domanda invece di affermazione]
F- No. I told you, I went out and got us dinner.	F- No, gliel'ho detto che andai a prendere la cena.
T- How long were you gone?	T- Quanto sei stato via?
F- I don't know, 15, 20 minutes maybe. Am I under some kind of suspicion here?	F- Non lo so. 15-20 minuti. Sono forse sospettato di qualcosa?
H- We're just looking at it from every angle.	H- Stiamo solo indagando su ogni possibilità.
F- No, Beverly Jean was, uh... was Benji's girl. I barely knew her.	F- Beh, Beverly Jean era...la ragazza di Benji. La conoscevo appena.
H- Strange, seeing as how she was about to be part of the family.	H- Sembra strano, dato che stava per diventare parte della famiglia.
F- Stop saying it like that.	F- Smetti di ripeterlo.
T- You said they hadn't set a date for the wedding.	T- Hai detto che non c'era una data per le nozze?
F- It was loose.	F- Era in sospenso.
H- They were engaged, weren't they?	T- Ma erano fidanzati, non è vero?
F- Benji thought they were.	F- Benji lo credeva.
H- The impression I got is that she was in love with him, wanted to marry him.	H- L'impressione che ho avuto è che lei fosse innamorata di lui e volesse sposarlo.
F- Oh, man, I don't want to rain on his parade...	F- Oh beh, non vorrei rovinargli la festa...
H- You're saying he made the relationship more	

than what it was?	H- Dici che Benji ha enfatizzato il rapporto più del reale?
F- She let him call her his girlfriend.	F- Lei lasciava CHE LA CHIAMASSE FIDANZATA.
T-He got that apartment for her.	H- Lui ha preso una casa per lei.
F- Yeah, that was the big plan, get her to move in.	F- Già, era quello era il piano, farla trasferire da lui.

SECOND INTERROGATION OF BENJAMIN T- You understand you're not under arrest? You're free to leave at any point, only have to talk to us if you want to. H- And you're okay with us recording this conversation? It's just so much easier than writing everything down. B- Yeah. I want to help if I can. T- You know a lot about this case you're not telling us, don't you? B- Uh, no, nothing more than what I already said. T- We talked to Frank. He paints a different picture of your relationship with Beverly. He said you made up that part about you and her being engaged. B- Uh...Well, I didn't have a ring yet, but, um, but I asked her and she said yes. H- It sounded like she wanted to keep her options open. Benjamin? B- Did Frank say that? T-He said a lot of things. B- 'Cause he was jealous. H- Jealous? Why would he be jealous? He's married. To your sister. B- Well...He was always asking when...she was coming around, always talking to her like she was his girlfriend.	T- Ti rendi conto di non essere in arresto, vero? Sei libero di andare quando vuoi e parlerai con noi solo se lo vorrai. H- Acconsenti che questa conversazione venga registrata? È solo più semplice di dover scrivere tutto. B- Io voglio aiutarvi, se posso. T- Conosci dettagli del caso che non ci hai riferito, vero, Benjamin? B- AH, no, niente più di quanto vi abbia già detto. T- Abbiamo parlato con Frank. ci ha dipinto un quadro diverso del tuo rapporto con Beverly. Dice che ti sei inventato il fatto che foste fidanzati. B- Ah...non le avevo dato un anello, ma...glielo avevo chiesto e aveva detto di sì. H- Sembra che volesse tenersi aperta ad altre opzioni. Benjamin? B- Ve l'ha detto Frank? T- Ha detto un sacco di cose. B- Perché era geloso. H- Geloso? Perché essere geloso? È sposato con tua sorella. B- Beh... lui chiedeva sempre quando...lei sarebbe venuta. E poi le parlava come se fosse la sua fidanzata. T- Che vuoi dire?
---	--

T- What do you mean? B- Like "Hey, hon," "Hey, babe," "Hey, sweetheart, go get me a beer." And...he was always getting her to sit on his lap. H- Did she want to sit on his lap? B- She had to or it would've been rude. H- Did he try to have sex with her? B - No, it didn't go that far. H- He told us he was interested. B- Beverly Jean was a beautiful woman. She wouldn't do that. H- Do what, have sex? She had sex with you. B- She loved me. H- But she wasn't exactly saving herself for marriage. Do you think you satisfied her, Benjamin? T- Did you see her that night when she got off work? B- No. I was home, I was watching television. T- Didn't you want her to come over, hang out with you? B- Of course I wanted her to come over, because I loved her. Now she's dead. Oh, my God! Oh, my God!	B- Tipo "hey, tesoro", "hey, baby". "Dolcezza, vammì a prendere una birra". E...se la faceva sedere sempre in grembo. H- E lei ci si voleva sedere? B- Beh, doveva farlo, altrimenti si arrabbiava. H- Ha provato a farci sesso? B- No, non è mai arrivato a tanto. H- Ci ha detto che avrebbe voluto. B- Beverly Jean era una bella ragazza. Non l'avrebbe mai fatto. H- Cosa, fare sesso? L'aveva fatto con te. B- Lei mi amava. H- Ma non si stava proprio conservando per il matrimonio. Riuscivi a soddisfarla, Benjamin? T- L'hai vista, quella sera quand'è uscita dal lavoro? B- No. Ero a casa, a guardare la TV. T- Non volevi che venisse per stare con te? B- Certo che volevo che venisse, perchè l'amavo. E ora è morta. Oh, mio Dio! Mio Dio!
---	---

EPISODE 6

INTERROGATION OF BENJAMIN T- I have two questions for you, Benjamin. First one...That thing on? What the fuck were you crying about last time we saw you? And secondly, and this one is a big question, so I want you to listen very carefully. Are you listening to me? Benji? Why? Why would you do that to Beverly Jean? Fractured	T- Ho due domande per te, Benjamin. Numero uno...è acceso? Perchè cazzo piangevi l'ultima volta che ci siamo visti? E numero due, questa è una grossa domanda quindi devi ascoltarmi con attenzione...Mi ascolti bene, Benji? Perché? Perché fare una cosa simile a Beverly Jean? Mandibola
--	--

jaw. Two black eyes. Why? Fourteen stab wounds in the torso with a kitchen knife. Blow to the head, blunt force trauma. Her breasts were amputated. I need to know this. Why would you do that to your girlfriend, man? (VERY ANGRY TONE) B- I didn't. H- So you're telling us it was Frank. INTERROGATION OF FRANK F- He called us. He was freaked out. I went over. H- And then? (PATIENT) F- I walked into the living room, and Beverly Jean was knocked out on the floor, tied up. T- Did he tell you what happened? F- Benji was a total mess. Think he tried to get into her panties, she wouldn't let him, he knocked her out. H-That's why he called you? F- He calls me when he's in trouble. H- She was alive at this point? T- So why'd you kill her? F- I didn't. AGAIN BENJAMIN T- Why would a man, any man, do that to a woman's breasts? And who would take a hunting knife to a woman's reproductive organs? H- Why did you do that to her hair? Frank seems to think Beverly Jean got to a point where she was interested in seeing other guys. She'd just had her hair done, right? T- Let me ask you one more thing. How does stabbing somebody in the asshole make you feel better? H- Tell us you're not a monster. Give us one reason to believe.	fratturata. Occhi lividi. Perché? Quattordici ferite da taglio al tronco con un coltello da cucina. Trauma alla testa da corpo contundente. Seni amputati. Ho bisogno di saperlo... Perché fare una cosa simile alla tua ragazza? B- Non l'ho fatto. H- Stai dicendo che è stato Frank? INTERROGATORIO FRANK F- Ci ha chiamato. Era fuori di sé e l'ho raggiunto. H- E dopo? F- Sono entrato in casa e Beverly Jean era per terra, svenuta e legata. T- Ti ha detto cos'era successo? F- Credo che Benji avesse provato a entrarle nelle mutandine, lei l'ha respinto e lui l'ha messa a tappeto. H- Per questo ti ha chiamato? F- Quando è nei guai mi chiama sempre. H- A questo punto lei era ancora viva? T- E perché l'hai uccisa? F- Non l'ho fatto. BENJAMIN DI NUOVO T- Perché un uomo, un qualunque uomo farebbe questo ai seni di una donna? E chi userebbe un coltello da caccia sugli organi riproduttivi di una donna? H- Perché prendersela con i capelli? Frank sembra credere che Beverly Jean fosse arrivata a un punto in cui era interessata a frequentare altri uomini. Si era appena fatta i capelli, vero? T- Ti chiedo un'altra cosa. Perché pugnalarlo qualcuno nel culo ti fa sentire meglio? H- Dicci che non sei un mostro. Dacci un motivo per crederci.
--	---

B- She fucked Frank. T- He told you this? B- I saw. T- What? B- I saw her on the living room floor with Frank on top of her. H- So what did you do? B- Nothing. T- You didn't do anything? You didn't hit him? H- You hit her. T- Why would Beverly Jean want sex with Frank? B- He's always saying he liked her hair. Every time he saw her. Thing is, he didn't care about her hair at all. He just used it to rile me. She was too stupid to notice. T- So you killed her? B- I didn't kill her. She was already dead when I stabbed her. She was already dead. AGAIN FRANK T- You raped her in front of him? F- He told you that? T- Why fuck your brother-in-law's girlfriend? H- Maybe show him how to do it? T- Maybe to mess with him? F- Fuck you. T- I hope they fry your ass in the fucking chair. LAWYER- Don't try to intimidate my client.	B- Si scopava Frank. T- Te l'ha detto lui? B- Li ho visti. T- Cos'hai visto? B- L'ho vista sul pavimento del soggiorno e Frank le stava sopra. H- A questo punto che hai fatto? B- Niente. T- Non hai fatto niente? Non l'hai colpito? H- Hai colpito lei? T- Perché Beverly Jean voleva farsi Frank? B- Lui le diceva che gli piacevano i suoi capelli. Tutte le volte che la incontrava. Ma a lui non importava dei capelli, lo diceva solo per irritarmi. E lei era troppo stupida per notarlo. T- Così l'hai uccisa? B- Io non l'ho uccisa. Era già morta quando l'ho pugnalata. Lei era già morta. FRANK DI NUOVO T- L'hai stuprata davanti a Benjamin? F- Ve l'ha detto lui? T- Perché scoparti la ragazza di tuo cognato? H- forse per insegnargli come si fa? T- Forse voleva soltanto provocarlo? F- Vaffanculo. T- Spero che ti friggano su quella sedia del cazzo.
--	---

H- If Benjamin killed her, you should just tell us. F- I didn't see Benji kill her. DIALOGUE BETWEEN TENCH AND HOLDEN T- I hate that fuck Frank, but it's always the boyfriend. When you're lost, you play the odds. It's Benjamin. H- I'm not so sure. You should have seen Frank after you walked out of the room. He looked at me and said, "I did not see Benjamin kill her." T- They're messing with us H- I believed him. T- I am sick and tired of this shithole. H- I know.	AVVOCATO- Non minacci il mio cliente. H- Se Benjamin l'ha uccisa, faresti meglio a dircelo. F- Non ho visto Benji ucciderla. DIALOGO TRA TENCH E HOLDEN T- Odio quello stronzo di Frank, ma è sempre il fidanzato. Nel dubbio, devi scommettere. È stato Benjamin. H- Non mi convince... Dovevi vedere Frank dopo che te ne sei andato. Mi ha guardato e ha detto: "Non ho visto Benji ucciderla". T- Ci prendono per il culo. H- Gli ho creduto. T- Sono stufo marci di questo merdaio. H- Lo so.
---	---

D.A. OFFICE W- It is acutely obvious that, in this instance, the anger was triggered by stressors that were focused on his fiancé in particular. DA- "Stressors"? W- Dramatic life events. Things that pushed both their buttons. DA- Frank Janderman was happily married with a new baby on the way. W- But Frank didn't want to be a father. He hated that. DA- Is that a motive? W- No. It's what we call a stressor. DA- So you think Frank did it? W- Benjamin wouldn't have been able to on his own. DA- You're saying Benjamin was provoked by Frank?	W- È più che evidente che in questo caso specifico, la rabbia è stata innescata da stressori collegati alla sua fidanzata in particolare. DA- "stressori"? W- Qualche evento drammatico che ha premuto l'interruttore a entrambi. DA- Frank era felicemente sposato e con un bimbo in arrivo. W- Ma Frank non voleva essere padre. Odiava l'idea. DA- Questo è un movente? W- No, è quel che chiamiamo uno 'stressore'. DA- Quindi crede che sia stato Frank? W- Benjamin non ci sarebbe riuscito da solo. DA- Quindi Benjamin è stato provocato da Frank?
--	--

W- Pushed. Yes. Frank saw his chance and raped Beverly Jean. Situationally motivated sexual assaults— DA - Wait. "Situationally"? W - As opposed to preferential, yes. DA- Well, look it. Here's my question. Who killed her? W- All three of them are responsible for her death. DA- So they all mutilated the body? W- No, that was Benjamin. Frank and Benjamin left her body at the dump, wrapped up. But Benjamin came back a few days later. He couldn't let go. Remember, he was under a lot of stress. He took the knife to her-- DA- Let me stop you there, because... here's the problem. How do I prove all this? W- I'm just here to provide you with intelligent, accurate analysis. DA- If a jury can't understand your analysis, then it's no use to anybody, is it? W- I agree. But it isn't my job to make the jury understand anything. That's your job. And we have all placed our trust in you. How do we translate this so you can use it? DA- What you're saying is that both Benjamin and Frank killed her, right? W- It's complicated, I know. Benjamin knocked her out because he felt like he was rejected, which is a stressor. He tied her up and called his brother-in-law Frank because he didn't know what to do. So Frank comes over and takes advantage of the situation and rapes her. Benjamin doesn't stop him because he wants to see her humiliated. Now Frank knows that he's in trouble, so he starts telling Benjamin what a slut she is. And that is a big problem for Benjamin. So they kill her. Then they call Rose, have her come and help clean up. And she sees the poor girl in the bathtub and realizes that she's still alive. So they stab her again. And	W- Spinto, sì. Frank ha colto l'occasione per stuprare Beverly Jean. Le aggressioni situazionali di natura sessuale... DA- Un attimo. "Situazionali"? W- In contrasto con "preferenziali", sì. (tono di una che pensa che sia qualcosa di ovvio) DA- Senta, la domanda è una. Chi l'ha uccisa? W- Tutti e tre sono responsabili della sua morte. DA- L'hanno mutilata in tre? W- No, è stato Benjamin. Frank e Benjamin hanno lasciato il corpo nel telo alla discarica. Ma Benjamin è tornato giorni dopo. Non riusciva a liberarsi. Ricordi che è sotto pressione. Ha preso il coltello da caccia... DA- Scusi se la interrompo, ma c'è un problema. Come faccio a dimostrarlo? W- Sono qui per fornirle un'analisi accurata e intelligente. DA- Se una giuria non può capirla, non mi serve a molto. W- Concordo. Ma non è compito mio far in modo che la giuria capisca. Quello è compito suo. E tutti noi confidiamo in lei. Come posso tradurlo in modo che lei possa usarlo? DA- Sta dicendo che l'hanno uccisa Benjamin e Frank insieme? W- Lo so, è complicato. Benjamin l'aggrede perché si sente respinto, è questo per lui è uno stressore. La lega e chiama suo cognato Frank perché non sa che cosa fare. Frank arriva e la stupra, approfittando della situazione. A quel punto Benjamin non lo ferma, perché vuole vederla umiliata. Ora Frank sa di essere nei guai, così comincia a dire a Benjamin che lei è una squaldrina. È questo è un bel problema per Benjamin. Quindi la uccidono. Poi chiamano Rose, perché li aiuti a pulire. Lei vede la povera ragazza nella vasca da bagno e si rende conto che è ancora viva. E allora la pugnalano ancora. E poi portano il cadavere alla discarica.
--	---

then they move the body to the dump.	
DA- Okay.	

DIALOGUE BETWEEN WENDY AND PARTNER W- I don't think that he even tried to understand what I was saying. He just wanted some Buzzwords that he could parrot. P- Intellectually, these people have reached their limits. They will never understand the discourse on any deeper level, nor will they ever become conversant in your vernacular. W- I actually think they're quite intuitive. Anyway, I'm not talking about my colleagues. P- Your colleagues? Are you an FBI agent? W- [scoffs] Don't be absurd. But that is what I wanted to discuss. I'm having a really hard time juggling my research and everything back here. P- I warned you this would happen. W- Well, I'm torn. And I'm not really delivering either place. And I should be spending more time at Quantico. P- I think that's a bad idea. But you know best. W- Well, I'm not sure I do or... It's why I wanted to talk it over. P- I don't have to remind you. Your review is in three months. If you aren't tenured, you'll have to leave the university. W- Yeah, you needn't remind me. P- It's no secret I find it difficult watching you waste your time down there. W- Waste my time? Do you think that I'm wasting my time? P- Come on, I don't wanna argue about this.	W- Non ha neanche provato a capire quello che dicevo. Voleva solo qualche parola a effetto da ripetere. P- Intellettualmente, queste persone hanno raggiunto il limite. Non capiranno mai il discorso a livello più profondo, né prenderanno mai dimestichezza con il tuo gergo. W- In realtà li trovo abbastanza intuitivi. Comunque, non parlavo dei miei colleghi. P- "Collegli"? Sei un agente dell'FBI? W- Non dire assurdità. Ma volevo parlarti proprio di questo. Sta diventando molto dura per me conciliare la mia ricerca con tutta la mia vita qui. P- Io ti avevo avvertita. W- Beh, sono divisa. Non sto dando il meglio da nessuna delle due parti. Dovrei passare più tempo a Quantico. P- Io credo che sia una pessima idea. Ma tu sai cos'è meglio. W- Non ne sono così sicura... Per questo volevo discuterne. P- Non devo ricordartelo. La tua valutazione è fra tre mesi. Se non passi di ruolo, dovrai lasciare l'università. W- Non devi ricordarmelo. P- Non te lo nascondo, faccio fatica a vederti sprecare il tuo tempo laggiù. W- Sprecare tempo? Pensi che stia sprecando il mio tempo? P- Senti, non voglio litigare per questo.
---	--

W- Neither do I. P- Babe, focus on the thing that will make your career. W- They've offered me a full-time position. P- You can't be serious. W- Why would you say that? P- [stammers] I'm sure it's flattering, but honestly, you said it yourself, these people have reached their intellectual limits. W- No, I didn't say that. P- Do they know you're lesbian? W- Of course not. P- Exactly. You can't be yourself. Are you really going to hide half of your life? W- I do that here. P- What do you mean by that? W- I can't tell any of your friends I work with the FBI because it could reflect badly on you. P- Let's not. I told Will and Gore I'd meet them for a glass of wine. Please. Come with me.	W- Nemmeno io. P- Tesoro, concentrati sulla cosa che ti farà fare carriera. W- Mi hanno offerto un posto a tempo pieno. P- E...? Non farai sul serio. W- Perché non dovrei? P- Sarai lusingata, ma onestamente l'hai detto tu, queste persone hanno raggiunto i loro limiti intellettuali. W- No, non l'ho detto io. P- Sanno che sei lesbica? W- Certo che no. P- Esatto. Non puoi essere te stessa. Vuoi davvero nascondere metà della tua vita? W- Anche qui lo faccio. P- Cosa vorresti dire? W- Non posso dire ai tuoi amici che collaboro con l'FBI per non metterti in cattiva luce. P- Ti prego... Ho detto a Will e Gore che ci saremmo visti per un drink. Ti prego. Vieni con me.
---	--

HOLDEN, WENDY AND TENCH W- It's all about process now. Refining our methodology, making sure we're airtight and idiot-proof. So we need more subjects. H- Ones just like Kemper, please. T- Those were the days. W- You know, you're going to see people present with similar pathologies, but the way a person kills is as individual and distinct as the way they have sex.	W- Adesso è questione di procedura. Perfezionare il metodo per essere ineccepibili e a prova di idiota. Ci servono altri soggetti. H- Tutti come Kemper. T- Bei tempi quelli. W- Vedrete persone che presentano patologie simili, ma il loro modo di uccidere è individuale e specifico, quanto il modo di fare sesso. H- E altrettanto complicato.
---	--

H- And just as complicated. W- Jerome Brudos. King of souvenirs. He amputated the breasts of his first and third victims. H- Just like Benjamin. T- It's themed. Wendy loves a pattern. W- It's all about finding patterns. Except he went a little further than Benjamin. He plaster cast the breasts and made them into bronze paperweights. T- He's creative. W- His second victim, he amputated a foot which he stored in his freezer. He had a collection of hundreds of women's shoes which he used for masturbation. I think we can learn a lot from this guy. H - I'm in. W- This time we use the questionnaire. H- Did we settle on that? W- We have to be able to distinguish the fractal similarities and differences so that we can codify it clearly. Otherwise, we're just wasting our time. H- Sure, but sometimes you got to go with your gut. W- And when you first walk in, you can trust your instinct. But once you get your subject talking, we need the protocols so we can build a consistent data set. H- Makes sense. T - What else do we know about Brudos? W- As a teenager, he started grabbing lingerie from clotheslines. Soon he was breaking into homes, stealing women's underwear, shoes, and dresses. And then eventually, he escalated to kidnapping and murder. But he was married with two children by then. T- This file is as thick as an encyclopedia. You think we're gonna get something	W- Jerome Brudos. Il re dei souvenir. Ha anche amputato i seni della prima e della terza vittima. H- Come Benjamin. T- è in tema. Wendy ama gli schemi. W- Trovare degli schemi è tutto. Ma lui è andato un po' oltre rispetto a Benjamin. Ha trasformato i seni in fermacarte di bronzo. H- Beh, è creativo. W- Alla seconda vittima ha amputato un piede E l'ha messo nel congelatore. Aveva una collezione di centinaia di scarpe che usava per masturbarsi. Possiamo imparare molto da questo tizio. H- Io ci sto. W- Stavolta useremo il questionario. H- Abbiamo deciso così? W- Dobbiamo saper distinguere affinità e differenze frattali per poterle codificare in modo chiaro. Altrimenti sprechiamo solo tempo. H- Ma a volte devi seguire l'istinto. W- Appena entrato, puoi fidarti dell'istinto. Ma quando fai parlare il soggetto, ci servono dei protocolli, per costruire un insieme di dati coerenti. H- Sembra sensato. T- Che altro sappiamo di Brudos? W- Da ragazzino, rubava l'intimo steso ad asciugare. Poi è passato all'effrazione, prendeva biancheria, scarpe e abiti da donna. E alla fine è arrivato al rapimento e all'omicidio. Ma aveva una moglie e dei figli all'epoca. T- Questo fascicolo sembra un'enciclopedia. Credi che possa dirci qualcosa di nuovo? W- Senza dubbio. In tutte quelle carte, non c'è una sola parola che spieghi cosa pensasse o provasse prima, durante o dopo i delitti. Non c'è niente sui suoi principi operativi, la sua logica.
--	---

that isn't in here? W- Absolutely. In all that paperwork, there's not a single word that illuminates what he was thinking or feeling, before, during, or after the crimes. There's nothing on his operation principles, his logic. T- Logic? W- His internal logic, yes. Which, hopefully, one day we'll be able to decipher. So, we all agreed. Brudos is next.	T- Logica? W- La sua logica interna, sì. Che un giorno speriamo di poter decifrare. Allora, tutti d'accordo. Brudos è il prossimo.
--	--

EPISODE 7

MEETING WITH BURDOS H- I'm Holden Ford, this is Bill Tench. We're with the Federal Bureau of... B- Can I get something to drink? H- Sure. Coffee? B- Coffee's okay, I guess. Actually... what I'd really love is some cigarettes and a pizza. H- Afraid we can't help you with that. B- Really? [LAUGHS] You're the FBI. T- We can get you anything in the commissary. B- Well, fuck you for wasting my time. - [LAUGHS] Just messing with you guys. H- Do you mind if we record? B- I don't know. Tony, do we mind?(Talking to the guard) I'll do it, as long as I know I don't have to. [LAUGHS] [HOLDEN CLEARS THROAT] H- Mr. Brudos... we are conducting interviews with people who've been convicted of violent crimes. What you discuss with us cannot be used against you in your applications...	H- Sono Holden Ford e lui è Bill Tench. Siamo due agenti dell'FBI... B- Posso avere da bere? H- Certo. Caffè? B- Il caffè va bene, credo. In realtà, quello che vorrei davvero sono delle sigarette e una pizza. H- Temo di non poterla aiutare. B- Ma come?! Siete dell'FBI. T- Può avere quello che chiedi allo spaccio. B- Andate a 'fanculo, mi fate perdere tempo. Vi prendo solo in giro, ragazzi! (ride) H- Le spiace se registriamo? B- Non lo so. Tony, ci dispiace? Ok, lo farò, adesso che so che non sono obbligato. (ride) [HOLDEN SI SCHIARISCE LA GOLA] H- Signor Brudos. Noi intervistiamo persone che sono state condannate per crimini violenti. Qualunque cosa dirà non potrà essere usato contro di lei in una richiesta...
--	---

B- That's your recorder? Where's the mic?	B- Questo è un registratore? Dov'è il microfono?
H- See that little shiny part on the top?	H- Vede quella piccola parte argentata?
B- No shit.	B- Cazzo!
T- You should see the cameras coming out, fit in your pocket.	T- Vedessi le nuove macchine fotografiche, ti entrano in tasca.
H- What you discuss with us cannot be used against you in your applications for parole. We will be asking you about your family history, antecedent behavior, and thought patterns surrounding the crimes you've been convicted of. Our goal is to eventually publish a statistical analysis which will not include your name.	H- Qualunque cosa dirà non potrà essere usato contro di lei nella richiesta di libertà vigilata. Le chiederemo dei rapporti con la sua famiglia, dei comportamenti e dei processi mentali riguardo ai crimini per cui è stato condannato. Il nostro scopo è quello di pubblicare un'analisi statistica in cui non comparirà il suo nome.
[BRUDOS PRETENDS TO SNORE]	[Brudos fa finta di russare]
B- Thought this was gonna break the monotony.	B- Pensavo che questo avrebbe rotto la monotonia.
T- We can go straight to the questions, if you prefer.	T- Possiamo passare subito alle domande se preferisci.
B- Please.	B- Sì, vi prego.
H- Let's discuss the pre-crime phase. Specifically, the day before you killed your first victim, Laura Sullivan.	H- Parliamo della fase prima dei crimini. Nello specifico del giorno precedente l'uccisione della sua prima vittima, Laura Sullivan.
B- I didn't kill Laura Sullivan.	B- Io non ho ucciso Laura Sullivan.
H- You didn't kill...	H- Non l'ha uccisa...
B- They never found her body. I was never convicted of that murder.	B- Non hanno mai trovato il corpo. Non sono stato condannato per quell'omicidio.
H- But you confessed to it.	H- Ma ha confessato.
B- Nope.	B- No.
H- On... June 27, 1969, you confessed to murdering Laura Sullivan, Jane Weber, and Kathy Schmidt.	H- Il... 27 giugno 1969, ha confessato l'omicidio di Laura Sullivan, Jane Weber e Kathy Schmidt.
B- Don't go by that.	B- Non è attendibile.
H- Why not?	H- Perché no?
B- It was given under coercion.	B- Ho confessato sotto coercizione.
T- You're saying it was forced?	T- cioè sei stato costretto?
B- I am looking at three consecutive life sentences	

thanks to an elaborate plot by the Portland PD.	B- Sto scontando tre ergastoli consecutivi grazie a una complessa macchinazione della polizia di Portland.
H- You pleaded guilty to three counts of murder.	H- L'hanno giudicata colpevole di triplice omicidio.
B- They drugged me. Beat me. Wouldn't let me talk to a lawyer. Turned away my wife. Told me they'd go after my kids if I didn't confess.	B- Mi hanno drogato, picchiato. Non mi fecero chiamare un avvocato. Portarono via mia moglie. Minacciarono i miei figli se non avessi confessato.
H- Are you saying you never met Laura Sullivan?	H- Dice che non ha mai incontrato Laura Sullivan?
B- Yeah, I met her. She was wandering around my front yard.	B- Sì, l'ho incontrata. Vagava davanti al mio giardino.
H- Selling encyclopedias.	H- Vendeva enciclopedie.
B- That's right.	B- Esatto.
H- So that part of the confession is correct?	H- Quindi questa parte della confessione è corretta?
B- Sure.	B- Certo.
H- You said... she was lost.	H- Ha detto che...si era persa.
B- It was raining, she couldn't find the right address.	B- Stava piovendo e non trovava l'indirizzo giusto.
H- But you told her that you ordered the encyclopedias.	H- E le disse che era lei ad aver ordinato delle enciclopedie.
B- Nope.	B- No.
H- You didn't say that?	H- Non glielo disse?
B- We got to chatting. She was an aspiring model. Not surprising, she was beautiful. I said I'd take some photos of her.	B- iniziammo a parlare. Lei era un'aspirante modella. Non mi sorprese, era molto bella. Le dissi che le avrei fatto delle foto.
H- Is that when you invited her in, took her to the garage? Sent your wife and children out to get hamburgers?	H- Poi l'ha invitata a entrare e l'ha portata nel garage? Mandò sua moglie e i suoi bambini a prendere degli hamburger?
B- I thought we could use privacy.	B- Volevo un po' di privacy.
T- Then you hit her with a two-by-four?	T- E poi l'hai colpita alla nuca con un pezzo di legno?
B- [CHUCKLES] Actually, I realized I didn't have any film. I apologized for wasting her time, showed her out.	B- [ride] mi sono reso conto di non avere rullini. Le ho chiesto scusa e lei se n'è andata.
H- Okay. The day before you met Laura Sullivan. Can you tell me what you were feeling?	
T- You consider yourself a bit of a photographer,	

right, Jerry? B- Got my first camera at 15. T- You're into ladies' fashions? B- Mm... it's women, isn't it? Can't call them ladies anymore. T- Women's fashions. B- I've got my magazine subscriptions, I know what's going on. H- You subscribe to... B- Mostly shoe catalogs. H- Shoe catalogs. B- It's my smut. T- So you masturbate to it? B- That's usually how it works. T- Did you masturbate to the photos of your victims? B- I'm not sure what you're talking about. T-The photos the police found in your garage? B- Did you see them? [SCOFFS] They're sloppy. I didn't take those. T- Actually, we did see them. There's one of them... Holden, maybe you can find it. H- Did you take this picture? B- I don't remember. Ever since the kids were small, I get these blackouts. It's hypoglycemia, low blood sugar. I could walk off the roof of a building and not know it. T- You see that? That's you in the photo. Which means you took this photo. Which means you killed that girl. B- Boy, oh, boy. Kemper was right.	H- Okay. Parliamo del giorno precedente a quello dell'incontro. Può dirmi come si sentiva? T- Ti consideri un bravo fotografo, vero, Jerry? B- Ho avuto la mia prima macchina fotografica a 15 anni. T- Ti piace la moda delle signore? B- Sono 'femmine', giusto? Non le chiamerei più "signore". T- Moda femminile. B- Ero abbonato a delle riviste, mi tenevo aggiornato. H- Era abbonato a... B- ...a cataloghi di scarpe. H- Cataloghi di scarpe. B- Perché mi eccitano. T- Quindi ti ci masturbavi? B- Di solito è così che funziona. T- Ti masturbavi sulle foto delle tue vittime? B- Non sono sicuro a cosa stai parlando. T- Le foto che la polizia ha trovato nel tuo garage. B- Ma le avete viste? Sono piatte. Non le ho fatte io. T- Effettivamente le abbiamo viste e ne abbiamo alcune... Holden, ce l'abbiamo? H- Ha fatto lei questa foto? B- Non mi ricordo. Ho dei vuoti di memoria, da quando i bambini erano piccoli. Sono dovuti all'ipoglicemia. Potrei finire sul tetto di un palazzo senza rendermene conto. T- Vedi qui? Sei tu nella foto. Significa che l'hai scattata tu e che hai ucciso quella donna.
---	--

H- Kemper? B- He said you guys were idiots. But I'd call you fucking morons. [CHUCKLES] Big Ed with his big mouth. I bet you swallowed every fucking line that came out of him. And he must have loved it. T- Wait a minute. As far as I know, all his communication is monitored. B- What can I say? Prisons are like knitting circles. Word gets around. [LAUGHS]	B- Oh, ragazzi. Kemper aveva ragione. H- Kemper? B- Ha detto che eravate degli idioti. Ma io direi fottuti imbecilli. [ride] Big Ed e la sua grossa bocca. Scommetto che avete creduto a ogni singola cazzata che vi ha raccontato. Dev'essersi divertito. T- Aspetta un momento. Per quanto ne so, ogni sua comunicazione viene monitorata. B- Che posso dirvi? Le prigionie sono come il club del ricamo. Le voci girano. [ride]
---	---

FBI OFFICE W- Fascinating. H- You think so? W- Hypoglycemia? Is he lying or denying? T- My vote's with lying. W- We can learn from what he doesn't tell us. You're not always going to get a Chatty Cathy like Kemper. H- Well, yeah, the whole talking to Kemper thing. T- We called around. There's no evidence they were in touch. H- Which doesn't mean they haven't. W- God, if only... H- If they're corresponding, it could screw up our thing. W- Really? H- How is the study valid if our subjects can compare notes? Wouldn't it be... cross-contamination? W- What would these two guys talk about? Would Brudos share with Kemper everything he's done? These are two organized killers, but they're on	W- Affascinante. H- Dici? W- Ipoglicemia? Sta mentendo o rinnegando? T- Io direi che mente. W- Possiamo imparare da quello che non ci ha detto. Non potete sempre trovare un chiacchierone come Kemper. H- Ah, la storia che ha parlato con Kemper. T- Abbiamo chiesto, non ci sono prove che siano in contatto. H- Ma non possiamo esserne certi. W- Dio, se fosse così... H- Se si scrivono, manderanno all'aria tutto. W- Davvero? H- Cosa succede se i soggetti si confrontano? I dati non sono... contaminati? W- E di che cosa potrebbero parlare? Brudos direbbe a Kemper quello che ha fatto? Sono due assassini metodici, ma sono agli antipodi quando si tratta di ammettere quello cos'hanno fatto. Kemper è anche troppo disponibile. Brudos nega tutto,
--	---

opposite sides of the spectrum when it comes to what they'll admit. Kemper is overly forthcoming. Brudos denies everything, even when confronted with evidence. It's a new behavior to sort by: post-conviction admission or non-admission of guilt. T- You're excited about this. W- I am. T- We didn't get anything useful out of that prick. W- I'm telling you, you did. T- Maybe in an academic sense, but this isn't only about your study. W- My study? Once we've collected all the data, we can all apply it. T- You mean, in four years? W- The way he lies is very interesting. H - How so? W- Well, it's just so exaggerated. He can't possibly expect you to believe him. H- We called him on a lie, showed him evidence, and that ended the interview. W- So don't back him into a corner. T- Guys, post-conviction sorting? What good is that? We need pre-apprehension info, not post. W- You know, Bill, all categories are important for cross-referencing and sorting. I bet you dinner that this guy's got more to add. H- You read the story about the girl he held at knifepoint when he was 15? Made her undress, took pictures, locked her in a corncrib. T- Then pretended to be his own twin brother. W- Right. And he talked all about Jerry. T- That shows how fucked up he is. W- Maybe. There's something about disguise,	anche davanti alle evidenze. È un nuovo comportamento da studiare: ammissione o non-ammissione di colpa anche dopo la detenzione. T- E la cosa ti entusiasma? W- Eccome. T- Non abbiamo ottenuto nulla da quello stronzo. W- Io penso il contrario. T- Forse in senso accademico, ma non si tratta solo dei tuoi studi. W- I miei studi? Quando avremmo acquisito tutti i dati, allora potremmo utilizzarli. T- Tra quattro anni? W- Il modo in cui mente è molto interessante. H- perché? W- Beh, è tutto così esagerato. Non può davvero aspettarsi che gli crediate. H- Gli abbiamo mostrato una prova schiacciante e lui ha troncato l'intervista. W- Dunque non mettetelo alle corde. T- A che serve caratterizzarli dopo la condanna? Ci servono informazioni per catturarli. W- Vedi Bill, ogni studio è importante per analizzare e comparare. Scommetto una cena che Brudos ha molto da dire. H- E la ragazza che ha minacciato a 15 anni? L'ha fatta spogliare, fotografata e chiusa in un granaio. T- Poi si è finto il suo gemello. W- E le ha detto che era stato Jerry. T- Dimostra quanto sia fuori. W- Forse. C'è qualcosa riguardo a travestirsi, fingersi qualcun altro. Gli consente che cosa? Dice che ha vuoti di memoria da quando i figli erano
---	--

pretending to be someone else. It gives him room for what? He said he started blacking out when his kids were small. So he isn't averse to talking about his family. Bill, you could talk about your son. T- I'm not discussing my son with him. W- Well, you don't have to talk about your family. You can make one up. It's just about building rapport. And he asked for stuff, cigarettes and pizza. Indulge him. H- When do you want to go back? AFTER INTERVIEW WITH BRUDOS W- So it was revenge? H - No. Speaking his language. W- This is a scientific study, not a locker room hazing. T - Let me explain. Guys communicate in a certain way. It can be rough, but it's like a code, it gets out the conflict. W- Well, thank you for illuminating me on male rituals. You threw our questionnaire right out the window. T- Your questionnaire, which wasn't working. W- All you wanted to do was force him to admit that he wears women's clothes. H- Yeah, get under his disguise. T- Cross-dressing is part of his psychology. His fixation on women's clothes, women's bodies, wanting to own them, wanting to inhabit them. If we can understand that, we can recognize it in another killer. W- Cross-dressing is not an antecedent to homicidal behavior. T- I didn't say that. W- For most people, it's a harmless form of expression.	piccoli. Quindi non è contrario a parlare della famiglia. Bill, potresti parlargli di tuo figlio. T- Non parlerò di mio figlio con lui. W- Non devi parlargli della tua famiglia, inventatene una. Serve solo a costruire un rapporto. Ha chiesto delle cose, no? Sigarette, pizza. Accontentatelo. H - Quando ci vuoi tornare? W- Quindi era una vendetta? H- No, abbiamo usato il suo linguaggio. W- È uno studio scientifico, non nonnismo da spogliatoio. T- Forse non capisci, Wendy. Gli uomini comunicano in un certo modo. Sarà anche rude, ma è una sorta di codice ed esplicita i conflitti. W- Beh, grazie per avermi illuminata sui rituali maschili. Avete buttato il nostro questionario dalla finestra. T- Il tuo questionario che non funzionava. W- Tutto quello che volevate era fargli ammettere che indossava abiti femminili. H- Volevamo entrare nella sua mente. T- Il travestimento è parte della sua psicologia. L'ossessione per gli abiti e i corpi femminili, il volerli possedere, volerli indossare... Se lo comprendiamo, potremmo riconoscerlo in altri casi. W- Il travestimento non è collegato al comportamento omicida. T- Non dico questo.
---	--

T- But it's usually sexual, right? And we know sex drives our subjects. W- It's sometimes sexual. Transvestism has been practiced in every era, in every human culture. T- If you want to teach a class, go back to Boston. W- No, you weren't speaking his language. You were persecuting him about something that challenges your masculinity. T- What? W- That interview was personal. T- No, this is personal. I seem to remember you encouraging us to use our families to get to him. How objective is that? W- I said use fake information, as long as you establish rapport... T- That's not what you said. And it's not possible. It is not possible to communicate with someone like Brudos and be fake. We can hassle him or we can open up to him, but either option has a cost. FBI OFFICE H- The mom and the shoes. Something happened there. W- Clearly. H- What was it? Her reaction? W- The force of it. Burning the shoes seared them into his mind as forbidden. H- Which became part of the sexual fantasy. W- Then the teacher had an entirely different reaction. So he's getting mixed messages from two adult women about his impulses. H- Brudos said that he was attracted to women's shoes before all of that. He took the stilettos from	W- Per quasi tutti, è un'innocua forma di espressione. T- Ma di solito è sessuale. E il sesso motiva i nostri soggetti. W- Qualche volta è sessuale. Il travestitismo è stato praticato in ogni epoca, in ogni cultura. T- Andiamo, Wendy. Se vuoi salire in cattedra, torna a Boston. W- Sai, non stavate "parlando il suo linguaggio". L'avete perseguitato per qualcosa che sfida la vostra mascolinità. T- Cosa? W- Quell'intervista era sul personale. T- No, questa è una cosa personale. Non sei stata tu a incoraggiarci a parlare delle nostre famiglie? Sarebbe obiettivo? W- Ho detto di usare false informazioni per stabilire un rapporto. T- Non è ciò che hai detto. E non è possibile. Non è possibile comunicare con uno come Brudos, se sei falso. Possiamo pressarlo o possiamo essere sinceri, ma c'è sempre un rischio. H- La madre e le scarpe. È scattato qualcosa. W- È chiaro. H- Ma che cosa? È stata la sua reazione? W- È stata estrema. Le scarpe bruciate gli sono rimaste impresse come proibite. H- E sono diventate parte di una fantasia sessuale. W- La maestra ha avuto una reazione diversa. Ha ricevuto messaggi contrastanti riguardo ai suoi impulsi da due donne.
--	--

the dump when he was five. W- Not everyone agrees with Freud's theories on sexuality, but he did hit upon how young we are when we start to form preferences. H- So when did that come in? How did it get tied to his sexuality? Was there a point at which someone could have... intervened? W- Well, you're asking the right questions. H- I want the right answers. W- Bill! What I was saying yesterday about remaining objective, you were right, it's bullshit. It's very hard. T- I've been around crazy. I was in the army. Road School was a cakewalk. I didn't mind talking about this stuff. But... what the fuck did I even know? W- These people are extremely damaged, and they know how to cause damage. T- I'm running on fumes.	H- Brudos ha detto che era attratto dalle scarpe già da prima. Aveva trovato quel paio nella discarica a cinque anni. W- Non tutti concordano con le teorie di Freud sulla sessualità, ma non c'è dubbio che iniziamo ad avere preferenze fin da piccoli. H- La sua quando sarà emersa? E come si è collegata alla sua sessualità? C'era un momento in cui qualcuno avrebbe potuto intervenire? W- Ti fai le domande giuste. H- Voglio le risposte giuste. W- Bill. Quello che ho detto ieri riguardo al restare obiettivi... Avevi ragione. Sono stronzate. È troppo difficile. T- Ho frequentato dei pazzi. Sono stato nell'esercito. I corsi erano una passeggiata. Non mi pesava parlare di questa roba. Ma prima non ne sapevo un cazzo. W- Sono persone squilibrate e sanno come creare squilibri. T- Sono al limite.
---	--

EPISODE 8

HOLDEN, TENCH AND WENDY W- We'd like you to ask before you do something like that again. Your behavior reflects on us. You cannot use the study as justification to launch personal campaigns. H- Is that what you think I'm doing? W- I really don't know. I can't imagine why you would go after a respected school principal with no history of abuse. H- Because you weren't there. Even Gregg saw something wasn't right. W- It's an incorrect application of the concepts that I'm trying to teach you.	W- Vorremmo che ce lo chiedessi prima di fare una cosa simile. Il tuo comportamento ricade su di noi. Non puoi usare lo studio come giustificazione per le tue campagne personali. H- Credi che faccia questo? W- Veramente non lo so. Non riesco a capire perché prendersela con un preside rispettato senza un passato di abusi. H- Tu non c'eri. Anche Gregg ha visto qualcosa di strano. W- È un modo scorretto di applicare i concetti che provo a insegnarti.
--	--

H- This has nothing to do with concepts.	H- I concetti non c'entrano.
T- She's right, Holden.	T- Ha ragione lei, Holden.
H- What if some guy were tickling Brian's feet?	H- E se qualche tizio facesse il solletico a Brian?
T- Don't bring my kid into this.	T- Non mettere in mezzo mio figlio.
H- Not just some guy, but a guy in power, the head of the school where he will be for years. He not only tickles, but gives money for putting up with it.	H- Non uno qualunque, ma uno importante. Il preside della scuola che frequenterà per anni. Gli fa il solletico e poi lo paga.
T- Do not use my family as an example.	T- Non devi usare la mia famiglia come esempio.
H- You ask him to stop, he won't. You go to the police, they blow it off. So it looks like Brian is going to get paid to get his feet tickled, and who knows what else, and there's nothing you can do.	H- Gli chiedi di smettere e non lo fa. La polizia ti ignora. Brian sarà pagato per farsi fare il solletico ai piedi e chissà cos'altro. E tu non puoi farci niente.
T- I'd tell him to take his fucking hands off my kid, just like I'm telling you to stop using him as an excuse for your unprofessional behavior.	T- Gli direi di togliere le sue mani del cazzo da mio figlio, proprio come sto dicendo a te di smettere di usarlo come scusa per il tuo comportamento non professionale!

EPISODE 9

INTERVIEW WITH SPECK (HAS A SOUTHERN ACCENT)	
SPECK- I'm gonna shit in your goddamn fucking poontang, you fuck-ass... Get off me, you cracker! I ain't talking to the motherfucking FBI!	S- Cagherò su quella faccia fottuta...Lasciami, stronzo! Non ci parlo con quelle merde dell'FBI!
T- I wouldn't say that too loudly, if I were you.	T- Fossi in te, non lo strillerei.
SPECK- Fuck you in your fucking mouth.	S- Chiudi quella bocca di merda.
T- We'd like to have a conversation, Richard. Or what do you go by?	T- Vogliamo solo parlare con te, Richard. Tu cosa vuoi fare?
S- I'm not talking to no faggot feds.	S- Non parlo con due froci di Federali.
T- Relax. We only want background information.	T- Rilassati. Vogliamo solo informazioni generiche.
S- Stick your background up your fucking ass.	S- Ficcatevele genericamente nel culo.
T- You're here, and we're gonna ask you a few questions. We can make it brief, or you can scream your head off and take all day.	T- Tu sei qui e noi ti faremo delle domande. Possiamo fare in fretta o continuare così e metterci tutto il giorno.

S- You fucking turned my cell out. How'd you like it if I looked up your fucking cracks? T- I wouldn't like it at all. Going through your cell was not our idea. Please. Have a seat. H- Mr. Speck, we're conducting interviews with people who've been convicted of violent crimes. We'll be asking about family history, antecedent behavior, and thought patterns surrounding the crimes... S- Fuck you, Hoover boys. H- Our goal is to publish a statistical analysis which will not include your name. S- You better know my name. H- I beg your pardon? S- "Beg your pardon." Fuck you. H- We know your name. Everybody knows your name. S- Who else you talking to? H- People who've been convicted of similar violent crimes. S- I'm not like them. T- No? H- Don't think you've committed violent crimes? S- I didn't say that. H- How are you not like them? S- Them fuckers are crazy. T- Is that a bird? H- Where'd you get it? S- It had a broken wing. I fed it meatloaf through an eyedropper. H- Oh... Did you give it a name?	S- Avete rivoltato la mia cella. E se lo facessi ai vostri culi di merda? T- Non mi piacerebbe affatto. Perquisire la tua cella non è stata un'idea nostra. Per favore. Siediti. H- Signor Speck, noi intervistiamo persone che sono state condannate per crimini violenti. Le chiederemo dei rapporti con la sua famiglia, dei comportamenti e dei processi mentali riguardo... S- Fottetevi, federali del cazzo. H- Il nostro scopo è di pubblicare un'analisi statistica in cui non apparirà il suo nome. S- Meglio che tu conosca, il mio nome. H- Chiedo scusa? S- Chiedi scusa un cazzo! H- Conosciamo il tuo nome. Tutti conoscono il tuo nome. S- Con chi altro hai parlato? H- Con persone che sono state condannate per crimini simili al tuo. S- Io non sono come loro. T- No? H- Non pensi di aver commesso dei crimini? S- Non ho detto questo. H- In che senso, non sei come loro? S- Quelli sono pazzi. T- È un uccellino? H- Dove l'hai preso? S- Aveva un'ala rotta. L'ho nutrito con un contagocce. H- Oh...Gli hai dato un nome?
---	--

T- They let you keep a pet here? S- As long as I suck their dicks. T- It won't surprise you, Richard, that we want to talk about July 14, 1966. You'd been drinking since the morning, is that correct? You'd gone a few times to the Maritime Union to see about getting a job, but nothing had panned out. Did this influence your state of mind? You drank at the Shipyard's Inn Tavern until after 10:00 p.m., when you walked over a mile to 2319 100th Street. Did anything about the nurse's apartment catch your eye? Was it your intention to commit robbery when you went to the door? H- May I see your... tattoo? I read about it. I collected these pieces on you. The tattoo is kind of legendary. I always wondered what it looked like. S- You're gonna have to roll up my sleeve. Well, come here, then, little boy. You want to pet my bird, too? H- Uh, no. Thanks. T- You went to the nurse's apartment, knocked on the door, one of the young women answered it. You flashed a knife at her, pushed your way inside, realized there were several women home. Was it still your intention to rob them at this point? At what point did you decide to kill them? H- I'm sorry. I gotta ask. What gave you the right to take eight ripe cunts out of the world? Some of them looked pretty good. You ever think you were depriving the rest of us? Eight hot pieces of ass. You think that's fair? S- You're crazy. That's a fine line that separates you from me. H- How the hell did you even fuck eight women the same night? What do you eat for breakfast, gunpowder? S- All right. I didn't fuck all of them. That story got blown all out of proportion. I only fucked one of them. H- The one on the couch?	T- Vi lasciano tenere animali? S- Se succhi il cazzo alle guardie. T- Richard, vorremmo parlare dei fatti del 14 luglio 1966. Avevi iniziato a bere la mattina, giusto? Eri stato all'Unione Marittima a cercare lavoro, ma... "non c'era mai niente". Ciò ha alterato il tuo stato mentale? Sei rimasto a bere allo Shipyard Inn fin dopo le 22, poi hai fatto 2 km a piedi fino al 2319 della Centesima Strada. Qualcosa nella casa delle infermiere attirò la tua attenzione? Avevi intenzione di derubarle quando sei andato alla porta? H- Posso vedere il... tatuaggio? Ho letto al riguardo. Ho collezionato questi articoli. È quasi leggendario. Mi ha sempre incuriosito. S- Dovrai tirarmi su la manica. vieni qui allora, ragazzino. Vuoi anche accarezzare il mio uccello? H- No, grazie. T- Hai bussato a casa delle infermiere e una di loro ha aperto. L'hai minacciata con un coltello, l'hai spinta dentro e hai visto che ce n'erano altre. A quel punto, volevi ancora derubarle? Quando hai deciso di ucciderle? H- Ti chiedo scusa. Devo chiederglielo. Chi ti ha dato il diritto di togliere otto belle fighe da questo mondo? Alcune erano belle. Non hai pensato che le avresti tolte a noi? Otto bei pezzi di fica. Pensi che sia giusto? S- Tu sei pazzo. C'è una linea sottile che ti separa da me. H- Come hai fatto a scoparti otto donne in una sera? Che mangi a colazione, dinamite? S- Basta. Non le ho scopate tutte. Questa storia è cresciuta in modo sproporzionato. Ne ho scopata solo una. H- Quella sul divano? S- Esatto. H- E perché lei?
---	--

S- That's right.	S- Potevo scoparmele tutte.
H- Why her?	H- Perché non l'hai fatto?
S- Could've fucked all of them.	S-Perchè arrivavano una dopo l'altra.
H- Why didn't you?	H-Cosa facevi quando arrivavano a casa?
S- They kept coming. One after the other.	S- Ne ho chiusa una in camera da letto, una nell'armadio.
H- What'd you do when they came home?	H- Le hai riunite come cavalli?
S- I put one in the bedroom, one in the closet.	S- Esatto. Le ho legate.
H- You corralled them like ponies?	H- Perché le hai uccise?
S- That's right. Tied them up.	S- Ne avevo già uccisa una, dovevo farlo.
H- Why'd you kill them?	H- Perché hai ucciso la prima?
S-Once I killed one, I had to kill all of them.	S- Perché piangeva e faceva rumore.
H- Why'd you kill the first?	H- Hai detto a Bob Greene che lei ti ha sputato in faccia, dicendo che ti avrebbe riconosciuto.
S- She was crying and all, she was fucking loud.	S- Quel figlio di puttana, non gli avrei dovuto parlare.
H- You told Bob Greene she spit in your eye, said she'd pick you out of a lineup.	H- Perché?
S- That son of a bitch, I should've never talked to him.	S- Ha messo tutta la baracca in agitazione. Volevo solo rilassarmi.
H- Why not?	H- Eri fatto di eroina e alcol?
S- He got the whole place all riled up. I just wanted to kick back.	S- Già.
H- Do your heroin, drink your hootch?	H- Dove trovavi la roba?
S- That's right.	S- Avevo le mie fonti. E il mio distillatore.
H- Where do you get that stuff?	T- Un distillatore?
S- Got my sources. Made my own still.	S- Era in un cassetto della scrivania delle guardie. Ce l'avevano sotto il naso. Non riuscivano a capire cosa fosse la puzza.
T- You made a still?	H- È vera la storia della prima ragazza? Che ti sputò in faccia? È che Sembravano tutte impaurite.
S- Hid it in a drawer in a guards' desk. Right under their fucking nose. They couldn't figure out what the stink was.	S- Beh, mi ha minacciato. Le ho detto di stare zitta.

H- Was that true about the first girl? She spit at you? Because they all sounded pretty timid.	H- Lei l'ha fatto?
S- All right, she got after me. I told her to shut up.	S- Ha fatto ciò che le ho detto.
H- Did she shut up?	H- E perché l'hai uccisa?
S- She did what I said.	S- Perché lo volevo.
H- Then why kill her?	H- E come l'hai uccisa?
S- 'Cause I wanted to.	S- L'ho soffocata. C'è voluto un'eternità.
H-How'd you do her?	H- Per questo hai accoltellato le altre? Per fare prima?
S- Choked her. Took forever.	S- Esatto.
H-Is that why you stabbed the others? It was faster?	H- Inizialmente avevi detto che non le avresti uccise, che volevi solo derubarle.
S- That's right.	S- Avevo mentito.
H- Originally, you told them you weren't gonna kill them, just rob them.	H- Magari eri sconvolto?
S- I guess I fucking lied.	S- No! Ho solo deciso di ucciderle.
H- Maybe you got overwhelmed?	H- Tranne una.
S- No. I just decided to kill them.	S- Quella puttana furba. Si è nascosta sotto il letto. Non sono mai stato bravo in matematica. E con tutte quelle ragazze, ho perso il conto.
H- Except the one.	H- E poi c'era sangue dappertutto.
S- She was a sneaky bitch. Hid under a bed. You know, I never did have much use for math. And all them girls, I lost count.	S- Eh già, me sembravano tutte morte.
H- And there was blood fucking everywhere.	H- E loro non fecero nulla, eccetto iniziare a piangere quando capirono che era finita. Ti sei chiesto perché l'hai fatto? Non sei curioso?
S- Yep, they all looked dead to me.	S – Io non ci pensavo più, ma poi siete arrivati voi stronzi.
H- They'd done nothing, except maybe start crying when they realized this was it. Ever wonder why you did it? Not even curious?	H- Dimmi di quando hai tentato di ucciderti.
S- I don't think about it at all until peckers like you show up.	S- Non so di che stai parlando.
H- What about when you tried to off yourself?	H- L'hai fatto in quel motel da un dollaro la notte.
S- Don't know what you're talking about.	S- Io non l'ho fatto.

H- You attempted suicide in that dollar motel. S- I didn't do that. H- Well, you slashed your wrists. S- Fuck no! That was a fight. H- What was? S- How I got cut. H- Who'd you fight? S- Some river coon trying to hustle. H- Just happened to be on both wrists? S- I killed that motherfucker. H- You killed him, too? S- Shit, yeah. H- I didn't see that in the paper. S- Because nobody gives a fuck about that. H- You lost a lot of blood. Did it hurt? S- I didn't feel fucking nothing. H- Do you still feel nothing? S- That's right. H- It feels good, feeling nothing. S- Sure. H- Are you sure, when you slashed your wrists, you didn't feel bad about those girls? S- I told you, I didn't do that. H- Maybe you weren't feeling bad about the girls. Maybe you were feeling sorry for yourself. S- Fuck you, peckerhead! You know why those cunts died? Because it just wasn't their fucking night.	H- Ti sei tagliato i polsi. S- Cazzo, NO! È stato in una rissa. H- Che cosa? S- Che mi sono tagliato. H- Con chi hai lottato? S- Un negro che voleva fregarmi. H- E ti ha ferito a entrambi i polsi? S- L'ho ucciso, quello stronzo. H- Hai ucciso anche lui? S- Cazzo, sì! H- Non l'ho letto sui giornali. S- Perché a nessuno fregava un cazzo di quello. H- perdevi molto sangue. Faceva male? S- Non ho provato niente. H- Continui a non provarlo? S- Esatto. H- Fa star bene non provare niente. S - Certo. H- Sei sicuro che quando ti sei tagliato i polsi non ti sentivi in colpa per quelle donne? S- ho detto che non l'ho fatto. H- Magari non provavi pena per quelle ragazze, ma forse tu compativi te stesso. S- Fottiti, testa di cazzo! (arrabbiato) Sai perché quelle fiche sono morte? Perché non era la loro serata.
--	--

OUTSIDE PRISON, HOLDEN AND TENCH

H- Well, that was fucked up. When he started talking about feeding it through an eyedropper, I actually felt sorry for the guy. We really should videotape these interviews. Audio is never gonna do it justice. A video archive of our most violent offenders. Imagine that for posterity. "It just wasn't their night."

T- You might want to consider losing the tape. Or saying it got mangled. The recorder chewed it.

H- Why would I do that?

T- "Eight ripe cunts."

H- I was getting him talking.

T- That excuse is wearing thin.

H- Bill, don't get caught up in semantics.

T- I don't like the language, and I know at least one person who won't either.

H- Am I supposed to be cowed by Wendy?

T- I'm just saying...

H- You pushed back when she reamed us about Brudos.

T- Because we got something worthwhile from him. I can do this stuff. I can choke down the bile, manufacture empathy, when our subjects are at least informative.

H- You couldn't choke it down with Brudos...

T- Shut up, let me finish. But someone like Speck isn't worth our time. The fact that his death sentence was commuted is a national disgrace.

H- We decided no one was beneath our contempt.

T- That snail didn't change your mind?

H- We can learn from snails.

H- Beh, è stato intenso. Quando parlava di come nutriva quell'uccellino, quasi mi dispiaceva per lui. Dovremmo fare delle riprese video. L'audio non gli rende giustizia. Un video-archivio dei criminali più violenti. Per i posteri. "Non era la loro serata."

T- Dovresti considerare di perdere quel nastro. O dire che si è rovinato. O che il registratore l'ha mangiato.

H- Perché mai dovrei farlo?

T- "Otto belle fighe."

H- Volevo farlo parlare.

T- Questa scusa ormai ci va stretta.

H- Bill, non far caso ai dettagli.

T- Non mi piace questo linguaggio e conosco almeno un'altra persona a cui non piace.

H- Dovrei farmi intimorire da Wendy?

T- Sto solo dicendo...

H- Le hai tenuto testa, su Brudos.

T- Avevamo ottenuto qualcosa di importante da lui. Posso fare queste cose. Soffocare la rabbia, fingere empatia se ci danno informazioni interessanti.

H- Non con Brudos...

T- Sta' zitto e fammi finire. Una persona come Speck non vale il nostro tempo. Che la condanna a morte sia stata commutata è una vergogna nazionale.

H- Si era detto di non disprezzare nessuno.

T- Quel verme non ti ha fatto cambiare idea?

H- Possiamo imparare dai vermi.

T- Che abbiamo imparato?

T- What did we learn? H- That some subjects have no idea what's behind the horrific acts they commit. T- It was disgusting. I don't want to be part of it. H- When did you get thin-skinned? T- I'm trying to warn you, your attitude is gonna bite you in the ass. There is no dishonor in losing at least the first three minutes of that tape.	H- Che alcuni soggetti non sanno cosa ci sia dietro le proprie azioni efferate. T- È stato disgustoso e non voglio farne parte. H- Da quando sei così sensibile? T- Sto cercando di avvisarti che il tuo modo di fare ti si rivolterà contro. Non c'è alcun disonore nel perdere almeno i primi tre minuti di quel nastro.
--	--

FBI OFFICE W- He admits to raping only one of the women. T- We already knew that. W- Why does he bring it up? He wasn't initially forthcoming. H- I believe I asked him how he managed to have sex with all those nurses. W- Wait, you caught him off guard, he told the truth? H- I guess so. W- This rape was committed reflexively. The crime scene photos indicate that she was facedown on the couch, so she was already depersonalized to him. It was probably just a "what the fuck" fuck. So he goes to the boardinghouse drunk, looking for someone to rob. And then he finds himself in this situation with all these women. He corrals them and then he rapes one of them. To prove he can? H- Statement of sexual competence. W- Which he later exaggerates in the interview, claiming he could have raped them all. H- He was bragging the whole time. He turned his suicide attempt into a bar fight. W- Yeah, projecting machismo. It would be interesting to know how old he was when he got	W- Ha ammesso di averne stuprata solo una. T- Quello già lo sapevamo. W- Sì, ma perché l'ha detto? Non sembrava collaborativo. H- Gli ho chiesto come avesse fatto a fare sesso con tutte quante. W- L'hai preso alla sprovvista e ti ha detto la verità? H- Penso di sì. W- Lo stupro è stato commesso d'impulso. Le foto indicano che la donna era a faccia in giù sul divano. Per lui era depersonalizzata. Probabilmente è stato 'massi cazzo, scopiamo'. Quindi lui è andato alla pensione ubriaco, cercando qualcosa da rubare. Poi si è trovato in quella situazione, con così tante donne. Le ha legate e ne ha violentata una. Per dimostrare cosa? H- Il suo predominio sessuale. W- Che poi ha esagerato, dichiarando che poteva stuprarle tutte. H- Sì è vantato tutto il tempo. Ha cambiato il tentato suicidio in rissa. W- Sì, proiettando machismo. Sarebbe interessante sapere a quanti anni aveva quando ha fatto quel
---	---

that tattoo. Because that was the conscious decision for him to brand himself a badass. H- We didn't get much history. The bird in the fan kind of ended things. W- That moment? Vintage Speck. You had just accused him of cowardice by attempting suicide. And nobody born to raise hell is a coward. The bird was just further demonstration. GREGG- I like the part where he doesn't want to be lumped in with other subjects because they're crazy. W - Again, projection of self-image. Speck is powerful, superior, exceptional. T- But did we learn anything new? Anything that wasn't in our files? W- He had no idea what he was going to do. Every single act he committed was... spontaneous. T- We knew that from the evidence. Speck was so out of it, the woman who answered the door was the only one he forgot to kill. W- Yeah, but to hear him say it, that's extremely valuable. We need terminology to distinguish a Kemper from a Speck. One drives around with ropes, knives, plastic bags in his trunk and returns to a specific hunting ground looking for specific prey, while the other just happens upon his victims. GREGG- Isn't it "Organized" and "disorganized"? W- No. Those terms describe procedure. I'm looking... For example, Charles Whitman is similar to Speck. He killed 14 people in 90 minutes. He's not a sequence killer, he's... H- Whitman was on a spree. W- His victims weren't selected. T- Spree is good for Speck or Whitman. But I think sequence killer is wrong for someone like Kemper. It feels too cadenced. H- It should feel like a long story. Continually	tatuaggio. Perché lì decise volontariamente di marchiarsi come uno cazzuto. H- Non ci ha più detto molto. La morte dell'uccellino ha concluso tutto. W- Ecco, in quel momento è il vero Richard Speck. Gli avete dato del vigliacco che ha cercato di suicidarsi. E nessuno che è "nato per scatenare l'inferno" è un vigliacco. L'uccello ne è la dimostrazione. GREGG- Mi piace la parte in cui non vuole essere associato agli altri perché sono "pazzi". W- Un'altra proiezione di autostima. Speck è potente, superiore, eccezionale. T- Abbiamo imparato qualcosa di nuovo? Qualcosa che non fosse già in archivio? W- Lui non aveva idea di quello che avrebbe fatto. Ogni azione che ha commesso è stata... spontanea. T- E lo sapevamo dalle prove. Era talmente ubriaco che ha dimenticato di uccidere proprio la donna che lo ha fatto entrare. W-Già, ma sentirglielo ammettere è stato estremamente prezioso. Ci serve una terminologia per distinguere un Kemper da uno Speck. Uno va in giro con corde, coltelli e sacchi nel suo bagagliaio e torna su uno specifico terreno di caccia in cerca di una preda, mentre l'altro incontra le vittime "per caso". GREGG- "Organizzato" e "disorganizzato"? W- No, quei termini descrivono la procedura. Sto cercando...Ad esempio, Charles Whitman è simile a Speck. Ha ucciso 14 persone in 90 minuti. Non è un "assassino sequenziale", è... H- Whitman era compulsivo. W- Non aveva scelto le vittime. Bill? T- "Compulsivo" va bene per Speck e Whitman. Ma "assassino sequenziale" non si adatta a uno come Kemper. È troppo cadenzato.
--	---

updated. T- A series of killings. H - Serial? Serial murderer? Serial killer? W- That's better. Let's see if it sticks.	H- Deve far pensare a una lunga storia, aggiornata di continuo. T- Una serie di omicidi. H- Seriale? Assassino seriale? Serial killer? W- Suona bene. Vediamo se si adatta.
---	---

FBI OFFICE, AFTER MEETING WITH the Office of Professional Responsibility H- I would've left it as is. I really don't have a problem with this being public. S- All of us have to go along with what you consider to be appropriate? H- We've never discussed what's appropriate. W- Of course we have. H- We haven't made decisions. There's no procedural rule book for how to talk to these people. W- We spent a month drawing up that questionnaire. It is a framework for substantive input. (ANGRY AS SHEPARD) H- It doesn't always work. W- You haven't let it work. You're so impatient, you weren't in there three minutes with Speck before you got him going with the cunt speak. H- That's when he admitted to raping only one of the women. You want truffles, you gotta get in the dirt with the pigs. S- No, we don't. We are the FBI. H- Look at that board. Look at our work. Because of that, Bill and I were able to identify a murderer last week in Georgia. This is no longer a theoretical exercise. W- That board is mostly the result of background research, not priceless gems you seem to think	H- Io non l'avrei redatto. Per me, possiamo renderlo pubblico. S- Dovremmo assecondare tutto ciò che tu ritieni appropriato? H- Non si è discusso di cosa sia appropriato. W- Certo che sì. H- Non abbiamo preso decisioni. Non c'è un manuale su come parlare a questa gente. W- Abbiamo passato un mese a fare quel questionario. È una struttura per nozioni sostanziali. H- Non sempre funziona. W- Non l'hai lasciato funzionare. Eri così impaziente. Eri lì da almeno tre minuti con Speck quando te ne sei uscito con la storia delle "fighe". H- E lui ha ammesso di averne stuprata solo una. Se vuoi tartufi, devi scavare insieme ai maiali. S- No, affatto. Noi siamo dell'FBI. H- Guardate quella lavagna. Il nostro lavoro. Io e Bill abbiamo identificato un assassino in Georgia. Non è più solo un esercizio teorico. W- Quella lavagna è risultato di una ricerca, non la gemma preziosa che pensi di aver trovato.
--	--

you're mining. H- It all goes together. Everything we do informs the bigger picture. W- Right, and if our tactics blow back on us, then the whole thing could be jeopardized. We have at least 40 convicts to interview, the data will aggregate...	H- È tutto collegato, Wendy. Quello che facciamo contribuisce al quadro completo. W- è esatto, ma se le tue tecniche ci si rivoltano contro, mettono a rischio l'intero programma. Abbiamo altri 40 detenuti da intervistare, i dati sono...
---	--

EPISODE 10

D.A. OFFICE; HOLDEN AND WENDY	
H- Follow my lead. I'm used to talking to law enforcement. District Attorney Mayweather, thank you for meeting with us on such short notice. DA (SOUTHERN ACCENT)- Oh, Esther, please. I am delighted to meet the man who delivered me Gene Devier. H- My pleasure. Professor Carr's a consultant at the FBI and she has been instrumental in developing a program... DA- I'm sorry. I have as long as it takes to finish this sandwich. W- We have been interviewing extremely violent offenders. The worst of the worst. This involves establishing an element of trust so that they offer information to us voluntarily. We try to be objective because what they have to say is valuable. But if they see that our techniques are being used to eradicate them, then... DA- Now how would your techniques be used for that? W- Agent Ford assembled a psychological sketch of Mr. Devier, based on research, which was used to secure a confession. So if he's convicted and executed, then... DA- Honey, we don't kill criminals. They kill themselves. W- What does that mean?	H- Lascia fare a me. Parlo spesso con le forze dell'ordine. Procuratore Mayweather, grazie di averci ricevuti senza preavviso. DA- Chiamatemi Esther. Sono lieta d'incontrare l'uomo che mi ha consegnato Devier. H- Piacere mio. La professoressa Carr è consulente per l'FBI ed è stata determinante nel creare un programma... DA- Mi scusi, ma una volta finito il panino devo andare. W- Intervistiamo criminali estremamente violenti. Il peggio del peggio. Questo comporta instaurare un minimo di fiducia perché ci offrano informazioni volontariamente. Cerchiamo di essere obiettivi, perché quello che hanno da dire è prezioso. Ma se vedessero che le nostre tecniche sono usate per eradicare, allora... DA- E in che modo servirebbero a questo? W- L'agente Ford ha realizzato un profilo psicologico del signor Devier basato sulla ricerca e l'ha usato per ottenere una confessione. Se lui sarà condannato e giustiziato, allora... DA- Tesoro, noi non uccidiamo i criminali. Si uccidono da soli. W- Che significa?

DA- It's their behavior that puts them in that chair. When I talk to a jury, I always ask, "Do you watch TV?" Most of them do. I say, "Who watches the cop shows?" Right there you know whether you've got a smart jury or a stupid one. So I say, "Forget TV, 'cause it'll never show you the experience of the victim." "You will never hear the cries of a woman being raped on The Rockford Files. You won't smell burning flesh from the cigarettes being put to her body on Hawaii Five-O." W- I'm not arguing prosecution strategies. I'm simply... DA- And I'm not done talking. My point is that when you go from an abstract idea of murder to the visceral reality, you can no longer be objective. Only when you feel the pain of those victims and their loved ones can you know the magnitude of the choice that killer made. And it's that choice that seals his fate. W- There's no reason to kill people when we have the wherewithal to lock them up. These people spend the rest of their lives in horrendous conditions, which likely reflect the environments in which they were raised. H- Maybe... I'm sorry. But maybe instead of debating the pros and cons of... DA- Yes, cut to the point. Are you actually asking me to shoot lower than capital punishment so it won't reflect poorly on the FBI? W- Not the FBI, our work in Behavioral Science. If it's compromised, I'm afraid we won't be able to achieve our ultimate goal, which is to hopefully prevent this type of crime from being committed. I am asking you to consider life without the possibility of parole. DA- I'm an elected official. Here in Georgia, death is the will of the people. And if you don't want to be involved publicly, then maybe you should keep yourselves out of the news. HOLDEN AND WENDY	DA- È il loro comportamento a metterli su quella sedia. Quando parlo a una giuria, chiedo sempre: "Guardate la TV?" I più lo fanno. "Vi piacciono le serie poliziesche?" Così capisco se ho dei giurati intelligenti o stupidi. Poi dico: "Dimenticate la TV, non mostra l'esperienza della vittima". Non sentite le grida di una donna stuprata, durante <i>Agenzia Rockford.</i> Non sentite la carne bruciata dalle sigarette premute sul suo corpo in <i>Hawaii Five-O </i>. W- Non discuto di strategie processuali. Voglio solamente... DA- E io non ho finito di parlare. Il punto è che quando passi da un'idea astratta di omicidio alla realtà viscerale, non puoi più essere obiettivo. Solo quando provi il dolore delle vittime e dei loro cari puoi comprendere l'enormità della scelta fatta dall'assassino. Ed è quella scelta a decretarne il destino. W- Non c'è motivo di ucciderli, quando abbiamo i mezzi per metterli sottochiave. Queste persone passano il resto della vita in condizioni orribili, che spesso riflettono l'ambiente in cui sono cresciuti e... H- Forse... Scusa, ma forse invece di dibattere i pro e i contro... DA- Sì, andiamo al dunque. Davvero mi chiede di non domandare la pena capitale per non mettere in cattiva luce l'FBI? W- Non l'FBI, ma il lavoro di Scienze comportamentali. Se fosse compromesso, temo che non potremmo raggiungere il nostro obiettivo, che dovrebbe essere di evitare che questo tipo di crimini venga commesso. Io le sto chiedendo di valutare l'ergastolo senza libertà sulla parola. DA- Sono un funzionario eletto. In Georgia, la gente vuole la pena di morte. Se non volete essere coinvolti pubblicamente, forse dovrete tenervi fuori dai notiziari. HOLDEN E WENDY
---	---

H- What did you expect? W- A reasonable conversation. I don't know what I expected. I... I've spent months of my life and... I had hoped that we could complete our research before seeing it used to this end. H- What difference would that make? W- I wouldn't have to be in meetings like the one we had. H- So you could walk away clean? Come on, Wendy. You're smarter than that. W- Evidently not. H- There's no way around the death penalty in death penalty states. Which doesn't mean what we're doing is wrong.	H- Cosa ti aspettavi? W- Ragionevolezza. Non so che mi aspettavo, ma... Ho passato mesi della mia vita... Avevo sperato di poter completare la ricerca prima di vederla usare così. H- Che differenza fa? W- Non dovrei partecipare a incontri come questo. H- Così ne usciresti pulita? Andiamo, Wendy, sei più furba di così. W- Evidentemente no. H- Non puoi evitare la pena di morte negli Stati in cui esiste. Non significa che ciò che facciamo è sbagliato.
---	---