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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

It—well, I don't think it's for glory, it's certainly not for profit, because there are many more profitable things than being a writer. If—-it's certainly not to change man's condition. If anything, I would say that's what it is, it's simply to leave a scratch on the earth that showed that you were here for a little while.

Faulkner, May 30, 1957
Faulkner in the University

In Playing in the Dark, Toni Morrison comments on the repeated appearance of images of whiteness at the end of narratives written by white American writers. In particular, she cites Edgar Allan Poe's The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym for its "figurations of impenetrable whiteness" (32). According to Morrison, these "white images"

appear almost always in conjunction with representations of black or Africanist people who are dead, impotent, or under complete control, these images of blinding whiteness seem to function as both antidote for mediation on the shadow that is companion to this whiteness-- a dark and abiding presence that moves the hearts and texts of American literature with fear and longing. (33)

"Impenetrable" as a metaphor for purity, these images of "whiteness" disclose a suggestion of violence close
to home, so close that the "companion" shadow, the "dark and abiding presence" of "dead" or "impotent," that is, sacrificed blacks, are perceived as a reflection of that violence. But the "whiteness" is, as Morrison states, a "blinding" obstruction for both the writer and his reader. In the end, the feeling of "fear," representing the writer's own violence, translates into a fear of blackness. The writer's "longing" or desire for peace and harmony is, however, an image of innocence that literary "whiteness" does not possess.

From the literary mind to the aristocratic slaveholder, this image of whiteness, that is, innocence, empowered them with a sense of regional pride and destiny and shielding them violence of slavery and miscegenation. But the collapse of what William R. Taylor calls the "aristocratic edifice" (Cavalier 183) exposed a reality of confusion and uncertainty. The "oppressive tax burdens" imposed by the North, according to W. J. Cash, reduced the Southern aristocracy to "the land-poor":

\[
\text{men so harried and overborne by the struggle to meet the demands made upon them, the effort merely to hold their property together, that their neighbors were more inclined to pity than to envy them. (The Mind 107)}
\]

Without any real control over its government, indeed, its own destiny, and seeking an outlet to vent its anger and frustration, the South turned from its outward conflict with the North to an inward concern with restoring the
familiar order of the Old South amidst a growing fear of continuous disorder. In the first thirty years of Reconstruction, Cash writes, the South lived by "a single plexus of ideas of which the center was an ever growing concern with white superiority and an ever growing will to mastery of the Negro" (106). Once confined to the plantation, the black represented the focal point from which the cultural order of Southern chivalry originated. However, the sight of a freed black only served as a painful reminder of what was lost while reflecting the disorder in the New South. Thus, in the chaos, fear and longing for the old Chivalric order stirred many to consider violence directed at the black as a means of restoring a sense of order and identity that would, once again, rival the industrial atmosphere of the North. In that sense, the "land-poor" were heralded by the poor whites as leaders of the movement to restore patriotism and chivalry. According to Cash, the aristocracy let their own hate run, set themselves more or less deliberately to whipping up the hate of the common whites, and often themselves led these common whites into mob action against the Negro. (117)

With violence came more confidence on the part of the aristocracy who pursued legal action to control the black population and curtail relations between whites and blacks. The advent of Jim Crow legislation was followed by a rise in postbellum narratives, expressing a longing
for the Old South, displaying a reconstructed Southern history to justify the racial order of New South. Thus, out of the ruins of past memories, arose yet another, Andre Bleikasten writes, equally mythical narrative about an "Old South":

Out of the nostalgic memories of a lost world and out of the nightmare of a lost war, an imaginary South had arisen, as if to obliterate the real one— a collective mirage in which the Old Cavalier legend blended into the Confederate myth born from the exploits of Lee, Jackson, Stuart, Forrest, and all the lesser heroes who have bravely fought and died for the Southern cause. And out of this compelling mirage grew Southern Shintoism and its wistful ritual. ("Fathers In Faulkner," 49)

This "imaginary... collective mirage" generated by nostalgic longing for the past, on the one hand, and the nightmare vision of a new cultural order, on the other hand, was a combination of the Cavalier and the plantation myths, re-created to forge a mythology of innocence in the New South.

The literature that developed in the Jim Crow era employed the setting of the Old South plantation to create an alternative history and destiny, free of the violent past of slavery and miscegenation while repressing the violence of legalized segregation of the races in the present. From this limited perspective, the literary romanticism of the novel presented a view of Southern culture seemingly removed from the human realm of tragic conflict. Instead, this literature, Cash writes, originates
from writers who absorbed the need of the South "to defend it, to shore up its pride at home, and to justify itself in the eyes of the world" (Times Mind 142). In short, Cash contents, the New South literature represented a form of "propaganda" (142) that took as its tradition the plantation novels of the Old South. This literature responded to a social need for escape from the reality of a South increasingly succumbing to the influence of Northern industrialism and the increasingly constraining race relations symbolized in the repetitious violence of mob lynchings. This violence of lynchings represented a contradiction of the Southern romance novels of the period and suggested something hidden within the structure of the cultural order.

For the most part, this situation is descriptive of William Faulkner's generation in the late 1920's and the early 1930's: the disturbing image of Southern chivalry against a backdrop of death and decay. In 1926, the constant reappearance of this violence prompted Faulkner to mistakingly declare, according to Joseph Blotner, that the central problem effecting the South was not the "race situation," but the "rise of redneck" (Faulkner 192), thus implicating the common Southerner (influenced by the North) as the sole cause for the rise of Southern industrialism (verses the agarianism of the former slaveholders) and violence. However, when he begins to write his first novel employing a Southern setting, the
creative process of building an environment similar to his own town of Oxford, Mississippi, allowed Faulkner to discover that it was the return of Southern chivalry, initiated by the aristocracy, that re-established an order depended on the violence of demonizing and segregating blacks.

The paradoxical image of "a Negro and a mule plowing a field" (223), initiated Faulkner's writing of Flags in the Dust (published in 1974 and earlier reduced to Sartoris in 1929) and helped to create a world, albeit mythical, for which, as he stated, he was "already preparing to lose and regret" (194). For, as Faulkner comes to recognize, a nostalgic reminder of the past, the image was also suggestive of something violently askew in the culture. In the process of writing from the perspective of Southern romanticism, that is, the myth of innocence, Faulkner draws closer to uncovering the role violence plays in his own personal heritage, that is, his own relationship with the black as proscribed by the cultural myth of innocence. In his hesitancy to provide more than a hint of that hidden violence underneath the mask of chivalry, he, nonetheless, does succeed in identifying the conditions under which Southerners existed in the New South—either they turned away from recognizing the truth within the paradoxical image of the black and Southern violence or they defied the image in a grand gesture of heroism.
As Faulkner moves from Young Bayard, to Quentin Compson (The Sound and the Fury), who yields to the lure of an illusion, to Horace Benbow (Sanctuary), who drifts back to the honeysuckled existence of his childhood, he discovers that these gestures amount to one and the same thing—death. For existence under the spell of the mythology of innocence invited an existence not for the living, but one in which both whites and blacks exhibited characteristics of the living dead. In that sense, Faulkner apprehends that to indulge the romanticism of Southern innocence is to separate oneself from humanity, for the existence of Southern romanticism extracts living flesh from both its perpetrators and victims. In "To Double Business Bound", René Girard writes,

[the] initial captivity of the writer in illusion corresponds, in his major work, to the illusion, finally revealed as such, of the hero himself.

Faulkner never returns to writing from the perspective of Southern romanticism. Instead, for him the actual or spiritual death of his heroes symbolizes a "death of the romantic self" (4), that is, a renunciation of his own idols culminating in his spiritual as well as creative metamorphosis (4).

Therefore, with each novel after Flags in the Dust to Go Down, Moses, Faulkner expands his creation of Yoknapatawpha County and its relationship with the myth of innocence. Beginning with the plantation, and proceeding
to the cultural implications of this myth, Faulkner discovers the universal tragedy of human violence, and along with that discovery, his role as a Southerner and a writer. On the cognitive level, Faulkner has to accept his own link as a Southerner to the same tradition of violence of sacrifice. However, on an aesthetic level, with *Sanctuary*, *Light in August*, and *Absalom, Absalom!*, Faulkner's mature work, he thematizes the role violence plays in the ordering of social and racial difference in the New South. In addition, Faulkner draws a profound connection between the Biblical and historical tragedy of sacrifice and Southern violence, as depicted in *Absalom, Absalom!*. For Faulkner, then, the creative process of writing provides an alternative to the self-destructive mechanism inherent in the mythology of innocence. He turns away from the myth and defies its image of itself as purity by linking himself to the plight of the sons of aristocracy and to the victims of Southern violence.

In turn, Faulkner gradually broadens his perspective of Southern culture, thereby discovering his place as a Southerner and writer, who comes to indict the Chivalric tradition's version of Southern history. By the writing of *Go Down, Moses*, Faulkner's prominent display of the violence of sacrifice in Southern history and in the organization of cultural order in the New South results in an examination of the origins of racial tension in American culture. For this reason, René Girard's theory
on the sacrificial mechanism provides a blueprint that allows for the recognition of Faulkner's theme of chivalry, that is, violence and sacrifice in Southern culture. Faulkner's own acknowledgment of the mechanism is emblematic of great writers who, as Girard states,

apprehend intuitively and concretely, through the medium of their art, it not formally, the system in which they were first imprisoned together with their contemporaries.

As such, Girard continues, "literary interpretation must be systematic because it is the continuation of literature" (Deceit 3).

In brief, according to Girard, the sacrificial mechanism becomes the means of maintaining order and stability in a community by expelling violence through the sacrifice of a victim. Cultural myths originate in the hidden violence of sacrifice in that the operation of the sacred, by allowing the community to distinguish between "good" and "bad" sacred, that is, violence, conceals the culture's role in the sacrifice. As Girard writes,

sacrifice... can be defined solely in terms of the sacred, without reference to any particular divinity; that is, it can be defined in terms of maleficent violence polarized by the victim and metamorphosed by his death (or expulsion from the community, which amounts to the same thing) into beneficent violence. (Violence 258)

In the expulsion of the victim, "bad" violence becomes "good" in that, with the victim's sacrifice, violence
is removed from the community. That is, the victim is both responsible for disorder, and when sacrificed, responsible for removing the sacred (violence) away from the community. In that sense, the collective sacrifice of the victim is interpreted by the cultural myth as a beneficial necessity for the restoration of harmony and order.

It is this presumed harmony that ultimately proves deceptive and self-destructive while it advances a mythology of innocence. In myth, Girard explains, the representation of the sacrificial crisis is obscured in a language that "disguises the issue" with visitations of "monsters and grotesques" (Violence 64), considered to originate outside the community with the victim. Yet, as Girard states, hidden deep within this mythical representation is the tragedy of this deception that conforms to the collective violence of sacrifice. In a crisis of difference, brought about by the victim, the community, Girard explains, affirms "its unity in the sacrifice [of the victim], a unity that emerges from the moment when division is most intense" (Things Hidden 24).

In the atmosphere of Jim Crow, racial conflict, Faulkner discovers, is symbolic of a conflict within the myth of Southern innocence, and in turn, represents a split in the psyche of the white Southerner between the idea of him or herself as purity and the Other as violence. Thus, the images of whiteness and shadows presented in
Southern myth are always envisioned as two distinct entities. But through Faulkner's literary efforts, they are brought together as one and the same image of sacrificial violence.

EARLY GROUND BREAKING:
Flags in the Dust and The Sound and the Fury

That...is a sad and tragic thing for the old days, the old times, to go...That I don't want it to change, but then that's true of everyone as he grows old. He thinks that the old times were the best times, and he don't want it to change.

Faulkner, March 13, 1957
Faulkner in the University

After writing Soldier's Pay and Mosquitoes (neither novel specifically deal with South culture), William Faulkner began work on a novel he called Flags in the Dust in 1926, a novel, according to biographer Joseph Blotner, that was to reflect his own nostalgic recollections of Southern culture in the New South. Accompanying his manuscript was a water-color dust jacket Faulkner painted depicting "'a Negro and a mule plowing a field'" on a Spring day under a blue sky (Faulkner 223). Blotner adds that the dust jacket was never used, but its significance and what it depicts are directly related to Faulkner's task of writing about the South. Both in Flags in the Dust and The Sound and the Fury (1929), Faulkner depicts a New South of decaying plantations and the legal segregation of Southern blacks in conflict with
dynastic order of the Old South and its heroic figures of legend. This chapter will argue that it is through his representation of Southern blacks that Faulkner takes as his subject the tension between the myth of Southern innocence and the reality of the New South. His two young protagonists Bayard Sartoris of *Flags in the Dust* and Quentin Compson of *The Sound and the Fury* are both from declining aristocratic families who refuse to give up the Southern myth of innocence that establishes hierarchical differences between the races and among the classes. For the Sartorises and Compsons have passed down to the young men their inheritance in the legendary stories of their heroic patriarchy. In turn, for both Bayard and Quentin, their youthful engagement with the past gives way to an encounter with the very image of "a Negro and a mule," one that helps maintain the semblance of old aristocracy for the families, but produces in the sons an uncomfortable feeling of loss.

With World War I at an end, the young pilot, Bayard Sartoris of *Flags in the Dust*, returns home to the Sartoris plantation. John, his twin brother, was killed in the war. Young Bayard purchases a car and spends time speeding between the plantation where his grandfather Old Bayard is driven in a horse-drawn carriage by his black servant, Simon Strother (*Flags* 8) and the Sartoris farm where blacks lived picking cotton and gathering late corn (313). Through Young Bayard's movement between the plantation and the
farm, Faulkner reveals the disparity between the decaying Old South and the reality of the New South, for he fills in the painted image of a seemingly serene scene of pastoral bliss with a real mule, "unwept, unhonored and unsung" (314), and the blacks who, when no whites were looking, "sang-- quavering, wordless chords into which sad monotonous minors blent with mellow bass" (314). Thus, for Young Bayard, the image of the mule and the blacks produces a eerie and haunting feeling of doom rather than one of serenity and harmony. For Faulkner, this sense of doom is inescapable, and as his protagonist soon discovers, an attempt to escape in the space between the myth and the reality of the New South is futile. Bayard's attempt to move forward only results in further encounters with the haunting presence of Southern blacks. His return to a state of prior innocence results in his marriage to Narcissa Benbow, daughter of a once prominent judge, who avoids a clash with the new culture by surrounding herself with her garden. As Bayard discovers, he cannot escape a life among the living-dead.

Along with Young Bayard, Faulkner introduces the surviving elder Sartorises, Old Bayard Sartoris son of Colonel John Sartoris (1823-1876) and his aunt, Virginia (Jenny) Du Pre who live on the Sartoris plantation. In the self-imposed mausoleum of "white simplicity" (11), the two elder Sartoris members pay their respects to the memory and history of the Old South. Surrounded by other
Sartoris ghosts and relics of the South, Old Bayard spends his time reading "fiction of the historical-romantic school" (35) while Aunt Jenny tells romantic stories about her Civil War brothers/heroes, John and Bayard. While partly true, mostly of the stories are inventions of Jenny's imagination. Jenny's storytelling takes on the task of creating the myth of Southern innocence. As Faulkner narrates, the effort presents a warped version of history that continues to perpetuate a myth in defiance of the actual history of the South:

...as she grew older the tale itself grew richer and richer, taking on a mellow splendor like wine; until what had been a hair-brained prank of two heedless and reckless boys wild with their own youth, was become a gallant and finely tragical focal-point to which the history of the race had been raised from out the old miasmic swamps of spiritual sloth by two angels valiantly and glorously fallen and strayed, altering the course of human events and purging the souls of men. (14)

Faulkner's reference to the "gallant and finely tragical focal-point" suggests the hidden violence behind the mask of chivalry that alters the interpretation of Southern history and results in the creation of the myth of innocence and in generations of the living dead. Jenny's memory of the "two heedless and reckless boys" (14) unfolds a history of gallantry emulating the rise of the South in the early 1800's from what W. J. Cash calls its "backcountry" origins (The Mind 9) to the "aged and mellow world" (11) of the aristocratic plantation. In the process,
Faulkner implies, the "glamorously fallen and strayed" aristocracy of the South drew an entire culture toward a plantation system of human exploitation. While Jenny characterizes her two brothers as having somehow developed beyond their "heedless and reckless" nature, Faulkner suggests that the entire extent of the two brothers behavior exemplified Southern chivalry in that they showed, as Cash states of the aristocracy in general, a "tendency toward unreality, toward romanticism, and, in intimate relation with that, toward hedonism" (44). Bayard (1838-1862), who left General Jeb Stuart's side to retrieve anchovies ("with all of Pope's army shooting at him") was shot in the back "with a derringer" (Flags 22). John returns home to restore his plantation only to die an equally unheroic death when he confronts a man in a duel without a weapon (7). Yet, for Jenny, John and Bayard Sartoris have become "gallant" figures (14) created to rival the nightmarish atmosphere of the New South's drive toward Modern commercialism.

Thus, in the portrait on the Sartoris' wall, John Sartoris stands above "with his bearded, hawklike face" (5), elevating the surviving Sartoris to the "glamor of his dream" (5). For Old Bayard and Jenny, John Sartoris dream, devoid of its violence, has become theirs in an attempt to deny the desperate conditions of a New South struggling with the actuality of a collapsed plantation system. Yet, even in the "white simplicity"
of the home, Faulkner presents a reminder of that violence and its mythologized interpretation of the Old South that calls for the "ceremonial" entrance on the part of Old Bayard, to a room where its "stateliness" is "seldom violated":

The room was cluttered with indiscriminate furniture—chairs and sofas like patient ghosts holding lightly in dry and rigid embrace yet other ghosts—a fitting place for dead Sartorises to gather and speak among themselves of glamorous and old disastrous days.

It is in this room, shut off from the rest of the house, Old Bayard comes to look on the relics of his family's heritage. In this room, there is no recollection of the "hawklike face," the "bold glamor" of his father's dream. Instead, Old Bayard sees "ancient disused things", relics in isolation. When he picks up and holds in his hands the rapier, he sees it as an embodiment of violence, and now, the sacred symbol and instrument of the Chivalric tradition:

seeing in its stained fine blade and shabby elegant sheath the symbol of his race; that too in the tradition: the thing itself fine and clear enough, only the instrument had become a little tarnished in its very aptitude for shaping circumstance to its arrogant ends.

In Old Bayard's attempt to re-order the past, John Sartoris and the rapier, that is, violence, are never associated together. However, as Faulkner reveals, the role of the rapier as the symbol and instrument of aristocracy suggests not only its role in the ordering of Southern culture,
but its method of violent differentiation in the process. Thus, hidden in the center of the "white simplicity" of the house, are the things of the past meant to symbolize Sartoris' dream that, on the one hand, Faulkner suggests, fuel Old Bayard and Jenny's mystified stories while, on the other hand, they are one and the same things that reveal the blood stained and "tarnished" figure of John Sartoris.²

In his implication that the violence of slavery motivates the necessity to commit to "heedless and reckless" behavior displayed in the Old South by John and Bayard, Faulkner also suggests that the legacy of violence becomes an inheritance, passed down to the Sartoris' descendants in the New South.³ For Faulkner shows in the similarity of their names-- John and Bayard--the continuation of "heedless and reckless" deeds, that is, the continuation of violence. Old Bayard's son, John, "succumbed to yellow fever and an old Spanish bullet-wound" in 1901 (94). Old Bayard's grandson also John (1893-1918), twin to Young Bayard, was shot while in flight during World War I. In a near-by plane, Young Bayard watched as his brother waved to him and then jumped from the plane. In turn, Young Bayard will accidentally kill Old Bayard (1919) in a car crash and will succeed in killing himself (1920) in a bi-plane. In their desire to live by the Cavalier myth, the descendants emulate John Sartoris by living in his "dream," not in the reality of the New South.
Thus, it is no wonder that Young Bayard, like his relatives, desires to escape the sense of doom he recognizes in the seemingly peaceful order on the Sartoris plantation. For Old Bayard and Jenny, life on the Sartoris plantation closely resembles the traditional plantation of the Old South, and as required, the black servants are in place. The Strother family—Simon, Elnora, Caspey, Saddie, Joby, and Isom—are faithful black servants, indeed, relics in their own right, who have served the Sartorises for five generations. The oldest black member on the plantation, Simon is not only a faithful servant, but faithful to the memory of the Old South and his old masters. On several occasions, Simon declares his appreciation for the past, "'in Marse John's time, when de Cunnel wuz de young marster en de niggers f'um de quawtuhs gethered on de front lawn, wishin' Mistis en de little marster well'" (420). In this respect, he is worthy of emulation by his descendants just as the Sartorises emulate John Sartoris. As Faulkner implies, in comparison to his old and current master, he is the perfect image of "Sambo" from the traditional plantation legend, a grateful subordinate whose head "bobbed lower and lower" (39) when Jenny called out orders. In contrast to Simon, however, Faulkner offers in Caspey, Simon's son, a glimpse of what lies outside the Sartoris' world, a glimpse of what the Sartorises perceive as a threat to the Cavalier myth. Like Young Bayard, Caspey has just
returned from serving in Europe and discovers that he, too, is at odds with his role as the black servant on the Sartoris' plantation. Caspey expresses to his father the desire to be free of the restrictions that keep him from being human:

'I don't take nothin' f'um no white folks no mo,' he was saying. 'War done changed all dat. If colored folks is good enough to save France f'um de Germans, den us is good enough to have de same rights de German has. French folks thinks so, anyhow, and if America dont, dey's ways of learnin' 'um.' (63)

Along with the conversations among his family, Caspey "was working little and trifling with continental life in its martial mutations rather to his future detriment" (62). At the request of Old Bayard and Jenny, Caspey is reprimanded repeatedly by Simon:

'I kep' tellin' you dem new-fangled war notions of yo'n wa'n't gwine ter work on dis place... save dat nigger freedom talk fer town-folks... whut us niggers want to be free fer, anyhow?' (87)

It is not long before the Sartorises subdue their loose cannon and declare Caspey "more or less returned to normalcy" (224), that is, returned to what Malcolm Bradbury in The Modern American Novel calls a state of "cultural sterility" characteristic of the American culture after the First World War.

By comparing Simon to his son, Faulkner shows that Simon accepts his role as "nigger" and would not think of freeing himself from what that term entails. His role
as nigger/faithful servant is an acceptance of the collective violence of the culture while it maintains this violence at a safe, beneficial distance. Thus, Simon in his role as servant is no threat to the Sartoris nor the culture as a whole. He is sacrificed for the benefit of the Sartoris' idea of themselves as "innocence" in that he is forced to remain a plantation representation of the Old South, the old order of racial difference. However, in Caspey's temporary defiance of his role, the Sartoris see what René Girard calls an apparition of uncontrollable and potentially "contagious" (Violence 281) violence. To the Sartoris, Caspey's talk and behavior is a threat to their identity and sense of well-being. For, apart from the role designated for the black by Southern culture, Caspey signifies a loss of difference between blacks and white and, in this lack of difference, suggests a humanity in what has been culturally declared non-human. That difference between Caspey and the Sartoris can only be re-established when he returns to his role as a black man, the non-human site of violence, that is, the sacred, by representing for the Sartoris the illusion of violence controlled and maintained at a safe distance. As Faulkner discovers, Caspey's return to "normalcy" is emblematic of the "structuring principle" (Girard) within the Southern mythology of innocence. His return to "normalcy" conceals the violence of the sacrificial mechanism that permits
the myth to establish a hierarchical order with a semblance of harmony. Like his contemporary Young Bayard, Caspey is forced to model a role (Simon), an image that can only lead to his death, symbolically, and to Young Bayard's death in actuality. Yet, underneath this image of loyalty and servitude, Faulkner reveals that Caspey hints not only at a possible social change among blacks, but the possibility of a change in portraying blacks in Southern literature.

In the meantime, Simon's behavior mimics the acceptable representation of Southern blacks, for in his loyalty to his master and his love for the past, as Faulkner indicates, Simon shields the Sartorises from any fear or suggestion of wrong doing. In that sense, the role of the sacrificed black is indelibly linked to the violence of the Sartoris' past and the concealment of that violence by the descendants in the present. Day after day, while Jenny sits by the window over looking the garden, she tells her stories and the young black servant Isom Strother, Simon's grandson, attends to her needs just as his grandfather serves Old Bayard. As she informs Isom:

'I want to look out that window... and see you in the garden with that hoe again... I want to see both of your right hands on it and I want to see it moving, too.' (Flags 59)

Jenny's creation of legends must take place alongside the image of the black servant appearing to work leisurely
in the garden. As Faulkner suggests, the white members of the Sartoris family are held captive within mythical representations of themselves, and this representation necessitates the image of servitude and loyalty seen in the Strother family, albeit, an equally mythical representation for Southern blacks. It is an image that reveals to Young Bayard the Strother family as victims of and servants to violence.

However, Young Bayard cannot accept what he recognizes in the blacks, and, in turn, he begins to behave as if his relationship to the legacy of his great-grandfather John Sartoris could be re-negotiated. As part of the Sartoris family, Young Bayard is an inheritor of the legacy of violence in which he cannot escape. Faulkner has Narcissa Benbow detect in Young Bayard an "air of smoldering abrupt violence" (76). For Narcissa, who spends her days between the garden on the Benbow estate and her piano, Young Bayard appears an "unwelcome" disruption to "that serene constancy to which she clung so fiercely" (160).

All of her instincts were antipathetic toward him [Bayard], toward his violence and his brutally obtuse disregard of all the qualities which composed her being. (158)

As Faulkner shows, Narcissa's effort to "fiercely" repel violence and cling to the "serene constancy" of the myth of innocence mirrors the effort of Southern aristocracy in the New South. Furthermore, Faulkner points out that
the relationship between Narcissa and Young Bayard is not as antipathetic as it appears to Narcissa. Rather, the raw violence Narcissa recognizes in the descendant of John Sartoris represents the underside of the Chivalric tradition and makes possible the appearance of serenity to which she clings so fiercely. The "honeysuckle-covered fence of iron pickets," the "cedar-packed drive" created by an English architect in the Tudor style, and the "jonquil and narcissus and gladiolus" lining the lawn (177-178) contribute to Narcissa's sense of well-being and her own inheritance of violence as a member of the culture's lingering aristocracy. Like the life at the Sartoris plantation, Narcissa's life benefits from the inheritance that is no longer limited to the aristocratic class. Thus, with her marriage to Young Bayard, Narcissa is able to move from the Benbow estate to the Sartoris plantation without difficulty.

For Young Bayard, the reprieve from the road back to the "garden" is short lived. Uttering to some countrymen that he had "been good too damn long" (133), he departs from his wife and the rural surroundings of the Sartoris plantation, trying to escape the "doomed immortality and immortal doom" (133) in the atmosphere of the New South. However, as Faulkner shows, Young Bayard is not only linked to but vertically drawn to what generates that sense of doom. In two key scenes, Faulkner depicts the irreconcilable desire for the pastoral Old South and its
link to cultural segregation between the two races. In one scene, Young Bayard is driving into the town of Jefferson when thoughts about his grandfather's gentlemanly routine of promptly retiring to his office in the rear of the bank (126) are interrupted by the sight of a black man on a wagon. He

held the car straight upon the vehicle until the mules reared, tilting the wagon for an instant. Then he swerved and whipped past with not an inch to spare, so close that the yelling negro in the wagon could see the lipless and savage derision of his teeth. (126)

Passing the "pompous effigy" of John Sartoris, Young Bayard thinks about Simon, walking away the way home, "clutching his rabbit's foot," and "again he felt savage and ashamed" (126) of his behavior. Getting out of his car, he walks along the sidewalk to observe Jefferson's black population:

Negroes slow and aimless as figures of a dark placid dream, with an animal odor, murmuring and laughing among themselves. There was in their consonantless murmuring something ready with mirth, in their laughter something grave and sad; country people—men in overalls or corduroy or khaki and without neckties, women in shapeless calico and sunbonnets and snuff-sticks; groups of young girls in stiff mail-order finery, the young heritage of their bodies' grace dulled already by self-consciousness and labor and unaccustomed high heels and soon to be obscured forever by child-bearing; youths and young men in cheap tasteless suits and shirts and caps, weather-tanned and clean-limbed as race horses and a little belligerently blatant. (127)

In contrast to Simon "clutching his rabbit's foot" (126), the "belligerently blatant" (127) look of these blacks
hint at a reality of uneasy difference in contrast to
the myth of innocence, a difference Simon in his role
as Sambo at the Sartoris plantation is able to make nearly
invisible. While it may be that the myth holds in check
this sense of instability, Faulkner implies that Young
Bayard and these young black men in their resemblance
and in their ability to suggest difference represent the
contradiction of harmonious existence within the myth
of Southern innocence.

As a young aristocratic descendant of John Sartoris' legacy, Young Bayard cannot desire to live outside the existence of the hierarchical structure of Southern culture because he is the culture in his very being-- everywhere. Thus, everywhere leads him back to the blacks who a witness to his very nature. Thus, in the second scene, fourteen miles outside of Jefferson, on Christmas Eve, the weary Young Bayard, now riding a horse, stops outside of a cabin and calls out to its owner: "'Hello... I'm lost.' Open the door'" (387):

the door cracked upon a dying glow of embers, emitting a rank odor of negroes, and against the crack of warmth, a head. (387)

When Young Bayard requests to sleep in the barn, the black man informs him that he did not have a barn and that Young Bayard should go down the road to the next house. In turn, Young Bayard offers to pay the man and then adds: "'Come on, uncle... don't keep a man standing in the cold' (388).
The unwittingly accurate description of his circumstances: "'lost'" (388) suggests that Young Bayard feels "lost" because he believes he has freed himself from the Sartoris' legacy. But Bayard can never leave "home." As Faulkner shows, in his behavior and language, Young Bayard re-establishes the hierarchical structure that binds him to the blacks as a necessary contributor to his identity. In turn, the black man perceives in Young Bayard's words his role and Young Bayard's "predicament" and asks Young Bayard how he managed "'to git so fur f'um home did time o' night, whitefolks?'" (388). For the black man and for Young Bayard, Faulkner suggests, "home" refers to where "Banker Sartoris's folks" live (388), in the well-kept mausoleum of the Old South. As Faulkner implies, Young Bayard's response: "'Lost'" (388) refers to not to a physical separation, but a psychological state of confusion.

Despite his desire to escape, he has found, in the black family's home, a familiar "home." Furthermore, the black family knows its "place" in the presence of "Banker Sartoris's folks." In their eyes, Young Bayard's flight is an expression of the aloofness characteristic of the Southern Gentleman. Therefore, he is recognized in that role, and the difference between himself and the black family is acknowledged when they call him "whitefolks." In turn, Young Bayard, who never asks their names, acknowledges the man and his wife by the familiar labels
of "uncle" and "aunty," and he calls the couple's children "pickaninnies" (393). In effect, Faulkner shows that fourteen miles outside of Jefferson, away from the Sartoris plantation, alongside the black family, Young Bayard's presence maintains racial difference, thereby maintaining all the advantages of home. Faulkner insists that Young Bayard soon becomes very comfortable in this setting, so comfortable that, while the black family members move around him in that familiar frame of servitude:

Bayard sat in his chair and dozed the morning away. Not asleep, but time was lost in a timeless region where he lingered awake and into which he realized after a long while that something was trying to penetrate; watched the vain attempts with peaceful detachment. But at last it succeeded: a voice. 'Dinner ready.' (393)

There is little to distinguish Young Bayard from Old Bayard, the black home from the Sartoris plantation. Young Bayard's desire for detachment resembles, in fact, the ideal image of his pastoral past, inclusive of the Southern black. Faulkner reveals that it is here, "lost in a timeless region" (393) that Young Bayard would prefer to stay. Young Bayard has not gone anywhere. With a familiar voice in his ear, he wakes up to the dual desires and contradictions inherent in Southern reality.

Young Bayard is as bound to his cultural past as the blacks, and the realization of this reality is intolerable to him who now courts death as a welcomed way out. From an airfield in Dayton, Young Bayard takes
off in a bi-plane. Ironically, the machine Young Bayard flies fails, and he watches himself "back toward the field now, in a shallow dive" (418). Even his final idea of courting death, as Faulkner shows, results in Young Bayard living and dying by the legacy of John Sartoris. Without a true understanding of this legacy of violence, Faulkner insists that the legacy will remain binding to all future generations. Thus, later that day, Narcissa Benbow Sartoris gives birth to Bayard's son. In the confusion, Jenny calls the child Johnny after Young Bayard's twin brother. Some days later, at the christening, Narcissa announces that the child's name will not be John (as Jenny envisioned) or Bayard, but Benbow Sartoris. With Young Bayard now buried underneath the "simple" headstone: "March 16, 1893--June 5, 1920" (426) among his ancestors, Jenny warns Narcissa that changing the name will not "'do any good?'" (432): "'Do you think,' Miss Jenny insisted, 'that because his name is Benbow, he'll be any less Sartoris and a scoundrel and a fool?'" (433). Narcissa, Faulkner states, did not listen. Instead, "with serene fond detachment" (433), she played her piano, and looked "beyond the window" where she could see that "evening was a windless lilac dream, foster-dam of quietude and peace" (433). In this image expressing the contradiction inherent in the Southern mythology of innocence, Faulkner implies that Narcissa is content in a world where the idea of "innocence," evenings of windless lilac dreams, forge a "foster-dam
of quietude and peace" (433), by repressing the reality of violence.
Like Young Bayard of *Flags in the Dust*, Quentin Compson is haunted by the legacy of Southern violence. Similarly, Faulkner, in *The Sound and the Fury*, portrays the once aristocratic Compsons of Jefferson, Mississippi, forced to sell their furniture and pasture (Sound 327), to live on in a hollow shell of a plantation. The oldest child of Jason and Caroline Compson, Quentin is a young man in search of a "home," but his failure to find it culminates in his inability to distinguish between the facts of Southern history and the fiction of his romantic idealism. But, unlike Young Bayard, Quentin wants to return to a past that never was, not the unsettling resemblance of that past he recognizes in his own family and in the New South's reality, but an actual state of innocence.

Thus, Faulkner portrays Quentin as a young man just awakened from a childhood dream only to find all has changed while he slept: "'When the shadow of the sash appeared on the curtains it was between seven and eight o'clock'" (93), and then he knew he was living in time again. For Quentin, this is an experience repeated over and over again, only awaking to find his childhood dream a little grayer and reality an ever larger, looming clock.
'You can be oblivious to the sound for a long while, then in a second of ticking it can create in the mind unbroken the long diminishing parade of time you didn't hear.' (94)

As Faulkner shows, Quentin is in search for that "'long diminishing parade of time'" he did not hear because, for him, it is the quickly diminishing specter of Southern chivalry. Thus, far from the South, Quentin is so obsessed by his desire to recapture the lost innocence of his family's history that his past overtakes his life as a first years student at Harvard University.

Like the Sartorises, Faulkner portrays the Compson family already in decline financially and morally, trying to maintain their aristocratic status in the New South's changing order. On the one hand, the Compsons have been forced to sell most of their plantation in order for their third child, Benjamin (Benjy), born an idiot, to receive medical treatment, to send Quentin to Harvard, and to pay for Caddy's wedding. The Compsons youngest son, Jason, when he is not running off to Memphis to visit a prostitute, steals money from his bed-ridden mother to supplement his income from a very un-aristocratic job as a clerk at a grocery store. In opposition to Quentin's look to the past, Jason desires respectability in the reality of the New South, that is, the modern South, where money is the only thing worth valuing. Mr. Compson, who awaits the pending doom of his family, along with Uncle Maury (Caroline's brother), drinks away a portion of the
family's fortune. As with the Sartorises, for Faulkner, it is the black family who, in its familiar role as caretaker, reflects the extent to which the white family will go to maintain their identity as aristocrats in the Cavalier myth of innocence.

The Gibson family-- Roskus, Dilsey and their children, Versh, Frony, T.P., and grandson, Luster-- provide the Compsons with the semblance of a stability and gracious life in which to view themselves as surviving aristocrats in the New South. As Thadious M. Davis writes, the Gibsons "in the early years of the South's transition to modernity [are] in the shadow of the Civil War as [are their] counterpart and [are] still held in a tenuous relationship to the South's cultural past and aristocratic values" (83). For their part, the Compson provide the black family with protection from the New South as well. For as long as the Gibsons remain on the Compson's plantation, they have protection from the violence of Jim Crow legislation. Davis explains,

The interaction between the Gibsons and the Compsons is a ritual of survival enacted by the black servant class and the southern white gentility: service and loyalty in exchange for material goods and protection. (Faulkner's Negro 72-73)

Since the Compsons are unable to view themselves and the Southern blacks, represented by the Gibsons, apart from the Cavalier myth of innocence, Faulkner implies that they are unable to recognize the humanity of their black
servants. For Faulkner this is the gravest of all the Compson's faults since it suggests their own degeneration as human beings.

As Faulkner shows, Dilsey Gibson's life in the Compson household is far from fitting the pastoral image of the Mammy of the Old South. In the opening section of Dilsey's narrative, Faulkner hints at the cruelty lurking beneath the Cavalier myth's interpretation of the plantation South. On Easter morning, Mrs. Compson, with a hot water bottle in hand, breaks the stillness by calling Dilsey, "at steady and inflectionless intervals," (Sound 333) five times from the top of the stairway. Finally, from her position beneath the stairway, beneath the towering figure of Mrs. Compson, Dilsey responds, telling Mrs. Compson that she will have the fire started soon.

But Dilsey's assurance that the task will get done is not good enough for Mrs. Compson, whose demeanor is meant to reiterate her authority by clearly marking Dilsey's position under her. She is determined to indicate not only her annoyance at having to wait for hot water, but of not hearing any evidence of work by the house servants: "'I've been lying awake for an hour at least, without hearing a sound from the kitchen'" (333). To appease Mrs. Compson, Dilsey instructs her to put the hot water bottle down and go back to bed. And then Dilsey toiled painfully up the steps, shapeless, breathing heavily. 'I'll have de fire qwine in a minute, en de water hot in two mo.'
'I've been lying there for an hour, at least,' Mrs. Compson said. 'I thought maybe you were waiting for me to come down and start the fire'. (333)

When Dilsey reaches the top of the stairs and picks up the hot water bottle, she explains that she has to start the fire because Luster went to the show the night before and overslept that morning. It would seem that face to face, mother to mother, Mrs. Compson would connect with Dilsey's predicament concerning Luster's conduct. But, as Faulkner implies, that connection does not take place. She is not seen by Caroline Compson as another mother, but as a sexless functionary whose only concern should be the needs of Mrs. Compson and her family.

Instead, Mrs. Compson chides Dilsey for "negligence": "'If you permit Luster to do things that interfere with his work, you'll have to suffer for it yourself'" (334).

However, in the following passage demonstrating a "negligence" that goes unnoticed by Mrs. Compson, Faulkner shows how Mrs. Compson's role as the Southern Lady forces her to resist expressing any signs of compassion toward Dilsey as she listens to Dilsey proceed down the stairs:

As she got into bed again she could hear Dilsey yet descending the stairs with a sort of painful and terrific slowness that would have become maddening had it not presently ceased beyond the flapping diminishment of the pantry door. (334)

Faulkner suggests that Mrs. Compson is so possessed with
the image of herself as the suffering Southern Lady that she is unable to recognize the humanity of blacks. The "'maddening'" sound of Dilsey descending the stairs represents the tension between the Cavalier myth of innocence in the New South and the reality of the Old South in that it indicates the presence of human suffering repressed for the benefit of the mythology of innocence. Faulkner demonstrates that the blacks are a necessity in both, but an undesired reminder of guilt in the former. Dilsey does reach Caroline Compson, but not as a reminder of her suffering; rather it is a reminder of Mrs. Compson's own suffering, that is, her own exposure to the racial conflict, that ceases once Dilsey has returned to her station in the house. Mrs. Compson can calmly rest now that order has been restored to the Compson household.

Faulkner's description of what is interpreted by the Compsons as order and harmony reveals how the Cavalier myth distorted and estranged human relationships in the New South. In W. J. Cash's study of the Southern mind, he discusses the New South's growing obsession to make money (The Mind 220). According to Cash:

The New South meant and boasted of was mainly a South which would be new in this: that it would be so rich and powerful that it might rest serene in its ancient positions, forever, impregnable. (184)

The necessity to make money expressed the New South's desire to return to its previous state of grandeur thus
forcing "'from the North that recognition'" of its worth and dignity of character (qtd. in *The Mind* 184). Thus, the aristocracy's acquisition of money for the building of cotton mills and schools for poor whites aided in re-establishing the "ruling order" (172). It became the paternalistic duty of the aristocracy in its drive toward commercialism to protect its own best interest in restoring the racial hierarchy of the past. For the aristocracy, expressing its despair over the collapse of hierarchical difference in Southern culture, perceived the Southern black to represent the intolerable difference and "set themselves more or less deliberately to whipping up the hate of the common whites" (117) for the black who was effectively excluded from economic and social gains:

So long as the Negro had been property, worth from five hundred dollars up, he had been taboo—safer from rope... than any common white man... But with the abolition of legal slavery his immunity vanished...The economic interest of his former protectors, the master class, now stood the other way about-- required that he should be promptly disabused of any illusion that his liberty was real, and confirmed in his ancient docility. (113)

In an attempt to unify the community against an accessible common enemy, the aristocracy lead the way in "formally disfranchise" (197) the black. In Jason Compson, Faulkner shows how the "notion of aristocracy... [continued] to dominate social relations and aspirations" (234).

Jason is driven by the commercialism of the New South, yet, shadowed by the Cavalier myth of innocence. As
Faulkner implies, however, the responsibility for the Compson household falls to him after in the absence of the father, Mr. Compson, who has recently died and in the wake of Quentin's attempt to restore the myth that dies with him. Thus, Jason finds it increasing difficult to fulfill his role as the Southern Gentleman when he is faced with the necessity of engaging in business ventures that fail while working at the local store for a man who was once of a lower class. His bitterness with the slow progress of the new order in restoring the grandeur of the ruling class turns to a hatred of Jews and blacks who he insists are the only two groups of people profiting from the sale of cotton. For Jason, it is, on the one hand, the "'eastern jews'" (Sound 237), inaccessible "'fellows that sit up there in New York'" (238), not the Southern ruling class, who initiated the cotton trade with the North, depriving the poor white farmer of a living:

'Cotton is a speculator's crop. They fill the farmer full of hot air and get him to raise a big crop for them to whipsaw on the market, to trim the suckers with. Do you think the farmer gets anything out of it expect a red neck and a hump in his back? Do you think the man that sweats to put it into the ground gets a red cent more than a bare living, I says.' (237)

On the other hand, the "'trifling niggers'" (237), who have it easy in that they do not have to concern themselves with the effort of restoring and maintaining the Chivalric tradition, exemplified in his and his family's concern
for and focus on "'six niggers that cant even stand up
out of a chair unless they've got a pan full of bread
and meat to balance them'" (237). In turn, his "pride
in and admiration for cleverness in acquisition" (The
Mind 221), as Cash notes of the Southern mind, results
in his petty manipulation of family, friends, and
neighbors. In other words, Jason's anger and frustration,
Faulkner shows, is directed not at Northerners. Instead,
Jason has lost his vision of the enemy, for while he
believes he is maintaining difference between whites and
blacks, he is exhibiting the self-destructive pattern
of behavior that ultimately results in the social and
moral collapse of the New South's order.

In his narrative, Jason recalls an altercation between
himself and Luster in the kitchen of the Compson home.
While Dilsey is preparing dinner, Luster informs her that
he needs a quarter to go to a minstrel show in town:

'Ef I jes had a quarter,' Luster says, 'I could
go to dat show.' 'En ef you hand wings you could
fly to heaven,' Dilsey says. 'I dont want to
hear another word about dat show.' (Sound 317)

Jason enters the kitchen and causally tells Luster that
he just happened to have "'a couple of tickets'" the show
manger gave him free. When Luster asks if Jason plans
to attend the show, Jason responds, "'I wouldn't go to
it for ten dollars'" (317). As Jason recalls, Luster asks
for one of the tickets:

'I'll sell you one,' I says. 'How about it?'
'I aint got no money,' he says.'

'That's too bad,' I says. I made to go out.'
(317)

As it turns out, Luster cannot afford to pay Jason a nickel for a ticket, and, while he repeatedly informs Jason that he "'aint got nothing'" (317), Dilsey tries to intercede by telling Luster to "'hush up'" (318), adding that maybe Jason will use the tickets. But Jason insists that he has no plans for the tickets and continues to taunt Luster for a nickel. Jason states that he went to the stove and dropped one of the tickets in the fire. Dilsey, seeing the man she once raised, appeals to a phantom image of the Southern Gentleman, replying to Jason: "'Aint you shamed?'" (318). Jason can no longer feel shame. As Faulkner shows, he is a man of the modern South in conflict with a tradition of chivalry that is not alive for him. Forced to live beside blacks, on a deteriorating plantation, with a mother who is not what she seems, Jason cruelty toward the Gibsons is one way to assert himself in a role of the Southern Gentleman that has stripped him of his humanity.

Jason's own narration of this event reveals how he inherits the legacy of slavery, that is, violence, as a means of confronting reality in the New South. In turn, Faulkner places Jason's violence beside his and the myth's
apparition of blacks violence, thereby commenting on the self-alienation that eventually results in the self-destructive behavior of his protagonist. (Jason will have all the money he has stolen from his sister Caddy and his mother taken from him by his niece, Quentin, Caddy's daughter, who runs off with it, never to be seen again). According to Jason, Luster's continuing pleas for the remaining ticket, "'please, suh,' I'll fix dem tires ev'ry day for a mont'" (318), prompts Dilsey to speak again. "'Hush, Luster,' Dilsey says. She jerked him back. 'Go on. Drop hit in'" (318). Finally, Jason says, "'All right'" (318) and in a very cavalier manner, drops the second ticket in the stove. While Jason leaves the scene, the image of his violence still lingers and, as Faulkner suggests, represents the potential for young Luster, unlike his "enduring" mother, to respond later in his adult life with the same contempt and disregard for human compassion witnessed in a model like Jason Compson.

Jason's brother, Quentin, discovers earlier that the forced separation of whites and blacks reveals a pattern of behavior that, instead of recalling pastoral images of the past, suggest the current state of despair similar to that experienced by Young Bayard Sartoris. As "Sambo" and "Mammy," blacks suggest not a presence of the world he desires, but its absence. On his train ride to start his Fall term at Harvard, Quentin recalls
that he was feeling homesick and found himself thinking about Roskus and Dilsey. "'I didn't know that I really had missed'" (106) them. But Faulkner reveals that, in fact, it is not Roskus and Dilsey as human beings Quentin misses, but "'a form of behavior... a sort of obverse reflection of the white people he lives among'" (106). However, Quentin falls asleep and, when he wakes up at a Virginia station, he realizes that the train has stopped moving. On cue, Faulkner presents Quentin with an image from the traditional plantation South. Looking out of his window, Quentin sees:

'a nigger on a mule in the middle of the still ruts, waiting for the train to move. How long he had been there I didn't know, but he sat straddle of the mule, his head wrapped in a piece of blanket, as if they had been built there with the fence and the road, or with the hill, carved out of the hill itself, like a sign put there saying You are home again.' (106)

Faulkner shows that Quentin does see an image, a sign, that welcomes him "home again," that is, welcomes him to engage the myth of innocence. However, as Faulkner shows, it takes the white and the black to exhibit in their roles the full theatrics of the Southern Cavalier myth.

With his head "'wrapped in a piece of blanket,'" the black man does see his fellow countryman until Quentin, taking on the role of the "Young marster," calls out to him: "'Hey, Uncle?'' (107). The black man lifts the blanket and looks at Quentin. "'Christmas gift!'" (107) Quentin
saying, and immediately, the black man, too, responds in recognition of Quentin, "'You done caught me, aint you?'" (107). As Faulkner implies, united by the image Quentin sees in his mind of the black man and home, the two now exist in a world alone, with the older black man responding to the younger white man's behavior, apart from the reality surrounding them. For the black man, Quentin firmly establishes his identity by saying, "'I'll let you off this time'" (107).

Reminiscent of the cruel behavior of Mrs. Compson and Jason shown toward the Gibsons, Quentin's own display of violence is concealed behind the treatment of the black man who becomes an image of something non-human. Thus, without any hesitation, Quentin throws a quarter out the window and says to the man, "'buy yourself some Santy Claus'" (107). Faulkner shows the black man responding appropriately to Quentin's behavior and words by scurrying for the quarter. "'Yes, suh'... Thanky, Young marster. Thanky'" (107). Quentin cannot resist playing the role of the "Young marster"; it is the only way he can act, the only behavior that gives meaning to his life. Quentin, Faulkner shows, belongs to the traditional plantation image of the "nigger on a mule": he belongs to the altered, romantic ideal order. Just as his mother and brother became immune to the feelings of pain in the Gibsons and the feeling of shame in themselves, Quentin, in his contact with the black man, shows little human compassion.
Yet, with the black man out of sight, Faulkner shows Quentin returning to his prior state of contemplation. Focusing on the black man, Quentin recalls his blend of "'childlike and ready incompetence and paradoxical reliability that tends and protects them it loves'" (107). In the black man, Quentin sees a projection of his own image as the white, in which he and the black man display the "'childlike and ready incompetence'" with "'paradoxical reliability'" that "'robs'" the black "'steadily'" and forces the Southern culture to evade its "'responsibility and obligations'" (107) toward humanity. Forced in a position of servitude, the black, Quentin realizes displayed a "'fond and unflagging tolerance for whitefolks' vagaries... which I had forgotten'" (108). As the originator of his identity in Southern culture, the black represented behavior that was "'a sort of observe reflection'" of whites (106), and in that sense, they suggested a world created from an illusion, a dream. Like the culture from which he springs, Quentin awakens from that dream and through the black, an inept disguise for Southern "blackness," recalls a distracting memory of the violent past. Thus, part of Quentin's confusion is that the traditional plantation image of the black is what he wants to see, what he needs in order to feel at "home." But, it is also comes to represent an image he wants to escape.

Since Quentin feels he cannot control the downfall
of Southern history, he concentrates on trying to control "Compson history." As he recalls events from his childhood, however, Quentin is quite willing to invent incidents of innocence and chivalric heroism even if they are the antithesis of reality. Faulkner locates Quentin's madness at the center of the South's desire for purification at all cost. For Quentin believes that in the union between brother and sister, he can maintain the fiction of the purity of white blood, thus denying Southern history its truth. He sees himself purging Southern blackness by talking with "'voices insistent and contradictory and impatient,'" to fellow believers who could make "'of unreality a possibility, then a probability, then an incontrovertible fact'" (145). Thus, to his father, Quentin insists that incest between him and his sister is a reality, contrary to the evidence of difference inherent in the New South's legacy of violence and miscegenation. Manipulating the historical to conform to the fictional, Quentin recalls the affair between Dalton Ames and his younger sister Candace (Caddy), then fifteen. Feeling his father's presence behind him ("'me beyond the rasping darkness of summer and August the street lamps Father and I protect women'" 119), Quentin fantasizes himself the Southern Gentleman, with an entire tradition behind him, set out to protect Caddy's virginity. Holding a knife to her throat (188), he tries to draw her from the natural progression of life to the static idea of innocence:
"'Caddy do you remember how Dilsey fussed at you because your drawers were muddy'" (189). In this image of Quentin holding a knife to Caddy, Faulkner reveals the insidious nature of innocence. For while Caddy represents the "image of ladyhood," as Diane Roberts writes, an image "so dear to the white South's sense of its past" (Faulkner's 106), she also represents the betrayal of that past. In this, Faulkner suggests that, in the "'rasping darkness'" (Sound 119), Quentin both protects and struggles with a contradiction of his own making, and the dilemma that exists within himself, manifests itself in violence.

However, this violence is not apparent to Quentin, as Mr. Compson notes, who remains "'blind to what is in'" himself (220). Immediately, Quentin recalls his encounter with the stronger Ames that, again, relies on an element of fictional chivalry: "'then I heard myself saying I'll give you until sundown to leave town'" (198). But Quentin's hands are shaking in contrast to Ames, whom Faulkner describes as standing calmly before Quentin, slowly smoking a cigarette (198). When he finally hits Ames (with an "'open hand'") (199), it is Ames who strikes him full in the face and draws blood. But, with his singular effort, the "'incontrovertible fact'" (145) is that Quentin cannot make Ames disappear or Caddy believe with him in the past. Calling him "'poor Quentin'" (189), Caddy walks away from her brother's dream of innocence. However, if Quentin cannot make Caddy or himself materialize in that dream
of innocence, he can fantasize incest: "'I have committed incest I said Father it was I it was not Dalton Ames'" (97). The fantasy of incest rather than the historical fact of miscegenation surrounds Quentin in an illusion of innocence, exemplified in hollow acts of chivalry.

Quentin expects his father to interpret his behavior as exemplifying the tradition's virtue of "'courage'" (219). But when Mr. Compson asks, "'do you consider that courage'" and questions how "'earnest'" he is (219), Quentin experiences the betrayal of the Chivalry tradition through one of its Fathers. While Quentin tries fiercely to defend his aristocratic dream of serenity, Faulkner employs the lower-case, first-person I to imply that Quentin's fading dream is emblematic of his and the tradition's impending death. "'You dont believe i am serious'" (219). For Quentin, the son, can be no more "'earnest,'" no more successful at fulfilling the dream of purity than its original inventors. Witness, Mr. Compson implies, the act of courage that is no courage at all since Quentin never committed incest, that is, was never able to transform the fantasy into a reality:

'and he i think you are too serious to give me any cause for alarm you wouldnt have felt driven to the expedient of telling me you have committed incest otherwise.' (219)

But Mr. Compson's cynicism is no match for Quentin's idealism because Quentin's reply, "'i wasnt lying i wasnt lying'" (220), expresses the open sincerity and the
underlying desperation of the whole tradition of Southern chivalry in its final hours. For Quentin, as with the tradition, innocence was a serious matter. Resisting Mr. Compson's efforts to offer a rationalization for the belief in the unreal, "'You wanted to sublimate a piece of natural human folly into a horror and then exorcise it with truth'" (220), Quentin follows with

'am i it was to isolate her out of the loud world so that it would have to flee us of necessity and then the sound of it would be as though it had never been.' (220)

Quentin's particular encounter with the myth of innocence reflects the tradition's in that Faulkner reflects on the absurd effort of that to identify itself as its own fantasy of purity, indeed, in defiance of its human affinity with violence. In this, Faulkner points to what becomes a dream inherited from generations of aristocratic belief in something that could never exist as reality.

At his father's urging, ("'i think you'd better go on up to cambridge right away'"), Quentin leaves for Harvard. The union he desires with innocence (Caddy) is achieved, albeit, a fantasy of purity through an act that was never committed. But it is all he can ever hope to achieve on earth. While he spend his last day preparing for his death, Quentin's memory returns to the event that never happened.

'honeysuckle beginning to come from the garden fence beginning she went into the shadow I could hear her feet then'
'Caddy'
'I stopped at the steps I couldn't hear her feet'
'Caddy'
'I heard her feet then my hand touched her not warm not cool just still her clothes a little damp still Caddy do you love him now'
'I don't know'
'outside the grey light the shadow of things like dead things in stagnant water.' (195)

Quentin, who sees Caddy in the shadow of Southern history, becoming the "'grey'" and "'dead'" "'stagnant'" shadow of the past, wishes she were dead (195). He calls out to her, "'I'll kill you do you hear.'" In the aftermath of his failure to retrieve innocence, only the honeysuckle of the garden remains, luring him to believe in some possibility beyond itself. But the honeysuckle 'got all mixed up... the whole thing came to symbolise night and unrest I seemed to be lying neither asleep nor awake looking down a long corridor of grey halflight where all stable things had become shadowy paradoxical.' (211)

As in the Old South, things in the New South "got all mixed up" (211). For a time, the fantasy of purity, residing in the image of the Southern female, appeared as reality. But the haunting image of the Negro and a mule brought with it feelings of longing and fear. Combined, the Cavalier myth and the plantation myth yielded not the purity of whiteness, but the suggestion of a
"shadowy paradoxical" state of grayness in the New South.

This "shadowy paradoxical" nature of the new cultural order is a reflection of Quentin himself, for, as Faulkner shows, he represents both the dream of innocence and its difference. In that space between innocence and difference, Quentin is, in fact, the embodiment of the New South, romanticizing and repelling himself at the same time, with the dream always revealing itself a nightmare in which he would lie awake "'thinking when will it stop when will it stop'" (210), smelling the honeysuckle and seeing "'a long corridor of grey halflight'" (211) until, between the two, Caddy appears now out of focus—her impurity having become invisible. As a historian of Compson history, Quentin repeats the New South's practice of excluding what it cannot control. For Quentin, Caddy becomes a symbol of both the past and its loss. 11

On June 2, 1910, the last day of his life, Quentin recalls seeing a picture in one of his school text that presented a dark place "'into which a single weak ray of light came slanting upon two faces lifted out of the shadow'" (215). Hours away from his death, Quentin envisions that the picture "'torn out, jagged out'" (215) from the book. In his mind, he substitutes the mythical imagery it offered with the reality it camouflaged. The two faces begin to represent as more familiar family portrait:

'I'd have to turn back to it until the dungeon
was Mother herself she and Father upward into weak light holding hands and us lost somewhere below even them without even a ray of light."
(215)

The original picture offers a mythical image suggesting freedom from the "shadow" of slavery. Yet, Faulkner indicates that Quentin's own family portrait reveals the melding of Cavalier myth to the reality of its past, suggesting its existence required the incorporation of the blackness it tried to exclude. "'Then the honeysuckle got in it'" (215). Quentin, unable to recognize that his origin in the blackness, turns his attention to his final pursuit of innocence. Thus, amid the remembrance of the honeysuckle, Quentin sees himself in union with the dead image of Caddy's purity. In this state of readiness, he awaits the hour of his own death: "'A quarter hour yet. And then I'll not be. The peacefulest words. Peacefulest words'" (216). He could see the corridor now, "'empty of all feet in sad generations seeking water'" (215), "water peaceful and swift'" (214). For Quentin, the water will purify him as he "purified" Caddy and both will remain in a state of innocence for an eternity. However, Faulkner offers Quentin's life and suicide as emblematic of the futility of Southern desire for innocence.
NOTES

1 See Joseph Blotner, Faulkner: A Biography (New York: Vintage Books, 1974) 197-202 for information on Ben Wasson's involvement with the writing and publication of Sartoris (Flags in the Dust).

2 In Faulkner's original version of Flags in the Dust, he made specific reference to John Sartoris' violence, that is, his involvement with miscegenation. When the manuscript was rejected by Horace Liveright, Sartoris took its place and was published in 1929, but Faulkner continued to work on a composite typescript. Somewhere between Faulkner's reconstruction of the composite and this "uncut version" that this study uses, Sartoris's involvement with miscegenation was lost. We are not told in this uncut version that the Strother family are descendant of John Sartoris. In fact, it is Simon Strother's late wife Euphony who bore a child by Sartoris. That child is Elnora depicted in the uncut version as Simon's wife. Originally, Elnora was the wife of Caspey, in the uncut version, Simon's son. However, Simon's actual son is Ringo (born 1851), depicted in The Unvanguished as the childhood friend of Old Bayard Sartoris. Joby, Saddie, and Isom are Elnora's and Caspey's children. In fact, there is a blood connection between the Sartorises and the Strothers.


4 Caspey Simon's exposure to European culture is comparable to Charles Bon's situation after he leaves his native land of Haiti for the American South. In Absalom, Absalom, Bon's discovery of racial difference and his act of resistance are the central focus of that narrative. However, in Flags in the Dust, Caspey's discovery and resistance troubling for a narrative determined to return him to his proper role within the racial framework of the American South.

5 It is in this novel that Faulkner introduces the Snopes family. With the Snopes, Faulkner presents the "decay of the content of the aristocratic ideal" (W. J.
Note the succession of Faulkner protagonists—Bayard Sartoris, Quentin Compson, Horace Benbow, Joe Christmas, Henry Sutpen, and Isaac McCaslin—who venture outside the boundaries of Jefferson and encounter the "beast." Faulkner suggests that a physical external space in opposition to an internal space is transcended by the protagonist who views an image of himself reflected in the external appearance of the "beast." In some sense, the "beast" refers not only to something internal, but individuals relationship with humanity.


Quentin's mask of the Southern Gentleman exposes what Henry Louis Gates calls a "loss of face." According to Gates: "the 'loss of face' refers primarily to the loss of the hiding mask and being exposed, unmasked; it brings about the feeling of shame and the desire to hide in invisibility" (*Figures in Black: Words, Signs and the "Racial" Self* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1987], 170-171).


Thomas Nelson Page, recalling the role of the antebellum plantation mistress, draws much the same picture. She was 'the most important personage about the home, the presence which pervaded the mansion, the center of all that life, the queen of the realm. (163-165)

It is this crystallized image of the Southern woman from the past that Quentin holds before Caddy. For Quentin she is the important personage who pervades the Compson household and is the center of the novel's life as some "dead" relic of the past. Just as the first appearance of plantation fiction could not contain the "first stirrings of the movement for woman's rights" 165, the actual Caddy resists the limitations of Quentin's patriarchal fantasy of order. She is very much in the
present, a characterization of the changing South.

I believe that what drives anyone to write is the discovery of some truth that had been in existence all the time, but he discovered it. It seems so moving to him, so necessary that it be told to everyone else in such a way that it would move them to the same extent that it moved him.

Faulkner, 1955
Faulkner in the University

In *The Sound and the Fury*, Quentin Compson's desire for permanent invisibility can be viewed as a desire to escape the nightmare of Southern culture. In *Sanctuary* (1929) and *Light in August* (1932), the nightmare of Southern culture is made invisible in that it is thought to reside, as Faulkner reveals, in the seemingly peaceful atmosphere of whiteness, as a geographical location and as an identity. For the protagonist of *Sanctuary*, Horace Benbow, attorney for town of Jefferson, blackness becomes something other, represented in the figures of individuals considered outsiders. The mulatto, Joe Christmas, in *Light in August*, considers his own blackness an otherness, be must repress. Thus, in both novels, Faulkner examines the way Southerners revised their conception of blackness
to repress the nightmare of the South's historical affinity with the violence of slavery and miscengenation. With the start of this novel, Faulkner is aware of the process of the sacrificial mechanism and its engagement by Southerners eager to erect edifices of mythical sanctuaries marked by the deceptive image of the garden free of blackness. For, as Faulkner shows, the New South's construction of these sanctuaries implies a Gothicism that establishes a dichotomy between white and black, good and evil. The symbolism of the sanctuary orders a world that depends on the notion of blackness and evil without to create the illusion of purity within. Eric J. Sundquist's argues that Faulkner excludes blacks from the novel *Sanctuary*. However, the novel itself attempts to resemble the notion of purity within and blackness without. Faulkner puts the Southern sanctuary of purity to the test of trying to recognize the enemy by its visible marking of blackness in the absence of blacks. In that sense, Faulkner shows how the town of Jefferson interprets its crisis of distinction as a threat to its purity by the Gothic apparition of something monstrous and alien. Thus, Faulkner shows in both novels that neither the establishment of class differences nor the partition of racial division provides convincing images of purity within these mythical sanctuaries.

As a new element of the mythology of innocence, the Gothic nightmare represents evil and violence and takes
on the coloration of "black," grotesque, alien figures excluded from the sanctuary of the community. According to Elizabeth MacAndrew, Gothicism gives "shape to concepts of the place of evil in the human mind" (The Gothic 3). However, MacAndrew explains (and Faulkner shows) that the "grotesques" are symbolic figures reflecting the state of the dreamer's mind (154) filled, as Sundquist states, with "the South's gravest moral sins and the consequent guilt" (The House 57). The image of the Negro and a mule, an image representing Southern longing, becomes a representation of something fearful, "demonic, not of this world" (The Gothic 158). Thus, no longer viewed exclusively in the stereotypical image of what Lewis P. Simpson calls "a pastoral clown" (The Dispossessed 46), the black becomes the "beast," the demonic figure not of the white community. The image of the "beast," contained in the space of blackness outside the sanctuary of the white community, can be called upon to evoke the idea of an invasion threatening to disrupt the purity of the community. As a result, "the 'Negro as beast,'" Sundquist writes, became a fixture of "Southern--and American--racial iconography" (The House 87). Violence is seen as something other and can be explained away by employing a deceptive, mythico-religious language that re-locates violence with the original victims, eliminating any responsibility for its occurrence in the community while justifying the racial violence of Jim Crow legislation. In Sanctuary, Faulkner
shows how Horace Benbow's interpretation of the rape of Temple Drake by Popeye (a white member of the community) and Temple's description of Popeye as black, together evoke the idea of blackness by symbolically isolating Popeye's violence as a difference not of this world. When Popeye is not available to be viewed and expelled by the town of Jefferson, he is replaced by an innocent white man, Lee Goodwin, who becomes the image of blackness prompting the court and then a mob citizens to kill him for the crime of rape. Thus, every act of communal violence in the novel is denial of white involvement and a claim of innocence and purity. As Faulkner shows, the corruption is a process of deception embedded in the myth of innocence that always requires the violent expulsion of blackness.

According to Blotner, contrary to his effort in the past, Faulkner, in revising *Sanctuary* for publication, showed less "concern for readers' sensibilities" (Faulkner 268). Instead Faulkner claims certainty about "the corruption with which he imbued the novel faithfully mirrored corruption in society at large" (268). Moreover, Faulkner's recognizes that this corruption is linked to the deceptive interpretation of violence in the Gothic myth. It is with this sense of certainty about Southern violence that Faulkner discovers his place as a writer. Faulkner presents, as Blotner writes, "the most horrific tale" (233) imaginable, one that exposes to white Southerners the monstrous double within the mythical
sanctuary of Southern innocence. However, while both Kerr and Sundquist refer to Faulkner's use of the Gothic tradition in *Sanctuary*, neither note how Faulkner reveals a racially motivated interpretation of the violence in that novel. Kerr's study of the Gothic devices in the novel does not mention the significance of blackness and the black race as they relate to the South's location of violence. Sundquist argues that there is no relationship between Horace's and Temple's description of Popeye as black and the Southern black population. Both interpretations agree with Faulkner's depiction of the corruption in the construction of innocence, but neither points to the significant role that the sacrificial mechanism plays in the creation of that construction and its counterpoint. The crucial characterization of both Popeye and Lee Goodwin as black, enables the community to expel them by linking them to the sacrificed blacks who are already the designated source and location of Southern violence.

For Faulkner's protagonist, Horace Benbow, the uncertainty surrounding the location of blackness reveals a hidden truth about Southern society. The state of innocence that Horace seeks-- "a hill to lie on for a while" (*Sanctuary* 16)-- is, as Northrop Frye writes, "above the state of experience" (*A Study* 32). In short, no such state exists or ever existed historically, yet, Horace believes that this innocence and its opposite, blackness,
maintain separate and easily recognizable abodes. The Southern mythology of innocence and the violence it attempts to conceal are not mutually exclusive, but, as Faulkner shows in the characterization of Horace, Temple, and Narcissa, both the myth and violence manifest the conflictual state of "homelessness." Thus, Horace's plight symbolizes not only his "homeless" state, but that of the entire tradition as it struggles to maintain the idea of itself as innocence. Within the sanctuary of his home, Horace's sexual attraction to his stepdaughter Little Belle, and his unusually close relationship with his sister, Narcissa Benbow makes him feel unease about his own identity, that is, his role as a Southern Gentleman. The hint of incest, however, while symbolizing the very intent of Southern chivalry's aristocratic dream, reveals, instead, the absurdity and, ultimately, the violence underneath the notion of purity. In his quest for a more idyllic home, he leaves his wife, Belle, and stepdaughter in Kinston with the intention of journeying back to Jefferson, the home of his childhood. As Faulkner implies, Horace comes home to his origins, for he encounters the nightmare of his and the Chivalric tradition's blackness in a barren vision of the New South.

Somewhere between Kinston and Jefferson, between city and country, Horace stumbles upon what he perceives to be an enclosed space of darkness surrounding a rural house at Frenchman's Place. The lone house sits behind
a "screen of bushes" (Sanctuary 3) and "a grove of unpruned cedar trees" (8); it is "a gutted ruin rising gaunt and stark" (8). Like the first stirrings of Southerners in the absence of the myth of innocence, Horace believes he has discovered an ominous location of darkness, signally some abnormality he cannot quite articulate. In the darkness and in the "shattered reflection" of the spring water (4), Horace encounters what he believes to be a nightmare image: the figure of Popeye. In Popeye's grotesque figure, his "queer, bloodless color," his black suit and rolled trousers caked with mud (4), Horace perceives a difference that stood apart from all he had known, suggesting the darkness he is trying to separate from himself. But Faulkner insists that the connection between Frenchman's Place and Jefferson and that between Horace and Popeye be relayed at least to the reader who looks on the two individuals. Thus, Faulkner describes Horace as the "drinking man" (4) until Horace distinguishes himself by supplying his name and societal status. He does so to a man who makes a living from the production of bootleg whiskey. Further, Horace's book, a badge of distinction he wears in his coat pocket is associated with the coat pocket where Popeye carries his pistol. As Faulkner implies, the symmetry suggests an atmosphere of non-difference, for the book and the pistol unite the two, bringing into focus the idealism of the tradition and its relationship to violence. Yet, Horace cannot
comprehend the similarities that are only superficial at this point in the narrative. Yet in Horace's own sense of confusion, Popeye hints at something Other, so alien as to appear inhuman. The necessity of making Popeye appear inhuman, and thus, a representative of "blackness," for Horace, dismisses the possibility of this white man having any connection with himself and the community, further reflecting the dilemma of Southern culture as a whole. For the monstrous double appears, as René Girard explains, as a "hallucinatory phenomena" that resists the recognition of reciprocity (Violence 164). Yet, the blackness Horace perceives in and around the house and in the person of Popeye reflects the way his own mind has so contaminated his perceptions and surroundings.

Escaping Popeye for the moment, Horace searches for familiar signs of conventionality. Faulkner places the disoriented Horace in the center of the house, in Ruby Lamar's kitchen where he tries to appeal for help. It is Ruby who will challenge Horace's sterile idea of Southern Womanhood and its relation to innocence. She instantly recognizes his situation: "'the poor, scared fool'" (Sanctuary 16). No longer, for the moment, threatened by Popeye's presence, Horace focuses his attention on Ruby who appears to contradict his idealistic concept of Southern Womanhood. On this setting, Horace tries to impose the same artificial conventions that drove him away from his own home in search for freedom. Thus,
similar to Quentin Compson (*The Sound and the Fury*), he tries to retreat behind the mask of the Southern Gentleman only to experience a "loss of face." He suggests to Ruby that she move to the city (16) where her plight and social status would improve (16). But his question to Ruby, "'do you like living like this?" and her response, "'why did you leave your wife?'" (17), points to the symmetry between them and returns Horace's attention on himself.

Horace finds himself trying to explain how "his great romance with Belle Mitchell," as Edmond L. Volpe states, "deteriorated into a stale marital routine, symbolized for him by his weekly trips to the railroad station for shrimp" (*A Reader's* 142):

'All the way home it drips and drips, until after a while I follow myself to the station and stand aside and watch Horace Benbow take that box off the train and start home with it...I following him, thinking Here lies Horace Benbow in a fading series of small stinking spots on a Mississippi sidewalk." (*Sanctuary* 17)

Like Quentin, Horace has been following the script, acting the part of the leading gentleman to a leading lady waiting for a box of shrimp, and has only recently discovered the absurdity of his behavior. His efforts are revealed to him as "a fading series of small stinking spots" (17), reflecting a more accurate depiction of the events in which the South perceived its uniqueness. On the other hand, Ruby, standing apart from the romantic image of the South, understands herself and her purpose apart from
the dictates of its social or moral convention. In contrast, Ruby's life is raw and without illusions of grandeur. Yet, her love and the care she provides for her child and husband, Lee Goodwin, are genuine. By the next afternoon, Horace is at his sister's home where Faulkner affords him the opportunity to compare Ruby and Frenchman's Place to Narcissa and the Sartorises plantation. 7

Ruby should appear the traditional "bad" woman to Narcissa's "good" woman image. Her physical appearance, her lack of social status, her former prostitution -- are in sharp contrast to Narcissa "in her customary white dress" (25), the perfect, ideal image of Southern Womanhood. However, "the contrast between appearance and reality," Kerr writes,

is sharpened by the traditional roles in which characters seem to be cast but which, when they play their parts, reveal dramatically how the forces inherent in respectable Southern society have created a false image of Southern womanhood and false moral views, and how justice is subverted to preserve that image and those views. ("The Persecuted" 99)

As Horace discovers, Narcissa, located at the heart of Jefferson's aristocratic society, presents rather a perfect, "false image" of Southern Womanhood. After Lee Goodwin is falsely accused of the rape of Temple Drake, Horace attempts to turn his and Narcissa's childhood home (Benbow estate) into a "safe" house for Ruby and her child. Narcissa, living at the Sartorises home, complains
bitterly: "'I cannot have my brother mixed up with a woman people are talking about'" (Sanctuary 184). Horace tries to defend Ruby by reminding Narcissa that Ruby and the child have "'been practically turned into the streets'" (182). But compassion is a foreign idea for Narcissa: "'That shouldn't be a hardship. She ought to be used to that'" (182). Horace responds:

'Listen. By tomorrow they will probably ask her to leave town. Just because she happens not to be married to the man whose child she carries about these sanctified streets. But who told them? That's what I want to know. I know that nobody in Jefferson knew it except---' (182)

As Horace comes to discovery, Narcissa, who, as Kerr points out, "would sacrifice nothing for anyone but herself" ("The Persecuted" 88). However, the "'sanctified streets'" of Jefferson are no place for a Ruby Lamar, yet the preservation of the illusion purity is fueled by her exclusion from the community.

Narcissa rejects Ruby and her child in order, as Horace puts it, to maintain Jefferson's "odorous and omnipotent sanctity" (Sanctuary 184). But Faulkner's representation of Narcissa's tarnished innocence points to the overriding interpretation of the loss of innocence in Southern culture exemplified in the characterization of Temple Drake. To counter the community and Horace's attempt to interpret the rape of Temple Drake in the genre of a Gothic horror, Faulkner allows Horace a closer look
at the promiscuous young woman who becomes for Jefferson the image of Southern Womanhood. Tracing Temple's progression from Jefferson to Frenchman's Place back to Jefferson, Horace discovers that the daughter of a prominent Jefferson judge is neither the heroine of a Southern romance nor the victim of a Gothic terror, but she is at once the embodiment of innocence and "blackness." The rape of Temple by Popeye takes place at Frenchman's Place; however, Popeye takes her to a brothel (Reba's Place) in Memphis. Since Popeye is impotent, he hires a man named Red to have sex with Temple. Sundquist discusses the "at once repelling and enticing" focus of the novel in which Popeye, "who can arouse himself (though he cannot physically do so at all) only by watching Temple and Red fornicate," turns Reba's whorehouse into a "peep-show" (The House 51). However, Faulkner employs the idea of a "peep-show" to expose what cannot be otherwise seen at a distance, through a romantic prism. This scene, repeated several times during Temple's stay with Popeye, discredits the mythology of innocence that the South claims for itself. For Temple, who might be considered to be held against her will, looks forward to the visits from Red whom she considers more of a man than Popeye. While there are two representatives of Southern innocence, only Ruby, standing outside that description, points to the hollowness of that innocence attributed to Temple. For Temple's behavior suggests the
The corruptibility of a mythology that whitewashes certain aspects of it nature. Yet, as Faulkner knows, in the town of Jefferson, it is this whitewash of Southern blackness that will restore Temple to the state of innocence.

The South's loss of innocence signaled danger for the Southern woman, for, as Diane Roberts states, the "walking symbol" of innocence was the Southern woman (Faulkner 104). The resulting hallucinatory phenomena, termed by Wilbur J. Cash the "rape complex," was, Diane Roberts writes, "a knot of nationalist and racist passion in which the 'ravishment' of the land during the war by 'invaders' became the feared revishment of white women by black men (104). As Cash explains, the North, while the target of Southern anger, does not become the target of its violence. Instead, the black becomes the "only really practical victim," the "scapegoat" figure (117), the invader, the a potential threat to the purity of the sanctuary, that is, white womanhood. In Sanctuary, blackness, too, is shown in the walking symbol of men described as "black." Girard has shown in his study of mythology that in the sacrificial substitution, the community never loses sight of the original object (Violence 5), in this case, the black. Although the community has to choose between two culprits, there is only one crime of rape that in the era of Jim Crow is associated with the black. Thus, Popeye and later Lee are incorporated in the myth of the black man as "beast."
The culprit is discovered, and he looks black. From the community's perspective, he is black. One can be substituted for the other while either becomes a substitute for the community. It is the latter substitution that allows Horace and the community to repress their own violence by focusing on the victim's violence as something alien to the community. Yet, knowledge about Narcissa and Jefferson's hypocrisy is not completely hidden from Horace. However, his idea of purity, "whiteness," once a steady attribute of his sister, "began to dissolve into the blackness," a blackness he perceived at Frenchman's Place and which he now believes represents an invading threat to the white community (*Sanctuary* 185). In his transference of blackness, Horace harbors what Harry Levin refers to as a "secret guilt" (*The Power* 74) shared by all of Jefferson.

After meeting with Temple and Reba, the owner of the brothel where Popeye kept Temple, and journeying back to Jefferson to the sanctuary of his childhood home, Horace senses something, to use Sundquist words, "repelling and enticing" about Frenchman's Place, Popeye, Ruby and Lee Goodwin. The contrast between Frenchman's Place and Jefferson further dissolves when he notices the "thick smell of honeysuckle" (*Sanctuary* 222), and the honeysuckle and "the voice of the night-- insects, whatever it was--" following him into his own house (222). He lifts the photograph of his stepdaughter, Little Belle, whose "face
dreamed with that quality of sweet chiaroscuro" (222).

All most immediately, there was his

own breathing, the face appeared to breathe
in his palms in a shallow bath of highlight,
beneath the slow, smoke-like tongues of invisible
honeysuckle. Almost palpable enough to be seen,
the scent filled the room and the small face
seemed to swoon in a voluptuous languor, blurring
still more, fading, leaving upon his eye a soft
and fading aftermath of invitation and voluptuous
promise and secret affirmation like a scent
itself. (Sanctuary 223)

As Faulkner shows, the dream of innocence turns into a
nightmare in which Horace is the grotesque figure of Popeye
while Little Belle is Temple. The raging violence triggered
by Popeye's act of violence manifests itself in Horace's
vision of "something black and furious" rushing from
himself. For in his and the community's eagerness to
sacrifice one of its own, Faulkner shows the desire for
both to separate themselves from their own blackness.
The sacrificial violence is made visible to Horace in
a vision reflecting his own desires and the repression
of those desires by the sacrifice itself. Thus, Faulkner
joins Horace to the nightmare of Southern culture. For
Horace's vision is a confession to himself that represents
what Harry Levin calls the "nightmare of the soul" (The
Power 143) in that his mind offers allegations of his
own blackness-- his own dark sexual desires. What he
embraces-- the "something black and furious"-- is the
violence that unites him and Popeye in what Cleanth Brooks
calls a "rapport with evil.""
By linking Horace's darker sexual impulses to Popeye's violence, Faulkner reveals a community suffering from the collapse of differences that, as Girard writes, "makes possible the act of sacrificial substitution" (Violence 159). With the collapse of difference doubles, that is, Popeyes, are exposed everywhere and the artificial boundary separating the community from the "outside" is dissolved. Faulkner unites Horace of Jefferson aristocracy and Popeye of Frenchman's Place in a mirror image of each other. However, Horace sees in Popeye a reflection of his own sexual impulses which he registers as frightful and alien. What he sees is something black and grotesque, that is, Popeye. Thus, forming a ridge between Horace and his own desires, Popeye is what Girard calls a "betokening difference" (160). For Horace, Popeye becomes the convenient scapegoat.

As a result, rather than reveal what he has learned about Temple, Horace joins with her in the characterization of Popeye and Lee Goodwin. Faulkner illustrates how Horace and Temple engage in what Girard calls "the shifting of differences" that occurs "in the form of a hallucination" (160). When Narcissa reprimands Horace for leaving his wife, "walking out just like a nigger" (Sanctuary 108), the image triggers a connection to Popeye and, in an hysterical state, he refers to "'that little black man,'" who had a "'flat little pistol in his coat pocket'" (109). When Temple first arrives at Frenchman's Place, she refers
to Popeye as "'that black man'" (49). From Temple and Horace to the community, the mimetic contagion against the apparition of blackness sends Jefferson into a hysterical scurry to rid itself of the inadmissible violence within its community. Visualizing itself in the grip of a Gothic tale of horror, with the invading forces of "blackness," Jefferson invades the marginal community of Frenchman's Place in search of a culprit.

The beginnings of Jefferson's Gothicism envisions an invasion of its "'most sacred'" sanctuary (284). Temple was the victim of Popeye's violence, but in an attempt to conceal her own guilt, she becomes the perpetrator of violence against another who is innocent.10 Thus, Temple's blackness is concealed behind the vision of her innocence. From the community's perspective, she is the "'ruined, defenseless child'" (288) violated by something alien and black. With the help of its "victim," the community engages in a double displacement of violence. As Faulkner shows, the unavailability of Popeye does not forestall the violence of vengeance but, instead, prompts the townspeople to seek a substitute villain. The sacrificial substitution of any member of the community (Horace) for one (Popeye) and the substitution of that individual for another (Lee), characterizes the movement of violence through the community. Turning its attention to the "wilderness" landscape of Frenchman's Place, the community discovers difference (his "'black head and gaunt
brown face'" 281) in Lee Goodwin that recalls all of its own dark desires, cruelty, indifference, in short, its own violence. Necessarily, his position in relation to the community becomes similar to the black, for he is neither inside or outside the community, but a white man who radiates "blackness." Lee's identity, as the Other, isolates him from the community. He becomes the human scapegoat responsible, as Girard states, for the ills that have befallen the community (Violence 77). In his position "outside" the community, he appears in the shadow of the sacred, thus, allowing the community to cling to a myth of innocence. He is no longer human, but the apparition of violence itself and justifies his own expulsion.

Popeye's hold over Lee Goodwin (who is afraid of Popeye and refuses to testify against him) and Temple Drake shows how thorough the corruption is in Jefferson, for the matter of justice becomes a pawn of a community determined to polarize its violence against a single individual. That Lee is wrongly arrested and charged with the rape of Temple does not matter to the town; an act of violence has taken place within the community, and someone must be sacrificed for the benefit of all others. Unquestionably, as John Duvall points out, Lee is no more innocent than others in the town. However, focusing on Lee allows Faulkner to expose the violence that ensues in order to maintain contradictory orders. Therefore,
Lee's association with Popeye and Frenchman's Place is enough to warrant his arrest. Yet, Faulkner is careful to show not only the corruption of Narcissa, Temple, and Horace, but the voice of the community is represented by someone who is heard expressing his desires toward Temple: "'I saw her. She was some baby. Jeez. I wouldn't have used no cob'" (Sanctuary 294). But this is a whisper in the crowd, for, through Popeye's violence, the entire community, including a justice system, is focused on the scapegoat.

While the community prepares for the trial of Lee Goodwin, Horace becomes the lawyer for the accused. The trial, as Faulkner presents it, supports Girard's contention that the justice system promotes "vengeance, sacrifice, and legal punishment" (Violence 24-25). Therefore, Horace's role, as is the trial itself, is a matter of ceremony, for Lee, perceived as violence itself, is already deemed guilty and it remains to impugn the character of Ruby (Sanctuary 270) in order to achieve an unanimous polarity of the community against this single victim. Once she is discarded as an immoral woman, the "guardians of public order" (Girard) are free to lead the chorus of approval for Temple and condemnation for the victim. Their "speeches" are part of the ritual of sacrifice that, according to Girard, represent "a form of active participation" for the community (Job 26-27). This relationship between the speeches and the crowd
participation relies on the collective imagination of everyone apart from the victim to recognize blackness, that is, violence as other, beyond the borders of the community. Thus, outranking Horace, District Attorney Eustace Graham, spokesperson for the legal community, displays the evidence, the stained corn cob, found at the scene of the crime (Sanctuary 283). The corn cob propels the Gothic narrative to its dramatic climax by allowing the community to focus on a symbol of aberration, suggesting a pillage of purity from someone in close proximity to the sacred. The suggestion that violence, that is, the "bad" sacred has contaminated the purity of the inner sanctity of Southern life comes from the medical community. A gynecologist, "'an authority on the most sacred affairs,'" (283-284) offers evidence of the violation itself against "'that most sacred thing in life: womanhood'" (283-284). Thus, both the district attorney and the gynecologist give evidence that a crime has been committed against the sanctuary of Southern Womanhood not by "'good men...fathers... husbands...'" (285) of the community, but from some evil outside its borders. Finally, to Horace's surprise, "'the Baptist minister took [Lee] for a text, not only as a murderer, but as an adulterer, a polluter of the free Democratic-Protestant atmosphere of Yoknapatawpha County'" (128). While the mythology of innocence formulates the difference between good and bad sacred, that is, violence, Lee's role as
the surrogate victim becomes the mythical text by which the community justifies its efforts to restore differentiated harmony. As a black pollution of white purity, Lee Goodwin is the embodiment of the "bad" sacred, who provides the community with an image of itself as the sanctuary of innocence.

The trial, as Faulkner shows, is a prelude for the mob lynching already in preparation. "Violence," writes Girard, "is always interpreted as an act of divine vengeance" (Job 17). As Faulkner shows, in the New South and in the "speeches" of the "guardians of public order" (17), violence is interpreted as an act of vengeance against the violation of Southern Womanhood, the symbol of innocence. Thus, the trial and sentencing and subsequent lynching of Lee represent a breach of justice in which truth is circumvented in order to maintain a mythology of innocence. As Faulkner reveals, instead of truth, vengeance and the desire for violence merge to form what Girard terms a "barbaric lyricism" (28) that obscures the community's comprehension of its own violence.¹² To some members of the community, notably those voices overheard by Horace, the stained corn cob in association with Lee appears monstrous, beyond the ability of the justice system to contain it. The violence inflicted by the corn cob encourages the violent desires of the crowd gathered around the courthouse. Consequently, Lee, who was never referred by name at the trial, is already "dead"
in that the community has gathered to witness his necessary expulsion. Walking toward the square, in the center of town, Horace sees a crowd of people and nearby, the sheriff, who examines the crowd with a look of "concern about his eyes" (Sanctuary 293): "'When a mob means business, it don't take that much time and talk. And it don't go about its business where every man can see it'" (293). The sheriff's look of concern and his comment hint, Faulkner implies, of his knowledge that Lee is already dead. However, while the sheriff's comment suggests that only a few members of the community will be responsible for Lee's murder, Faulkner shows that this is not entirely true. All the members of the community must and do come to accept Lee as the apparition of violence whose expulsion will restore purity, that is, the difference between themselves representing innocence and him representing violence. In his "death," Lee looms large as something supernatural. As Girard explains,

only the lynchers themselves can believe enough in their own lynching to read it as the emergence, in supernaturally troubled circumstances, of an all-powerful demonic figure threatening to destroy the entire community and only prevented from doing so by this community's timely violence. ("To Double" 190)

In the aftermath of this Gothic nightmare, the tragedy of this violence will go unnoticed by the community. Faulkner, however, has left no doubt as to the actual location of violence.

At mid-night, as Horace watched, "they [the "mad"
crowd] appeared to come from nowhere, to emerge in midstride out of nothingness" (Sanctuary 295). "Against the flames," their "black figures" show, antic" (296). They form a circle around Lee, ablaze in "the center of a vacant lot" (296). In that sense, the "circle" that forms around the victim, Lee, confirms the unanimous agreement of the community with his sacrifice. Furthermore, Faulkner shows that the perpetrators of this violence resemble, in their "black figures," the very apparition of violence they are attempting to expel. Even Horace joined the circle (296), where he noted that from the "central mass of fire... came no sound at all" (296). He could not "hear the man who had got burned screaming" (296). For, soon the apparition of "the man" covered in a "white-hot mass" (296) becomes the central figure in the center of town, and this central figure is violence, itself. For Faulkner the presence of the flames implies the presence of violence swirling "upward unabated, as though it were living upon itself" (296). In that sense, Faulkner presents the relationship of violence to human nature in that violence in the figure of Lee's burning body is central to the "black figures," that is, the community. As Girard states, "violence and the sacred are inseparable" (Violence 19). For Faulkner, it is this relationship to violence that establishes the foundation of Southern culture, the mythology of innocence. The difference the community claims between itself and Lee
is not only mythical, but supported by a misunderstanding of its relationship to violence. As a result, this misunderstanding that, as Girard writes, "must remain within the system" (159) in order for the sacrificial mechanism to be effective, points to the culture's mythical origins in innocence. Thus, in the "roaring" yet "soundless" presence of violence, Faulkner shows that the contradictory aspect of the sacrificial mechanism escapes comprehension by Horace and the community. Instead, Jefferson considers the apparition--"a voice of fury like in a dream, roaring silently out of a peaceful void" (Sanctuary 296)--a return to harmonious order. As a result, Faulkner shifts the novel's attention from the apparition in Jefferson to the suburb of Kinston where Horace returns to his new home, "on a fairish piece of lawn," with "the trees, the poplars and maples... still new" (299). The community begins again, as does Horace, in the belief of its innocence and the restoration of its cultural order. The nightmare is over. Violence has been expelled from the community, and all is well again. Yet, Faulkner hints at the violence that remains within the community. On his way home, Horace cannot respond to the driver who refers to how justice was served in Jefferson and adds, "'we got to protect our girls. Might need them ourselves'" (298). Faulkner shows that Horace himself hurriedly enters the house to call Little Belle is supposedly with friends at a party. Everything returns,
Faulkner suggests, to the same as it was before the sacrifice-- a picture of whiteness concealing the "shadowy paradoxical" state of grayness.
The reviews of *Sanctuary* were not favorable. Not surprisingly, the town of Oxford, Mississippi did not appreciate its role as what Clifton Fadiman calls, Faulkner's "perfect Inferno" (*Party of One* 105). According to Joseph Blotner, it condemned the author for "presenting the worst possible aspects of the modern South and its people, not to mention gratuitous horrors a gentleman wouldn't discuss" (*Faulkner* 276). Clifton Fadiman claims that Faulkner's revelation about the Gothic in the "territory of northern Mississippi," caused readers to react with "nervous resistance" rather than "abandon" themselves to Faulkner's "witchcraft" (*Party of One* 105). 13 Far from the South's ideal writer of "idealized or at least complimentary fiction" of the Southern condition (*Faulkner* 276), here was the real "Popeye" of Oxford, set on disrupting an order made possible by distinguishing "innocence" from "blackness." Determined to insist on the occurrence of the sacrificial mechanism as the foundation of cultural order in the South, Faulkner, in *Light in August*, returns to the image of the Negro as "beast" to reveal the combined role of the Cavalier tradition and Southern Calvinism in the operation of the sacrificial mechanism. In that sense, what "witchcraft"
the sacrificial crisis of and expulsion of Joe Christmas.

On the one hand, in turning to the figure of Joe Christmas, Faulkner moves beyond the soothing representation of blacks as a form of behavior. He is neither the plantation myth's ideal "Sambo" nor the devil in disguise; he is a Southerner, created in a more authentic image of the South's racial reality. For, as a mulatto, Christmas is the ultimate representation of what Eric J. Sundquist calls the "black within white." In Faulkner's identification with Quentin Compson's fear of blackness, he discovers through Christmas his own an affinity with Southern violence, a violence that he cannot walk away from as Horace Benbow (Sanctuary) does nor mythologize as does the town of Jefferson. Apart from the rigidity of the hierarchical structure of the Cavalier myth and the divisive Calvinism of Southern culture, Christmas' mixed blood, resembles Southern culture's racial mixed origins. However, the uncertainty surrounding his racial identity points to an intolerable reality that must remain repressed by the tradition and its religion. Christmas' racial status of being neither black nor white, represents, as James A. Snead argues, the exact "points of chaos threatening to destroy every plot of false serenity" (Figures 82). As author and protagonist, the disruptive atmosphere Faulkner and Christmas create reveals the actual state of undifferentiation in the culture. Both point to the sacrificial crisis, that is, what Rene
Girard calls the "disappearance of the difference between impure violence and purifying violence" (Violence 49). In that sense, both are seen as violators of the sacred taboo, that is, contaminators of the sanctity of purity, for Christmas, as victim, exposes the truth about the sacrificial mechanism that allows for the distinction of violence while Faulkner, as writer, reveals the blackness that originates from within a culture in conflict with itself. Thus, in Light in August, Faulkner shows how the language of Calvinism and the Cavalier myth's image of the black man as "beast" come to identify Christmas as the location of its blackness, that is, a disruptive violence, deemed by the community "impure," generating the "purifying" communal violence of sacrifice. Christmas represents undifferentiation, the loss of racial difference and difference between "impure" and "purifying" violence, thus, cultural order. His name, "Christmas," Faulkner implies, suggests the re-birth of cultural order founded on his violent expulsion from the community. In that sense, Christmas life and death symbolize "the continued existence of the collectivity" (Girard) (255). Thus, it is not surprising that Christmas' appearance in the town of Jefferson warrants attention from a community eager to doubt the possibility of Christmas' origins among them. To the town, Joe Christmas is seen as the drifter, who arrives from nowhere, and three years later, kills a townswoman and is murdered
himself by law enforcers. However, for the reader whose role as an observer becomes more prominent in this Faulkner novel, Christmas is seen as a member of the community with his beginnings in Mottstown, near the town of Jefferson. Faulkner supplies the reader with an image of Christmas' origins as one of hate and violence in the person of Doc Hines, Christmas grandfather. He describes Christmas' grandfather as a "dirty little old man with a face which had once been either courageous or violent--either a visionary or a supreme egoist" (Light 324). Known as "Uncle Doc" about the town square, it is this man who murders Christmas' father whom he suspects of being black. ("'Telling old Doc Hines, that knowed better, that he was a Mexican'" 353). While Christmas' mother dies in childbirth, Hines hears God's voice acknowledge the child as a "'pollution and a abomination on My earth'"(365), and he is ordered by God to wait and watch (362-363). Hines, in other words, regards the child as "bad" sacred, that is, violence, considered impure, Girard writes, "when it is inside the community" (Violence 258), signaling the loss of cultural order. For only sacrificial violence is consider "good" sacred, a necessary indulgence in violence intended to purify the community of unsanctioned, that is, nonsacrificial violence. It is this violence that Hines and the community advocate for the removal of Joe Christmas. Faulkner unites Hines, now the janitor at a white orphanage where he has placed the six year
old Christmas, with its female dietitian whom Hines suspects is having an affair with an intern. Hines finds the woman's "'bitchery'" (Light 119) contemptible, but his overriding concern is with the "'Lord's abomination'" (363), that is, Christmas. In turn, the woman, fearful of Hines' condemnation of her behavior, anxiously displaces her guilt on the child. Thus, the scene, brings together Southern Calvinism, with its emphasis on the expulsion of blackness, and the Cavalier myth, with its emphasis on innocence, to show how both, through hatred and fear, conspire to deny the humanity of others.

Focusing on Christmas, that is non-difference, the Hines and the dietitian epitomize the communal, yet absurd effort to distinguish between good and bad violence:

they faced one another in the coalgrimed doorway, mad eyes looking into mad eyes, mad voices talking to mad voice as calm and quiet and terse as two conspirators. 'I've watched you for five years... Watching him and hearing the other children calling him Nigger. That's what you are doing. I know. You came here just to do that, to watch him and hate him. You were here ready when he came. Maybe you brought him and left him on the step yonder yourself.' (119)

Both Hines and the dietitian exemplify the madness of the tradition of chivalry and religion of Calvinism to attempt to distinguish pure from impure violence, for, as Girard writes, "there is no such thing as truly 'pure' violence" (Violence 40). Faulkner shows that in their madness, that is, in their attempt to designate Christmas
as "nigger," impure violence, Hines and the woman manifest the culture's irrational fear of racial pollution. Thus, Faulkner emphasizes the monstrous symmetry between Hines and the woman in that these two "blackened" figures, conversing in "the coalgrimed" darkness with their "mad eyes" and "mad voice talking to mad voice" (Light 119). The two present an image of violent doubles that in itself suggests an evil pollution within the community.

Faulkner shows that though there is symmetry between the dietitian's guilt for her sexual involvement with a young intern and Hines' murder of Christmas' father, neither recognizes any similarity in the other. Instead, Hines attributes his acts of violence to the will of God; thus, his religious fantasy is absorbed by external shapes of "'damnation'" (119) and blackness fostering the proliferation of more violence. Therefore, the child Christmas becomes a victim of Hines' violence and the dietitian's fear of reprisal. While Hines awaits God's final judgment on his grandson, the woman waits "in a coma state" (115) for the child Christmas to exert his power to speak out against her. Thus, Faulkner implies, the woman, "in a coma state" (115), denies her own guilt but, in the child, sees an apparition of blackness symbolic of death-in-life that promises a mythic re-birth in innocence for herself:

'I've known it all the time that he's part nigger'... [Yet] she had not thought of it before, but she believed that she had, had known
it all the while, because it seemed so right: he would not only be removed; he would be punished for having given her terror and worry.' (121)

The dietitian's description of Christmas as "nigger" (121), forges a personal myth of innocence that mirrors that of the culture's myth of innocence. For the dietitian, her own sense of guilt focuses on the child's parchment skin and, in retrospect, she, along with Hines, evokes the cultural myth that accepts and supports the recognition of Christmas as "'part nigger'" and, thus, the "'damnation'" and an apparition of blackness that cannot and did not ever exist within the sanctuary of innocence and therefore requires expulsion.

However, further complications develop, as Faulkner reveals, when Christmas' adopted parents, the McEacherns, expose him to the doctrine of Southern Calvinism. He is forced to recite from an "enormous Bible" (137) or face punishment. His adopted mother, also subjected to the paternal rule of her husband, tries to offer the child compassion and love. In contrast to his father, the woman "trusted him" (158), and with her kindness, she "'would try to get herself between him and the punishment'" (157):

'...she had always been kind to him. The man, the hard, just, ruthless man, merely depended on him to act in a certain way and to receive the as certain reward or punishment, just as he could depend on the man to react in a certain way to his own certain doings and misdoings. It was the woman who, with a woman's affinity and instinct for secrecy, for casting a faint taint of evil about the most trivial and innocent
Raised in a predominately paternal system of "'reward or punishment,'" Christmas learns to become suspicious of kindness, as it came to represent to him something feminine and therefore, evil. In turn, he identifies with and depends on the father's order. To Christmas, Mrs. Eachern's behavior is disruptive and outside the norm. As Faulkner shows, the woman who cast "'a faint taint of evil,'" reflects the habit of violence inherent in the paternal familial structure. To the youth, Mrs. McEachern's personage as a woman and her acts of kindness becomes a difference, an evil imposition he is forced to reject. As Christmas discovers, beyond Mr. McEachern's moral doctrine, there is confusion, and within it, there is the order of reciprocal violence. It is this order that Christmas has come to accept as order. Furthermore, he suspects he is, in his being, what McEachern wants to expel. The difference of Mrs. McEachern's kindness cannot be a part of the relationship between "father" and "son," a relationship that is anything but congenial. Instead, Christmas is drawn to wage a silent battle with the "demon" who represents for him both Mr. McEachern and his own blackness. In that sense, Faulkner implies, Christmas' waging war with himself and others represents the raw appeal to violence.

Faulkner shows that Christmas never progresses beyond
the hate and fear of the orphanage in Mottstown. Into his adult life, he remains that orphan boy absorbing the violence of his culture while his "orphanage" expands to become the entire community of Jefferson. Thus, he has all the markings of an "orphan" when he arrives in that town. To the community, "'he looked like a tramp, yet not like a tramp either'" (27). It recognizes in him someone like them, yet it suspects, he is not one of them. Watching the stranger's "'dark, insufferable face... and [sensing his] quiet contempt'" (28), they are reminded of the dark, ominous presence of a black man. Girard's definition of the orphan/victim is suitable to Faulkner's description of Christmas as a man who partakes of all possible differences within the community, particularly the difference between within and without; for he passes freely from the interior to the exterior and back again. (Violence 271)

With his apparent "'rootlessness'" (Light 27), he has all the markings of a black man in Southern culture. In Jefferson, Christmas possesses that quality of homelessness in which the dark, brooding "home" within himself begins to engulf the entire community around him.

As orphan, Joe Christmas is still a ward of the community, albeit an undesirable one. In that sense, his brooding silence exemplifies his own inherited hatred and fear of blackness and is characteristic of the entire Southern culture, in particular, its Calvinist doctrine. From his father, a representative of the tradition and
Calvinist doctrine, Christmas learns to remain silent about the uncertainty of his racial origins and, like the culture of his origins, the repression of his blackness prevents him from establishing any viable relationship with humanity. Thus, Christmas shares in the community's desire to erase from memory the enslaving vision of blackness that is the legacy of slavery denoted not as a symbol of past violence, but as a symbol of present evil. "'Ruthless, lonely, and almost proud'" (27), Faulkner shows that Christmas is an embodiment of the myth, of the community, and the other, a container of the whole racial crisis in the New South responsible for its regional alienation. In his non-identity, that is, his lack of being either white or black, he is the visible contradiction of the South's mythology. As Faulkner describes him,

'his face was gaunt, the flesh a level dead parchment color. Not the skin: the flesh itself, as though the skull had been molded in a still and deadly regularity and then baked in a fierce oven.' (30)

He is undeniably a blend of both races, yet, he is designated by his historical inheritance, Donald Kartiganer writes, "to resist the complexity of actual conditions," by running from those conditions ("The Meaning Of Form" 23). Joe Christmas is running from what is already a part of him, what is himself, what is impossible to escape—his origins and identity in the violence of Southern
history. As it is for the South itself, Faulkner claims, there is no sanctuary for the community nor the individual. The only difference between the two originates with the operation of the sacrificial mechanism.

Christmas takes a job at the local mill in town where he is surrounded, Faulkner implies, by fellow "outcasts," that is, individuals not of the aristocratic class. Thus, the local mill in this novel is the Frenchman's Place of Sanctuary. Yet, here in this setting, Christmas hints at a difference among difference. Among this community of marginal individuals is a young man named Byron Bunch who daily leaves his job to sit and talk with the Reverend Gail Hightower, yet another "outcast," isolated on the outskirts of town. According to Bryon, Christmas looked like a "'foreigner'" (Light 29). He had a name that "'nobody a-tall'" (29) heard of-- Christmas. It was a name that could not be read, but "'in the sound of it,'" the name carried "its own inescapable warning, like a flower its scent or a rattlesnake its rattle'" (29). But, Byron adds, he "'didn't talk to any of them'" at the mill (30). Thus, as Faulkner reveals, those closest to Christmas, who comprise his first community, and who are themselves outcasts, become active in constructing an image of Christmas that further alienates him from them and the community as a whole. In that sense, Christmas becomes a Job-like figure, and as such, according to Girard, is "persecuted by those who could least indulge
in persecution" (Job 6). He becomes the difference outside of them, the stranger, the one made to appear most threatening to all.

In the process, the community around Christmas expands to include Joe Brown, Joanna Burden, and at the center, Lena Grove. Faulkner evokes the pastoral myth of innocence by introducing Lena at "home" wherever she moves while the other story of Joe Christmas, the wanderer, in search of a "home," recalls the Gothic horror imagined in the New South. But as Faulkner implies, Lena's world points to the reality around her, for the very pregnant Lena has left Alabama in search of Joe Brown who has deserted her. Brown, who works at the mill, is characterized by Byron as "'tall, young. Dark complexioned'" (50) with a "'little white scar'" on his mouth (51) indicating an instability, a delusion of certainty regarding blackness. Thus, the pastoral haven surrounding Lena reveals itself as a "shadowy paradoxical" state of grayness from which the community originates. From within this grayness, the rise of Southern Gothicism surrounding Christmas will intrude on this crisis of distinction to re-establish the difference between innocence and blackness. However, as Faulkner shows, the symmetry between Brown and Christmas suggests the presence of doubles and the elimination of difference, further implying that initially either man qualifies for the role of the sacrificial victim. Even Byron refers to the similarity of their names and their
home in Jefferson: "'two fellows named Joe that live out that way somewhere. Joe Christmas and Joe Brown'" (48). When Christmas settles down in a cabin he shares with Brown on the property of Joanna Burden, Faulkner implies a complete dissolving of geographical distinctions within the community of Jefferson.

Joanna Burden's estate, in its isolation, appears to Christmas a luring sanctuary. He tells himself, "'I won't be bothered here'" (221). Christmas hopes to isolate himself from the Jefferson's watchful eyes. As Christmas discovers, however, Joanna's home is an illusion of distance. Notably perched just above the cabin, the occupant of the home, the granddaughter of a New England abolitionist, is both an aristocratic member of the community and one of its outcasts. Yet, Joanna is another Hines as she is another McEachern. When Christmas reveals that he is black, Joanna's embrace surrounds him in the atmosphere of the orphanage and of the McEachern home. In turn, Christmas submits to a narrative of familial history that reads like a chapter in Southern history:

Sitting beside her on the dark cot while the light failed and at last her voice was without source, steady, interminable, pitched almost like the voice of a man... (227)

Through memory, Joanna's voice, "without source, steady, interminable," reveals an intimate connection with a past Christmas has been attempting to erase from his memory. As Christmas discovers, her memory, like his, manifests
a genealogy of violence. She was "'like all the rest of
them,'" he thought. "'When they finally come to surrender
completely, it's going to be in words'" (227).

Alwyn Berland's study of Light in August argues that
the conflict between Christmas and Joanna develops more
from the "radical divisions of the Calvinist world" than
from the issue of race (A Study 40-41). According to
Berland, Faulkner presents blackness, for Joanna and
Christmas, as something already in the world, present
at the beginning:

the black comes to symbolize original sin; his
bastard birth, his propensity to evil. More
than that: Black here is not a symbol for part
of each individual, so much as it is a symbol
for a view of the total individual. (41)

However, in a language made applicable to the culture's
fear of impurity, Faulkner claims that Southern Calvinism
espoused the racial hierarchy of the Cavalier myth. The
black identified as such by blood literally becomes the
original sin, the symbol of evil. Therefore, Christmas'
revelation about his racial origins forces Joanna to become
busy with the "burden" of normalizing Christmas for
acceptability within the Southern community and that
translates into situating Christmas in his place as a
black. As a result, Joanna's desire for him to be "normal"
is echoed in the town's desire to place him in a racial
and social category. Given what she knows or believes
she knows about Christmas' racial identity, Joanna places
social demands on Christmas—he attends to her estate and her business affairs with the local black colleges while attending a black law school—the same demands required of him by the community. Thus, Joanna wants Christmas to "surrender" to the cultural conditions that would completely silence him along with the black population of the New South. Therefore, in pleading with Christmas to accept his blackness and his place in Southern culture, Joanna Burden speaks not only on behalf of the "radical divisions" of her Calvinist beliefs, but also on behalf of the South's mythology of racial division. The religious vision of Calvinism aids in the justification and enforcement of the legal system of segregation.

Faulkner presents Christmas trapped in a symbolic representation of his culture's contradictions and paradoxes that singles him as an evil and an impurity. To submit to this masquerade of cultural order is to submit to a personal order of chaos that would obliterate him as a human being:

> And she would listen as quietly, and he knew that she was not convinced and she knew that he was not. Yet neither surrendered; worse: they would not let one another alone; he would not even go away. (Light 264)

As a black, Christmas cannot go away; there is no where left for him to go. Nonetheless, in the subtle expression of frustration, Joanna, refusing herself to surrender, desires the sacrifice of Christmas.
Joanna may not surrender to Christmas' demands to be left alone, but she does surrender to the words, to the language of difference, violent in what it attempts to exclude because it cannot encompass Christmas' ambiguous position. Faulkner, through Christmas, is attempting to represent the ambivalence, the state of nondifference surrounding the figure of Christmas; however, from Christmas, Burden only hears difference. She can offer only one solution to the problem: prayer. On behalf of the well-being of the community, Joanna offers Christmas to God as a sacrifice:

'Will you kneel with me?' she said. 'I don't ask it.'

'No, he said.'

'I don't ask it. Remember that' (267).

Acting as a high-priestess, Joanna offers to speak on his behalf: "'You won't even need to speak to Him yourself'" (265) while, underneath her shawl, she conceals a pistol.

As the novel's narrative indicates, Christmas had already suspected the outcome of his last encounter with Joanna. On his way to her home, he recognized what came between them as "'corruption which she seemed to gather from the air itself'" (246) and moved from her to him. Christmas, seeing himself "'being sucked down into a bottomless morass'" (246), becomes afraid. He could hear himself speaking, hear a voice like that of another "without source, steady, interminable"-- "'I had to do
it' already in the past tense; 'I had to do it [commit murder]. She said to herself'" (264)-- echoing her words expressing the necessity for sacrificial violence. That is, in Joanna's words he hears that someone had to be murdered, sacrificed for the common good. Joanna, in absolute acceptance and certainty of Christmas' blackness, has determined him eligible for the sacrifice while Faulkner shows in Christmas' racial ambivalence that both interchangeable candidates for expulsion.

By presenting Christmas and Burden, one black, one white, as violent doubles, Faulkner exposes both races to a universal truth about their relationship to violence. In his careful display of the symmetry between Joanna's "concealed" pistol and Christmas' "concealed" razor, he suggests the confusion of trying to distinguish victim from perpetrator, perpetrator from victim. For both, having surrendered to the words, the voices of their past, surrender to that violence that was more than the sum total of their personal lives. In the dark bedroom, Christmas hears her plea to pray and watches the shadows on the wall: "her arm and hand on the wall did not waver at all, the shadow of both monstrous" (267). Between these two human figures, one black and the other white, Faulkner's image of the monstrous shadow of violence reveals what has come to symbolize their personal and cultural experience together: words dissolve into "the shadowed pistol on the wall" (267).
The countryman who heard fire "'inside the house'" (84), on further investigation discovers a drunk Joe Brown running from the house and the murdered body of Joanna Burden upstairs. The town of Jefferson immediately searches for someone responsible for this violence, but as Faulkner illustrates, the fire, that is, the violence is inside the house of Jefferson, and in that sense, there are no immediate culprits visible because all are indistinguishable. According to Bryon both Christmas and Brown were missing until "'Brown showed up... yelling about how it was Christmas that killed her and making his claim on that thousand dollars'" (86). Just as Brown, the outcast, "'dark complected'" (50) begins to appear indistinguishable from Christmas, in his effort "'to hide Joe Brown behind what he was telling on Christmas'" (90), Faulkner implies that Brown's telling absorbs the town in the "'hate and dread'" (42) of its own violence. However, to the town's Marshal, it is Brown who, in his familiarity with Joanna and Christmas, resembles not innocence, but violence. But when he is accused of the murder, Brown panics: "'It was like he had been saving what he told them next... because this would save him'" (90-91):

'Go on. Accuse me. Accuse the white man that's trying to help you with what he knows. Accuse the white man and let the nigger go free.' (91)

Brown puts the word "nigger" before the town to which
the Marshal responds:

'You better be careful what you are saying, if it is a white man you are talking about,' the marshal says. 'I don't care if he is a murderer or not.' (91)

For the Marshal, speaking on behalf of the community, murderer and "nigger" call for different responses. The Marshal's "'be careful'" is a warning to a man who is most careful to distinguish himself as white and align himself with the community while separating Christmas as the culprit. Brown "'knows'" that in Southern culture, he need only refer the community to Christmas' blackness, that is, make it appear visible so it can be made to differentiate its opposite, innocence. This act of violent division must be part of what Girard terms the "collective experience" of his community, and Brown knows that it is just that. Thus, in his absence, Christmas is made to appear black-- "'that nigger, Christmas'" (329), unifying the community by unifying the Calvinist image of blackness and the Cavalier myth's image of the black man in a vision of unspeakable evil.21 Christmas' racial ambiguity resembles the nature of the community, yet, for the community, he becomes something both monstrous and inhuman, reflecting a distorted image of their own violent nature. Thus, sanctioned by God on the one hand and the law on the other, the community mobilizes its hatred and fear toward one that has been singled out as not one of them.
In life, Joanna Burden had no significance for the community, but in death, as Bryon reports to Hightower, she is "'found'" (85). "'She was lying on the floor. Her head had been cut pretty near off; a lady with the beginnings of gray hair'" (85). Where she had been the body in an unauthorized sacrifice, Joanna is now a suitable victim for a community in search of more violence. In contrast, as Faulkner implies, Christmas' position in the community and his behavior along with the community's reveals similarity rather than difference, and it is this similarity that results in more violence, encompassing all members of the community. As James A. Snead writes, the more blood is spilled to distinguish black from white blood, the more difficult it is to see the difference; at a considerable price it becomes clear that black and white 'blood' are the same. (Figures 93)

The fear of human violence-- all against all-- forces the modern community to protect itself by replacing reciprocal violence with ritual violence directed toward one member or a group of sacrificeable individuals. In the South's cultural mythology of innocence, the fear of violence is associated with the fear of racial pollution. In Faulkner's representation of the conflict between Burden and Christmas, Joanna Burden is the monstrous double; however, in the myth, Christmas takes over that role in order to support what Girard calls that "awesome vision of evil" (Violence 161).
This is the tragedy the Reverend Gail Hightower recognizes after Christmas' death. It is what he would rather "'not think... dare not think'" (Light 464) when he sees a face:

'that of the man called Christmas. This face alone is not clear. It is confused more than any other, as though in the now peaceful throes of a more recent, a more extricable, compositeness. Then he can see that it is two faces which seem to strive (but not of themselves striving or desiring it; he knows that, but because of the motion and desire of the wheel itself) in turn to free themselves from one another, then fade and blend again.' (465-466)

The "'desire of the wheel itself'" represents the collective undertaking of a community's insistent drive to escape its own history of violence, a desire that, as it progresses, encompasses even the victim of that violence.

The picture of Christmas' inside-outside, circular life also reflects the fate of the New South. After returning to Mottstown, the place of his birth, Christmas is discovered and returned to Jefferson to stand trial for Joanna's murder. Christmas' return "home" to his fate, already written in the fictional narrative of origins embraced by the New South, points to the destructive nature of that fictive narrative. His escape from jail is an illusion of freedom, for, on the run, he is drawn to the house where his mythical transformation will take place. The Reverend Gail Hightower's house is "where the old disgraced minister lived alone" (438), isolated from the
community of Jefferson. But Byron Bunch and Christmas' maternal grandmother hope that Hightower's home might be a "'sanctuary [for Christmas because it] would be inviolable not only to officers and mobs, but to the very irrevocable past'" (424). However, the Reverend Doc Hines, who comes to Jefferson after hearing of Christmas' arrest, offers the community what Girard calls a "curative" procedure for the current outburst of violence (Violence 23). In contrast to Hightower, Hines is not alone. Where Hightower is uncertain about what do to regarding Christmas, Hines is certain. As Girard writes, religion sanctions the sacrificial rite that is intended to restore peace and harmony to the community. In that sense, the "judicial system appeals to a theology as a guarantee of justice" (23) by proclaiming that the sacrificial victim, in this case, Christmas, meets the "approval of the divinity" (23). Hines stirs the religious fervor of the community with words he claims to have heard from a deity: Christmas, he says, is a "'pollution and a abomination'" (Absalom 365), that is, "bad" sacred, what Girard calls "the vicious cycle of revenge" (Violence 24), an impure violence that permanently disrupt the cultural order, if it is not expelled from the community.

From his window, Hightower observes what W. J. Cash calls the "characteristic Southern trait," the code of honor dictating "social responsibility" (The Mind 75), that in fact, represents a blend of "posturing and
violence" (73) exemplifying the Cavalier tradition. Thus, Hightower notes in recognition of "'the apotheosis of his own history, his own land, his own environed blood'" (Light 347), the legacy of that tradition's past in the present chaos, that is, loss of difference, in the New South.

'pleasure, ecstasy, they cannot seem to bear: their escape from it is in violence, in drinking and fighting and praying; catastrophe too, the violence identical and apparently inescapable And so why should their religion drive them to crucifixion of themselves and one another?' (347)

Most important, he observes the New South's desire to separate itself from the guilt of slavery engages the community of Jefferson in sacrificial violence-- "'And they will do it gladly-- (348), resulting in their own self-destruction, that is, the "'crucifixion of themselves and one another'" (347). Thus, as Hightower notes, the religious fervor of Calvinism and the Southern code of honor come together to legitimize and effect the sacrificial expulsion of a member of the community.

Christmas does end up at Hightower's home, where he is pursued by the law enforcement of Percy Grimm and his men. A traditional literary motif of the Old South's romantic era, Faulkner shows that the "hunt" and the "chase" reveal a transformation of the hunters and the victim as the essence of Southern violence in the New South. Grimm and company enter Hightower's home, bringing
with them the "shameless savageness" (438): "out of it their faces seemed to glare with bodiless suspension as though from haloes" (438). The "bodiless suspension as though from haloes" exhibits the hunters view of themselves as agents of a divine being. Considering themselves inspired, as Girard writes, by a "divine decree" (Violence 14), the hunters, lead by the image of an inscrutable god" (276), elevate their deed of murder to "the realm of the divine" (276). In the meantime, the victim is running up the hall with "his raised and armed and manacled hands full of glare and glitter like lightning bolts, so that he resembled a vengeful and furious god pronouncing a doom" (Light 438). That is, in the process of being sacrificed, it is the victim who reveals to the community its own affinity with violence. For Christmas is both the "captured" and the "god" of their adoration to which the hunters pays homage to an apparition of their own violence glittering before them-- a violence that eliminates the difference between beast, humankind, and "god."26 Hence, the hunters themselves appear apart from the human realm, "savage," divinely inspired, like Hines, by the sacred, that is, by violence. Surrounded by a "quasi-religious aura of veneration" (Girard), Christmas becomes, to use Girard's term, a "cult object" (Violence 95), a god of darkness, a central obsession in the mind's of the hunters. Therefore, Hightower's appeals to Grimm and his men, "'Men'... 'Gentlemen!'" (Light 438) cannot
reach them. Absorbed in the "glare and glitter" of violence, for the hunters, only the sacrifice, that is, the murder of Christmas can restore them to an appearance of normalcy.

Thus, Faulkner leaves the reader and witnesses to Christmas' death with an authentic vision of blackness. In the double vision of Grimm and Christmas, Faulkner alludes to the collective violence of the community in preparation for the sacrifice of one of their own members. Grimm, obsessed with his desire for vengeance against the perpetrator of impure violence, represents the community's enforcement of sanctioned violence. Therefore, his murder of Christmas is desired by the community. But as Faulkner shows, Grimm's castrates Christmas in a bloody scene in which Christmas' body resembles Joanna Burden's body, exposing not a sacred violence, but one that is human and equally brutal:

Then his face, body, all, seemed to collapse, to fall in upon itself, and from out the slashed garments about his hips and loins the pent black blood seemed to rush out of his body like a released breath. It seemed to rush out of his body like the rush of sparks from a rising rocket; upon that black blast the man seemed to rise soaring into their memories forever and forever. They are not to lose it, in whatever peaceful valleys, beside whatever placid and reassuring streams of old age, in the mirroring faces of whatever children they will contemplate old disasters and newer hopes. It will be there, musing, quiet, steadfast, not fading, and not particularly threatful, but of itself alone serene, of itself alone triumphant (Light 439-40).
Faulkner wants to dispel any notion of a divine justification for this very human tragedy. Instead, the blood that rushes "out of his body like the rush of sparks from rising rocket" sets on the face of the man who seemed to "rise soaring into their memories forever and forever." Christmas is penned against a wall, surrounded by a grim vision of humanity. In this enclosed space, he and the community finally face one another in a confrontation that leaves the survivors more scar-ridden than his dead body. For what lies before Grimm and his men is a paradox: Christmas is a haunting image, not of a black man, but of a man, a human being, who leaves behind an uneasy feeling of moral uncertainty that "they are not to lose" (440). Covered in blood and dying, Christmas emerges as a likeness of the Southern community. The sacrifice of Christmas is not an isolated episode of human injustice, but represents an event repeated throughout Southern history, and in itself, this violence of sacrifice contradicts the mythical account of Southern history as anything but pure and innocent. "Hence the serpent is never cast out," Harry Levin writes, but remains near-by (The Power 13).
NOTES

1 Eric Sundquist in Faulkner: The House Divided (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983) believes that Sanctuary is a "profoundly conservative document" because, similar to another Southern document, I'll Take My Stand, it has "little to say about slavery and blacks" (59).


3 Lewis P. Simpson states in The Dispossessed Garden: Pastoral and History in Southern Literature (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1975) that "the writer of Faulkner's generation is devoted to the 'private lives' of individuals, to their purely personal distinctiveness, he is concerned with their relation to a quest he, storyteller, is making for an order of memory and history" (79).


7 In Flags in the Dust (New York: Vintage Books, 1973) (1927), Narcissa married Young Bayard Sartoris who leaves her a widow.


It is thought by Lee and Temple that Popeye is somewhere nearby the jail and the courthouse watching both of them.


Calvin S. Brown argues that Temple Drake is set on protecting Popeye. He is convinced "that reprisal against Ruby is one of the strongest reasons, if not the only" reason Temple perjured herself at the Goodwin trial. Brown concludes that the courtroom and the proceedings serve Temple's desire for vengeance against Ruby Lamar ("Sanctuary: From Confrontation To Peaceful Void," ed. Harold Bloom Modern Critical Interpretations: Sanctuary [New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1988], 45).


From one point of view it hardly matters that the evidence of Christmas's 'black blood' boils down to the second-hand testimony of a circus owner who had employed his reputed father, and that we receive that testimony from Christmas's fanatical grandfather, who has murdered the father; what matters is the other point of view, the climate of fantasy in which the evidence, whichever way it may point, counts for little beside the suspicion that overwhelms and submerges it, repressing and distorting it at the same time. (68)


...this white man who very nearly depended on the bounty and charity of negroes for sustenance was going singlehanded into remote negro churches and interrupting the service to enter the pulpit and in his harsh, dead voice and at times with violent obscenity, preach to them humility before all skins lighter than theirs, preaching the superiority of the white race, himself his own exhibit A, in fanatic
and unconscious paradox. (325)

Also see W. J. Cash for a discussion on how the Southern evangelical ministry furthered the ideology of racism. The Mind of the South (New York: Vintage Books, 1991) 130-134.


The "orphan chosen by lot" applies to Joe Christmas as well as specifies the status of the black race particularly during the era of Jim Crow. Previous plantation literature along with the era's myth of the "black beast" worked to situate the black race as the "orphans" of the American culture. According to Rene Girard in Job: The Victim of His People trans. Yvonne Freccero (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987):

The procedures for selecting victims bear the stamp of sly caution aimed at preventing the spread of any violence by eliminating any potential ambiguities, any uncertainties that might lead to dispute. The temptation for the community to become the victim's champions is reduced to minimum by risk of adding oil to the flames of violence. The chances of the sacrifice being effective are maximized. (78)

See Lewis P. Simpson's The Dispossessed Garden: Pastoral History in Southern Literature (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1975) 34-64 for a discussion on how, in the nineteenth-century, the regional alienation of the South affected its literary culture.

Other notable "outcasts" in Light in August: Initially, Lena Grove arrives in Jefferson without family or connections and would be considered an outsider to the community. But, in the process of her stay, Jefferson takes her in as one of its own. Byron Bunch is most unique for his quiet observations on the town's behavior during the search for Christmas. He also befriends the very isolated Reverend Gail Hightower. Like Joanna Burden,
Hightower's home sits apart from the community, and like her, he relives the past glories of the Old South, remembering the time when he "couldn't get religion and that galloping cavalry and his dead grandfather shot from the galloping horse untangled from each other, even in the pulpit" (56).

20 What René Girard calls the "interplay of antagonisms" manifests itself in the relationship between Joe Christmas and Joe Brown. It is Brown, alias Lucas Burch, who introduces to the community of Jefferson Christmas' black blood as the "tragic intervention of an enfeebled difference," serving to separate him from Christmas and Christmas from the community (Violence and the Sacred trans. Patrick Gregory [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972], 206).


Monstrosities recur throughout mythology. From this we can only conclude that myths make constant reference to the sacrificial crisis, but do so only in order to disguise the issue. Myths are the retrospective transfiguration of sacrificial crisis, the reinterpretation of these crisis in the light of cultural order that has arisen from them. (64)

22 See Faulkner in the University eds. Frederick L. Gwynn and Joseph L. Blotner (Charlottesville: University Press Of Virginia, 1959) 72.

23 Hightower was forced by the community of Jefferson into isolation: "there was nothing against him personally, they all insisted. He was just unlucky" (William Faulkner Light in August, [New York: Vintage Books, 1972], 52-70).

24 Some critics argue that the religious symbolism in Light in August "is important also in relation to the theme of cyclical renewal, of rebirth and human continuity" (Alwyn Berland, Light in August: A Study in Black and White [New York: Twayne Publishers, 1992], 70).

25 See Faulkner's "Was," "Pantaloan In Black," and "Go Down, Moses" in Go Down, Moses for other incidents of the hunt and chase motif.

CHAPTER 4

IN THE HEART OF DARKNESS:
Absalom, Absalom!

A black figure stood up, strode on long black legs, waving long black arms across the glow. It had horns-- antelope horns, I think-- on its head. Some sorcerer, some witch-man, no doubt; it looked fiend-like enough.

Joseph Conrad
Heart Of Darkness

In Absalom, Absalom! (1936), Faulkner dramatizes the tragedy of the Thomas Sutpen family. The one surviving member of the Sutpen family, Rosa Coldfield (1845-1910) has summoned Quentin Compson (The Sound and the Fury) to her home prior to his leaving for Harvard University. Thomas Sutpen (1797-1869) married Ellen Coldfield (1818-1863) and had two children, Henry (1839-1909) and Judith (1841-1884). Ellen dies while the now Colonel Sutpen is away fighting in the Civil War. Rosa moves to the Sutpen mansion where she lived with her niece and Sutpen's mulatto daughter, Clytie (1834-1909). When Sutpen returns from the war, he proposes to Rosa and is rejected by her. It would seem that this is the story Rosa wants to impart to Quentin. However, within this story of the Sutpens, as Quentin discovers, there is the murder of Charles Bon
(1829-1865), Sutpen's first son from a previous marriage, by Henry. Like his father, Thomas Sutpen, Charles Bon has married a mulatto and fathered a child, only to desert both because of a "little matter like a spot of negro blood" (Absalom 308).

With Sutpen and Quentin, Faulkner examines the role of the Cavalier myth in its opposition to Southern history. As the main staple of the myth of innocence, the legend of the Cavalier served to justify the violent desire for land and profit gained at the expense of human compassion. Thus, in becoming a Cavalier Gentleman, Colonel Thomas Sutpen passes to both his sons the legacy of this mythology that results in the sacrifice of Charles Bon (mulatto) by his brother, Henry Sutpen. Shocked by this image of fratricide, Quentin arrives at Sutpen's Hundred to discover the now "wasted yellow face" (Absalom, Absalom! 373) of Henry surrounded by "desolation and decay" (366). In turn, Quentin is forced by this image to reject Rosa's version of the Sutpen legend in which she attributes the violence of slavery to Thomas Sutpen. Eventually, Quentin comes to recognize Rosa's Gothic narrative and Sutpen's design as parallel aspects of Southern chivalry that function to conceal the tragic sacrifice of Charles and the "wasted" figure of Henry. Quentin's re-telling of the legend focuses on what Girard calls the "fraternal theme" in which he recognizes himself and all of the sons of Southern chivalry
trapped in a repetitious cycle of sacrifice and violence whose emblem is the Civil War.¹

In 1909, when Quentin Compson arrives at Rosa Coldfield's house, he enters a symbolic representation of the mausoleum of the Old South, where the primary relic is in her father's office seated in his too tall chair. With the wisteria vine "blooming" on "a wooden trellis" (7) surrounding her home, Faulkner represents Rosa Coldfield as the heart and soul of the paternal system of slavery. For the wisteria vine marks as innocence, a space reminiscent of the Old South in which the romantic narratives manifest a reality symbolic of the Sutpen plantation, itself surrounded in wisteria vines. In this "hot airless room with binds all closed and fastened" (7), sits Rosa, dressed in the "eternal black... she had worn for forty-three years" (7). Faulkner suggests that it is the substantial presence of blackness in this scene that sustains the wistful image of innocence. To Quentin, she resembles a "crucified child" (8), projecting "precisely what she has made herself see," as Thadious M. Davis writes, "and what she has come to feel after forty-three years of static rage" (Faulkner 194). In this sense, she represents the Old South's wistful image of innocence and the New South's "static rage" (194). Therefore, Rosa sees herself as a crusader for a tradition in which she has already come to recognize her identity.
and her worth as a storyteller, recounting the woes inflicted on Southern chivalry. Thus, as with the tradition of Southern chivalry, Rosa's innocence is a calculated image of herself, representing that paternal tradition, and, with a "'gentleman'" (Absalom 12) like Quentin, she assumes they share a common heritage in Southern innocence.

Along with her appearance and status in Southern culture, Faulkner presents Rosa Coldfield's narrative as an example of the creative impetus toward a romanticism that runs head-long into a Southern nightmare. Beginning with the literary representation of the master-slave relationship, the history of Southern romanticism, Craig Werner writes, emphasized the "mythical elements of history" (History 81) in which the plantation was characterized as a gracious setting for the "child-dependent" Negro. This image of the black became a symbol of Southern innocence that, according to William R. Taylor, allowed Southerners to justify "the peculiar institution" of slavery to themselves and others (Cavalier 300). However, after the Civil War, Southerners were haunted by the "awful nightmare of the Santo Domingo massacres" (301) and the bloody uprising of black slaves led by Nat Turner in 1831, and as Rosa Coldfield recalls, people began "'to frighten each other with tales of negro uprisings'" (Absalom 161). As Taylor points out, from the tension between the image of innocence and the image
of the nightmare, Southerners generated two conflicting and problematic images of blacks: "the Negro as child and the Negro as animal" (304). In the former image, blacks are incorporated in the myth of innocence while in the later, they are excluded. Owing to the fears of racial impurity and the threat of slave retaliation, Southerners collectively resorted to a Gothic interpretation of their history that mythicized their fears as a nightmare. No longer incorporated in the tradition of Southern chivalry's mythology of innocence, Southern blacks became the embodiment of blackness. In turn, Rosa's narrative reflects this shift from the romanticism of Southern chivalry to the Gothicism of the New South. The Gothic aspects of her narrative typifies a blue-print for the violent expulsion that occurs in the Sutpen legend and in the New South under Jim Crow legislation.

However, arguing on behalf of Rosa Coldfield's marginal role in the Thomas Sutpen legend and the novel, Diane Roberts claims Rosa's narrative challenges the "masculine stories about the South, about history, and about her own 'embattled virginity'" (Faulkner 163). Rosa's "gothic discourse" (163), Roberts suggests, should be read as a story of a woman "speaking of her desire and her fury at the way her desire has been devalued" (163). However, in Absalom, Absalom!, Faulkner does not represent Rosa as "an inquisitor, interrogating the masculine
versions of the story" (164), but as an admirer of Southern romanticism who is neither a marginal figure nor a challenger of the patriarchal tradition of Southern chivalry or its interpretation of Southern history. Rosa is the messenger from the past, a spokesperson for a tradition whose message proclaims the "positive good" of Southern innocence. Consequently, her narrative strategy both models and mimics the cultural confusion and racial hysteria present in the antebellum and postbellum South.

According to Rosa, the legend of Thomas Sutpen depicts a "misrepresentation" of Southern innocence. While she takes the role of a victim, Rosa suggests Thomas Sutpen for the role of the scapegoat responsible for the disruption of the romantic idea of social and racial harmony, that is, the demise of the entire Southern slave culture. In recalling Sutpen's first appearance in Jefferson, Mississippi some eighty-six years earlier, Rosa describes Sutpen as the violence that "'came out of nowhere'" (Absalom 8), that is, not from within the community, but from some location outside. He "'wasn't a gentleman'" (14) of the tradition of Southern chivalry, for, she claims, Sutpen was not even human, but an apparition of something demonic, a "'fiend blackguard and devil'" (15), with "'faint sulphur-reek still in hair clothes and beard'" (8), an image that ironically recalls the symmetry between Rosa's oral telling of Southern
innocence and the violent coercive use of gun powder that helped transform romantic fiction into fact. In short, Rosa's image of the sulphur-reeking Sutpen evokes the violent origins of Southern history. In Rosa's mythic interpretation of Southern violence, Faulkner shows the community's encounter with its monstrous double. In this encounter between the community and the scapegoat, René Girard explains, the "community is both attracted and repelled by its own origins. It feels the constant need to reexperience them, albeit in veiled and transfigured forms" (Violence 99). Thus, unlike any other planter in Jefferson, Sutpen violently assaults the land ("'tore violently a plantation'") (Absalom 9) and corrupts good men like her father, Goodhue Coldfield who provides further financing for the plantation and, later, a daughter, Ellen, for the proliferation of his "mad dream." However, for Faulkner, Rosa's narrative erupts "violently" on the Southern landscape of the New South providing an image of something equally as demonic as the plantations of the Old South. For Rosa's narrative of Southern history captures the mad dreams of Southern slaveholders like Thomas Sutpen and reveals the link between the Old and New South, slaveholder and writer, both depended on the sacrificial mechanism in maintaining the appearance of Southern innocence.

Rosa's explanation for Sutpen's corruption draws
its support from the narratives expressing the fear and regret surrounding the defeat of the South in the era of Reconstruction. Arguing that Sutpen's "wild negroes" (14) were different and foreign, Rosa implies that these slaves were unlike the more soothing plantation slaves who had become invisible within their designated roles as field hands and house servants. Equally, Mr. Compson notes, the difference between "'Sutpen's negroes'" (85), "'the wild blood which he [Sutpen] had brought into the country and tried to mix, blend, with the tame which was already there'" (85). Speaking on behalf of the Jefferson community, Rosa and Mr. Compson express an idea of difference represented by the Haitian blacks who point to a contamination, a disruption of order from without, for in their subservient roles and with their child-like manner, Southern blacks symbolized the gracious institution of slavery while concealing hierarchical order of the paternal system. Sutpen's slaves, however, helped introduce what René Girard states is a "destruction of difference" (Violence 241) in that they allowed Sutpen, "in the guise of a new and somewhat equivocal kind of difference" (241) to disrupt the very structure that conceals the violent ordering of Southern culture. In that sense, Faulkner suggests that slavery itself appeared as the source of violence within the community, for the idea of difference between Sutpen's slaves and American slaves made visible
to Rosa Southern violence. Yet, Rosa will insists that it was Sutpen's close proximity to the slaves that represented a taboo of the sacred and in effect, represented his, not the community's, contamination by violence.

What angers Rosa and Sutpen's detractors is that Sutpen reminds them of slavery, Southern violence. Emulating as they did the colonial aristocracy of Virginia, Sutpen revealed to the Jefferson community the violent sacrificial mechanism responsible for Southern chivalry. The collective, unanimous sacrifice of blacks permitted the communal display of chivalry. Rosa omits from her account Sutpen's friendship with a very "influential" slaveholder, General Compson, Quentin's grandfather, but Quentin discovers later that day from his father that "'it was General Compson, who seemed to have known well enough to offer to lend him [Sutpen] seed cotton for his start, who knew any better, to whom Sutpen ever told anything about his past'" (Absalom 41). From Mr. Compson, Quentin is able to gather that Sutpen's innocence drew the attention of fellow townspeople of Jefferson because they were not too pleased with the way he flaunted his power and wealth. According to Mr. Compson, on Sutpen's return from Haiti, he became "'the biggest single landowner and cotton-planter'" in the county (72), and, in the process, he "'became a little pompous'" (72). However,
Sutpen's acquisition of material possessions and his pretensions were values he learned from best of the aristocratic class. It was the desire, as W. J. Cash writes, of every planter to become a member of the aristocracy (The Mind 74), and the one-time son of a tenant farmer from Tidewater Virginia did just that by becoming an aristocrat among aristocrats. In fact, the "swaggering of all his gestures" (Absalom 246) reflected the "good fortune" and violent origins of the long-standing aristocrats of Jefferson, Mississippi. Thus, contrary to Rosa's interpretation of blackness, Faulkner shows that Sutpen was a faithful embodiment of the myth of innocence.

Through Rosa's own words, Faulkner shows how her rhetorical design complements Sutpen's social design, that is, the paternal order of the Old South. In their similarity rather than difference, Faulkner pairs both as childlike, "simple" but "outrageous" (246) individuals whose struggle to maintain the innocence of their "designs" mirrors the efforts of the Old and the New South to represent Southern violence as something external and alien. Consequently, the innocence of both Rosa and Sutpen, as James A. Snead writes, replicates a general innocence in white American society: in the first place, innocent or ignorant about the violence that guarantees its sense of identity; secondly, innocent after the prior innocence is outgrown, because it believes that prior innocence can still be feigned. (Figures 119).
As Faulkner shows, Sutpen's innocence became a state of ignorance in which he became a willing participant in overseeing a land "manured with black blood from two hundred years of oppression and exploitation" (Absalom 251). In Haiti, prior to his return to the American South, Sutpen prepared to defend the sugar plantation he has been hired to oversee. He pretended not to hear "the air tremble and throb at night with the drums and the chanting" of the Haitians in revolt and not to notice "that it was the heart of the earth itself he heard" (251-252). Sutpen could not respond to the voices of the slaves, for violence had become a way of life for him. It became a design dictating how he was to relate to others. When married the plantation owner's daughter, Eulalia, in hopes of inheriting the plantation, he discovers that she is an octoroon, not Spanish as he was lead to believe. In his rejection of both his wife and their child Charles Bon, Sutpen complied with the system of difference that helped maintain the institution of slavery. As he recalled to General Compson years later, his wife and child "'rendered it impossible'" for them to be "'incorporated'" (264) in his design because blacks could not be wives and sons. Yet, he did recognize the necessity for them as slaves. Thus, comparable to Sutpen's innocence, Rosa's indulgence in heroic poetics as a Gothic discourse that parallels Sutpen's general pose of ignorance by engaging in a
creative disregard for historical facts. Her narrative design renders it impossible to incorporate slaves as victims of Southern violence. As such, to Quentin as a young man of the New South, Rosa offers an unrealistic image of Southern violence that vilifies the victims of slavery and strongly encourages racial segregation for the New South. Faulkner shows that both Rosa and Sutpen engaged in the violence of Southern chivalry that made them undifferentiated partners in the myth of innocence.

Similar to Sutpen, Rosa's discovery of Southern innocence occurs at the site of racial conflict amidst an atmosphere of violence. That is, according to her narrative, Rosa's first view of innocence originates at Sutpen's plantation while he was away at war. Rosa recalls a brief period when she was visiting her sister Ellen:

'Once there was... a summer of wistaria. It was a pervading everywhere of wistaria (I was fourteen then) as though of all springs yet to capitulate condensed into one spring, one summer' (143-144).

Her nostalgic recollection of that summer and its wistaria vines is restricted to the confines of her own mind, yet symbolically represents how the idea of romantic "love" developed in an enclosed space, albeit an imaginary one, at the center of Southern chivalry. While war swept across the Southern landscape, according to Mr. Compson, Rosa began writing "'heroic poetry'" (68) about "'love'" and "'bravery'" among the Confederacy. In the process, she
encountered in Sutpen's garden the wild wistaria vines enclosing a display of courtship between Charles Bon and Judith Sutpen, Thomas Sutpen's daughter (145). In contrast to the reality of the Civil War, the wistaria vines create and protect an image of Southern innocence that lingers in her memory longer than its actual duration. As Rosa comments:

'It was a pervading everywhere of wistaria (I was fourteen then) as though of all springs yet to capitulate condensed into one spring, one summer' (148-149).

This summer of wistaria is a memory that became the model for Rosa's image of Southern innocence. Moreover, as Faulkner implies, this vision of innocence surrounded a courtship of two people who represented two embattled races in a familial conflict mirroring the cultural conflict for which the war is being fought. In that sense, Rosa's romanticized version of the South concealed the hidden violence of sacrifice, and it did so, as René Girard writes of myths, by representing innocence as a reality rather than a mythical creation (Violence 62). Thus, from Rosa's perspective where she "'lurked'" in the garden, this "'courtship'" became an ideal model of the antebellum pastoral garden of inclusion and harmony. Thus, in Rosa's re-creation of that pastoral myth of innocence, Charles Bon was surrounded with an image of love that became "'more than love'" (Absalom 146), for
it represented the Chivalric tradition's obsessive desire to surround itself with a deceptive image of itself as purity.

Rosa spied an image of innocence and "'love'" from a face she never saw, alive or dead: "'Why did I not invent, create it'?" (147). As Faulkner shows, in Rosa's mind, Charles became Southern innocence. His "'ease of manner'" and his "'swaggering gallant air'" was gentlemanly in comparison to "'Sutpen's pompous arrogance'" (74). Charles "'was a picture, an image'" (74) intended to rival the image of Southern slavery as violence, that is, what she recognized in Sutpen's "blackness." As Faulkner reveals, Charles was indistinguishable from his father. However, so enclosed was this atmosphere symbolic of the romantic South that Rosa cannot see in Charles the underlying violence and tragedy of mythical creation. Charles was, at once, Faulkner implies, a paradoxical image of Southern innocence, for he was the perfect "gardener" in the garden (the black) and the Chivalric gentleman (the white), concealing, as does Rosa's memory of this image, the violence of slavery and miscegenation.

Rosa's model of innocence takes on further similarity to its original model in the culture of the Old South. In "the summer of wistaria," drawing her own identity as both a Southern Lady and a writer from the established plantation literature of her time, Rosa succumbed to a
"'dreamy panoply of surrender'" (149) in which she enclosed the figures of herself and Charles as ideal representatives of the Southern chivalry, created not for submission to reality, but to serve as a weapon to fight on behalf of the Chivalric tradition. Yet, Rosa's image of herself and her image of Charles shared characteristics of maimed honor and love (150) at battle on behalf of the tradition. For Rosa mimetically created and surrendered to the sentimental fiction of the antebellum South at a time when the representations of blacks and women were portrayed as "one and inseparable" (Cavalier 172) in "the flawless and harmonious social order" of the South (174). Thus, unaware of the error of her romantic dream, for five years, Rosa Coldfield indulged in Southern romanticism while in actuality, her Charles of the garden became for Sutpen and Henry an incarnation of the black as beast. It is this alteration in Southern history that awakened Rosa to the reality of a defeated South. She recalls a "'shot heard only by its echo'" (Absalom 153). The "echo" that disrupted Rosa's mythical narration made reference, as Girard states, to "the symmetrical conflict and identity crisis that characterizes the sacrificial crisis" (Violence 63).

In the South's battle with the North, it insisted on maintaining racial hierarchy that allowed for its fantasy of purity. The South's obsession with the idea
of itself as pure became a perverse desire, an incestuous desire, on the part of the collective culture to deny the reality of miscegenation. In Absalom, Absalom!, with the Civil War, the clash between purity and impurity present in the background, Faulkner draws a character who, in his very being appears to epitomize the racial conflict affecting all. For Charles Bon represented the reality of miscegenation and the desire for purity. However, Charles, shared the same desires, the same strategies, the "same illusion of rigid differentiation within a pattern of ever-expanding uniformity" (Girard 78-79). That is, his desire for racial purity, a desire emblematic of Southern culture, revealed a perversion, an impurity, symbolic of an incestuous desire on the part of the community. In that sense, Charles' insistence on inclusion (by way of marriage to his sister, Judith) exposed his own desire for racial purity and his similarity to his brother, Henry, who desired to have all three of them-- Charles, Judith, and himself-- "'in a world like a fairy tale,'" free from impurity (Absalom 318). The brothers were "each doubles of the other" (Girard) until one became the "double of all others; that is, the sole object of universal obsession and hatred" (Violence 79):

As soon as a community begins to regard an isolated individual as responsible for a sacrificial crisis-- that is, responsible for the disintegration of distinctions within the community-- it follows that this same individual is accused of violating society's most
fundamental rules, the rules of kinship. In short, the individual is considered essentially 'incestuous' in nature. (114)

Charles Bon became the sole member of the community responsible for committing "an ultimate act of evil" (115) with a "highly contagious form of violence" (115). In the process, the collective element of violence is ignored and, as Girard writes, the incestuous individual is accused of what comes to represent the culture's affliction (77). As the mulatto, representing what Girard calls the "effacement of difference" (79) in Southern culture, Charles dared both his father and Henry to recognize him as human, moreover as family. To Sutpen and Henry, Charles came to represent the cause of the sacrificial crisis, that is, as crisis of difference, and his death represented its resolution, a resolution that is only provisional. As a result, outside the Sutpen mansion, Charles was denied access to his rightful role as son and brother, and the fraternal conflict between the brothers results in his sacrifice and the self-annihilation of Henry. For, in Henry's departure from the mansion, Faulkner claims that the paternal inheritance of the Chivalric tradition amounts to the self-destruction of the Southern community, that is, its familial structure.

Rosa is not privy to this drama nor does she inquire about what took place. Nonetheless, with Rosa, Faulkner recalls the twin motif of incest and miscegenation, that
is, the clash between innocence and blackness, purity and violence at Sutpen's Hundred where Rosa found herself running "'blind full tilt into something monstrous and immobile'" (Absalom 139) "'standing before that closed door which [she] was not to enter'" (150) extending a terrifying hand on her shoulder. Denied a view of Charles' dead body, Rosa was confronted with Clytie, with "'Sutpen face enough, but not-his; Sutpen coffee-colored face enough there in the dim light, barring the stairs'" (136). In that dim light, Rosa encountered the monstrous double of Southern romanticism. Similar to Horace Benbow's (Sanctuary) self-recognition in the grotesque of Southern culture, Rosa found at the top of those "'nightmare stairs'" not something alien, but the familiar partnership of slavery and miscegenation.

For Rosa, the romanticism of the myth of innocence faded to a reality not of "'what used to be,'" but "'what had not, could not have ever been'" (141). To Quentin, she admits to living the life of a dreamer, "'clinging yet to the dream,'"

'waking into the reality, the more than reality, not to the unchanged and unaltered old time but into a time altered to fit the dream which, conjunctive with the dreamer, becomes immolated and apotheosized.' (141).

As Faulkner reveals, Rosa recognized in the myth of innocence a reality of violence, "'immolated and apotheosized'" (141), "'altered to fit the dream'" (141),
that is, the belief in purity. In this reality of darkness and confusion, violence of miscegenation and of fratricidal sacrifice, once hidden, was made visible, no longer contained outside the community. That is, from Rosa's perspective, Clytie Sutpen evoked the image of the "bad" sacred within, "the maleficient violence polarized," Girard writes, "by the victim" (Violence 258). Representing the violence of the past (miscegenation) and hinting at the cause for the fratricidal sacrifice of her brother, Charles, Clytie pointed to a disruption of the racial and social purity (incest) Rosa had come to accept in Southern culture. For Rosa, the violence Clytie revealed became Clytie herself.

According to Girard, in myth, the "false differentiation" of the victim turns "to outright undifferentiation in a violent dissolving of the community" (A Theatre 213). Faulkner represents this "violent dissolving of the community" (213) as a clash between incest, the idea of purity which both Henry and Charles share, and the actuality of miscegenation that results in the fratricidal sacrifice of difference in which one brother is killed. That is, Charles was a figure representing the nondifference of incest and the difference of miscegenation. The fratricide/incest motif in myth implies, Girard writes, that "violence and nondifference are present in magnified and highly concentrated form"
(Violence 77), but hidden behind the operation of the sacred. In that sense, Rosa's clashes with Clytie represented the Chivalric tradition's engagement with fratricidal sacrifice. No longer focused on entering the room, Rosa's concern turned to Clytie's hand on her shoulder and "'the fall of all the eggshells shibboleth of caste and color too'" (Absalom 139). For as Rosa states, she "'stopped dead'" and encountered more than a "'woman's'" and "'negro's'" hand (139). She saw in Clytie's face "'the furious and unbending will--'" of the tradition of Southern chivalry (139). However, in the confusion, symbolic of the culture, Rosa interpreted the monstrous double as something other than herself and the tradition. For Rosa, Clytie became the visible difference in opposition to the myth of purity who, like her brother, must be sacrificed in the narrative interpretation of Southern history. Thus, Faulkner suggests that Rosa's rejection of Clytie mirrored the tradition's post-war attempt to restore racial difference and represented its incestuous desire for purity just as Henry's heroic gesture of firing the pistol at Charles symbolized the culture's fear of blackness and represented the fratricidal sacrifice of difference.

In Rosa's encounter with Clytie, Faulkner permits Rosa a view of the tradition of Southern chivalry as the "'furious and unbending will'" of a self-destructive
violence within herself. That is, as the Southern Lady, the central figure of Southern innocence, Rosa was drawn to see through Clytie her connection to the Civil War and the defeat of the South by its own deceptive myth of innocence. However, it is interesting to note that in comparison to Rosa, Judith, Rosa's niece, already had a glimpse of Southern violence, had already been exposed to the contradictory aspect of Southern chivalry and the savage beast. For it was a young Judith, sitting calmly with Clytie, both "'looking down through the square entrance to the loft'' (Absalom 30) where her father "'naked to the waist'" fought with "'the black beasts'" (29), his slaves. In turn, the young Henry, "'screaming and vomiting'" (29), was forced to observe the event by Sutpen's slaves who were holding him (29). While Judith was able in her adult life to accept the paradoxical contradictions of Southern culture and open the door of the Sutpen mansion to Charles' son and grandson, Henry, like his aunt, Rosa, insisted on denying difference by excluding from their fairy tale the reality of impurity. Thus, in the interim period between the Civil War and Jim Crow, disappearance of the tradition's protection, that is, its fantasy of purity, forced Rosa to attempt her own heroic posturing resulting in her crying out not to Clytie, but "'through the negro, the woman'" (140), to the blackness of this "'monstrous'" and "'immobile'" visage she encountered in the figure of Clytie. But
"'receiving no answer'" (140), Rosa, in her hysteria, addressed Clytie, the "'Sutpen coffee-colored face'": "'take you hands off me, nigger!'" (140). Unlike the "stranger," Popeye, whom Horace Benbow encountered as his monstrous double in Sanctuary, Clytie was a familial figure. However, Rosa's recognition of familial connection, only forced her to try and re-establish the system of difference that would separate her from Clytie, that is, Southern violence.

"Because of her race and the social stigma it carries" (210), Davis points out, Clytie became the "'nigger' and the physical embodiment of all blackness" (Faulkner's 210). Rosa recalls how she had been taught as a child "'not only to instinctively fear'" but "'to shun the very objects which [Clytie] had touched'" (Absalom 140). Yet, Clytie, as the ultimate symbol, the sacred taboo of Southern violence, pointed to what was hidden within the myth of innocence, and in that sense, Rosa saw in Clytie her double. Faulkner suggests that Rosa's interpretation of Clytie as "'the agent of [her] own crucifixion'" (142), that is, slavery and miscegenation, imitated the culture's attempt to separate the violence of slavery from its history. But from Rosa's distorted interpretation of Southern history, the victim becomes the perpetrator of Southern violence:

'Clytie who in the very pigmentation of her flesh represented that debacle which had brought Judith and me to what we were and which had
made of her (Clytie) that which she declined to be just as she had declined to be that from which its purpose had been to emancipate her, as though presiding aloof upon the new, she deliberately remained to represent to us the threatful portent of the old'. (157)

Thus, Rosa's view of Southern history draws attention to the crisis of difference that resulted in the Civil War and the later development of Jim Crow legislation. Uncompromising in her rejection of any thought of gender-identification or blood kinship with Clytie, Rosa attributed the "'debacle'" of slavery and miscegenation to its victims, the blacks who, in turn, came to represent something alien, outside the Southern culture. In that sense, her shift to Southern Gothicism displayed a new order of racial segregation, a new order in conflict with Southern romanticism's idea of racial incorporation.

For Faulkner, the remainder of Rosa's narrative reveals her determination to restore social and racial difference at the site of her own vision of Southern romanticism. Thus, for Rosa, the plantation at Sutpen's Hundred symbolizing the nightmarish reality in which Clytie, "'presiding aloof upon'" a new cultural order, violated not only the racial, but the social code and, thus, threatened the idea of Southern hierarchy. However, Rosa quickly discovered that not only did Clytie not adhere to a recognizable pattern of behavior established for blacks by literary characterizations of Southern romanticism, but contrary to the stereotyped representation
of the black female servant as "Mammy," Clytie was both
daughter of Thomas Sutpen and kin to Rosa, more "family"
than the imaginary incorporation of the "Mammy" stereotype.
In that respect, as Faulkner implies, Clytie was true
to the reality of the Old South and stood in uncompromising
opposition to Rosa's idea of racial separation.

Thus, Clytie appeared to Rosa a "'perverse
inscrutable... paradox'" (156) who "'declined'" to be
slave and free, yet "'holding fidelity to none like the
indolent and solitary wolf or bear'" (156). More
threatening than the "tamed" plantation image of The Sound
and the Fury's Dilsey Gibson, Clytie's strength and
tenacity as a female, her ability to rise above her
circumstances, were perceived by Rosa as assets that
hindered her efforts to attain the status of a Southern
Lady. Rosa's romantic narrative included Clytie's brother
Charles Bon only in her ignorance of his racial identity,
but her Gothic narrative attempts to erase any trace of
the original inclusion of blacks in Southern culture or
in her family. Therefore, where Rosa perceived a collapse
of difference in the previous order, she creates a
description of Clytie as the "indolent and solitary wolf
or bear" that serves to remove Clytie and all blacks from
the human race. As "animal," Clytie's dubious status on
the plantation can easily be associated with the idea
of "savageness" (156). To adjust to white fear and the
changed atmosphere of Southern society, this rhetorical
classification of the black exemplifies Faulkner's contention that they are "'a little out of place'" in either the romantic or the Gothic aspect of Southern history. While Rosa recognized Clytie's kinship, her position at the top of those "'nightmare flight of stairs'" (149), she resorted to seeing an image of "savageness" that, as Faulkner insists, reflected not Clytie, but Rosa's identification with violence in her attempt to re-write Southern history.

After relegating Clytie to the classification of an animal, Rosa agreed to stay at Sutpen's Hundred with Judith and Clytie (her honorable enemy) and wait for Sutpen's return from the War. She recalled that her decision to stay was based on the availability of eligible men to marry. In her narrative to Quentin, Rosa explained that because she was not the "'daughter of a wealthy planter'" but "'the daughter merely of a small store-keeper,'" she would have been "'doomed to marry at last some causal apprentice-clerk'" in her father's business (169). Sutpen was her "'best,'" her "'only chance'" (169) of having her own family. But more than a potential husband, Sutpen was a plantation owner, a Southern Gentleman, one who would, no doubt, return and begin restoring the plantation and, hopefully, her to the rightful position of Southern Lady. In the atmosphere of confusion and racial hysteria, where women "'locked doors and windows at night and began to frighten each
other with tales of negro uprisings" (161), Faulkner links Sutpen's return and his effort at restoration to the culture's effort to restore the social and racial hierarchy of its past. It was through Sutpen's efforts at restoration, then, that Rosa hoped to re-establish her status over Clytie, that is, over the "nigger" and reign as the ideal Southern Lady at Sutpen's mansion. Clearly marking the blacks as "'the ANARCHISTS and the DOMESTIC ENEMY: the COMMON ENEMY OF CIVILIZED SOCIETY'" (qtd. in Franklin 76), Rosa did not compromise her ideas by accepting Sutpen's first proposal of marriage. As Rosa recalls, "'I do not know what he looked at while he spoke, save that by the sound of his voice it was not at us [Judith, Clytie and herself] nor at anything in that room'" (Absalom 164). However, Faulkner implies that what Sutpen looked at and spoke to, the restoration of the dynastic order of the Old South, that is, the mythology of innocence, was, in fact, the same desire shared by Rosa. For, with that proposal, she linked herself consciously and deliberately to "'that spark, that crumb of madness'" (167) represented in their desire to restore what never was or could ever exist in Southern culture. Thus, their "courtship" represented a microcosm of the large scale attempt by most Southerners, regardless of gender or class, to restore and maintain racial differentiation so crucial to Southern identity at a time when that identity was in crisis. Their "courtship," according to Faulkner,
allowed Rosa to take on a more active role in the design, for she worked "'in the garden'" (162) helping Sutpen to "'restore his house and plantation as near as possible to what it had been'" (160). Only in retrospect will she condemn his dream as monstrous and, therefore alien.

The "'courtship'" (164) between Rosa and Sutpen ends with Sutpen's second proposal to marry Rosa only if she produced a male child. With the proposal came "'the death of hope and love, the death of pride and principle, and then the death of everything save the outraged and aghast unbelieving which has lasted for forty-three years'" (168). The sense of degradation and self-delusion Rosa experienced forty-three years earlier, in retrospect, becomes a desire for revenge against the one man whose "'bold blank naked and outrageous words'" (167) words were uttered, "'as if he were consulting with Jones or with some other man'" (168). That is, the "'bareness'" of Sutpen's words stripped her of the possibility of ever obtaining the status of a Southern Lady, equal to that of the Southern Gentleman. Instead, as James Snead claims, Rosa was reduced to a status equal with the "nigger" "whose social elevation the community [had] permanently barred" (Figures 110).

Having already equated violence with blacks, Rosa's "'simple'" but "'outrageous'" strategy is to make Sutpen pay for attempting to permanently bar her from the tradition. By linking Sutpen with the blackness of Southern slavery, Rosa claims before Quentin that Sutpen was the
only perpetrator of Southern violence. In this "'outrageous'" tale of woe, Rosa insists that only someone "'not articulated in this world... a walking shadow'"
(Absalom 171), in fact, a "nigger," could possibly induce such havoc on the culture. By separating Sutpen from the human community, Rosa is free to recall and embellish his arrival into Jefferson. Characterizing his arrival as an invasion of "blackness," Rosa suggests that the "wild niggers," the "'beasts,'" and the two black women who accompanied Sutpen into Jefferson were a contagious release of violence that touched the Southern landscape, infecting everything in sight. Rosa recalls seeing this violence in

'a glimpse like the forefront of a tornado, of the carriage and Ellen's high white face within it and the two replicas of his face in miniature flanking her, and on the front seat the face and teeth of the wild negro who was driving, and he, his face exactly like the negro's...all in a thunder and a fury of wildeyed horses and of galloping and of dust.' (23)

Thus, the lingering image, far removed from Rosa's chivalric figure of Charles Bon among the wistaria vines, is demonic and black.
In *Absalom, Absalom!*, through the process of what René Girard calls desymbolism, the "deciphering of mythological motifs" (*Violence* 64), Faulkner reveals how the tragedy of fratricidal violence is generated in the conflict between nondifferentiation and the mythological representation of difference. This conflict is apparent in Rosa Coldfield's struggle to show difference between Southern innocence and her characterization of Thomas Sutpen and blacks. Symbolically, her mythical narrative re-enforced the necessity of Charles Bon's death, a death that can characterized as the foundational violence that triggered the advent of a new cultural order of legal segregagtion. In the space between Rosa's romantic mythicism of inclusion and her Gothicism of isolation, appears the innocence that never was and the blackness of white transgressions "hidden from sight by the awesome machinery" (Girard) of the ritual (19) re-enactment of the sacrificial mechanism, serving to separate violence from the community (92). In that sense, Faulkner suggests, Rosa's narrative is a product of the sacrificial crisis, and as such, it originates in and as a result of the violence of nondifferentiation it tries to conceal. In capturing the moment of sacrificial violence, her narrative
initiated racial polarization in the South.

Within Rosa's mythical narrative of Southern history, the moment of disquieting interruption points to a reality apart from mythical innocence in which the image of nondifferentiation and sacrificial violence appear in Quentin's mind. While Rosa conjures beastly figures, Quentin focuses on the image of nondifferentiation and sacrificial violence appearing in the person of Henry, just returned (with Charles) from the Civil War, confronting his sister Judith and standing above the body of his brother Charles. Henry was "hatless, with his shaggy bayonet-trimmed hair, his gaunt worn unshaven face, his patched and faded gray tunic" (Absalom 172) facing Judith with "the pistol still hanging against his flank" (172):

'Now you can't marry him.'
'Why can't I marry him?'
'Because he's dead.'
'Dead?'
'Yes. I killed him.' (172)

Faulkner insists that the familial conflict between the brothers was an encompassing motif for the Civil War, a battleground for the re-enactment of sacrificial fratricide that united both the South and the North in the sacrificial crisis involving race. On the one hand, Henry in his Confederate uniform re-enacted the tragedy of the Civil War, for in his confrontation with difference, he kills his own brother, Charles, for having black blood. As rival brothers, the one black and the other white,
Charles and Henry epitomized the entire crisis, in terms, as Girard explains, "of real violence... that reaches out to destroy a whole society" (*Violence* 63-64), that is, Faulkner implies, a geographical location not limited to the region of the South. On the other hand, Quentin, the Southerner, is faced with the task of seeing beyond Rosa's Gothic image of Sutpen or the "wild negroes" to the historical human tragedy within the Sutpen legend that links him and his Canadian roommate, Shreve, to the tragic history of human violence.

Rosa's irrational, contradictory representation of Southern history is precluded by her insistence that Quentin accompany her to see what lies "'hidden'" (*Absalom* 172) at Sutpen's Hundred. The visit to Sutpen's Hundred serves to confirm for Quentin a living rather than speculative image of the South's interior history. What Quentin witnesses at Sutpen's Hundred represents Faulkner's strongest image of the all encompassing nature of violence. As Faulkner shows, the destruction is not limited to humans. The wistaria garden no longer exists. Instead, nature reveals the "desolation and decay" (366) of the plantation at Sutpen's Hundred, "as if the wood of which it was built were flesh" (366). This "protracted violence" (366) originates from the inhabitants without and within the home, for the plantation rests on the decaying flesh of slaves and with the survivors, Clytie and Henry Sutpen, they manifest a more realistic view of Southern chivalry.
Quentin encounters Clytie, "a handful of sticks concealed in a rag bundle" (370), and hidden in a "bare, stale room," in a "wasted yellow" (373) face, Quentin encounters "that debacle" (156) of human sacrifice eating away at Henry's flesh. Faulkner united Henry with Charles in sacrificial fratricide, but exposes Henry and Clytie as exemplifying the unity of the races in self-destruction, presenting a disturbing vision of human violence.

This is the image of tragedy that Quentin carries with him to Harvard some months later when, urged by Canadian roommate, Shreve McCannon, to "'tell about the South'" (174), he decides to relay the legend of Thomas Sutpen. In the act of interpreting the legend, Quentin and Shreve in the twentieth century, Faulkner implies, manifest the nineteenth-century conflict that resulted in the violence of sacrificial fratricide. Their speculations about the behavior of the Sutpen family, Charles and Henry in particular, in turn, reflect how deep-seated is the sacrificial mechanism that allows for the repetition of human violence. Linked to the racial conflict of the Western culture, Quentin and Shreve, Faulkner shows, embody both the mechanism and its cover-up. For while Quentin, the Southerner, sits "quiet, reposed, curiously almost sullen" (181), listening to Shreve, the Canadian, re-tell the story again, inserting, once again, images of blackness that disassociate the monstrosity from its human aspects, he thinks on the disturbing figure
of Henry:

'that gaunt tragic dramatic self-hypnotized youthful face like the tragedian in a college play, an academic Hamlet waked from some trancement of the curtain's falling and blundering across the dusty stage from which the rest of the cast had departed last Commencement, the sister facing him across the wedding dress which she was not to use...'

(174)

While Quentin's tragic vision and his demeanor suggests his experience of guilt and shame in connection with the history of the Sutpen family, for Shreve, the feeling of guilt and shame and the desire for distance results in the justification of violence. Yet, beyond the drama of the American South, Faulkner connects the racial conflict of Western culture to the ancient story of sacrifice and violence transmitted through literary history. For, as Quentin discovers, Henry's heroism dissolved into an image revealing a tragic tradition of avenger and avenged.

Thus, Quentin speculates that Henry followed Hamlet into what Girard calls "the no-man's land of sick revenge" (A Theatre 285), demonstrating that "Hamlet has no beginning and no end" (285). The murder of his brother was part of a continuous flow of sacrificial solutions on behalf of sacred duty (274), a repetitious enactment of "foundational violence with substitute victims" (210). Therefore, Henry's act of revenge did not represent an isolated event of "mischance" as Mr. Compson exclaimed.
On the contrary, as a representative of the Southern Hamlet of the South after its defeat, Henry was among the revengers and victims of this Southern tragedy, a tragedy rooted in the historical tragedy of human conflict. Consequently, in recognizing his identification with Henry, Quentin moves back only to move forward and draws a connecting line from the past to the present:

'maybe nothing ever happens once and is finished. Maybe happen is never once but like ripples maybe on water after the pebble sinks, the ripples moving on, spreading, the pool attached by a narrow umbilical water-cord to the next pool which the first pool feds, has fed, did feed...' (Absalom 261)

In sum, the sacrificial murder of Charles Bon represented contemporary history's contribution to a legacy of human violence.

The dormitory room at Harvard becomes yet another site for Faulkner to emphasize how the sacrificial crisis, "assumes the form of a loss of difference between the living and the dead," Girard writes, "a casting down of all barriers between two normally separate realms" (Violence 254). Focusing on the "white oblong of envelope" from his father that announced the death of Rosa Coldfield, Quentin sees "that dead summer twilight--the wistaria, the cigar-smell, the fireflies" of the Southern landscape (nature) mingling with the "strange iron New England snow" (culture) (Absalom 173). However, with the intrusion of the Southern landscape, he is reminded of the tomblike
atmosphere of Coldfield's "dim hot airless room" (7). Soon, the dormitory room begins to feel "tomblike" (346), "stale and static and moribund beyond any mere vivid living cold" (345). With the warm Southern landscape arrives its cold foundation of slave's corpses, Faulkner implies, dissolving the geographic differences between the North and the South, the past and the present. Stripped of its mythology cover, Southern chivalry reduced its inhabitants past and present to wasted flesh, sticks "concealed in a rag bundle" (370), zombies exposed in the "living cold" (345). Thus, the cold, tomblike atmosphere in the dormitory room reflects Quentin's awareness of his and the present's connection to the past's very "stale and static and moribund" message.

Contrary to James A. Snead's suggestion that Quentin carries with him to Harvard "a fixed text" representing an "inherited narrative" (Figures 123), Faulkner shows that Quentin is far from feeling obligated to generate an "exact transmission" of Rosa's narrative (122). Unlike Rosa' narrative, Quentin's narrative, neither "fixed" nor "exact," is focused on the sacrificial mechanism, that is, the violence of fratricidal sacrifice at the heart of the legend. Shreve, on the other hand, replicates both the rhetorical image of youthful love and pictorial images of demons, "'Faustus,'" and "'Beelzebub'" (Absalom 178) of Rosa and Mr. Compson's narratives, thereby, effectively mimicking legends of Southern chivalry. Quentin
has already discovered from Rosa that tragedy lies behind the shapes of monsters. "To pontificate on the subject of monsters is in effect to take them seriously," Girard explains,

to enter into their game; it is to be duped by their appearance instead of recognizing the human being who lurks behind the monstrous form. (Violence 253)

Rather Shreve tries to manipulate a separation from the past and present, a separation of Coldfield and Sutpen's story from that of Charles Bon and Henry Sutpen, and finally, a separation of himself as a Canadian from the story of the American South:

'Jesus, the South is fine, isn't it. It's better than the theatre, isn't it. It's better than Ben Hur, isn't it. No wonder you have to come away now and then, isn't it.' (Absalom 217)

Faulkner shows that in Shreve's denial of fraternity with the tragedy of sacrifice and violence is the repetitious pattern of contagious and binding behavior, suggesting similarity with rather than difference from human tragedy. For, as Quentin notes in Shreve's behavior and attitude, the human tendency to draw violence away. Quentin thinks:

'We are both Father. Or maybe Father and I are both Shreve, maybe it took father and me both to make Shreve or Shreve and me both to make Father or maybe Thomas Sutpen to make all of us.' (261)

Without Quentin's intervention, Faulkner insists, Shreve's version of history would generate another reiteration
of mythical history, as Nietzsche would state, full of "abstractis and shadows" (Advantages 29).

Quentin decides to interrupt Shreve's characterization of Thomas Sutpen. In search of the internal link between Sutpen and his sons, Quentin begins by re-creating the moment when Sutpen "'discovered his innocence'" (Absalom 226). Recalling what his father was told by General Compson, Quentin presents the moment when Sutpen discerned a difference "'not only between white men and black ones, but... a difference between white men and white men'" (226). Faulkner suggests that the significance of Sutpen's discovery confirms what can be identified as a mimetic aspect involved with the experience of "innocence." Through Sutpen's eyes, Faulkner depicts what W. J. Cash calls the extravaganza of chivalry "by which the ruling class, including the Virginians, habitually designated itself" (The Mind 65). This extravaganza of chivalry not only limited the freedom of Southern blacks, but the white lower class as well. Blacks and poor whites shared in providing for the planter an identity of distinctions above them in the hierarchy of Southern culture. It is this recognition of arbitrary difference that Sutpen recalled to Quentin's grandfather, General Compson. "'He [Sutpen] didn't even know he was innocent that day when his father sent him to the big house with a message'" (Absalom 229). A Negro servant "'told him, even before he had had time to say what he came for, never to come
to that front door again but go around to the back" (232). The young fourteen year old did not remember leaving the door, for "'all of a sudden he found himself running and already some distance from the house, and not toward home'" (232). He found himself in the woods (233) "'arguing with himself quietly and calmly'" (234) while he recalled the scene at the plantation door.

Sutpen recalled seeing himself split between the "'boy outside the barred door'" who stood "'in his patched garments and splayed bare feet'" (235), and the other one who looked beyond the boy. The latter saw

'himself seeing his own father and sisters and brothers as the owner, the rich man (not the nigger) must have been seeing them all the time-- as cattle, creatures heavy and without grace, brutally evacuated into a world without hope or purpose for them.' (235)

Seeing beyond his frozen figure at the front door, the second figure recognized a state of perpetual limbo in which the poor whites

'spawn with brutish and vicious prolixity, populate, double treble and compound, fill space and earth with a race whose future would be a succession of cut-down and patched and made-over garments bought on exorbitant credit because they were white people, from stores where niggers were given the garments free.' (235)

Sutpen's anger and humiliation recalled the glittering "'house, the portico,'" and the "'smooth white brass-decorated door'" (233) and the Negro servant, all symbols of the white planter's "'innocence.'"
Then, suddenly, something struck Sutpen "'like an explosion'" (238). According to him, something "'too mixed up to be thinking'" (237) shouted something at him. It was as if he were possessed, for something took hold of him, "'a bright glare'" enveloped him and then "'vanished and left nothing'" (238). In place of human compassion, Sutpen was left with "'his intact innocence'" rising from "'a limitless flat plain'" "'like a monument'" (238). Innocence, described by Sutpen as some inanimate entity, instructed him as calmly as the others had ever spoken (238):

'and when it said them in place of he or him, it meant more than all the human puny mortals under the sun that might lie in hammocks all afternoon with their shoes off.' (238)

As Faulkner shows, Sutpen's desire to emulate what William R. Taylor terms, the "classical ideal" of aristocratic qualities (Cavalier 83), originated with the Tidewater planter who became the model for the entire tradition and, subsequently, both model and rival for the young Sutpen. As he informed General Compson, his energy went into thinking about how to "'combat'" "'them'" (Absalom 238), how to have "'what made them do what the man did'" (238). In 1823, Sutpen concluded that the only way to combat the aristocratic class was to have what they had: "'You got to have land and niggers and a fine house to combat them with'" (238). His decision to fight the tradition of Southern chivalry, that is, to acquire his
own land, plantation, and slaves, coincided with his and the tradition's birth in Southern culture. Without returning to the home of his natural father, Sutpen, instead, "'went to the West Indies'" (239) to become the son of the aristocratic tradition.

From Quentin's speculations about Sutpen, it is clear that Sutpen was not alone in his desire for land. As Faulkner implies, Sutpen became a participant in "'a theatre for violence and injustice and bloodshed and all the satanic lusts of human greed and cruelty'" (250). Absorbed in a cultural quest for identity, Sutpen was obsessed by the desire for autonomy, power, and wealth equal to his monstrous double-- the Chivalric tradition. Undifferentiated from the desires of the aristocratic tradition, moreover, Sutpen's recognition of the violent hierarchical system of difference that separated the races and classes was negated by his acceptance of those categorical differences. Thus, becoming one with the planter, Sutpen, initially the poor white, as Cash writes, "gave eager credence to and took pride in the legend of aristocracy which was so valuable to the defense of the land" (The Mind 67). After fifty years of living in the glare of "innocence," Sutpen became an immutable fixture of Southern chivalry, a father, in his turn, to a black son who threatened to become heir to his plantation. Quentin suspects that Sutpen could not hear the call of "'the forlorn nameless and homeless lost child'" (Absalom
267), of his son, Charles Bon, no more than he did fifty years earlier when "'it was the heart of the earth itself he heard'" (251):

'a soil manured with black blood from two hundred years of oppression and exploitation until it sprang with an incredible paradox of peaceful greenery and crimson flowers and sugar cane sapling.' (251).

Instead, Sutpen marked Charles Bon as a difference to be expelled by the other son whose sole inheritance was to learn from the father the violent mechanism of sacrifice for the expulsion of his brother. The "incredible paradox" of Charles Bon revealed the familial conflict between father and sons and between brother and brother and afforded Quentin in his vision of Henry to discern that any "disintegration of the system of difference" develops "from the top down" (A Theatre 165). Sutpen had risen "'upon a volcano'" (Absalom 251) in which he, as the father figure, the external mediation, was always in danger of self-destruction by a system of difference. As the external mediation, Sutpen represented the paternal system of difference and its contradiction in that the violent racial and social hierarchy that he accepted and that allowed him to father and then desert Charles returned in the figure of the difference who is neither white nor black, but son. In this sense, Charles represented a disruption of familial and cultural order originating with the external mediation, the father. In turn, both Henry and
Charles learned from Sutpen to value the system of difference that eventually destroyed them as a family.

Quentin's recognition of the link between Sutpen and the fraternal conflict of Charles and Henry defies any attempt to understand and relay the story of father and sons as isolated events in the chronicles of Southern history. As if to emphasize this point, Faulkner shows how the two living sons Shreve and Quentin, sharing a brotherhood, begin to compete for the role of storyteller. Shreve, prefers to treat the murder of Charles lightly without seeing and understanding what is unseen and what can only remain unspoken. As a result, on two occasions, he interrupts Quentin with remarks "not intent for flippancy nor even derogation" (275), but

born (if from any source) of that incorrigible unsentimental sentimentality of the young which takes the form of hard and often crass levity—to which, by the way, Quentin paid no attention whatever, resuming as if he had never been interrupted. (275)

The "crass levity" of Shreve's remarks intends to dismiss his identification with the tragedy and violence of the South. Yet, as Faulkner shows, Shreve's "crass levity" mimics the "tensions and frustrations felt by those who had long battled for the Lost Cause" (Cavalier 337) and who, as a defensive measure, rose to give the Cavalier legend a new lease on life (341). Quentin, however, is determined to what connects Shreve and himself to the legend of Sutpen. "'Wait, I tell you!' Quentin said, though
still he did not move nor even raise his voice-- that voice with its tense suffused restrained quality: 'I am telling'" (Absalom 277).

Yet, Shreve interrupts Quentin again: "'No,' Shreve said; 'you wait. Let me play a while now'" (280), and the dialogue returns, prematurely, to the death of Sutpen. Mocking the gravity of Quentin's tone, Shreve jokes: "'Well, Kernal, they mought have whupped us but they aint kilt us yit, air they?'" (280). It was not "flippancy" (280), but "that protective coloring of levity behind which the youthful shame of being moved hid itself" (280). However, emphasizing how the re-telling of the legend reveals Quentin and Shreve as rival doubles, Faulkner shows the "two of them back to back as though at last ditch," with Shreve saying "No to Quentin's Mississippi shade" while "Quentin did not even stop. He did not even falter, taking Shreve up in stride without comma or colon or paragraph" (280).

Even when Quentin is finally able to shift the focus of the dialogue to the two brothers, Shreve intervenes, offering speculations of a love triangle of Charles, Henry, and Judith. Shreve, however, has trouble sorting out the object of this love triangle that seems to be Judith one moment and then something intangible the next. Taking his cue from Mr. Compson's romantic conjectures, Shreve considers this threesome an idyllic interlude, albeit an adventurous one for Charles because of "'the possibility
of incest'" (323), the possibility of being accepted in the myth of purity that would negate his own origins in violence, that is, miscegenation. In that sense, Faulkner reveals how Shreve's innocence recalls that of Charles' own innocence in that both fail to comprehend the extent to which Sutpen and the American Southern culture are willing to preserve the mythology of innocence. For Charles was, in fact, the hidden violence, the reality of Southern culture that had be sacrificed for the preservation of the myth. Therefore, the playfulness of Shreve's view of this encounter between Charles, Henry and Judith reveals an "innocence" not to be found anywhere in the legend or the culture of the South determined, at all cost, to conceal its impurity with the fantasy of incest. Thus, as Faulkner shows, the meeting between Charles and Henry was no chance encounter, but an encounter between the reality of miscegenation (Charles) and the idea of innocence (Henry) constructed "'not on the rock of stern morality but on the shifting sands of opportunism and moral brigandage [Sutpen]" (260), drawn together by a mother (Eulalia Bon) with an "'implacable will for revenge'" (298) against the man who had cast her and Charles aside (297). United by Sutpen, the "'brigandage,'" and Eulalia, the "'revenger,'" the two brothers, instead, displayed not love, but the repetition of the tradition's worst traits.

In 1860, at his mother's request, Charles abandoned
his octoroon wife and their child in New Orleans and prepared to leave for the University of Mississippi where "'he would have a chance to observe another and a provincial section of the country in which his high destiny was rooted'" (311). Again, Faulkner presents not only the symmetry between father and son, but the state of ignorance that forces them both to repeat the past. While Eulalia's lawyer forwarded a letter to Henry Sutpen at the university in Oxford, Eulalia prepares Charles for his encounter: "'He is your father. He cast you and me aside and denied you his name. Now go' and then sit down and let God finish it: pistol or knife or rack; destruction or grief or anguish''" (297). Equally, Faulkner insists, Charles' mother was an inherent fixture in the tradition of Southern chivalry. As the rejected mulatto female, it was she who re-assembles not a mythical three-some, but what is a historically constituted triangle consisting of a recognized son and heir and her son as the black rejected and displaced by a white father. Contrary to Shreve's "'love'' triangle, for Faulkner, this triangle of undifferentiated antagonists epitomized the cultural state of confusion. It simultaneously acknowledged a familial bond while proclaiming difference. The "paradox and inconsistency" (316) apparent in Shreve's romanticized notion of "'love'' will give way to the "paradox and inconsistency" of undifferentiation and mimetic violence.
Shreve still does not know that Charles was cast aside and denied Sutpen's name because he has black blood. Quentin delays imparting this information he received from Henry on his visit to Sutpen's Hundred. While he listens to Shreve, he thinks: he sounds "'just exactly like father if father had known as much about it the night before I went out there as he did the day I came back'" (Absalom 181). However, the delay allows Faulkner to develop the fraternal theme in Absalom, Absalom! and then draw attention to how the issue of racial differentiation, more specifically, the irrational fear of black blood, undermines the familial relationship hidden at the foundation of Southern culture. As brothers, Charles Bon and Henry Sutpen represented what Girard considers the "least differentiated relationship" (A Theatre 274) in the kinship structure. Yet, it is this undifferentiation that is feared and, therefore, concealed in the cultural demands of difference. For undifferentiation opens the door for imitation and, simultaneously, mimetic rivalry. As Quentin's speculations on Sutpen pointed out, Sutpen's brothers in kind-- the Tidewater planter, General Compson, Major De Spain, and others-- became models and rivals for his emergence as the largest landowner in Jefferson, Mississippi! His rise
in the minds of Southerners, did not represent so great a threat to the cultural order as would the rise of a black plantation owner. But this is exactly the scenario Faulkner presents with Charles as the rightful heir of Sutpen's Hundred. In the context of this novel, rather than class or gender, race represents the greatest threat to cultural stability and contributes to the birth of the mythology of innocence. Therefore, the internal conflict between Charles and Henry represented a microcosm of the cultural fear of racial undifferentiation, and it was this fear, repressed in the mythology of innocence, that generated the tragic repetition of sacrificial fratricide evident in the conflict of the Civil War itself.

Beyond the Southern landscape, Faulkner extends this recognition of undifferentiation to the American and Canadian narrators at Harvard to symbolize the universality of this human conflict. Just as Charles and Henry are marked by the psychological and social mandates of racial difference, the narrators reflect the two extremes of fear and indifference toward the black race that results in the same repression of similarity. Faulkner invokes, once again, the metaphor of the "glare" as a symbolic representation of a mimetic understanding passed from Quentin to Shreve:

They stared-- glared-- at one another. It was Shreve speaking, though save for the slight difference which the intervening degrees of latitude had inculcated in them (differences not in tone or pitch but of turns of phrase
and usage of words), it might have been either of them and was in a sense both: both thinking as one, the voice which happened to be speaking the thought only the thinking become audible, vocal... (Absalom 303)

The conflict of sacrificial fratricide encompassing the North and the South by "intervening degrees of latitude," elicits in Quentin and Shreve a recognition of fraternity in which their thinking, speaking, and listening are finally joined to the moment of when Charles, too, discovers his brother.

Now the four of them are at the university campus in Oxford, Mississippi. Shreve speculates that Henry must have shown Charles the letter from his mother's lawyer. Charles, who "'had no visible father'" (313), looked on his brother's face for the first time:

'there was no gentle spreading glare but a flash, a glare (showed it to him who not only had no visible father but had found himself to be, even in infancy, enclosed by an unsleeping cabal bent apparently on teaching him that he had never had a father, that his mother had emerged from a sojourn in limbo, from that state of blessed amnesia in which the weak sense can take refuge from the godless dark forces and powers which weak human flesh cannot stand, to wake pregnant, shrieking and screaming and thrashing, not against the ruthless agony of labor but in protest against the outrage of her swelling loins; that he had been fathered on her not through that natural process but had been blotted onto and out of her body by the old infernal immortal male principle of all unbridled terror and darkness) a glare in which he stood looking at the innocent face of the youth almost ten years his junior... [and said to himself] He has my brow my skull my jaw my hands..." (313-314)
In this recognition of fraternity, Charles recognized his connection to the conflict that draws him to this place of origins, "'this particular one above all others'" (313). Emerging "'from a sojourn in limbo, from that state of blessed amnesia'" (313), Charles saw in Henry's brow, skull, jaw, and hands not only the similarity of familial traits, but the arbitrary ordering of race that denied him a place in the human community.

Through the same skull, brow, sockets, shape and angle of jaw and chin and some of his thinking behind it (317), Charles perceived a differences between himself and Henry "'a bucolic heir apparent who had probably never spent a dozen nights outside of his paternal house... until he came to school'" (315) that replaced his sense of identity and suggesting to him a less than acceptable existence:

'this flesh and bone and spirit which stemmed from the same source that mine did, but which sprang in quiet peace and contentment and ran in steady even though monotonous sunlight, where that which he bequeathed me sprang in hatred and outrage and unforgiving and ran in shadow.' (317-318)

Henry's face was a mirror that reflected the state of Southern confusion and contradiction, for Charles saw himself as Henry would-- as both "brother" and "nigger," something child-like and monstrous, something belonging and yet other.

Charles' presence in the American South, for that matter, his presence in the novel, questions the irrational
fear of racial mixing. As exemplified by Rosa's narrative confusion and the efforts of Quentin and Shreve to discover the problem, the concern for identifying Charles' racial background reflects the extreme attention race receives not only in Southern culture, but in American culture (beginning with Jefferson's notations) as well. Without the notation of Charles' racial difference, the story of the Sutpen family would not yield Quentin's tragic version. In bringing Charles and Henry together, Faulkner is concerned not with them as individuals, but as related individuals eventually divided by the race. For that reason, Faulkner centers this issue of racial differentiation around a young man lifted from the soils of Haiti where, as Ramón Saldívar writes, he was part of a historical "class of racialized identity that is neither black or white but distinct" (Faulkner 105). 9 Charles brought to the Southern culture, restrained by its own racial code, an ambiguity that in Haitian culture allowed for "a more intricate expression of difference" (104), but on American soil, creates a sacrificial mechanism for its expulsion. Unlike his racial status in Haiti, his racial ambiguity in the South was far more problematic since it suggested a uncertainty as to his proper "place" in society and, further, suggested the threat of a continued disruption by others like him who might threaten the established line of difference between whites and blacks. Thus, the relationship between Charles and Henry revealed the
collective impulse of a culture to organize itself around the subordination of individuals with black blood even when there are indications of familial connections, even when, in fact, there are others like Charles as a result of miscegenation.

Faulkner attributes to Charles the humanity denied him within the cultural milieu of the South, and, in turn, Charles revealed the very human desire for inclusion. Under the circumstances, like his father before him, Charles did not choose the object of his desire (Sutpen as father). It was chosen for him by Henry, the "recognized" son who became his model. While Charles was the one rejected by what Sutpen was "told" by his first wife's father, Henry was the other who was "visibly" acknowledged by the paternal tradition. Therefore, Charles' subsequent obsession with his brother did not imply, as John N. Duvall suggests, a "homoerotic desire" for Henry (Marginal 110). On the contrary, Faulkner implies that Charles looked on Henry and recognized a desire for inclusion, for paternal recognition from the Southern cultural order that he belonged to by blood. He looked at Henry and saw not his brother's face "'whom I did not know I possessed and hence never missed,'" but as Charles thought, "'my father's, out of the shadow of whose absence my spirit's posthumeity has never escaped'" (Absalom 317). In fact, Charles was Sutpen's shadow in that his desire for inclusion, for paternal recognition from the cultural order, while
recalling his father's same desire for inclusion and recognition in 1820, pointed to the repetition of violence and rejection. For Charles, too, has abandoned his wife, part black, and their child:

'So at last I shall see him, whom it seems I was bred up never to expect to see, whom I had even learned to live without,' thinking maybe how he would walk into the house and see the man who made him and then he would know; there would be a flash, that instant of indisputable recognition between them and he would know for sure and forever-- thinking maybe 'That's all I want. He need not even acknowledge me; I will let him understand just as quickly that he need not do that, that I do not expect that, will not be hurt by that, just as he will let me know that quickly that I am his son.' (319)

Simply put, Charles desired from Sutpen the acknowledgment "'that I am his son'" as Henry was son.

It may seem as if Charles was naively "'blundering'" his way toward a relationship with his father; however, intuitively, he understood the dilemma Sutpen faced in the South and his own precarious position in that culture. Since Sutpen as representative of patriarchal tradition is responsible for uniting both sons through his rejection of wife and son, Charles wanted, not for Henry, but for Sutpen to say "'we belong to you'" (328). It should be noted that unlike Joe Christmas in Light in August, coping with the forced alienation of Southern blacks some seventy years later, Faulkner shows that Charles was in the midst of his family. He is enclosed in a familial triangle where he truly belonged. In Charles apprehension of the "paradox
and inconsistency" (316) within this familial triangle, he recognizes the familial bond, but also perceived that Sutpen's first rejection of him was in accordance with a contradicting principle of incorporation that attests to Charles' racial make-up and his rejection, simultaneously. Rather than forcing an open display of acknowledgment, he was willing to accept a "'secret acknowledgment'" (327) of the human, familial bond that was already evident in his very being.

In attempting to seek recognition from his father, however, Charles discovered in Henry an immutable obstacle, "'the brother and the son'" (349), recognized by a patriarchal system that had already denounced him once, and will no doubt, Charles sensed, do so again. The need for a "'secret acknowledgment'" by the father was to preclude a mimetic rivalry with the one who was the apparent son and heir of "Sutpen's Hundred in Mississippi" (118). After recognizing Henry as brother, Charles considered killing Henry: "'That young clodhopper bastard. How shall I get rid of him'" (318). As an example of mimetic violence and doubling, Faulkner offers this image of Charles in connection with one in which Henry had already considered Charles a model, a man of the world, "'lounging in one of the silk robes the likes of which'" he "'had never seen before'" (316). Charles wanted to be Henry and Henry wanted to be Charles, both exhibiting a symmetry that represented anything but love. For Henry had already placed the two
of them including Judith in a world where they were only "'attitudes without flesh'" (319), "'a world like a fairy-tale in which nothing else save them existed'" (318). In that sense, Charles realized that his desire for recognition would only "'outrage and shame'" (308) the "'too many brothers'" (308) like Henry, and he decided to bypass his brother/rival and directly seek equal recognition from his father at the plantation on Sutpen's Hundred.

However, Charles' Christmas visit to the Sutpen plantation did not yield the desired recognition he sought from his father. But to demonstrate Charles' inclusion in the familial heritage of violence, Faulkner makes Charles' appearance to everyone in the household, except for Sutpen, seem anything but a reminder of Southern violence. Outwardly, that is, Charles appears the proper aristocratic suitor for Judith. Despite the heated debate over slavery and the threat of an impending civil war, the wisteria vines at Sutpen's mansion played host to the young couple. In fact, everyone in the household begins to talk of "'the engagement almost before the fiance had time to associate the daughter's name with the daughter's face'" (327). Encouraged by Henry, Charles took on the role of a chivalric lover, "courting" Judith in the garden among the wisteria vines. Thus, Charles' outward appearance readily complemented, as Rosa noted earlier, the Sutpen plantation while, simultaneously, he presence revealed
to Sutpen a symbol of Southern impurity threatening to destroy the very foundation on which stood the plantation.

Thus, when Shreve wildly speculates that Charles appeared to emulate the indecisiveness of a Hamlet in love, Quentin finally objects: "'but it's not love'" (322). Quentin rightly suspects the engagement to be no more than a romantic charade concealing the tension of the South's racial code. However, Charles' version of the Southern romance focused on obtaining from Sutpen recognition as son, that is, his version focused on inclusion rather than exclusion. While back at the university, he waited for a letter not from Judith, but from Sutpen. "'He will write'" a letter that would just have to say "'I am your father. Burn this' and I would do it'" (326). Yet, no letter arrived from Sutpen, and Charles was left feeling "'despair and shame'" (321) at Sutpen's failure "'in physical courage'" (321). For Sutpen, Charles comprehended, will not come forward even to offer a "'secret acknowledgment'" of paternity, something not altogether uncharacteristic of white planters.

Confronted by Charles' return, however, Sutpen could only surmise that Charles represented a re-enactment of his own rejection. While applauding his own rise from the lower class to the aristocratic class, Sutpen could not condone the rise of his black son to heir and owner of the plantation at Sutpen's Hundred. For Charles' romantic tale of love was to Sutpen an absurd contradiction of
Southern innocence. To General Compson, Sutpen indirectly referred to Charles' blackness as a monstrosity that must be expelled:

'either I destroy my design with my own hand, which will happen if I am forced to play my last trump card, or do nothing, let matters take the course which I know they will take and see my design complete itself quite normally and naturally and successfully to the public eye, yet to my own in such fashion as to be a mockery and a betrayal of that little boy who approached that door fifty years ago and was turned away.' (274)

In Sutpen, Faulkner points out the unification of difference between the poor whites and the aristocratic class in the effort to maintain racial difference between whites and blacks, that is, maintain the difference between innocence and blackness emphasized in the Southern myth of innocence. Sutpen recognized that Charles Bon not only threatened the familial order but Sutpen's own goal of vengeance, rivalry, and emulation. Comparable to Rosa Coldfield's vision of blacks "'presiding aloof'" upon a new order, Sutpen saw his land and plantation owned by the black "'to be a mockery'" of his "'design'" and of the tradition itself. Along with Rosa, Sutpen, Olga Vickery writes, became "the staunchest defender of the idols of the South at a time when they most need defending" (The Novels 93). His fear equals that of Rosa's fear exhibited in her Gothic narrative. But for Sutpen, Charles was not a stranger "who came out of nowhere," but Sutpen's own son who drew from him the racial fear of blackness. 10
However, Sutpen delayed playing his "trump card."
Instead, Faulkner shows that Sutpen's mistaken assumption that the matter of bigamy and incest would "separate" the two brothers, lead to its opposite, that is, a display of kinship, doubling images that extends from the two brothers to all four youths. "The four of them and then just two-- Charles-Shreve and Quentin-Henry" (334) are not affected by Sutpen's information about Charles' octoroon wife and child or Charles' kinship with the Sutpen family, for Sutpen himself was equally guilty of bigamy. Both narrators along with Henry and Charles journey to New Orleans where Shreve speculates that "'the octoroon and the child would have been to Henry only something else about Bon to be, not envied but aped if that had been possible'" (336). Dismissing the charge of bigamy, Charles reminded Henry of the code of conduct that permits such behavior:

'have you forgot that this woman, this child, are niggers? You, Henry Sutpen of Sutpen's Hundred in Mississippi? You, talking of marriage, a wedding, here?' (118)

Sutpen and Charles revealed to Henry a less-than "'fairy-tale'" image of Southern chivalry, one that further identified Charles with his father. From both father and brother, Henry understood that blackness was to be rejected, seemingly, with no moral or legal consequence. Thus, as one gentleman to another, Henry pardoned his brother's behavior and confirmed the status of brotherhood between
himself and Charles: "'you are my older brother'" (341).

Ironically, Charles' and Henry's identification with one another resulted in Charles' death. For Henry murders Charles not for the crime of incest, but for (as Charles told Henry in reference to his own wife) "'a little matter like a spot of negro blood'" (308). Quentin returns to South Carolina in the year 1865, where Charles and Henry were engaged in retreating from the Northern army. Henry has been told by Charles that he plans to marry Judith as soon as the War is over. Relieved, Henry answered, 'Thank God. Thank God,'

'not for the incest of course but because at last they were going to do something, at last he could be something even though that something was the irrevocable repudiation of the old heredity and training and the acceptance of eternal damnation.' (347)

The threat of incest between Judith and a supposed white Charles brings Henry and Charles "'together in torment'" (348), for the desire for purity symbolized the acceptance of a fantastic yet immoral existence. Aside from the moral issue of incest, Henry's acceptance of incest, his "'acceptance of eternal damnation'" (347), was the price to pay for maintaining racial difference, for the desire for an incestuous existence denied the reality of miscegenation in Southern culture. Charles' visible whiteness concealed the violence of miscegenation and allowed for his incorporation into Henry's fairy tale of Charles, Judith, and himself as one. Yet, Henry felt that
the distance between himself and Charles and the end of the War "'was a good deal less'" than before. As Faulkner shows, Charles' focus on Sutpen drew him away from Henry toward Sutpen. In his determination to close the distance between himself and his father, Charles traveled to the next regiment where Sutpen was stationed:

"He will not even have to ask me; I will just touch flesh with him and I will say it myself: You will not need to worry; she shall never see me again." (348)

Venturing to the next regiment, Charles put "'himself in Sutpen's way'" (348). Looking on the "'rocklike face'" (348), Charles saw that "'there was no flicker, nothing'" in the "'pale boring eyes'" (348). But in the face, "'he saw his own features... he saw recognition'" (348) that was more of a warning than an acknowledgment (349). In turn, it was Henry who received from Sutpen the recognition of son when he notified an orderly to locate Henry:

"'Sutpen, the colonel wants you in his tent'" (350).

Quentin stops talking and Shreve's voice recalls the night at the Sutpen mansion, when Quentin discovered the "secret" upstairs, in one of the bedrooms (351). And then, "Shreve ceased" (351):

It was just as well, since he had no listener. Perhaps he was aware of it. Then suddenly he had no talker either, though possibly he was not aware of this. Because now neither of them were there. They were both in Carolina and the time was forty-six years ago, and it was not even four now but compounded still further, since now both of them were Henry Sutpen and both of them were Bon, compounded each of both
yet either neither, smelling the very smoke
which had blown and faded away forty-six years
ago. (351)

Thus, the two narrators follow Henry to his father's tent
where Sutpen's shadow was "swooping high and huge up the
canvas wall" (352). Henry saw a face which he did not
recognize (352). Father and son stood facing one another
until Sutpen moved, and Henry realized "'his father holds
his face between both hands'" (353). Without love, but
as a matter of profound urgency, Sutpen recognized the
ultimate heir of his innocence. "'--I have seen Charles
Bon, Henry'" (353). They stared at one another, but Henry
said nothing. "'--He must not marry her, Henry'" (354).
But Henry insisted, "'brother or not'" (354), they will
marry. And Sutpen responded as the defender of the South's
sacred taboo:

'--He must not marry her, Henry. His mother's
father told me that her mother had been a Spanish
woman. I believed him; it was not until after
he was born that I found out that his mother
was part negro.' (354-355)

It has been noted by Snead and others how Charles
was transformed into a monstrous evil, becoming not "son,"
but "nigger."11 This designation of Charles pointed not
only to the polarization and subsequent moral destruction
of the white aristocratic "sons" of Southern chivalry,
but to that repetitive tendency to isolate violence, a
tendency Faulkner makes apparent in the twentieth-century
figures of Quentin and Shreve. With Charles on one side
of the racial line, the two narrators try to extract a
justification for Henry's behavior. However, Faulkner suggests an equally tragic outcome for Henry, whose recognition by Sutpen clearly implied he no longer had a "father" in a familial sense, but a cold and calculating mouthpiece of the paternal tradition of chivalry. It is to Henry, as Carolyn Porter states, that Sutpen relayed his "message" ("(Un)Making the Father" 189) of exclusion to Charles. It was Henry who, in delivering the message, carried out the act of sacrificial fratricide. As the novel's title alludes to, the story of the American South is the story about the "loss" of a son, not only Charles, but Henry as well. For Absalom, whose father, King David, mourned for his loss

--the king covered his face, and the king cried with a loud voice, 'O my son Absalom, O Absalom, my son, my son!' (2 Samuel, 19:4)

was Henry who, like Charles, had no father to mourn for him. Henry's "father," the father Quentin also recognized as his father, was no more than an arbitrator of cultural difference whose only fatherly act was to alienate all his sons and daughters from one another along racial battle lines even if the accomplishment of this goal of maintaining difference required the sacrifice of Henry in the process. Faulkner implies that, as a father figure of the Chivalric tradition, Sutpen exemplified the South's inability to recognize its self-destructive nature. In that sense, the South was incapable of mourning its own loss of conscience
and humanity. Thus, without a "visible" father to exhibit some "physical courage" or compassion, Henry assumed "the role of father and king" (Violence 158). Despite his own resignation, his identification with his father alienated him from himself and placed him as the monstrous double of his father. Henry, who was willing to allow the brother to marry his sister, would not now allow the "nigger" to do so. Absorbing like his father before him the authority of the tradition, Henry echoed the words "'You shall not'" (Absalom 357) designating the separation of the two brothers.

The alienation and monstrous transformation Henry undergoes revealed a loss not only of identity, but of "place" as well. In 1865, Henry inherited a South in stark contrast to his "'fairy-tale'" (Absalom 318) acquired in blissful ignorance. As Faulkner shows, he perceived a South alienated from the very existence it claimed as origins. To Quentin, Henry recalls that he left his father in the tent and wandered about the ruined field toward

'a lonely place and leaned against a pine, leaning quietly and easily, with his head back so he could look up at the shabby shaggy branches like something in wrought iron spreading motionless against the chill vivid stars of early spring, thinking I hope he remembers to thank Colonel Willow for letting us use his tent.' (355)

No longer a paradise, Faulkner shows that the New South had become "'a lonely place,'" "'shabby'" rather than virile, paralyzed by "'wrought iron'" (355) sentiments
of its own making, reflecting the morally impotent ethos of the fathers of Southern chivalry. Faced with this crisis of difference, Henry's reflections on the Southern landscape and on his legacy emulated the period immediately following the Civil War when "estopped by the necessity for unity" with the old tradition, as W. J. Cash writes, the sons of old aristocracy became "bound rigidly within the single great frame by the hypnotic Negro-fixation" (The Mind 129). Yet, even in this crisis of distinction, Faulkner insists that the symmetry among the four brothers and sons reveals their "interchangeability":

They were both in Carolina and the time was forty-six years ago, and it was not even four now but compounded still further, since now both of them were Henry Sutpen and both of them were Bon, compounded each of both yet either neither. (Absalom 351)

As Faulkner implies, the past and present, reality and fantasy dissolved and all four are surrounded by the "dawn" and "the cold" (355) in which Charles and Shreve noted the "panting breath" (357) and the violent and uncontrollable jerking (360) of Henry and Quentin, visibly disturbed by what they assumed to be a monstrous visage of the Other. In this interim before the sacrifice, Henry focused on the blackness but not that of the father as a representative of the tradition, but that of Charles' blackness. As Vickery writes, "the shadow of the Negro, effectively separates brother from brother" (The Novels 98) by providing an image of the monstrous visage more
imaginary than actual. No longer "brother" for Henry, Quentin, and Shreve, Charles became "nigger," and the "role of the father" extends to the narrators who come to subtle but definite identification with Henry as their blood brother.

Faulkner implies that both guilt and fear resulted in the justification for the sacrifice of Charles. According to Cash, in the period of Reconstruction, killing a black was a way to assert "the white man's prerogative... to move as certainly toward getting the black man back in his place" (The Mind 119). The act of murder was interpreted as an "act of patriotism and chivalry" (119). As a result, it was "'the miscegenation, not the incest, which'" Henry-Quentin-Shreve could not bear (Absalom 356). But in the confusion, the blackness of this crime took shape around the figure of Charles Bon who became the monstrous Other, disguising a morally corrupt system of difference that promoted the communal violence of sacrificial fratricide. Charles, then, represented the ultimate example of paradox and inconsistency, for his death, which was meant to bring order, actually resulted in the destruction of the familial and, in turn, the cultural order. His death represented by an "'echoed shot'" (149) heard but not seen in Rosa Coldfield's narrative was a "bloodless" death that could be read as a foundational murder, one that symbolically terminated the end of an era and began another in which the "unanimous mimetic polarization" (Girard)
(Theatre 203), resulted in the legal segregation of the races. Far from "bloodless," however, the sacrificial expulsion generated further ritual violence disguised as purification lynchings. The only eye-witness to the murder, disappeared immediately afterward and remained "lost" for forty three years. This is the legacy of Southern chivalry in the New South.

Between Rosa Coldfield's romantic and Gothic narratives, Henry Sutpen exposed Quentin to the tragic, dark enclosures of his ancestral heritage. At Sutpen's Hundred, Henry's "wasted yellow face," enclosed in a "bare, stale" room (Absalom 373), spoke to Quentin about the legacy of Southern violence:

'And you are--?'
'Henry Sutpen.'
'And you have been here--?'
'Four years.'
'And you came home--?'
'To die. Yes.'
'To die?'
'Yes. To die'
'And you have been here--?'
'Four years.'
'And you are--?'
'Henry Sutpen.'" (373)

According to Peter Brooks, the "virtually identical backward and forward" (Incredulous 306) nature of this dialogue makes Quentin more than an observer. In fact, he is, as Henry made clear to him, a participant in the self-destruction of an entire culture predisposed to human sacrifice. In that sense, Henry and Quentin are both messengers of this human tragedy. Unlike Rosa Coldfield,
Henry represents the underlying tragedy, that is, the reality of the Old South when he directs Quentin, who becomes his Horatio, to tell this story about miscegenation, fratricide, and sacrifice-- the true visage of Southern monstrosity.

Quentin comes to recognize that there are no surviving sanctuaries-- no more dusty summers, gardens of wistaria, no more cigar-smell air and fireflies. As Mr. Compson states, in 1865, Henry "'just vanished'" (Absalom 78), and with him, the "vainglorious swashbuckling" (Flags in the Dust 94) of the Old South revealed itself to be charged with the violence of fratricide. Furthermore, his denunciation, "'I don't hate it!'" the South (Absalom 378), can no longer protect him from the recognition of his own connection to a tradition that tragically worships the dead, that is, worships an idea that never had a chance of materializing. Thus, what Quentin "had seen out there" (372), at Sutpen's mansion, was a likeness of himself just twenty years old in 1910 and already a wasted vestige of past, unheroic attempts to achieve a state of purity. Along with the practice of fratricidal sacrifice, suicide, Faulkner suggests, epitomizes the only real reality the South ever produced. In turn, Quentin fails as a carrier of Henry's underlying message of tragedy and self-destruction, for, in Shreve's mocking rebuttal to the legend, that is, to the destruction of the Sutpen mansion by fire, he separates himself from the violence
of the South. Everything is "'all right, it's fine,'" and the fire, rather than suggests the catastrophic dimensions of human violence, for Shreve, it "'clears the whole ledger'" (378). "'You can tear all the pages out and burn them, except for one thing... You've got one nigger left'" (378).

The surviving grandson of Charles Bon, Jim Bond, escapes the flaming mansion and runs howling into the darkness (376). The myth, Faulkner implies, has ended where it began with the whites (Benjy Compson) and with the blacks (Jim Bond), in mad confusion, symbolic of Southern existence under the spell of innocence. As Mr. Compson noted earlier, "'the fateful mischance had already laid its hand to the extent of scattering the black foundation on which it had been erected'" (78). For the Northerner, however, Bond signifies Shreve's belief in a Gothic entity heard "out there" at night, (378) howling. In the "fateful mischance" of racial conflict in the American culture, the recognition of hidden violence in the mythology of innocence comes too late for the Southerner and not at all for the Northerner. Left with only the reader as a potential witness and messenger of this human tragedy, Faulkner offers Absalom, Absalom! as a text confronting the issue of sacrifice and violence in the Modern era, anticipating the racial conflict of World War I.
NOTES


2 Since Thomas Sutpen's origins is in the violence of the Southern tradition of chivalry, he can be said to be a "misrepresentation" of not only innocence, but of aristocracy as well. It can be said that Sutpen arrives "with the emergence of the new order of planters" (W. J. Cash, The Mind of the South [New York: Vintage Books, 1991], 59-74). As such, he inherits the legend of the aristocracy from the colonial aristocratic landowners before him.

3 During the 1830's, the aristocracy "became a model for social aspirations" for the new planter (Cash The Mind of the South [New York: Vintage Books, 1991], 60). Yet, as Cash states, the aristocracy was no more aristocratic than the new planters, both having their origins, for the most part, in the "backcountry" of the South (3-28). However, the new planters would not, in fact, be content merely to imitate, merely to aspire, to struggle toward aristocracy through the long reaches of time, but wherever there was a sufficient property, they would themselves immediately set up for aristocrats on their own account... Hence, a large part— in a way, a very large part— of its [the South's] history... is the history of its efforts to achieve that end, [that is, aristocracy] and characteristically by means of romantic fictions. (60-61)

4 Faulkner's own telling introduces against Rosa Coldfield's narrative of the Gothic the tragedy of Southern innocence, what for Rosa would be a demonic element of revisionist history.

5 For fear of contamination, contact with the sacred, likewise violence, is forbidden. For the sacred consists of all those forces who dominance over man increases or seems to increase in proportion to man's effort to master them. Tempests, forest fires, and plagues, among other phenomena, may be classified
as sacred. Far outranking these, however, though in a far less obvious manner, stands human violence—violence seen as something exterior to man and henceforth as a part of all the other outside forces that threaten mankind. Violence is the heart and soul of the sacred. (René Girard, Violence and the Sacred trans. Patrick Gregory [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972] 30-33).

6 The South has its origins in violence. In the Old South, it was characteristic for Southerners to settle conflicts among themselves in a duel. As W. J. Cash states in The Mind of the South (New York: Vintage Books, 1991), among the planters,

the tradition of fisticuffs, the gouging ring, and unregulated knife and gun play tended rapidly, from the hour of their emergence, to reincarnate itself in the starched and elaborate etiquette of the code duello. (71)

With the end of the Civil War and the defeat of Southern chivalry, Southerners, in an effort to unify the community once again, directed their violence at the black population. Thus, the foundational violence that helped to establish Southern chivalry now served to re-establish that tradition in the New South. See also C. Vann Woodward, The Strange Career of Jim Crow 3rd rev. ed. (New York: Oxford, 1974):

The determination of the Negro's 'place' took shape gradually under the influence of economic and political conflicts among divided white people—conflicts that were eventually resolved in part at the expense of the Negro. In the early years of the twentieth century, it was becoming clear that the Negro would be effectively disfranchised throughout the South, that he would be firmly relegated to the lower rungs of the economic ladder, and that neither equality nor aspirations for equality in any department of life were for him.

The public symbols and constant reminders of his inferior position were the segregation statutes, or 'Jim Crow' laws. They constituted the most elaborate and formal expression of sovereign white opinion upon the subject. In bulk and detail as well as in effectiveness of enforcement the segregation codes were comparable with the black codes of the old regime, though the laxity that mitigated the harshness of the black codes was replaced by a rigidity that was more typical of the segregation code. (6-7)

7 In the plantation novels written around 1830, there appeared two characterizations of the Southern gentleman,
the Southern Hothead and the Southern Hamlet. According to William R. Taylor in the *Cavalier and Yankee: The Old South and the American National Character* (New York: Oxford, 1993), the Southern Hamlet was "introspective, given to brooding":

The best of them, however, are made to bear the full weight of remembered greatness and suffering, just as they are made to bear the burden of the South's injustices and inhumanities, both inflicted and received. They are the consciousness and the conscience of the South and they are paralyzed by their knowledge. (160).

Taylor suggests that Quentin Compson is a "Southern Hamlet." I agree and offer that Faulkner intends for Quentin to be seen as a descendant of Henry Sutpen as both brother and son.

8 Also, Sutpen's vision of aristocracy provides his new found innocence with an illusion of hope typical of the Adamic romantic in American literature. See R. W. B. Lewis' *The American Adam: Innocence, Tragedy, and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955) 48-49. Like Whiteman, Sutpen displays, "a preadolescent wonder which permits... [him] to take in and reproject whatever there is, shrinking from none of it" (48). In the throes of "primal innocence" (49), Sutpen begins to make himself "with an undeniable grandeur which is the product of his manifest sense of... [responsibility] for his own being" (49).

9 In his article, "Faulkner and Paredes," Ramón Saldivar rightly argues that as a racially mixed Haitian, Charles Bon's identity is far more problematic in American culture:

The category of the racially mixed mulatto and the many other gradations of mixed race mestizaje, problematic as it remains for both Afro- and Hispanic-Caribbean colonial society, nevertheless represents historically a class of racialized identity that is neither black nor white but distinct, even if determined in the last instance by its racial pedigree. No such distinction holds in the context of American Southern racism, where one drop of African blood makes one totally black, as, later, Sutpen to his peril will decisively understand. American slavery and class structures do effectively create identities formed on the basis of dividing lines between master and slave or landlord and tenant, but Haitian colonial society acts as if the division were precise, all the while living the experiential blur between the
two. At least in some instances, notably in the legitimation of the mixed-blood mulatto through the legalisms of marriage and property rights, Haitian colonial society, for all its limitations, allows for the complicated experiential reality of racial difference. (The Cambridge Companion To William Faulkner ed. Phillip M. Weinstein [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995], 104).

10 Regarding the fear of black retaliation see Lewis P. Simpson, "The Mind of The Antebellum South," ed. Louis D. Rubin The History of Southern Literature (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1985). Simpson points out that the racial motive for not allowing Southern blacks to read or write was prevent the black from participating "in the modern definition of history" (173). Behind this dictate, Simpson shows, is the "unspoken fear of the potential mental capacity of the slaves" (173) capable not only of up-risings, but of contradicting the mythology of the "Southern man of letters" (173).

11 James A. Sneads argues that "blacks are epithets ('nigger'), not persons; therefore, Charles Bon cannot be considered "son" or "brother" (Figures Of Division: William Faulkner's Major Novels [New York: Methuen, 1986], 129).
CHAPTER 5
RECONSTRUCTION:
Go Down, Moses

That novel was—happened to be composed of more or less complete stories, but it was held together by one family, the Negro and the white phase of the same family, same people.

Faulkner, 1957
Faulkner in the University

Beginning where Absalom, Absalom! ends, Go Down, Moses (1942) is an attempt to "read" the past and reconstruct its history. Faulkner's novelistic effort to free blacks from the stereotypical representations of the 19th Century, mirrors his protagonist's attempt to free himself from his heritage. While the family ledger reveals hidden realities of the Old South, as author and protagonist, Isaac (Ike) McCaslin, discover, the business of reconstructing the "ledgers" of slavery does not yield, as Thadious M. Davis suggests, a peaceful compromise with "heritage and with the Negro" (Faulkner's 240). Contrary to Karl F. Zender's contention that for Faulkner blacks represent a "fantasy of freedom" (Crossing 76), Faulkner shows that "heritage" and the black have become entrapped in the legacy of Southern violence. Created by men like
this legacy of violence is recorded in the family ledgers, revealing the disturbing history of both the white and black descendants of the McCaslin family. However, as the collection of stories in this text shows, Ike's attempt to escape this legacy with monetary retribution results, as Faulkner shows in the last story, "Delta Autumn," in an acceptance of the inheritance of racial difference he turns from in the first story, "Was."

In the story "Was," Faulkner introduces Ike to his heritage in the Southern mythology of innocence. Faulkner insists that the legend of Terrel Beauchamp (Tomey's Turl) was "not something he [Ike] had participated in or even remembered except from the hearing, the listening" (Moses 4), but it has been passed down like a relic to the descendants of the McCaslin family. Here, Faulkner alludes to oral transmission of the Thomas Sutpen legend (Absalom, Absalom!) from Rosa Coldfield to Quentin Compson. Hearing and listening connect the young boy Ike to Quentin in that the story of "Was" told to him by his cousin Carothers McCaslin (Cass) Edmonds relays not only family history, but the culture's history and practices as well. In that sense, both Quentin and Ike receive an interpretation of Southern history, that is, as René Girard states, "an interpretation of the role of violence in the destiny of the community" (Violence 256):

This interpretation states explicitly that the origin of any cultural order involves a human death and that the decisive death is that of
However, as Girard writes, such interpretations are "misconstrued" so that the violence of sacrifice is concealed behind the unanimity of the community. In *Go Down, Moses*, the oral transmission of Southern history and the written documentation of the family ledgers emphasize the cover up, that is, the mythology of innocence rather than the sacrifice. However, as a literary text, the novel demystifies Southern culture's mythic interpretation of Southern history by exposing the reader to the collective mechanism of sacrifice inherent within the myth of innocence. In that sense, Faulkner reconstructs the history of the McCaslin-Beauchamp family to reveal to Ike the Old South's representational sacrifice of the black in designated roles as servants just as Quentin discovers Charles Bon's death represented for the New South the beginnings of Jim Crow, legalized segregation, that often resulted in lynching, a physical form of sacrifice. Thus, the sacrifice in "Was" is the beginning, the origins of the violence that resulted in the sacrificial death of James Beauchamp, Tomey's Turl's great-grandson.

In "innocence" Cass, seventeen years Ike's senior, recounts what he understands is a antebellum romantic comedy he once witnessed as a youth. According to the legend Ike hears from Cass, at least twice a year, Uncle
Theophilus (Buck) and his twin brother, Uncle Amodeus (Buddy), sons of Carothers McCaslin, anticipate the slave, Tomey's Turl, will run off to Beauchamp's plantation to be with Hurbert and Sophonsiba's house slave, Tennie Beauchamp:

'Tomey's Turl had been running off from Uncle Buck for so long that he had even got used to running away like a white man would do it.' (Moses 8-9)

In preparation for the chase, the McCaslin brothers eat, drink, and, on this special occasion, Uncle Buck put on his necktie (6) "'as another way of daring people to say'' he and Buddy "'looked like twins'' (7).

Dogs lead the way to the Beauchamp plantations ("'he owned two separate plantations'") where Hubert "'was sitting in the spring-house with his boots off and his feet in the water, drinking a toddy'" (9). Along with Sophonsiba, Hubert and the brothers sit down to another meal. Hubert makes a bet of five hundred dollars that the brothers could "'catch that nigger'" by walking up to Tennie's cabin after dark and calling him (14). Uncle Buck agrees to the bet and a slave is sent to the cabin only to return without Tomey's Turl. Hubert immediately changes his bet to five hundred dollars that Tomey's Turl will not be caught in Tennie's cabin. But the hunters are never able to catch Tomey's Turl:

'They hunted the banks both ways for more than an hour, but they couldn't straighten Tomey's Turl out. At last even Uncle Buck gave up and
they started back toward the house, the fyce riding too now, in front of the nigger on the mule.' (17)

Tomey's Turl, Faulkner implies, can quite conform to the traditional plantation of the "'nigger on the mule'" (17) the hunters encounter in their frustrating attempt to "'straighten'" (17) him out. Instead, he runs "'like a white man would do'" (9), like any human being, seeking an escape from the confinement of slavery. Yet, Tomey's Turl is trapped into repeating the past, returning in a circular move to yet another plantation to the role he is forced to play in the McCaslin family.

Furthermore, where the hunters appear unsuccessful at controlling Tomey's Turl, as card players, they have the means of restricting Tomey's Turl from blurring the line that separates him from the hunters. The next day, as expected, the hunting party (including Hubert) returns to the McCaslin plantation where everyone sits down to a poker game by candle-light. As witness to this game, Cass relays how Hubert established another bet directed at Uncle Buck:

'Five hundred dollars against Sibbey [Sophonsiba]. And we'll settle this nigger business once and for all too. If you win, you buy Tennie; if I win, I buy that boy of yours.' (23)

Uncle Buck, having lost the game, forces Uncle Buddy to play against Hubert. In the dim light, Hubert calls out to "'the first creature that answers, animal mule or human,
that can deal ten cards'" (25). Tomey's Turl, who was nearby, enters the dining room. Neither Uncle Buddy nor Hubert look up at him; instead, "'they just sat there while Tomey's Turl's saddle-colored hands came into the light and took up the deck and dealt'" (26). In the end, Uncle Buck does marry Sophonsiba, and they become Ike's parents. Tomey's Turl and Tennie marry and live on the McCaslin plantation and become Lucas Beauchamp's parents.

Cleanth Brooks has commented that the chase of Tomey's Turl is a ritual, but not a "practical act" with a purpose (William Faulkner 246). His comment, either consciously or unconsciously, reveals how white critics dismiss the significance of the black as the one who helps establish and maintain the rules by which Southern culture is organized. The "ritual" hunt serves as a "practical act" by re-enacting white supremacy (displayed in the card game) over the black and effectively denying familial relationships their proper recognition. That is, while it is not a bloodletting event; nonetheless, it refers to the cultural violence of racial segregation and to a future of lynchings under Jim Crow. As a result, the ritual hunt of Tomey's Turl is a family affair that complements the cultural crisis involving race relations. Yet, its bloodless nature serves to stress a romantic, somewhat humorous depiction of race relations on the Southern plantation that disguises the violence and tragedy of human bondage. Without the original act of violence
that motivated the behavior within the story, and without the appearance of that violence, the violence of the storyteller is not apparent. Consequently, the legend exemplifies the mythology of innocence in that it excludes the historical account of miscegenation and incest, for Carothers McCaslin, Uncle Buck and Buddy's father, fathered his slave, Tomasina, and her son, Tomey's Turl.

In what seems to be an ironic form of repentance, Cass recounts how the twins relinquished the McCaslin mansion to the black slaves, locking the doors at night so they would not run away, and made their home "'in the quarters where the niggers used to live'" (Moses 6). This absurd theatrics does nothing to rescind the collective violence of racial discrimination that results in human bondage. The blacks, wherever they are located on the plantation, are still the property of the McCaslins. Further, of all the slaves owned by the McCaslin, it is Tomey's Turl, Uncle Buck and Uncle Buddy's brother, who stands as a poignant reminder of the wayward violence of their absent father. When Hubert tilts the light to see who was dealing the cards, he notes "'Tomey's Turl's arms that were supposed to be black but were not quite white'" (28). He is a McCaslin brother. However, subjugating Tomey's Turl to the status of "slave" and performing the ritual hunt of the "nigger," keeps the violence of Carothers McCaslin distant and maintains the racial hierarchy even among brothers. Reminiscent of
Charles Bon's diminished status in *Absalom, Absalom!*, the status of "slave" and not "brother" upholds difference between the white brothers and Tomey's Turl. This attempt to construct difference exposes the human tragedy in Southern culture, for the irony is that Tomey's Turl, as brother and mulatto, represents a loss of difference. Faulkner suggests that both Uncle Buck and Uncle Buddy, in rejecting their own brother, inherit the patriarchal system of difference initiated by Carothers McCaslin. As a result of his relationship to the twin brothers, Tomey's Turl becomes the scapegoat for his father's violence.

Once the victim of his father's violent will, that is, miscegenation, Tomey's Turl's genealogy now becomes the victim of sacrifice. From the McCaslin's perspective, the legend of Tomey's Turl represents the idealization of Southern chivalry at its best. Sacralized in a stereotypical representation, Tomey's Turl is rendered by the storytellers a willing participant in his own victimization. Just as Uncle Buck dons a necktie for the ritual hunt, Tomey's Turl always dressed in "'his Sunday shirt... every time he ran away'" (*Moses* 28). Cass does not see any conflict in the way Tomey's Turl is represented in relation to the McCaslin brothers or Southern history. But Faulkner's placement of "Was," as Ike's earliest memory of the past, is intended to show Ike how he and the blacks are not only products of the violence concealed in this
romanticized history, but are trapped in the repetitious behavior that returns them to the past.

In light of the mythicized legend of McCaslin history, the McCaslin ledgers present a factual, but dehumanized recording of violence. At sixteen, Ike has the opportunity to examine the ledgers and focus on the image of Carothers McCaslin and his own inheritance. "The Bear" records how Ike's father, Buck McCaslin, noted the drowning death of Tomasina's mother, Eunice, who died "'in Crick Christmas Day 1832'" (255). As if to question the entry, Buddy responds, "'Drownd herself'" (256). The next entry in Buck's handwriting read: "'Who in hell ever heard of a niger drownding him self'" (256). While Ike questions why Eunice would kill herself, he finds another entry on the next page that recorded "what he knew he would find" (257). In "old Carothers' bold cramped hand far less legible than his sons" (257), Ike read:

'Tomasina called Tomy Daughter of Thucydus @
Eunice Born 1810 dide in Child bed June 1833
and Burd. Yr stars fell.' (257)

and the next entry

'Turl Son of Thucydus @ and Eunice Tomy born
Jun 1833 yr stars fell Fathers will.' (257)

Ike remembers seeing the old man Tomey's Turl looking very much like a McCaslin, sharing the same paternal blood that drove his grandmother to her death. Then returning
to the ledger, to the "yellowed page" on which Eunice appears (259), Ike seemed to see her actually walking into the icy creek on that Christmas day six months before her daughter's and her lover's... child was born. (259)

The entries marking Eunice's suicide and her death do little to transcend the romantic stereotype of Southern blacks. But through Ike's own imaginative powers, she is able to share with him what Olga W. Vickery considers "the horrifying vision of the white man ordering his Negro daughter into his bed" (The Novels 126). In that sense, Eunice's death reveals to Ike a vision, representing an unwritten history of violence that is difficult to comprehend and even more difficult for Ike to put into words: "'his own daughter his own daughter'" (Moses 259). For its revelation requires the same imaginative fervor that exploited the sacrificial mechanism. The sacrifice of this horrifying vision of Southern violence and its legacy is the story Faulkner has tried to tell in his previous novels and the story Ike is trying to reconstruct in this novel. But, at best, this history may remain unwritten while its legacy of violence lives on among its survivors.

Criticized for the production of "illegible" novels, Faulkner seems to answer his critics by pointing to the difficulty of trying to extract from Southern writings the unwritten history of his culture. For, in "less
legible" handwriting beside the mention of Tomey's Turl's birth, "'Fathers will'" refers to the "'thousand-dollar legacy'" that denies the horrifying vision any reality. As Ike comes to understand, any "definite incontrovertible proof that he [Carothers] acknowledged" his son (258) was erased by the issue of money that would have been "'cheaper than saying My son to a nigger'" (258). Just as Thomas Sutpen in *Absalom, Absalom!* refused to recognize his son, Charles Bon, Carothers' violent act of miscegenation precipitates his act of sacrifice in that Carothers does not and cannot by the order of his own vision of racial difference, acknowledge his son as human. Faulkner shows that Tomey's Turl's humanity is sacrificed in order to maintain the system of racial difference. The legend, as a family romance, and the McCaslin ledger, ("'which was a whole land in miniature... multiplied and compounded was the entire South'")) (280), must be seen together masking Southern history and only hinting at the violence and sacrifice of its combined legacy.

Representing the romanticized antebellum South, the legend of Tomey's Turl guides Ike to the last entry of the ledger which questions his attempt to repudiate his inheritance by placing his beliefs against the son of Tomey's Turl. Lucius (Lucas) Quintus Carothers Beauchamp's name alone draws attention to the connection between grandfather and grandson:

'not Lucius Quintus @c @c @c, but Lucas Quintus,
not refusing to be called Lucius, because he simply eliminated that word from the name; not denying, declining the name itself, because he used three quarters of it; but simply taking the name and changing, altering it, making it no longer the white man's but his own.' (Moses 269)

Dominating the fourth generation of McCaslins, Lucas has taken possession of and made "his own" Carothers McCaslin's aristocratic greed, vainglory, and ruthlessness, in short his violence. According to Lucas' wife Mollie, Lucas is "'sick in the mind'" (99). She is referring to Lucas' nightly search for gold on his portion of the McCaslin plantation.

'When a man that old takes up money-hunting, it's like when he takes up gambling or whiskey or women. He aint going to have time to quit. And then he's gonter be lost, lost..." (100)

While his father had to endure the humiliation of an incestuous birth and a family name denied, Lucas relishes the name McCaslin. Indeed, he "composed" himself as "old Carothers himself was" (269), lost in the vision of the past.

In "Fire And The Hearth," Faulkner presents Lucas as a "revised" Tomey's Turl, a complex mix of specific characteristics, intelligence, arrogance, pride, that move beyond the image of blacks as "beast" or "enduring." But, unfortunately, Faulkner shows that like the aristocratic New South, Lucas turns to the past for a model, guide for living in the present. For the "oldest
living McCaslin descendant still living on hereditary
land" (39), the difference of race becomes inconsequential,
only inheritance matters. As Ike continues to read the
ledger, he recalls the day Lucas came into his inheritance.

One morning Lucas stood suddenly in the doorway
of the room where he was reading the Memphis
paper and he looked at the paper's dateline
and thought 'It's his birthday. He's twenty-one
today and Lucas said: 'Whar's the rest of that
money old Carothers left? I wants it. All of
it.' (269)

Since that day, as the story recalls, Lucas, too, believed
he lived his life resisting his inheritance "'simply by
possessing it'" (101). That is, as "'the composite of
the two races,'" he resisted living exclusively as a
"Negro," contained to being the "'battleground and victim
of the two strains'" (101). Instead, in accepting both
his white and black heritage, he became a "'durable'
'vessel... in which the toxin and its anti'" (101), that
is, Carothers' violence and Eunice's morality, "'stalemated
one another'" (101).

Bound to the McCaslins by blood, Faulkner shows that
Lucas also becomes victim of the same desires that enslave
the culture to violence. As Ike recounts, as the oldest
and direct descendant of Carothers McCaslin, Lucas at
"'sixty seven years old... already had more money in the
bank now than he would ever spend'" (34). Nonetheless,
nightly, for twenty years, he had been making and selling
whiskey on his own field until some six years earlier,
he witnessed whites excavating for gold in an area near
the creek bottom. Faulkner implies that Lucas, watching
the gold diggers with a "'cold and contemptuous curiosity'"
(37), loses himself in the desire of others. Girard has
noted that "those who desire mimetically abdicate their
freedom of choice" (A Theatre 74). In that sense, Lucas'
obsession with the search for gold entraps him in a
ritualistic pattern of behavior that binds him to his
rivals. The anonymous gold diggers are replaced by Cass
Edmonds' son, Zachary, and his son, Roth.

With the death of Zachary's wife in childbirth, Lucas'
wife, Mollie, leaves her home to tend to the nursing of
the baby, Roth. For six months, Lucas considers the
possibility that Zachary may be sleeping with his wife.
Zachary's moral iniquity prompts Lucas to resort to a
violent resolution. He arrives at Zachary's home with
a razor and threatens to kill him in the name of Carothers
McCaslin:

'You knewed I wasn't afraid, because you knewed
I was a McCaslin too and a man-made one. And
you never thought that, because I am a McCaslin
too, I wouldn't. You never even thought that,
because I am a nigger too, I wouldn't dare.
No. You thought that because I am a nigger I
wouldn't even mind.' (Moses 52)

In challenging his rival, Lucas calls on his heritage
and on the "divine" wisdom of Carothers. That is, Lucas
ascribes his inspiration to Carothers McCaslin who serves
as both the object and model of Lucas' blind desire for
an identity distinct from that of "Negro." According to Lucas, he was doing "what Carothers McCaslin would have wanted" him to do (52): "'So I reckon I aint got old Carothers' blood for nothing, after all... I needed him and he come and spoke for me'" (57).

Lucas is "inspired" to dismiss the social and racial status Zachary acknowledges as his privilege, preferring to recognize his own familial position as a male-descendant McCaslin. Faulkner implies that Lucas prefers the more immediate, familial, less differential relationship to the McCaslin heritage, one that is more representative of the actual culture whether or not that culture is in accordance with that relationship. Unlike the unacknowledged relationship between Carothers and Tomey's Turl, Lucas, in forcing Zachary to acknowledge him as family, succeeds in establishing himself as equal and Zachary as rival. But he does so in the name of violence: "'So he entered his heritage. He ate its bitter fruit'" (110). Lucas absorbed the very idols of the patriarchal system that receives his reverence and allies him to its lingering corrupting forces. He became a replica of the old Carothers. As "enemy brother," Zachary and Lucas' relationship comes to resemble the characteristic of a stalemate exemplified in Lucas' own being. The young Roth Edmonds believed that there was "'something more than difference in race'" (110) between the two men. Indeed, Faulkner suggests that the threat of violence, the threat
of total elimination of both men, supersedes the question of race.

The story of the Beauchamp family in "Fire And The Hearth," is anything but an imitation of the Southern family romance. Instead, for Faulkner, Southern violence has become a family affair truly incorporating the black. In the last story, "Go Down, Moses," Faulkner's vision of the black family merges with the image of death and madness, symbolic of the white Southern culture. In opposition to the stereotypical image of the Gibson family as spiritual liberators (The Sound and the Fury), the history of the Beauchamps begins in the violence of miscegenation and incest and ends with the unexplained murder of a Chicago police officer by the grandson of Lucas and Mollie, Samuel Worsham (Butch) and his execution. At nineteen, Butch was caught by the police officer breaking and entering a store, and, in an instant, he struck the officer "with a piece of iron pipe" (Moses 354). Mollie points to the community represented in the familial figure of Roth Edmonds, Zachary's son and Jefferson's District Attorney, Gavin Stevens. Refusing any familial connection, however, Roth decides not to have anything to do with Butch's plight. In the meantime, Stevens, who called Mollie by the familiar term "'Aunty'" (353), attributed Butch's mad behavior and death to "'some seed not only violent but dangerous and bad'" (355). Representative of Jefferson's social and legal communities,
Stevens assigns Butch's behavior to an already marginalized, that is, "sacrificed" source: "'A bad son of a bad father'" (357). Without Attorney Stevens' impressive resume ("Phi Beta Kappa, Harvard, Ph. D., Heidelberg") (353), Mollie's effort to save her grandson from execution entails an intuitive understanding of violence in Southern culture.

In her own way, Mollie tries to argue that Roth's expulsion of Butch from the McCaslin plantation was not only a failure to recognize the familial pattern of violence, but an illegal expulsion from his rightful "home." For Butch Beauchamp's story is one of inherited or mimetic violence and represents an extension of the unwritten history of the McCaslin family that is not comprehended as such. But, as Mollie discovers, the community, beyond comprehension, cannot perceive Butch's violence as originating from within. In order to maintain the image of itself as innocent and further prevent violence, Butch's violence is made to appear monstrous, something "'dangerous and bad'" (355), let loose upon the community from the outside. In that sense, not only is Butch sacrificed, but his story is shrouded in the myth of difference and, therefore, sacrificed from the history of Southern culture and segmented to the annals of criminal behavior. Like his great-grandfather, Butch Beauchamp comes to represent the "transfigured representation" of Southern violence (Girard).
After the execution of her grandson, Mollie requests the return of his body and makes Stevens participate in the funeral and burial arrangements. However, she recognizes that the fervent activity of the arrangements disguised an effort to quickly discard her grandson's body. Mollie, in turn, attempts to record the event of her grandson's death in a language that would be familiar to the community. That is, she offers up a Biblical transcription, an image of Butch surrounded by the community and at its center, Roth Edmonds: "'Roth Edmonds sold my Benjamin. Sold him in Egypt. Pharaoh got him—'" (353). Faulkner's choice of this Biblical reference recalls the title of his narrative effort, once again, to tell the story concealed behind the sacrificed body. The metaphorical language of Mollie's lamentation suggests the transference of Butch's violence from the family realm to the community where he has been taken possession of and delivered as the sacrificial representation of violence. When Faulkner has Mollie pattern her lamentation after this inscription of Jewish history, he refers to a precedent in all of Judeo-Christian history for the repetition of this tragedy in Southern culture. Yet, not even this language registers with Stevens or members of the community, and Mollie is forced to turn to the secular world. She requests that the newspaper editor print the circumstances surrounding Butch's death: "'I wants hit all in de paper. All of hit'" (365). Mollie's intent to
publicly expose the community to its legacy of violence ends where it begins. For only the novel's narrator notes the tragic vision of violence in the image of the "'slain wolf'":

>'the two cars containing the four people-- the high-headed erect white woman [Miss Worsham], the old Negress, the designated paladin of justice and truth and right, the Heidelberg Ph.D.-- in formal component complement to the Negro murderer's catafalque: the slain wolf.' (364)

What begins in violence ends in violence. In Ike's youth, he witnessed this entire configuration of this human violence in the ritual hunt of the bear, Old Ben. As Faulkner stated in a 1957 interview, "The Bear" is part of the novel, "held together by one family, the Negro and the white phase of the same family, same people" (4). "The Bear" is an allegorical re-enactment of all that takes place in the McCaslin family. Just as the yearly ritual hunt of Old Ben ultimately ends in his death, the ritual hunt of Tomey's Turl, a practice that kept him separate from his family, ends with the ritual sacrifice of his great-grandson. The violent death of Old Ben comes at the hands of hunter Boon Hogganbeck, who is consumed by madness and violence. As the hunter and hunted, also consumed by madness and violence, Butch Beauchamp exemplifies the sacrificial substitution in that he becomes the "'slain wolf'" replacing Old Ben. For Faulkner, these two events, the one allegorical and the one representing
the actual, illustrate what Girard calls, the "strange
deception underlying the sacrificial substitution"
(Violence 6). The first sacrifice allows the community
in their "madness" to view Butch not as one of them, but
as some beast, "dangerous and bad."

In a sense, Faulkner exposes an original state in
which the similarity between the "hunter" and the "beast"
exist even in the community's effort to eliminate that
similarity. Once again, it is the narrator and not Ike
who captures in the death of Old Ben an eternal moment
in human relations:

For an instant they almost resembled a piece
of statuary: the clinging dog, the bear, the
man stride its back, working and probing the
buried blade... then the bear surged erect,
raising with it the man and the dog too, and
turned and still carrying the man and the dog
it took two or three steps towards the woods
on its hind feet as a man would have walked
and crashed down. It didn't collapse, crumble.
It fell all of a piece, as a tree falls, so
that all three of them, man dog and bear, seemed
to bounce once. (Moses 231)

In the fury of the kill, they all resemble one another--
man dog and bear-- representing an encompassing image
of violence. For the bear, singled out as the sacrifice,
does not bring harmony. Sam Fathers dies instantly while
the hunter becomes mad. Even more disturbing, this passage
echoes the beginning of the novel, to the beginnings of
Southern culture. For where one cycle of the ritual hunt
ends, another begins with the advent of Jim Crow.

As Faulkner shows in "Delta Autumn," it is a new
era with a cycle of sacrifice that repeats the violence, that is, miscegenation and rejection, of the past. Until he encounters Roth's black mistress, Ike believed he maintained his distance from his "heritage." Now in his sixties, he is confronted with the issue of miscegenation and incest again. With her baby, the woman has come seeking "Uncle" Ike's advice. Not aware that the woman is black and related to the family, Ike hands her an envelop with money and tells her to take the baby and go; Roth would not be inclined to accept the responsibility of being a husband and father. But as the woman reveals her genealogy, Ike looks on at her and thinks:

'Maybe in a thousand or two thousand years in America... But not now! Not now!' He cried, not loud, in a voice of amazement, pity, and outrage: 'You're a nigger!' (344).

She was, in fact, the granddaughter of James Beauchamp, Tennie's Jim. The illusion of his own difference didn't "collapse," "crumple," but "fell all of a piece, as a tree falls" (231). As Vickery argues, Ike's "withdrawal" has been "an attempt to evade both the guilt of his forefathers and his own responsibility" (The Novels 133). His attempt to imitate Christ fails. His attempt to keep "himself aloof from close human ties" (133), results in his rejecting the woman and child of his blood, his own family. Looking down on him, the woman tells him,

'Old man,' she said, 'have you lived so long and forgotten so much that you don't remember
anything you ever knew or felt or even heard about love?' (Moses 346)

As Quentin Compson discovered earlier, the tragic drama played out in the South has nothing to do with love or human compassion (Absalom, Absalom! 322). Instead, the mythology of Southern violence guides Ike's decision to give the woman money and send her and her child away. Thus, he embodies both the past and the present unwritten history of the McCaslins. In the end, Ike supports the culture's foundational violence of sacrifice he has tried all his life to escape.

It is this story of foundational violence, that is, the repetition of violent sacrifice that Faulkner presents in his attempt to reconstruct the image of whiteness. This whiteness--an all consuming desire for violence--reveals within itself an obsession with blackness. Finally, Mollie Beauchamp resists the desire of the community to dispense with the dead body of her grandson. The victim's body is put on display. In the last image of Go Down, Moses, troubled by the disturbing image of the victim presented by its one witness, Mollie, District Attorney Gavin Stevens is forced to consider, briefly, this vision of blackness within his own mind:

'It doesn't matter to her now. Since it had to be and she couldn't stop it, and now that it's all over and done and finished, she doesn't care how he died. She just wants him home, but she wanted him to come home right. She wanted
that casket and those flowers and the hearse and she wanted to ride through town behind it in a car.' (Moses 365)

The victim comes "'home right'" (365), as a haunting memory "they are not to lose... in whatever peaceful valleys, beside whatever placid and reassuring streams of old age" (Light in August 440). Mollie put it there, and Faulkner, making sure the hidden violence of sacrifice is fully exposed to the reader of his work, responds to Mollie Beauchamp's pleas, "'Is you gonter put hit in de paper. I wants hit all in de paper. All of hit'" (Moses 365).
NOTES

1 Some of the stories in Go Down, Moses have their origins in stories William Faulkner heard and began to write as early as 1914. According to Joseph Blotner, in Faulkner: A Biography (New York: Vintage Books, 1971), one of the stories Faulkner heard was about "Old Reel Foot" who "was both secure and deadly in his domain" (48-49). For the most part, Blotner states, Faulkner, in 1940, considered his collection of "negro stories" connected with the story of Old Reel Foot and the South (417-422).

2 The reference to a "nigger on a mule" recalls the New Southerner, Quentin Compson's search in The Sound and the Fury for an image of lost innocence.

3 See René Girard's Violence and the Sacred trans. Patrick Gregory (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972) for further discussion on how "enemy brothers... epitomize the entire" sacrificial crisis (63-64).
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