

The Locus of Identity:
Death, Genealogy, and History in William Faulkner's Works

Kayoko Shimanuki

To my father, mother, and brother

Oxford, Mississippi

December 1987 – July 1991

Contents

Introduction		1
I.	Beginning: <i>The Sound and the Fury</i>	
Chapter 1	A River Runs Through Him: Quentin's Suicide	11
Chapter 2	Seeing Through the Other: Quentin's Return	20
II.	Middle: Short Stories	
Chapter 3	One More Ditch to Cross: Quentin's Story about Nancy's Fate in "That Evening Sun"	32
Chapter 4	A Reconsideration of the Color Line: Quentin's Awareness of Sam Fathers' Blackness in "A Justice"	43
III.	End: <i>Absalom, Absalom!</i>	
Chapter 5	From Mother's Instrument to Father's Abandoned Son: A Story of Charles Bon	53
Chapter 6	In Search for Identity: A Story of Canadian Shreve	66
Chapter 7	A Story for Future Generations: The Legacy that Remains after Quentin's Death	77
IV.	Afterward: The Compson Appendix	
Chapter 8	The Impact of Quentin's Death on Caddy: Re-reading <i>The Sound and the Fury</i>	91
Conclusion		100
Notes		103
Works Cited		110

Introduction

In New Orleans, 1925, Sherwood Anderson suggested to William Faulkner that he explore the fictional possibilities of the place and people that he knew best. Anderson explained the following:

You have to have somewhere to start from: then you begin to learn. . . . It dont matter where it was, just so you remember it and aint ashamed of it. Because one place to start from is just as important as any other. You're a country boy; all you know is that little patch up there in Mississippi where you started from. But that's all right too. It's America too; pull it out, as little and unknown as it is, and the whole thing will collapse, like when you prize a brick out of a wall. (*ESPL* 8)

Faulkner was a native Mississippian; he was born in New Albany in 1897 and spent most of his life in Oxford until his death in 1962. With his third novel, *Sartoris* (published posthumously in full length as *Flags in the Dust* in 1973), he followed Anderson's advice and began to develop the fictional world based on his "own little postage stamp of native soil" (*LG* 255). In this process, his hometown, Oxford, became the basic model for Jefferson, and Lafayette County was transformed into Yoknapatawpha County. In his 1956 *Paris Review* interview, Faulkner described his works as "sublimating the actual into the apocryphal," demonstrating that he had "created a cosmos of [his] own" (*LG* 255). This well-known quote indicates that Faulkner incorporated special meanings into the settings, which became the basis of his identity as a Mississippian.

Settings, such as the time, place, physical characteristics of the surroundings, and social circumstances, provide essential information about a story's background and enable readers to better imagine how a story unfolds by relating the necessary physical details of each scene. Of all these settings, place is particularly important for creating a mental picture of a literary work. As such, the definition of setting used in the field of human geography is helpful in examining the meaning of place in Faulkner's works. "'Space' is more abstract than 'place,'" says Yi-Fu Tuan, and "[w]hat begins as undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value" (*Space* 6). In other words, the space changes into a place when one puts meaning and experience into it and becomes attached to it.

Another geographer, John Agnew, points out three basic aspects of place: locale, location, and sense of place. The "locale" is the informal or institutional "settings in which social relations are constituted." It is the actual form of place within which people conduct their lives. Agnew defines the "location" as "the geographical area encompassing the settings for social interaction as defined by social and economic processes operating at a wider scale." It can be simply reworded as "where." While these two kinds of places demonstrate setting's material sides, the third one, "sense of place," has a different connotation. According to Agnew, sense of place signifies "the local 'structure of feeling'" (28). It is the personal and emotional

attachment people have to a place, which involves a way of looking at and evaluating the world they engage in.

Some critics have made a comparison between Faulkner's "actual" and "apocryphal" worlds and have added a deeper understanding of locales and locations in his works. One of the earliest critics, Elizabeth M. Kerr, reconsiders the significance of the actual places, which "have been limited to footnotes," and introduces the "comprehensive view of Yoknapatawpha" by examining "its geographical, historical, and social prototype" (*Little Postage Stamp* 1, 2). There is also Calvin S. Brown, who was born and raised in Oxford and was acquainted with the Falkners.¹ While admitting the influences of Ripley and New Albany, Brown stresses the resemblance between Jefferson and Oxford and states that "the vast majority of [Faulkner's] local references and descriptions apply to Oxford and its environs" (224). According to Charles S. Aiken, Faulkner transformed the "actual" into "apocryphal" by changing the names, deleting the details, transferring the locations, and mixing fabrication with reality (26). And, similar to Aiken's geographical approach, Gabriele Gutting meticulously verifies the geographical and historical characteristics of Yoknapatawpha from the actual places and source. Her conclusion that Faulkner's "fictional domain . . . is characterized by a close interconnectedness of space, time, and identity" (278) reveals how important each setting is for story development in Faulkner's works.

There has been a long debate regarding whether Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha represents the entire South.² Aiken states that, contrary to most Faulkner critics who regard Yoknapatawpha as a miniature of the South, "geographically Yoknapatawpha is a microcosm within the South rather than a microcosm of the South" (55). Aiken, however, adds that "[w]hen we accept Faulkner's principal objective to be the telling of the universal, mutual experience of the human heart, Yoknapatawpha County becomes more than Lafayette County, Mississippi, or the South" (55). Faulkner did not just intend to record the climate of the South; his works reveal that each place plays an important role in defining characters' personalities and circumstances.

The more sense of place is recognizable, the more people understand their own identity. Of all the critics, Gutting in particular pays close attention to the significance of sense of place, identifying it as "an element of heritage and inspiration to the writer which is particularly identifiable in Southern literature" (8). According to Gutting, sense of place includes not only physical aspects but also the historical, social, emotional, and intellectual background. She argues that "the Southern microcosm of Yoknapatawpha is always more than mere scenery or backdrop setting" (11). Her study demonstrates that the importance of place lies in its power to evoke one's awareness of his/her own value in society.

Indeed, one of Faulkner's greatest achievements in the field of literature is that he created an imaginary Southern world and depicted local people struggling with the issues of racial tension, religious fanaticism, family ruin, and the burden of the past. For Don H. Doyle, "Faulkner's intuitive knowledge" is more important than "his 'factual' accuracy." Doyle states that Faulkner "reveals layers of historical experience historians can never document," which include "not only the action but also the thoughts and unconscious feelings that compelled the action" (14). As some chapters of this dissertation reveal, there are inconsistencies between the

historical evidence and the works' description—there are even discrepancies within the Yoknapatawpha Saga. However, Faulkner attempted to repeatedly write about the “human heart” in his stories (*FU* 10), which transcends the regional limit. In his later years, Faulkner stated that his homeland was a tool for his stories: “I was using what I knew best, which was the locale where I was born and had lived most of my life. That was just like the carpenter building the fence—he uses the nearest hammer” (*FU* 3).

It may be true that, essentially, “people are [not] that different” (*FU* 87) as Faulkner claimed. However, an environment surely affects the consequence of its inhabitant's life. As E. Relph states, “events and actions are significant only in the context of certain places, and are coloured and influenced by the character of those places even as they contribute to that character” (42). Just as W. J. Cash's *The Mind of the South* has “become part of the American intellectual landscape” of the South (Wyatt-Brown vii), Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha Saga has presented one of the literary archetypes of Southerners and their way of living.

Obviously, Faulkner was keenly aware that his Yoknapatawpha was part of the real South. In *Absalom, Absalom!*, Quentin Compson tells the story of Thomas Sutpen in response to Shreve McCannon's request: “*Tell about the South. What's it like there. What do they do there. Why do they live there. Why do they live at all*” (142). Although some critics raise an objection to Sutpen's symbolical position as a Southern planter,³ Sutpen takes up his residence, Sutpen's Hundred, in Yoknapatawpha and tries to establish his dynasty based on Southern white-male ethics. In the novel, Faulkner even created a map of Jefferson, Yoknapatawpha, as part of Mississippi, and called himself its “sole owner and proprietor” (315). The map includes the size and population of the county as well as the explanations of the events that have taken place in his other works. The meticulous details included on the map demonstrate Faulkner's strong attachment to his Yoknapatawpha world and his recognition that it forms a part of the Deep South in Mississippi.

In spite of the strong presence of Yoknapatawpha, Faulkner used other locations in his Yoknapatawpha works. In *The Sound and the Fury*, for instance, Boston and Cambridge in Massachusetts appear as the important settings for Quentin's suicide. *Absalom, Absalom!* is much more international; it includes Jefferson, the Appalachian area (today's West Virginia), New Orleans, and Haiti. In both novels, Canadian Shreve appears as Quentin's close friend and roommate at Harvard. As discussed in chapters 1, 5, 6, and 8, these non-Yoknapatawpha places are not only contrasted with those of the Deep South but also carry their own meaning and purpose in the story. Charles Bon, who was born in Haiti and grew up in New Orleans, and Shreve can juxtapose their values with those of the Southerners and enhance their selfhood. (Bon fails, but Shreve succeeds in doing so.) In her later life, Caddy might have tried to open up a new field of activity in Europe to break off her connection with the South, just as Quentin tried to do at Harvard just before his death.

Much like his characters, Faulkner stayed in various places throughout his life. Although he spent most of his life in Oxford, Mississippi, in 1918, he visited New Haven, Connecticut and stayed in Toronto, Canada. In 1921, he went to New York City and worked at the bookstore of Elizabeth Prall, the future wife of Sherwood Anderson. Like other writers of the

“Lost Generation,” including Ernest Hemingway and F. Scott Fitzgerald, his six-month trip to France in 1925 was a meaningful experience for his later career. Additionally, he frequented New Orleans off and on from 1924 to 1926, Hollywood from 1932 to 1954, and Charlottesville, Virginia, from 1957 to 1960. As the winner of the Nobel Prize in 1949, he visited various places overseas, including Japan in 1955, and gave lectures. Regardless of whether he enjoyed these travels, such as his stay in Hollywood, the places he visited must have affected his way of thinking toward his homeland and reconfirmed himself as a Mississippian.

One’s attachment to a certain place is closely related to the issues of identity and individuality. Relph relates the sense of belonging to the meaning of place and explains its connection with identity as follows:

The essence of place lies in the largely unselfconscious intentionality that defines places as profound centres of human existence. There is for virtually everyone a deep association with and consciousness of the places where we were born and grew up, where we live now, or where we have had particularly moving experiences. This association seems to constitute a vital source of both individual and cultural identity and security, a point of departure from which we orient ourselves in the world. (43)

According to Relph, place reflects one’s rootedness and authenticity and correspondingly proves his/her presence in the world. It also enables us to explain the “directly experienced phenomena of the lived-world” (Relph 141), which can increase the sense of affinity and the degree of commitment to the place. The connection between the actual place and the sense of rootedness is inseparable in discussing the identity issues.

However, the closeness to a particular place does not always create a positive effect. As many chapters reveal, the interrelations between places and people can induce their feelings of discomfort, rootlessness, and dissatisfaction, which may culminate in rejecting the historical connection with their community, or being caught in their identity crisis. These people’s negative responses to their native land, however, come not only from their abhorrence but also from their distorted emotions of love and hate. As Faulkner stated in his retrospective essay “Mississippi,”

[l]oving all of it even while he had to hate some of it because he knows now that you dont love because: you love despite; not for the virtues, but despite the faults. (*ESPL* 42-43)

Faulkner’s mixed feelings toward Mississippi had inevitably become one of his motivations to write; his works enabled him to rethink the meaning of his existence in his hometown. Chapter 2 deals with Faulkner’s contrapuntal writing and suggests his ambivalence toward Mississippi through the contradictory attitudes of Quentin and Jason. Faulkner’s Yoknapatawpha Saga indicates both an adherence to a certain place and a fluctuation of characters’ identities.

It is difficult to provide a clear, concise definition of identity. According to Peter Gleason, the word derives from “the Latin *idem et idem* (the same and the same)” (qtd. in Wetherell 5).

The psychoanalyst Erik H. Erikson defines identity as “a personal coherence, manifested as an authentic and stable self” and discusses its development in one’s life-cycle. According to Erikson, “a nourishing sense of identity and personal continuity was not automatic; it was a struggle, a task and a never completed project” (Wetherell 6). In this regard, he pays close attention to the condition of the “crisis.” Although he realizes that the words “identity” and “identity crisis” have become a cliché and appear in “ritualized usage” in *Identity: Youth and Crisis*, he argues that the latter term is now considered to “[designate] a necessary turning point, a crucial moment, when development must move one way or another, marshaling resources of growth, recovery, and further differentiation” (16). Even today, the identity crisis is still important in developing one’s selfhood.

Furthermore, it is when identity is in danger that people recognize it as “a felt sense of personal place, continuity and location” and “accounts of ‘who one is’ which can be assembled and used as a guide to what should be done next” (Wetherell 3). Basically, identity studies deal with what Avatar Brah describes as “name and looks” (Wetherell 3), but such subjective, personal approaches to identity have nowadays expanded their research areas into the levels of society and nation. As Erikson points out, “[a] sense of community, a realistic understanding of one’s place in culture and society and what one shared with others” are considered highly valuable for establishing one’s identity (Wetherell 6). Erikson’s argument that “identity formation . . . is really a *generational issue*” (*Identity* 29, italics original) also suggests that the subject of identity is concerned with not only spatial connection but also temporal continuity. Just as history is handed down from generation to generation (especially history of the Civil War in the South), the genealogical/familial relationship to the homeland weighs heavily upon each character in Faulkner’s works. Identity refers to the sameness within oneself and the sameness shared with others through the sense of place that evokes certain events, genealogy, and history.

According to Erikson, in a person’s life cycle, the periods of adolescence and early adulthood are of particular importance concerning the identity crisis. In this regard, this dissertation will concentrate on Faulkner’s works related to Quentin Compson, who is one of the most important protagonists in the Yoknapatawpha world. Considering Quentin as a “semi-autobiographical figure” for Faulkner, Michael Millgate discusses that Quentin is “at one stage intended to function as the essential recording figure” and suggests that Faulkner “intended Quentin to fill some structural and indeed specifically regional role” as “a focal point—though not necessarily the only one” (41, 42). It is undeniable that Quentin holds a special place in Faulkner’s mind in that he plays a pivotal role in *The Sound and the Fury*, *Absalom, Absalom!*, “That Evening Sun,” “A Justice,” “Lion,” and “Appendix: Compsons: 1699-1945.”⁴

A controversial issue among Faulkner critics is whether to consider these works as parts of the Compson story or to treat them as individual works. One of the biggest problems lies in Quentin’s re-emergence after his suicide in *The Sound and the Fury*. As Doreen Fowler notes, “It seems as if Faulkner elected to revoke Quentin’s suicide or that, in Faulkner’s mind,

Quentin was not dead and that Quentin's telling changes Quentin as well as Faulkner" (*Postmodernism* 108). In his later years, Faulkner said, "I don't have any trouble at all going back to pick up [a character]. . . . These people I figure belong to me and I have the right to move them about in time when I need them" (*FU* 78, 79). However, as discussed in chapters 3, 4, and 8, many discrepancies among Quentin-related works exist—especially in regard to his age—which have perplexed readers. Because of this, there are some critics, such as Hans H. Skei, who treat each work autonomously as much as possible (Skei 179-80). However, the significance of these works increases, owing to Faulkner's re-using of Quentin as a protagonist and narrator after his suicide. If we consider these novels and short stories as a part of a series, it could shed more light on the identity issues. Accordingly, it is worthwhile to focus on Quentin-related works and explore the locus of each character's identity in terms of death, genealogy, and history.

First of all, it is important to always remember the fact that Quentin committed suicide in Massachusetts—not in the South. Faulkner once explained Quentin's mixed feelings toward the South in *Absalom, Absalom!*, stating, "It's incidentally the story of Quentin Compson's hatred of the bad qualities in the country he loves" (*FU* 71). This comment is in reference to Quentin's attempt to leave his native land as a Harvard student and to his intention of drowning himself in the Charles River in Massachusetts. Although the reason for avoiding his homeland as the location of his suicide is open to debate, it is unlikely that his suicide is the consequence of his thoughtless behavior. This dissertation begins with an emphasis on Quentin's firm resolution to end his life outside Mississippi and examines his sense of rootlessness and his effort to overcome the identity crisis through death.

Quentin's death in the very first book in which he appeared has become an unforgettable episode because of his reappearance in Faulkner's other works. While Estella Schoenberg's main interest lies in Quentin's "double function as protagonist and narrator in *Absalom, Absalom!*," she places a special emphasis on his suicide in *The Sound and the Fury*. Schoenberg offers this explanation:

[I]t is Quentin the suicide Faulkner's readers remember. That Quentin, defined by his death, appears only in the two novels to which his death is as central as it is to all the fictions of Yoknapatawpha and all the fictions of the American South. (28)

In *Absalom, Absalom!*, it is unclear whether Quentin's death is a suicide. However, his early death in Massachusetts in 1910 coincides with the chronology of *The Sound and the Fury*, and considering his health (if not mental) condition, seems strange if it is a natural death. Schoenberg often comes to a hasty conclusion by developing her argument as if the two novels were combined into one (especially when she mixes up the chronologies of the two novels that do not fit completely). Still, it is suggestive that the strong presence of Quentin presupposes his suicidal death. Quentin's identity can be examined not only from his ambivalent feelings toward the South, which includes his family, but also from his obsession with death. Chapter 1 discusses that his actual suicide contributes to the formation of his identity.

Second, Quentin's identity can be found in the Compson genealogy, which embodies the transition of Southern history from antebellum to postbellum periods. In this regard, John T. Irwin's psychoanalytic study of *The Sound and the Fury* and *Absalom, Absalom!*, which draws on Sigmund Freud's concepts of "the Oedipus complex, the death instinct, and the repetition compulsion" (4), provides supporting evidence for this dissertation. Discussing Quentin's suicide in the context of Christianity, Irwin focuses on two major elements that are related to genealogy: "the Oedipal triangle (father, mother, son) and the three generations of patrilinearity (grandfather, father, son, or father, son, grandson)" (125). These factors are noteworthy because they dictate Quentin's suicide and identity through genealogy. As chapters 7 and 8 succinctly show, the Compsons are highly conscious of their genealogy and cannot escape its influence. When they become sensitive to their familial roots, they either reject or engage in the continuation of such tradition. Chapters 4, 5, 7, and 8 deal with the genealogical/familial issues concerning three generations, parent-child, and brother-sister and examine their significance in relation to each character's identity.

Third, historical attachment to the native land enables Quentin to reconfirm his identity. As John W. Hunt notes, Quentin is the first major character-narrator who scrupulously tells the story of Yoknapatawpha County (368). His roles as a narrator and listener are indispensable in Yoknapatawpha's formation and development. Hunt adds that "Quentin's special task had been to give a moral and historical account of Yoknapatawpha County with the sensibility of a young and vulnerable aristocrat who suffers from the diminishment of meaning in his time" (375). His awareness that he is a Harvard student from Mississippi provides a distorted sense of reality that cannot be fulfilled. There is little doubt that Quentin is suffering from a serious identity crisis and is trying to cope with it. Together with the genealogical issues, a historical approach to Quentin's identity addresses the fundamental reason for his existence. All chapters more or less demonstrate that history is not unrelated to one's position in society and that one must reconsider his/her identity, which has been uncertain and often complex.

In the meantime, Quentin is not the only character who appears as the subject of this dissertation; there are also other characters who provide valuable information on identity problems. In fact, all of the chapters, with the exception of chapters 1 and 7, involve characters and narrators other than Quentin and reveal supplementary aspects of the identity issues that he cannot fully disclose. As Faulkner once said, "[E]very time any character gets into a book, no matter how minor, he's actually telling his biography—that's all anyone ever does, he tells his own biography, talking about himself, in a thousand different terms, but himself" (*FU* 275). In other words, the act of retelling characters' stories refers to the search for their identity, which is largely influenced by their sense of place, family relationships, and history.

As previously stated, this dissertation focuses on Quentin-related works. For structure purposes, it is divided into four parts and eight chapters.

Chapter 1 focuses on the second section of *The Sound and the Fury* and examines the meaning of Quentin's suicide in relation to the location of his suicide, the Charles River. I will investigate the possible location for Quentin's suicide and discuss the geographical dimension of the meandering river, which signifies his feelings of stagnation and rootlessness regarding

the South. I will also make a comparison between the flows of the river and time and point out that both of them remind Quentin of Mr. Compson. Quentin's drowning can be understood as an act of defiance to his father's nihilistic values and attitude; in fact, it is through the act of suicide that he tries to recover his identity.

Chapter 2 verifies the strong presence of the dead Quentin in the fourth section of *The Sound and the Fury*. The fourth-section narrator takes advantage of the objective narrative of the first-section narrator, Benjy, while showing emotional attachment to the second-section narrator, Quentin, and the third-section narrator, Jason. The fourth section, particularly Dilsey's story, reveals that this section's narrator internalizes Quentin's values, and predicts that his presence continues to exist in Faulkner's later works. This section reconfirms that the fourth-section narrator, "Faulkner," still cares for Quentin and does not hesitate to recover his identity in another narrator's mind.

In chapter 3, I will explore the reason why Quentin is chosen as the narrator of "That Evening Sun." The age Faulkner gave him in this story, twenty-four, has long puzzled critics and readers, since a person of the same name commits suicide when he is around twenty years old in *The Sound and the Fury*. I will contend that Faulkner purposefully set Quentin's age at twenty-four to imply that Nancy, a black washerwoman, met the same fate as Quentin. Although Nancy's voice and feeling—her identity—are mostly neglected in the short story, Quentin eventually understands her difficult situation in the South and overlaps his position with hers.

Although "A Justice" primarily focuses on Sam Fathers' relationship with the Choctaws, chapter 4 reexamines his blackness, which is derived from his black slave mother. In the end, Quentin becomes aware of racial discrimination based on the "one-drop rule" in the South, to which even Sam is no exception. Sam's genealogical explanation ironically results in his emphasizing his blackness. Quentin's retrogressive commentary in the last section signifies his inability to face the burden of the South until his death. His obsession with death would become a trigger for reconfirming his identity as a Southern white man.

Chapters 5 through 7 deal with *Absalom, Absalom!* While the focus of chapter 5 is Charles Bon, it also includes the analysis of the Voodoo trickster Legba, who shares sexual, racial, and spatial ambiguities with Bon. Additionally, I will examine the histories of Haiti and New Orleans and infer that Bon's role as a trickster comes from his mother. In the end, the parent-child relationship becomes the central issue in Bon's story. The contrast between being his mother's instrument and being his father's abandoned son, in addition to the issue of his mixed-race identity, eventually produces a sharp image of Bon as a mysterious and ill-fated figure in the South.

Chapter 6 is about Shreve McCannon, who reconstructs the Sutpen story with Quentin in their Harvard University dormitory room. Although Shreve plays an important role in compensating the missing links of the Sutpen story and giving it coherence in the novel, critics have considered him as a mere foreigner with a detached demeanor. If we reconsider Shreve's role as a narrator in the historical context of Canada, however, he comes across as being more than an outsider. Through the reconstruction of the Sutpen story, Shreve deepens his

understanding of the South and revalidates his own Canadian identity.

In chapter 7, I will argue that Quentin makes the decision to commit suicide when he meets Sutpen's son, Henry, at Sutpen's mansion. Because they share similar characteristics and life experiences, Quentin intuitively associates his future self with the dying Henry and decides to leave the Sutpen story, or the legacy of the South, as his will to Shreve. Quentin has selected as his successor someone who is completely exempt from the historical and moral burden of the South's roots in slavery and yet can feel close to and identify with the Sutpen story. Shreve's entry, located at the very end of the genealogy, shows that he has become a part of the Sutpen story as its last successor.

"Appendix: Compsons: 1699-1945" is neither the introduction nor the summary of *The Sound and the Fury*; rather, it is structured as the Compson genealogy. Instead of examining Quentin's entry in the Appendix, chapter 8 pays attention to the first half of Caddy's account and reconsiders her inner feelings toward Quentin and the impact of his death later in her life. Her sense of loss caused by his death becomes one of the incentives for her to love her daughter, Miss Quentin, who inherited her uncle's name. Caddy's memory of beloved Quentin is reinforced when she thinks of Miss Quentin. The Appendix exhibits the influence of genealogy on each character's identity and fate.

Exploring his own identity as a Mississippian, Faulkner "created a cosmos of [his] own" (LG 255) with the people who endure their situation and cope with the world they live in. The examination of Quentin's sense of place especially explains that his identity is deeply rooted in and intertwined with the problems based on his attachment to a certain place. This would be the primary reason why Faulkner made a bold decision to re-use the dead Quentin in subsequent works. At the same time, Quentin is not the only person who struggles with the identity issues; other characters also face their identity crisis and try to overcome such difficulties. The brief summaries of each chapter reveal that the search for identity does not always result in a happy ending, which is best represented in Quentin's suicide. Yet, it is Faulkner's often-severe treatment of the characters that ultimately makes his works "real," even though they are set in fictional, mythical Yoknapatawpha.

I. Beginning: *The Sound and the Fury*

Chapter 1

A River Runs Through Him: Quentin's Suicide

In the second section ("June Second, 1910.") of *The Sound and the Fury*, readers are led to believe that Quentin commits suicide by drowning himself in the Charles River in Massachusetts. He goes back and forth in time (the past and the present) as well as in place (Mississippi and Massachusetts) throughout the section and eventually sets off for the bridge where he has determined to kill himself. As Noel Polk succinctly points out, Quentin "is trying to shape his memory into an acceptable version of his life that will both explain his present misery and justify his decision to commit suicide" (150). Quentin indeed makes careful preparations for drowning himself in the Charles River. The conversation between Quentin and his father, which had taken place in Mississippi the last summer ("I said, You can shirk all things and he said, Ah can you" [80]), indicates that he has been thinking of killing himself for some time. According to Arthur Geffen, Quentin commits suicide in an orderly manner by carefully setting the date of his suicide on the day prior to the Southern Memorial Day (247). Quentin also develops concrete plans to put an end to his "acceptable version of his life" by buying the flat iron weights to immerse himself under water and writing suicide notes to his father and his Harvard roommate Shreve MacKenzie. It is, therefore, likely that Quentin, who dwells in the specific time and means of his suicide, has carefully selected the place of his suicide when he wanders around greater Boston.

While the symbolic nature and importance of water are suggested in Quentin's suicide, few critics have paid close attention to the fact that he commits suicide in the Charles River. This chapter examines how the river's shape and flow, along with its function as a border between Cambridge and other greater Boston areas, reflect Quentin's own mindset and his final choice of suicide. His suicide is a way of showing his presence in the world and a result of his search for identity, which will be engraved in other people's memory.

1. Characteristics of the Charles River

The discussion of Quentin's suicide is not new if we take the river just as a body of water. The relationship between water and suicide in the second section of the novel has been thoroughly discussed by critics such as John T. Irwin, who associates suicide with "a symbolic incest (a return to the waters of birth, to the womb)" (124), and André Bleikasten, who notes that "[w]ater . . . is in Faulkner a trope of desire and drowning a recurrent metaphor for the lures and perils of sex" (*Ink* 90). Since the muddy drawers that Quentin's sister Caddy wears and the image of her lying in the branch of the river on the Compson's premises imply her promiscuity as well as cleansing and purifying, "[Quentin's] memories [that] evolve out of scenes of trauma, all centered in his loss of Caddy" (Polk 150), have been understood to be transformed into his desire for death. Bleikasten further argues that for Quentin, who wishes to escape from his own narcissism, drowning means "a reentry into the waters of death/birth, a

return of self to self, blotting out all otherness and erasing all difference” (*Ink* 103). Michael Millgate and Olga Vickery share a similar understanding with Bleikasten that water suggests “cleansing, redemption, peace and death” (Millgate 86) and that “[w]hatever suggestion of purification may be present, water is primarily a symbol of oblivion for Quentin” (Vickery 42). Instead of discussing the images of water as a whole, the first half of this chapter focuses specifically on the characteristics of the Charles River that would explain the sequence of Quentin’s wanderings and the choice of his suicide place.

Although Quentin drowns himself in the Charles River, Faulkner names Cambridge as Quentin’s suicide place both in the Genealogy of *Absalom, Absalom!* and the Appendix of *The Sound and the Fury*.¹ Since Quentin always identifies himself and behaves as a Harvard student when he wanders around greater Boston, it may at first seem reasonable to consider Cambridge as his final destination. When he recollects the Mississippi days in a chaotic mental condition and confuses himself with his father and Caddy (“I can be dead in Harvard Caddy said in the caverns and the grottoes of the sea tumbling peacefully to the wavering tides because Harvard is such a fine sound forty acres is no high price for a fine sound” [174]), it sounds as if he will soon end his life at Harvard instead of drowning himself in the Charles River.

Contrary to the image he has of himself dying in Cambridge, Quentin’s suicide place is the Charles River that lies between Cambridge and other greater Boston areas. The in-between space of the river that physically separates two cities reflects Quentin’s feeling of being out of place, both in New England and Mississippi.² On his last day, he randomly walks around and cannot settle down anywhere, including intellectual Cambridge, urban downtown Boston, and the suburbs. His unsettledness can also be found in his appearance. Three boys whom Quentin meets in greater Boston, for instance, at first consider him as “a Canadian” and his voice as that of “a colored man” (120) even though he dresses “with all that primping” (“They’ll think you go to Harvard” [82]). His restlessness contributes to his uncomfortable feeling toward his homeland Mississippi where he feels out of place mainly due to a conflict with his father, a tenuous connection with his mother, and his unease about Caddy’s unintended pregnancy and marriage. In spite of his Harvard identity and his awareness as a Southerner, he does not seem to fit in anywhere. The ambiguous location of the Charles River demonstrates the precarious position Quentin occupies both in New England and the South.

Additionally, the meaning of the river’s original name and its shape sheds light on Quentin’s state of mind and helps to account for the choice of his suicide place. The present name of the Charles River derives from Charles I of England and first appears on a New England map that John Smith created in 1616 (Krieger 82). Captain Smith initially named the river the “Massachusetts” after the Native Americans of the Massachusetts tribes who lived around Massachusetts Bay, but Charles I of England (at that time Prince of Scotland) subsequently ordered Captain Smith to change the name to the Charles (Krieger 82, 159). Meanwhile, the Native Americans had several names, including “*Mi-sha-um*,” “*Quinobequin*,” and “*Norombegue*,” for the Charles River before Captain Smith put down the river’s name as the River Charles on his map (Horsford 18-19). Harvard University Librarian T. W. Harris

once pointed out, however, that the word “*Quinobequin*” (“*Quinnebequi*” or “*Quinebequy*”) indicates a place where the flow of the river is disrupted for a long time (“*Quinne*” means “long,” and “*bequi*” means “stagnation”) (Horsford 5, 18). “*Quinobequin*,” according to Harris, is, therefore, not necessarily an official name of this river (Horsford 18). The Native Americans of the Massachusetts tribes called any place where they found the flow of a river extensively disrupted “*Quinobequin*.” In this case, the Native Americans’ use of the name “*Quinobequin*” suggests that the river’s meandering shape is one of its most distinctive features.

There is no evidence that Faulkner visited Boston and Cambridge before the publication of the novel or that he conducted research before writing it.³ However, Faulkner obviously had some understanding of the geographical situation of the Cambridge and Boston areas since he uses actual place names, such as “the Square” (Harvard Square) (82) and “Parker’s” (Parker House Hotel) (83). At the same time, Faulkner is on very firm ground when the location is Mississippi. According to Don H. Doyle, Faulkner consulted Cyrus Byington’s *A Dictionary of the Choctaw Language* (1915), “the best available source on the Chickasaw [and Choctaw] language during Faulkner’s time,” to learn about the Native American words and geographical names, including “Yoknapatawpha” (25).⁴ This shows that Faulkner was generally not indifferent to the origins and characteristics of the rivers and lands that appear in his works, which could also be said to include non-Yoknapatawpha places.

Faulkner seems to take advantage of the long and meandering course of the Charles River to signify Quentin’s emotional turmoil and his extensive wanderings in greater Boston. The distance from the source of the Charles in Hopkinton to the mouth of the river in the Boston Harbor is only twenty-five miles, but the river runs a meandering course of about eighty miles between the two (Haglund 2). Because of the river’s snakelike shape and the dams built across it, it is extremely slow, flowing only 370 cubic feet per second, and the color of its water is brownish green caused by stagnation (Haglund 493). On the day of his suicide, Quentin approaches and leaves the river and then finds an unpopular, quiet bridge somewhere southwest of greater Boston, which “was of gray stone, lichened, dappled with slow moisture where the fungus crept” (115), giving it a stagnant and gloomy atmosphere.⁵ Although the actual place of Quentin’s destination is hardly evident in the novel, it is not arbitrarily-chosen; rather, he deliberately selects a place for his suicide that reflects his dead-end mentality and wanderings.

Quentin is also careful enough to check the quality of water to determine whether it satisfies his needs for his suicide place. Unlike the muddy, brownish green water of the actual Charles River, the water near the bridge is “clear and still” (115) enough to “see down for a long way, but not as far as the bottom” (116). Trying to watch the bottom of the river at the bridge after hiding the flat iron weights, Quentin imagines himself in an incestuous relationship with Caddy and in a situation where the two of them are in hell: “*If it could just be a hell beyond that: the clean flame the two of us more than dead. Then you will have only me then only me then the two of us amid the pointing and the horror beyond the clean flame*” (116). This passage alludes to the illicit love story of Paolo and Francesca in the Dante’s *The Divine*

Comedy (Kerr, *Keystone* 14; Ross and Polk 103), in which bodies of water play an important role as a boundary among different worlds. Indeed, one of the reasons that Quentin decides to drown himself in the Charles River may be that it symbolizes the spiritual boundary between this life and the afterlife. The phrase “crossing a river” can be a psychological metaphor for both death and liberation, and the river figuratively symbolizes a boundary that a person needs to overcome during life in being forcefully displaced. There are several rivers and bodies of water that Dante encounters as he crosses into Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven, and Quentin presumes that he needs to go beyond the Charles River, like Dante crossing the Acheron River, in order to enter hell. Quentin, thus, looks for a place where he can see through the water and evoke the image of Caddy.

It is difficult to imagine, however, that Quentin believes he can permanently submerge himself in water with two small flat iron weights that weigh six pounds each. Even though his imagination of being in hell with Caddy attracts him to the bottom of the river, what he tries to immerse at the bottom of the river is his own shadow. Throughout the second section, Quentin endeavors to detach from and eliminate his shadow, or his dark double, by immersing it under water, trampling it under foot, and burying it in other shadows. His attempts to eradicate the presence of his shadow, in turn, reveal his desire to commit suicide if taken into account with the fact that the dead in *The Divine Comedy* no longer have their shadows (only Dante does, which signifies his being alive). Contrary to Vickery’s explanation that “death by water is Quentin’s way of reconciling his two worlds, of merging shadow and reality and tempering their conflict” (42), he plans to commit suicide by immersing himself deep under water so that he can liberate his body from his shadow that reflects the stagnant condition of his life.

Quentin finds that drowning himself in the Charles River is one of the most effective ways to separate his shadow from himself. When he looks down at the river from the bridge just above the boathouse on the morning of his final day, he sees his shadow lying on the surface of the Charles River. He then visualizes his suicide for the first time in the second section by invoking the old black tradition in Mississippi:

[M]y shadow leaning flat upon the water, so easily had I tricked it that would not quit me. At least fifty feet it was, and if I only had something to blot it into the water, holding it until it was drowned, the shadow of the package like two shoes wrapped up lying on the water. Niggers say a drowned man’s shadow was watching for him in the water all the time. It twinkled and glinted, like breathing, the float slow like breathing too, and debris half submerged, healing out to the sea and the caverns and the grottoes of the sea. (90)

While wishing to go to hell beyond the Charles River with Caddy, Quentin attempts to move toward “the caverns and the grottoes of the sea” by himself. Quentin’s later allusion to Archimedes’ principle of buoyancy (“The displacement of water is equal to the something of something” [90]) (Ross and Polk 61-62) further implies that his interest lies more in the possibility of floating than drowning, since he repeatedly emphasizes that he will not stay at the bottom of the river for good but will eventually flow into “the caverns and the grottoes of

the sea” (90, 112, 174). After putting his shadow behind him, Quentin goes down the Charles River while restoring his flesh and blood. His “healing out to the sea” suggests that he does not merely go with the river’s flow but travels down the river that flows like the meandering course of his life.

2. Flow of the Charles River

Given that Quentin’s suicide is only implied in the text, his mystic and ideal vision of “the caverns and the grottoes of the sea” is a product of his imagination. Taking into account the meandering shape and stagnation of the Charles River, Quentin would presumably be found as a drowned body, disfigured and swollen, somewhere along the river (probably found close to the bridge where he jumped in), and his shadow would not leave him. His “murmuring bones” (80) deep under water will eventually be weathered into “the lonely and inviolate sand” (80), and the trout he sees under water that hangs “delicate and motionless among the wavering shadows” (117) is only his ideal figure. The point here is that drowning himself in the Charles River is not necessarily a reluctant act and a miserable end for Quentin; his drowning is not for an escape from his life. As Janet St. Clair argues, Quentin is “the one character strenuously trying to *do* something in a world paralyzed by moral inaction” and considers “his suicide as an articulation of faith in the possibility of a new start” (327-28, 333). Quentin faces up to himself, the reality, and the past, perhaps for the first time, by drowning himself in the river and attempting to leave his own shadow at its bottom. The latter half of this chapter discusses his challenge to cast himself into the Charles River that flows like his life full of twists and turns, which ultimately provides him an opportunity to capture the present time and come into a place of his own.

Quentin keeps an eye on the flow of the Charles River when he wanders around greater Boston. The river’s flow, in fact, corresponds to his awareness of death as he plans to commit suicide by drowning himself in the river. On the morning of his last day, he takes an interurban car from downtown Boston to the suburbs and observes the landscape that goes by from the car window. In the distance he notices the river on and off: “I watched [the landscape] sort of frazzle out into slack tide flats, and then trees. Now and then I saw the river” (105). Quentin initially pays more attention to the changing landscape (“watched”) than the river (“saw”), but gradually his awareness of the river becomes keen as the time of his suicide closes in on him.

Quentin’s perception of the water through the sense of sight changes into perceiving its “feel” just before he finds the place of his suicide (“I began to feel the water before I came to the bridge” [115]). When he later walks around with a little girl he calls “sister” after hiding the flat iron weights at the bridge, he “could feel water again running swift and peaceful in the secret shade . . . that sense of water swift and peaceful above secret places, felt, not seen not heard . . . the sense of water mute and unseen” (135-36). At the very end of the second section, he continues to talk to himself: “This was where I saw the river for the last time this morning, about here. I could feel water beyond the twilight, smell” (169-70). While previously noticing the presence of water through his sight, he no longer considers the river as a tangible artifact;

rather, he recognizes its flow with his perception of its “feel” and its “smell,” which is more indefinite and fleeting than other senses. It is true that he cannot see the actual river from the car as the sun has gone down, but his different reactions toward the river in the preceding examples suggest that he increasingly captures the river’s flow in an impalpable manner.

Moreover, the flow of the Charles River changes in Quentin’s mind along with his memory of Caddy, as his recollections of the past frequently intermingle with the present events. As mentioned earlier, he finds his suicide place where the river is “clear and still” (115) and imagines him and Caddy in hell. In addition to the clearness of the water, its stillness is an important factor for the choice of his suicide place because it reminds him of his stagnant relationship with Caddy and his desire to be in hell with her. The river’s flow reflects his dead-end mentality since going to hell provokes his senses of sin and guilt as well as his attempt to escape the personal connections of the real world.

After hiding the flat iron weights at the bridge, however, the river’s flow becomes “swift and peaceful” (135, 136) in Quentin’s mind when he walks around with the little girl and recalls his memory of Natalie whom Quentin met at the barn in his youth. Although the two girls remind him of Caddy, he momentarily frees himself from the image of Caddy and feels peaceful when he conjures up an image of his suicide. His impression of the river as a moving figure also dominates his mind, bringing him an increasing emotional uplift toward the limited remaining time of his life.

Quentin becomes peaceful when he thinks about his death by drowning but cannot feel so when the image of Caddy re-emerges in his mind. As if corresponding to his later recollection of Caddy, the river’s flow restores its “dark and still and swift” (138) condition immediately after three boys splash water at him and the little girl. While the words “still” and “dark” resemble the scene of hell at the bridge where he hides the flat iron weight, the difference is that his memories of Caddy in this case suggest not only hell (“still” and “dark”) but also the branch of the river on the Compson’s premises (“swift”). With the presence of Caddy, he can neither imagine the “swift” flow of the Charles River nor become “peaceful.” When his flashback fades for a while during the investigation on suspicion of kidnapping the little girl, the flow of the Charles River returns to its “swift and peaceful” (140) state because Caddy does not appear in this scene. At the end of the second section, the river’s flow becomes “peaceful and swift” (169, 172) when Quentin no longer flashbacks to the conversation with Caddy and the confrontation with Dalton Ames over Caddy, both of which take place at the branch of the river on the Compson’s premises (149-64). It is after the disappearance of Caddy’s image at the end of the second section that the word “peaceful” comes before “swift” and that Quentin’s attitude becomes calm and self-possessed toward his suicide.

Quentin’s awareness of the river’s “peaceful and swift” flow and his wish to move toward “the caverns and the grottoes of the sea” (90) by himself show that his distressful relationship with Caddy cannot be the direct cause of his suicide, although she evokes the image of water as well as his suicide and death. As Takuya Niuro suggests, it is difficult to find Caddy’s shadow in Quentin’s repetitive drowning image (“Saidoku” 47). Rather, Quentin seems to feel at once fury filled with disappointment toward his father and sympathy toward his father’s

lonely modes of life and death when he encourages himself to drown in the river (Niuro, "Saidoku" 47). Indeed, there is a strong influence of his father on him throughout the second section. His father's words take on an air of authority when the second section starts and ends with his father's lessons about time ("the reducto absurdum" [76] and "was the saddest word of all" [178]). As Millgate points out, his father is his "principal enemy, his cold and even cynical logic persistently undermining the very basis of all those idealistic concepts to which Quentin so passionately holds" (95). Even though the place of his suicide reflects his uneasy feeling about Caddy, his mixed feelings about his father eventually lead to his final choice of throwing himself in the river.

Quentin begins his last day by denying time and recalling fragmented past events. His first recollection begins with a watch his father gave him. His father tells him that it is his grandfather's and that "I give it to you not that you may remember time, but that you might forget it now and then for a moment and not spend all your breath trying to conquer it" (76). With his father's pessimistic and fatalistic view of time remaining deep in his mind, Quentin becomes overly self-conscious about the physical time represented in the watch as well as this grand vision of "conquering time." For Quentin, to conquer time is at once to come to terms with his life and overcome his memories of the past largely of Caddy and his father, since he is both concerned with Caddy's dishonor ("I've got to marry somebody" [113, 115]) and his father's nihilism toward life ("nothing is even worth the changing of it" [78]) and is distressed by the overall decline of the old aristocratic Compson family within the changing South in the early twentieth century. On his final day, he at first cannot confront the physical time and tries to escape from it by destroying his grandfather's watch and taking his eyes away from everything that could tell the time, such as his shadow, the dormitory's window pane, the smoke stack, and the clock of the Unitarian steeple. A series of his actions results in his adhering to the physical time more than ever before, and Quentin realizes that he is unable to control the flow of time by himself.

Quentin internalizes the image of the Charles River through the figurative use of its flow and challenges his father's concept of time by drowning himself in the river. The flow of a river is often used as a metaphor to describe the flow of time,⁶ and Faulkner used the metaphor himself during an interview with *The Paris Review* in 1956: "[T]ime is a fluid condition which has no existence except in the momentary avatars of individual people. There is no such thing as *was*—only *is*" (LG 255). He also refers to Bergson's concept of time and explains, "There is only the present moment, in which I include both the past and the future, and that is eternity" (LG 70). Critics, such as Jean-Paul Sartre, nevertheless point out that as early as 1947, "[Faulkner's heroes] never look ahead. They face backwards as the car carries them along" (269). To be sure, many of Faulkner's characters, including Quentin, find some difficulty going with the flow of time and feel at a loss and out of place in the real world. In Quentin's case, he recalls his past events fragmentally on his final day, and there seems to be almost no distinct time and historical continuity in his thoughts, language, or behavior. According to Bleikasten, "Bergsonian river metaphors will hardly do here. . . . Quentin's present is a line, but a dotted one. . . . Quentin's narrative produces an uncanny staccato effect"

(*Ink* 94).⁷ Paul Douglass also refers to the earlier criticism and suggests that Quentin has a “dissociated awareness of time,” unlike Bergson’s, in the second section (122). In fact, it is his father’s awareness of time that best explains Bergson’s ideas of duration and fluidity (“Because Father said clocks slay time. He said time is dead as long as it is being clicked off by little wheels; only when the clock stops does time come to life” [85]). Trying not to be trapped in his father’s notion of time, Quentin looks for a means to identify his own present time in the river’s flow.

Quentin’s awareness of the present moment contradicts his father’s theory of time, and his drowning explains his challenge to the Bergsonian river that resembles his father’s philosophy. In response to his father’s cynical commentary that “was the saddest word of all there is nothing else in the world its not despair until time its not even time until it was” (178), Quentin refutes his father’s words by saying, “Again. Sadder than was. Again. Saddest of all. Again” (95). “Again” haunts Quentin because the past (“was”) does not stay in one place but re-emerges right before him over and over again. He is overwhelmed by the transcendence over time embodied in the perpetual flow of the river, which reflects both of the river’s repetitive nature in shape and its irreversibility and continuity in movement. In order to overcome his dead-end mentality and the stunted time of his past, he confronts the meandering flow of the Charles River and jumps into it so that he will not lose his way in time and will reconfirm his own existence as an actual person, living in the present.

Struggling to capture a present moment of time, he throws himself in the river to “conquer time” and ends up “spending all his breath” (76), as his father paradoxically predicted at the beginning of the second section. Quentin’s recognition of time at the last stage of his life no longer reflects Bergson’s idea of duration that his father holds; rather, it becomes similar to Gaston Bachelard’s notion of “instant.”⁸ Quentin tries to capture a moment of time by drowning himself in the river, and what will ultimately become central to Quentin are his instantaneous determination and behaviors drawn from the strength of his mind. As if corresponding to the “peaceful and swift” (169, 172) flow of the river, his concern on the day of his suicide changes from the denial of physical time to the recognition of temporal continuity that culminates in accepting his present time of life. He finally discovers the possibility of true life to be found in the spot of the river’s flow where he jumps in. The stillness of water that reminds him of Caddy (e.g., “stagnant water” of the branch of the river in Mississippi [157]) no longer continues to exist in his mind. He eventually faces the “swift” flow of the Charles River “peacefully” by himself.

Even if Quentin endeavors to grasp the present time, or the instant, by immersing himself in the river, the sluggish flow of the actual river is probably not as dramatic as he romantically imagines. Explaining that “a man is the sum of his misfortunes. One day you’d think misfortune would get tired, but then time is your misfortune” (104), Quentin’s father denies the possibility of Quentin’s suicide by saying, “It’s not when you realise that nothing can help you—religion, pride, anything—it’s when you realise that you dont need any aid” (80). Quentin, in turn, secretly commits suicide by drowning himself in the Charles River when he realizes that he “[doesn’t] need any aid.” Searching for his own existence as an actual person,

he eventually confronts the meandering flow of river and time by himself and endeavors to leave his shadow and memories of the past at the bottom of the river.

At the same time, the flow of the river is used figuratively not only for time but also for the “stream” of consciousness that articulates the incessant flow of sense, including perceptions, feelings, thoughts, and memories in the human mind. Faulkner takes advantage of this narrative technique to express Quentin’s pain and challenge. Indeed, a wide variety of Quentin’s stream of consciousness revelations through his complex narratives is found in the second section. After repeated random associations, Quentin’s interior monologues, intertwined with the memories of the past and the present condition, seem never to end (“murmuring bones” [80]), like the sluggish flow of the long and winding Charles River.

From the point of narrative structure, his drowning in the Charles River ends his “river of speech” and “stream of words” that flow like the actual river, confining his spoken words to a moment of the time. Quentin’s confusing senses of place and belonging, for instance, dominate the second section along with his complex notion of time until the end: “A quarter hour yet. And then I’ll not be. The peaceullest words. Peaceullest words. *Non fui. Sum. Fui. Non sum.* Somewhere I heard bells once. Mississippi or Massachusetts. I was. I am not. Massachusetts or Mississippi. . . . I am. Drink. I was not” (174). In spite of his chaotic mental condition, he eventually feels peaceful when he thinks about his suicide. Following the long interior monologue at the very end of the second section, he suddenly blinks himself out of his trance, puts his belongings in order, and heads for the bridge where he hides the flat iron weights. Quentin moves toward “the caverns and the grottoes of the sea” by himself, without being distressed by Caddy’s dishonor and his father’s words, and frees himself from his complicated interior monologues. In spite of his sense of fate, he tries to conquer time by capturing the present time and to liberate himself from the past by throwing himself into the river, thus ending his stream of consciousness.

The Charles River is quite significant in Quentin’s suicide; its salient features, including its shape, its character as a border, and its flow suggest Quentin’s mindset and actions on the day of his suicide, both literally and figuratively. Suicide is usually seen as distressing and self-destructive, as Sartre sees Quentin’s suicide as “an immobile wall, a *thing* which he approaches backwards, and which he neither wants to nor can conceive” (269, italics original), but there may be some encouraging implications and a greater meaning for Quentin as a splendid failure. His drowning could be a means to fully experience the present time, which his father fails to do, and an opportunity to willfully reject his father’s determinism and fatalism in addition to his loss of Caddy. In the end, his father ironically predicts that “he does [commit suicide] only when he has realised that even the despair or remorse or bereavement is not particularly important” (178). Although immersing himself at the bottom of the river may end in failure according to some, Quentin at least endeavors to establish his presence in the river by drowning himself and letting the river run through him.

Chapter 2

Seeing Through the Other: Quentin's Return

While the first three sections of *The Sound and the Fury* are narrated by the three Compson brothers, the fourth section is told by a third-person narrator. As Donald M. Kartiganer points out, this is the only section in which “we get novelistic description: weather, place, persons, the appearance of things as from the eye of a detached but interested spectator” (*Fragile* 18). It is true that the fourth-section narrator provides “an orderly, consistent portrait of the Compson family” instead of “confused and confusing versions of reality” of the Compson brothers (Kartiganer, *Fragile* 19). At the same time, Kartiganer further argues that the fourth section, too, is one of the “four fragments” that stays in the “separate and incoherent” condition (*Fragile* 19). By contrast, this chapter examines how the third-person narrator of the fourth section internalizes the perspectives of the other narrators and integrates the three fragments of the Compson story into one entity. In particular, recovery of the dead Quentin's point of view would be the key to understand the sentiment of this narrator. If we assume the fourth-section narrator as the “Faulkner,” as the author repeatedly stated later in his life, this section reveals his complex, uncertain identity within himself.

1. Referring to Benjy as “Ben”

Unlike the first-person narrator, who takes part in the story, the third-person narrator usually stands outside the story and writes the story in the third person. Although the fourth-section narrator follows the general rules of the third-person narrative, one may feel uncomfortable about the way this narrator refers to the youngest brother, Benjy. Oddly enough, this narrator calls him “Ben” instead of Benjy. Other than this narrator, Jason, the narrator of the third section, is the only character who uses this nickname. All of the other characters use the nickname Benjy, except for Mrs. Compson, who calls her son by his given name, Benjamin. There seems to be a particular reason that the fourth-section narrator has chosen the minor nickname “Ben.”

One possible explanation may be that Jason's voice is reflected in the narrative of the fourth section. Some critics, such as Margaret Blanchard, have discussed the fourth-section narrator as a speculative person because of the narrator's intervention in Jason's mind (Blanchard 558). Nevertheless, the fourth-section narrator does not necessarily talk about “Ben” from Jason's point of view. In the third section, Jason identifies Benjy as a nuisance and attempts to put him in the insane asylum in Jackson: “He'll be happier there, with people like him. . . . I says if they'd sent him to Jackson at first we'd all be better off today” (221-22). Whereas Jason calls Benjy “that dam boy” (207) and “a bear” (252-53), the fourth-section narrator describes Benjy's eyes as “sweet blue gaze” (297) with compassion. The fourth-section narrator neither mentions about Jackson nor Benjy's idiocy in a malicious way.

It is, then, difficult to presume that Jason's attitude toward Benjy is applicable to the

fourth-section narrator, who often describes Benjy's moaning voice with great sympathy. According to the fourth-section narrator, for instance, Benjy "[bellows] slowly, abjectly, without tears; the grave hopeless sound of all voiceless misery under the sun" (316). In the affectionate eye of the fourth-section narrator, Benjy's voice is figuratively explained in relation to the planetary motions: "Just sound. It might have been all time and injustice and sorrow become vocal for an instant by a conjunction of planets" (288). Such a poetic expression by the fourth-section narrator does not fit well with Jason's realistic and sarcastic narrative: "Just let it come toward sundown and he'd head for the gate like a cow for the barn, hanging onto it and bobbing his head and sort of moaning to himself. That's a hog for punishment for you" (253). Jason's attitude toward Benjy, indeed, is just the opposite of the fourth-section narrator.

All the same, Jason and the fourth-section narrator share the nickname "Ben." The reason why Benjy is always referred to as "Ben" by the fourth-section narrator may be to suggest the presence of other sections' narrators within this section. In this regard, this chapter especially focuses on the second-section narrator, Quentin, who does not actually appear in the fourth section, and examines the possibility of his reemergence in this section. Quentin's presence in the section explains the ambivalent feelings of the fourth-section narrator, the "Faulkner," whose identity fluctuates between the notions of the "Old South" and "New South."

2. Composition of *The Sound and the Fury*

Some critics have pointed out that the fourth-section narrator often shares the senses of other people. According to Hugh M. Ruppensburg, for instance, "an uninvolved, external narrator may observe and describe [other characters], penetrating their conscious and unconscious minds, channeling their perceptions to the reader" (9). Additionally, Blanchard and André Bleikasten argue that the point of view of the fourth-section narrator is that of the readers (Blanchard 560-63; Bleikasten, *Ink* 126). It is, nevertheless, difficult to imagine that Faulkner wrote this section with readers' responses in mind. At that time, he was in a difficult situation as a writer. After many rejections of his early works, he finally said to himself, "Now I can write," when "a door had clapped silently and forever to between me and all publishers" (Faulkner, "Introduction" 230). As such, in *The Sound and the Fury*, it is probable that he was not concerned with other people's reactions at all and instead pursued what he wanted to write for his own sake. Faulkner's main interests at the time of writing the fourth section (and the entire novel) seem to lie in "what and how to tell" and "who is telling" the story.

In his later years, Faulkner repeatedly emphasized the significance of the narrative and narrators of *The Sound and the Fury*. According to Faulkner, the novel is the product of three brothers' narratives that mainly deal with their memory of Caddy's dirty drawers on the day of their grandmother's funeral:

And so I told the idiot's experience of that day, and that was incomprehensible, even I could not have told what was going on then, so I had to write another chapter. Then I

decided to let Quentin tell his version of that same day, or that same occasion, so he told it. Then there had to be the counterpoint, which was the other brother, Jason. By that time it was completely confusing. I knew that it was not anywhere near finished and then I had to write another section from the outside with an outsider, which was the writer, to tell what had happened on that particular day. And that's how that book grew. That is, I wrote that same story four times. (LG 147)

As the title of each section—a date—indicates, the novel does not merely reflect the funeral scene of the brothers' grandmother, Damuddy, nor do all of the narrators' stories overlap with each other. At the same time, it is unsafe and inaccurate to identify the fourth-section narrator with the writer, Faulkner (Ruppersburg 10). Although we cannot take Faulkner's previous comments literally, his recollection about the novel could provide helpful suggestions for understanding the relationship between the composition of the novel and the narrators.

What is notable in the previous passage is that Faulkner thought of Benjy's story as "incomprehensible" and the stories of Quentin and Jason as "completely confusing." Accordingly, the fourth-section narrator tries to reconstruct their stories in a meaningful way. Another remarkable point in the previous passage is that Quentin and Jason are each considered the "counterpoint" to the other. In the Introduction of the novel, which was written in 1933, Faulkner wrote the same thing in a different way: that he "wrote Quentin's and Jason's sections, trying to clarify Benjy's" (231). Faulkner's words reveal that the original form of the novel is Benjy's story, and that the stories of Quentin and Jason were added to explicate Benjy's story.

The dialectic structure of the novel becomes important for examining the significance of the fourth-section narrator. The fourth-section narrator offers conjecture about Jason's sentiments, using words such as "think," "seem," "feel," "imagine," "believe," "see," and "tell himself." At the end of Jason's pursuit of Caddy's daughter, Miss Quentin, the narrator even speaks for Jason's internal monologue:

He grasped at the hatchet, feeling no shock but knowing that he was falling, thinking So this is how it'll end, and he believed that he was about to die and when something crashed against the back of his head he thought How did he hit me there? Only maybe he hit me a long time ago, he thought, And I just now felt it, and he thought Hurry. Hurry. Get it over with, and then a furious desire not to die seized him and he struggled, hearing the old man wailing and cursing in his cracked voice. (311)

If Jason's state of mind is partially articulated in the fourth-section narrative, it is probable that the fourth-section narrator incorporates the inner feelings of Jason's "counterpoint"—Quentin—to some extent in the narrative. In short, the novel is structured with the similar "objective" descriptions of the first (Benjy) and fourth sections (Kartiganer, *Fragile* 7-8), as well as the contradictory "subjective" feelings of the second (Quentin) and third (Jason) sections.

As in the case of the composition of the entire novel, the fourth section is divided into four parts: the Compsons' Easter Sunday morning and the discovery of Miss Quentin's escape; the scene of Easter Sunday service; Jason's pursuit of Miss Quentin; and the scene where Luster and Benjy head to the graveyard in the surrey. If we compare the structure of the entire novel with that of the fourth section, we notice that Jason's story takes place in the third part in both cases. It is, then, not entirely off the mark to say that a similar connection can be found between Quentin's story in the second section and the Easter service scene in the fourth section. In other words, the order of each episode in the fourth section is carefully set to maintain consistency with the composition of the entire novel.

3. Recovery of Quentin's Voice

Because Quentin drowned himself in the Charles River in Massachusetts on June 2, 1910, he does not appear in the fourth section of the novel. Unlike the other sections, which include various past events, only the episodes of Easter Sunday, April 8, 1928, are chronologically included in the fourth section. Nevertheless, Quentin's memory is brought to mind whenever the fourth section narrator mentions the name of his niece, Miss Quentin. In fact, the scenes of her final flight and the Easter service—particularly Reverend Shegog's sermon—suggest Quentin's presence in the fourth section.

We can find the connection between Quentin and Miss Quentin in Mrs. Compson's words. Although Miss Quentin has stolen Jason's hoarded money and escaped with the man who works for the traveling carnival show, Mrs. Compson mistakenly believes that Miss Quentin has committed suicide. Mrs. Compson's claim rests on the fact of her son's suicide: "I knew the minute they named her Quentin this would happen" (283). Mrs. Compson has a firm belief in Miss Quentin's suicide and requests that Dilsey look for a suicide note, as Quentin prepared one on his last day. When Dilsey returns from the Easter service, Mrs. Compson once again asks Dilsey about the note and becomes pessimistic about Miss Quentin's whereabouts: "It's in blood. Like uncle, like niece. Or mother. I dont know which would be worse. I dont seem to care" (299). We may recall here that Mrs. Compson—and the Compsons in general—have a strong attachment to their names. Jason is named after his father, Mr. Compson, and the family renamed Maury, who inherited the name of Mrs. Compson's brother, to Benjamin (Benjy) when they found out about his mental condition. Mrs. Compson's speculation about Miss Quentin's suicide demonstrates that the name "Quentin" has an ominous connotation and is even considered to be the cause of suicide.

The fourth-section narrator introduces Mrs. Compson's words as an effective reminder of Quentin's suicide. It is noteworthy that her previous comments about Quentin's suicide are located before and after the episode of the Easter service. Although it seems natural to place the drama of Jason's pursuit of Miss Quentin after the family's discovery of her flight, the fourth-section narrator changes the subject and talks about Dilsey's participation in the Easter service before Jason's episode. Because these events take place at the same time, which is the sole exception to the chronologically arranged fourth section, Jason's pursuit could have been

explained before the scene of the Easter service. Yet, the fourth section narrator places Jason's story in the third part, after the service, as if to take the novel's entire structure into account. Because of Jason's third position in the fourth section, Mrs. Compson's words about Quentin's suicide result in readers caring more about the second part of the fourth section—the Easter service.

The Easter service, which comes second in the fourth section and is placed between Mrs. Compson's implications of Quentin's suicide, not only celebrates the resurrection of Jesus Christ but also signifies the reappearance of the dead Quentin at the narrative level. In the service, Reverend Shegog starts his sermon with the phrase "I got the recollection and the blood of the Lamb!" (294). He soon repeats this impressive phrase in a non-standard, black dialect: "I got de ricklickshun en de blood of de Lamb!" (295). One may easily notice that, instead of saying "de resurrection," Reverend Shegog has selected the atypical expression "de ricklickshun." Because the Easter service episode is surrounded by Mrs. Compson's "recollection" of Quentin's suicide, Reverend Shegog's sermon evokes Quentin's death in readers' minds. The fourth-section narrator emphasizes Reverend Shegog's skillful word choice in the Easter scene in order to show the presence of the dead Quentin in the fourth section.

What is notable in Reverend Shegog's sermon is the shift from "de ricklickshun" to "de resurrection." After talking about the crucifixion of Christ, he explains that "de darkness en de death everlastin upon de generations" (296) is gone and continues passionately, "I sees de resurrection en de light" (297). In this regard, John T. Matthews sees Quentin in Reverend Shegog's saying "I hears de weepin en de cryin en de turnt-away face of God: dey done kilt Jesus; dey done kilt my Son!" and "de whelmin flood" (*SF* 296), as well as in the inarticulate sounds of the congregation ("still another, without words, like bubbles rising in water" [*SF* 296]) (*Play* 109-10). The intention of the fourth-section narrator, however, seems to go beyond Matthews' argument. In addition to Jesus' resurrection, the narrator appears to reflect on the re-emergence of Quentin, who committed suicide in 1910. Reverend Shegog's sermon ends, once again, with reference to "de ricklickshun": "I sees de doom crack en de golden horns shoutin down de glory, en de arisen dead whut got de blood en de ricklickshun of de Lamb!" (297). Reverend's "de arisen dead" in the previous passage resembles the Quentin of the second section. When Quentin suggests his eventual suicide in the second section of the novel, he says, "Until on the Day when He says Rise only the flat-iron would come float" (80). Reverend Shegog not only preaches about the resurrection of Jesus Christ but also implies the "resurrection" of the dead Quentin at the narrative—"de ricklickshun"—level.

At the beginning of the second section, Quentin attempts to keep his distance from Christ. When Mr. Compson explains that "Christ was not crucified: he was worn away by a minute clicking of little wheels," Quentin opposes his father's words by saying, "That had no sister" (77). His attitude, however, changes as his last moment nears. Just before committing suicide, Quentin notices blood on the tie that he has planned to give to Deacon, a black man who has moved to the North from the South and is said to be "a graduate of the divinity school" (98), and imagines Deacon talking about "a pattern of blood" on the tie as the "one Christ was

wearing” (172). He finds a connection between his own “pattern of blood” and that of Christ in Deacon’s words and overlaps his eventual death with that of Christ.

Furthermore, Reverend Shegog’s sermon about “de ricklickshun . . . of de Lamb” (295) bears resemblance to Quentin’s memory. Quentin’s distress and anguish correspond with the implication of “the Lamb of God,” which stands for the sacrificial Jesus Christ in Christianity. Of course, Quentin would not be crucified as Jesus Christ was. On his last day, Quentin momentarily reveals his sense of guilt after purchasing the flat-iron for his suicide: “What a sinful waste Dilsey would say” (90). After suffering his incestuous feelings toward Caddy and wrestling with the idea of time represented in and by his grandfather’s watch, Quentin drowns himself in the Charles River. Additionally, his suicide is only implied in the second section; indeed, it is mentioned in other sections as part of the family’s memory. The fourth-section narrator, too, indirectly provides evidence for Quentin’s suicide in the Easter scene.

As the previous passage of Dilsey’s comment demonstrates, her life has little to do with suicide in Quentin’s eyes. In the first place, she is not distressed by the flow of time. While Quentin repeatedly suffers from the “minute clicking of little wheels” (77) of the watch in the second section, Dilsey constantly pays attention to the sound of the clock above the sideboard and acts in accordance with the present time in the fourth section. As Bleikasten points out, “[w]hile for Quentin there is an unbridgeable gap between the temporal and the timeless, Dilsey’s eternity, instead of being an immobile splendor *above* the flux of time, is already present and at work *in* time, embodied in it just as the word was made flesh” (*Ink* 136, italics original). What Dilsey embodies, then, is at once the duration of time in daily life and the perpetual present of Christianity. If one of the reasons for Quentin’s suicide is to liberate himself from his father’s (and his ancestors’) sense of time, the Easter service and Dilsey’s sense of time in the fourth section would provide a means for his salvation.

Dilsey’s words, which “see in the midst of action the direction of action, understand the living moment because it is part of a history that has already, and always, ended” (Kartiganer, *Fragile* 20), speak for Quentin’s inner feelings. After the Easter service, Dilsey quietly sheds tears and says, “I’ve seed de first en de last” (297). This is, in fact, what Quentin has struggled to do in the second section. In the fourth section, however, the Easter service occurs at the same time as Jason’s pursuit of Miss Quentin. Because of this, the contrast becomes clear “in the juxtaposition of the Easter service, in its celebration of God’s time, and Jason’s mad chase, his striving in the context of human time” (Kartiganer, *Fragile* 19). Here, Dilsey’s sense of time is contrasted with that of Jason, not Quentin.

Nonetheless, it is not only Jason who struggles “in the context of human time” in the novel; Quentin also faces “human time” and tries to overcome his trouble in the second section. When Dilsey says, “I’ve seed de first en de last” (297) with tears falling from her eyes, it does not only mean that she has seen the life of Jesus Christ, the flow of time, and the history of the Compsons. This must also be the moment when Dilsey captures the troubles and struggles of Quentin’s life. Dilsey’s tears in the fourth section overlap with Quentin’s general image of blacks in the second section:

They come into white people's lives like that in sudden sharp black trickles that isolate white facts for an instant in unarguable truth like under a microscope; the rest of the time just voices that laugh when you see nothing to laugh at, tears when no reason for tears. (170)

Without Dilsey, Quentin's "resurrection" would not become possible in the fourth section. Through Dilsey's presence, the fourth-section narrator attempts to talk about the Easter service and speaks for Quentin's inner feelings and hope.

4. Recovery of Quentin's Story

In spite of Dilsey's strong presence in the fourth section, she is not the narrator of the section. Unlike the other sections, which are told by the first-person narrators of Benjy, Quentin, and Jason, the fourth section is narrated by the third-person narrator, the "Faulkner." Some critics, including Arnold Weinstein, argue that Faulkner did not allow Dilsey to assume the role of the first-person narrator because she might be the Other (a black female) for him (A. Weinstein 342). This may not, however, be the only reason for the use of the third-person narrator in the fourth section. In addition to Dilsey's participation in the Easter service, the fourth section includes the conflict between Jason and Miss Quentin and its consequences. Because of the "arrangement of the dual quests of Dilsey and Jason" (Kartiganer, *New Essays* 93), the fourth section cannot be told only from Dilsey's point of view. In the novel, the contrapuntal relationship of Quentin and Jason corresponds with the juxtaposition of Dilsey and Jason in the fourth section, both of which are "neatly opposed in outcome and significance" (Kartiganer, *New Essays* 92). As such, we can presume that the fourth-section narrator takes advantage of Quentin's perspective when telling Dilsey's story. It is, then, necessary to compare Quentin's image of blacks in the second section to the actual Gibson family—particularly Dilsey—in the fourth section.

In the first place, the words and deeds of Quentin and Jason demonstrate a considerable difference in their reaction to blacks. In the second section, Quentin recalls blacks with "his nostalgia for a romanticized past" (Davis, *Faulkner's "Negro"* 95) and "a white dream of pastoral innocence" (P. Weinstein 49). On the contrary, in the third section, Jason is disgusted with Compson's blacks and calls them "these dam trifling niggers" (190-91). Jason's attitude toward these blacks is always harsh and uncompromising.

Indeed, Quentin and Jason act oppositely toward blacks. On his way home from Cambridge, Quentin meets a black man on a mule in Virginia and generously gives him a quarter out of the train's window as part of "Christmas gift" (87). According to *Reading Faulkner*, "Christmas gift" is "a customary game in the South, usually between blacks and whites, where the one who can say 'Christmas Gift' first gets a gift" (Ross and Polk 58). If Quentin follows the rule, he is the one who gets a quarter. However, by contrast, he gives a quarter to the black man, saying, "Buy yourself some Santy Claus" (87). The black man responds in an old-fashioned manner and thanks Quentin by calling him "Suh," "boss," and

“marster.” On the other hand, Jason flashes around a ticket for the carnival show and burns it in front of Dilsey’s grandson, Luster, who is desperate to go to the show. Luster has lost a quarter somewhere on the Compson property and laments, “Ef I jes had a quarter . . . I could go to dat show” (254). However, Jason gives Luster neither a quarter nor a ticket. Quentin’s favorable image of unrefined yet heart-warming blacks of the South is not only contrasted with the sophisticated blacks of the North in the second section, but it also becomes the “counterpoint” to Jason’s negative image of lazy, indolent blacks of the South in the third section.

One must keep in mind, however, that the previous images of blacks from Quentin and Jason are two sides of the same coin—Southern paternalism. As Stephen M. Ross and Noel Polk explain, Quentin’s “Christmas gift” takes on “an affectionate albeit racist paternalism left over from slavery” (58). That Quentin and Jason both act as a father to black people—who are thereby cast as children—demonstrates the influence of Southern patriarchal society. Moreover, Quentin’s recollection in 1910 cannot entirely be compared with Jason’s in 1928. The family’s situation has drastically changed since Quentin’s death, as Jason has become the head of the declining Compsons.

Cheryl Lester’s study about the relationship between the changing social structure and racial consciousness demonstrates that Quentin’s image of blacks was already obsolete to some extent by the year 1910. According to Lester, Quentin, who “migrated” to the North just before the full-scale Great Migration began, has been concerned about and feels threatened by the migration’s consequences (136-37). In reality, at the time, it greatly affected the social structure of racial composition nationwide. In the early 1900s, 90 percent of blacks had their home in the countryside of the South, but a million and a half of them left their places between 1915 and 1930 (Lester 128, 129). As Lester explains, “black migration, urbanization, and proletarianization altered socioeconomic conditions throughout the nation, leading to labor shortages in the South, the formation of urban ghettos in the North, and a flurry of debates over the meaning and likely consequences of black migration (Lester 128). This large-scale social change may be one of the major factors of why Quentin clings to the good old days of the South on his last day. The fourth-section narrator seems to identify with Quentin’s difficult situation and assumes Quentin’s thought patterns about blacks.

In spite of his anachronism and his growing awareness of social change, Quentin gives blacks an important place in his mind in the second section. Here, Quentin describes the black people who are familiar to him: the Gibsons—particularly Roskus and Dilsey—who work for the Compsons. Even though Deacon, who puts on “a cast-off Brooks and a hat with a Princeton club” (97), looks as though he has completely adjusted to Northern society, Quentin finds Roskus in Deacon: “His eyes were soft and irisless and brown, and suddenly I saw Roskus watching me from behind all his whitefolks’ claptrap of uniforms and politics and Harvard manner, diffident, secret, inarticulate and sad” (99). When Quentin sees the nostalgic sight of Virginia, which appears as though it is welcoming him with the words “You are home again” (87), he realizes that “I didn’t know that I really had missed Roskus and Dilsey and [niggers] until that morning in Virginia” (86). Additionally, the black man who waits at the

crossing until the train passes by with “shabby and timeless patience, of static serenity” (87), overlaps with the images of Roskus and Dilsey in Quentin’s mind.

In fact, the description of blacks in the fourth section alludes to Quentin’s image of blacks in the second section, which acts as a primer. Matthews argues that “through Dilsey’s point of view, but not in her own words, the reader acquires a new perspective on the Compson family troubles” (*Lost Cause* 77). It seems, however, that blacks, including Dilsey, are depicted from Quentin’s point of view in the second section in the following way: “a nigger is not a person so much as a form of behavior; a sort of obverse reflection of the white people he lives among” (86). Philip M. Weinstein notes that blacks in *The Sound and the Fury*, excluding the Gibsons, are “pure symbol” who “[lack] the narrative freedom of unpredictability” (47). Nevertheless, a series of Quentin’s associations in the second section demonstrates that the Gibsons, too, embody the good old South for him. All of the blacks in Quentin’s recollection in the second section, after all, are “[i]dealized and tranquilized by white nostalgia and unconscious condescension” (P. Weinstein 48-49). Such images of blacks can also be found in the fourth section. Although some interactions among Dilsey, Jason, and Mrs. Compson follow the stories of the first and third sections of the novel, Quentin’s stereotypical images of blacks primarily prevail throughout the fourth section.

Contrary to his confusing internal monologue, Quentin dispassionately observes and describes the details of his surroundings in the second section. On his last day, Quentin often recalls his memory of blacks. The episode of Louis Hatcher, a superstitious black man who makes no attempt to clean the lantern until the next flood, and the lore of an anonymous black demonstrate well the fact that Quentin has had various opportunities to learn about the beliefs and superstitions of blacks in the South. Even Reverend Shegog’s sermon, which is often regarded as the story’s distinctive episode about blacks, resembles Quentin’s story about blacks in the second section. Here, Quentin recalls the impressive situation he encountered in Memphis that signifies the uplifting feelings of blacks at religious service: “A brothel full of them in Memphis went into a religious trance ran naked into the street. It took three policemen to subdue one of them. Yes Jesus O good man Jesus O that good man” (170). These black people resonate with the Jefferson congregation, who repeatedly shout, “Yes, Jesus!” (295-96) in the middle of Reverend Shegog’s sermon in the fourth section. Quentin’s memory of blacks in the second section is revitalized in the living and present blacks of the fourth section.

In particular, the fourth section focuses on Dilsey and the Gibsons, who resemble the blacks of Quentin’s memory in the second section. The Gibsons still work for the Compson family as they did when Quentin was alive. The comical conversations between Dilsey and Luster, as well as Dilsey’s caring attitude toward the Compsons, evoke Deacon, who is a “guide mentor and friend” (98) of Harvard freshmen in the second section. Blacks in the fourth section also correspond with Quentin’s image of blacks in the second section:

[T]hat blending of childlike and ready incompetence and paradoxical reliability that tends and protects them it loves out of all reason and robs them steadily and evades responsibility and obligations by means too barefaced to be called subterfuge even and is

taken in theft or evasion with only that frank and spontaneous admiration for the victor which a gentleman feels for anyone who beats him in a fair contest, and withal a fond and unflagging tolerance for whitefolks' vagaries like that of a grandparent for unpredictable and troublesome children. . . . (87-88)

In the second section, Quentin intermittently talks about his memory of Dilsey, who has long worked for the Compsons and has devoted herself to taking good care of the family like a mother. The episodes of Quentin's broken bone ("*Dilsey said you goin to ruin yoself aint you got no mo sense than that not fo days since you bruck hit*" [113]), Caddy's dirty drawers ("Caddy do you remember how Dilsey fussed at you because your drawers were muddy" [152]), and the wisteria trellis ("When Mother stayed in bed Dilsey would put old clothes on us and let us go out in the rain because she said rain never hurt young folks" [169]) demonstrate that Dilsey has been with the Compson family for a long time and has looked after them.

Likewise, Dilsey takes care of the Compsons and her own family in the fourth section. With a tone of concern—"Ef I dont worry bout y'all, I dont know who is" (290)—Dilsey supports Mrs. Compson, cares for Benjy, supervises Luster, and manages the entire household. On the other hand, Luster, who often escapes from work to have fun and creates uproar with his mischievous behavior, is depicted as a simple and lighthearted black child. Although the fourth-section narrator talks as a non-participant observer, we can find similar features of Quentin's images of blacks in the voice of the fourth-section narrator.

Quentin's point of view concerning blacks is most reflected in the account of Dilsey in the fourth section. For instance, Dilsey's appearance described at the beginning of the fourth section accords well with Quentin's explanation of black physicality in the second section. Dilsey's "gaunt hand flac-soled as the belly of fish" (265) can be compared with Deacon's "worn, gentle quality of niggers' hands" (98), whose color, "the envelope white in his black hand" (99), resembles Quentin's previous description of Dilsey's hand. Furthermore, her "expression at once fatalistic and of a child's astonished disappointment" (266) corresponds to Quentin's explanation of blacks as the "blending of childlike and ready incompetence and paradoxical reliability that tends and protects them" (87). The way the fourth-section narrator puts emphasis on Dilsey's physical descriptions of "skeleton" and "bones" (266) overlaps with the motif of bones that Quentin has repeatedly used in the second section (e.g., "murmuring bones" [80]).

While Quentin's images of bones suggest his eventual suicide, Dilsey's "indomitable skeleton" (266) indicates her strong will, endurance, and fortitude. As described previously, her appearance, including "her myriad and sunken face" (265), is similar to that of the black man in Virginia, who waits for Quentin's train to pass by with "shabby and timeless patience, of static serenity" (87). Her "dress of purple silk" that covers her bony "gaunt" (265) body and the gown "in color regal and moribund" (265) characterize her life as she endures with all her strength and dignity: "I does de bes I kin . . . Lawd knows dat" (317). As Dilsey says to Benjy, "You's de Lawd's chile, anyway. En I be His'n too" (317), she at once relies on faith and lives her life in a humane manner. In addition to her sense of time, her dignified and faithful

manners become the signs of strength and hope for Quentin, who nevertheless faces “Compson devilment” (276) and commits suicide.

Faulkner later re-used Quentin as a narrator in “That Evening Sun,” “A Justice,” “Lion,” and *Absalom, Absalom!*—and Quentin’s reappearance, however indirectly and partially, has already taken place in the fourth section of *The Sound and the Fury*. The fourth-section narrator not only speaks for Jason’s inner feelings but also incorporates Quentin’s images of blacks into the narrative. On the one hand, this narrator uses the nickname “Ben,” which Jason only uses, and reports Jason’s internal monologue when the section reaches the climax of his episode. On the other hand, the same narrator represents the voice inside Quentin. The Easter sermon at the black church suggests the “resurrection” of the dead Quentin at the narrative (memory) level. In order to demonstrate Quentin’s reappearance, the fourth-section narrator follows Quentin’s portrayal of blacks—particularly Dilsey—in the second section. If this narrator is indeed the “Faulkner,” it means that the author shares the same sentiments of both Quentin and Jason. His conflicting views toward his native land are juxtaposed in both characters’ attitudes and are eventually integrated (though not blended) into one entity as the “Faulkner” in the fourth section. This section reveals how the author tried to deal with his inner feelings. We could even say that, from this novel, Faulkner began to explore his own identity as a Mississippi/Southern on a full scale.

II. Middle: Short Stories

Chapter 3

One More Ditch to Cross: Quentin's Story about Nancy's Fate in "That Evening Sun"

1. Twenty-four-year-old Quentin

A twenty-four-year-old Quentin appears as a frame narrator in "That Evening Sun" (hereinafter "TES"). The age Faulkner gave him in this story has long puzzled critics and readers, since a person of the same name commits suicide when he is around twenty years old in *The Sound and the Fury* (hereinafter *SF*).¹ While "around twenty" may be considered to be within the margin of error,² Faulkner's specific number is too large to ignore because he could have modified Quentin's age in the newer versions of the story that were published two years after *SF*.³ Kenneth G. Johnston argues that Quentin's age of twenty-four is no more an incident than Faulkner's mistake; rather, his age suggests that the present time of "TES" is 1913. This short story, Johnston insists, is "a jubilee story told in the year marking the 50th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation" (95). Despite Johnston's insight on the "Year of Jubilee," one may still question whether Faulkner overlooked the inconsistency of Quentin's ages in "TES" and *SF* in order to set the present time of "TES" to 1913.

This chapter contends that Faulkner purposefully set Quentin's age as twenty-four in "TES" to imply that the black washerwoman Nancy in the short story met the same fate—suicide—as *SF*'s Quentin. Because of the ambiguous ending of "TES," critics have long debated whether Nancy's estranged husband, Jesus, who is said to have left for Memphis or St. Louis, comes back to town to kill her or whether his return is just a rumor or her hallucination. No scholars have considered suicide as Nancy's fate since, as a jailor explains in "TES," it is generally considered to be true that "no nigger would try to commit suicide" (291). To be sure, statistics show that the suicide rate among blacks is extremely low compared with that of whites mainly due to their strong faith, mutual assistance, and concentrated communities (Lester 60-61; Gibbs 68, 73). However, other researchers question the accuracy of such statistics (Gibbs 68-69). In Faulkner's *Go Down, Moses*, Eunice McCaslin, a black slave, commits suicide by drowning herself in a branch.⁴ It is, therefore, not out of the realm of possibility that Nancy, who once attempted suicide in prison, would resort to suicide at the end of the story and stun the nine-year-old Quentin, who eventually threw himself into the Charles River. Just as Quentin's last moment is blurred in the second section of *SF*, he alludes to Nancy's suicide by obscuring her ending in "TES."

In brief, Nancy's suicide does not conflict with Johnston's argument about the Year of Jubilee and could explain the significance of the adult Quentin's narrative, which is told after his suicide. As discussed in chapter 1, Quentin tries to confront the reality and reconfirm the meaning of his existence by drowning himself in the Charles River. For Quentin, his identity crisis can only be settled through his death. When he looks back his old days, he notices that there was another person who had conducted a similar suicidal act. Nancy's suicide enables

him to accept his consequence, which may seem tragic and helpless to others, as one way of expressing his individuality and, thus, preserving his own identity. This chapter attempts to demonstrate the possibility of her suicide, which in turn enhances Quentin's death as part of his identity.

2. The Eloquence and Silence of Quentin

Critics have performed elaborate comparative analyses of the four versions of "TES."⁵ One of the most notable changes is the introduction of the twenty-four-year-old Quentin as a frame narrator in the magazine version. It is true that he appears only at the beginning of the first section, and the rest of the short story is told from the point of view of the nine-year-old Quentin (Pearson 67; Skei 179). Faulkner usually uses a simple, childish verb of attribution like "said" or "whispered," and the narrator does not probe deeply into any matter. Nevertheless, the descriptive parts of the story correspond with the recollections and supplemental remarks of the twenty-four-year-old Quentin rather than the situational reactions of the nine-year-old Quentin. As May Cameron Brown points out, "Although Quentin in a sense becomes the nine-year-old boy again, his insights are colored and modified by the older Quentin, for whom the story of Nancy's plight has much personal significance" (353). The perceptions of the adult Quentin are reflected in the story when he provides information that indicates he is talking about the past: "I was the oldest. I was nine and Caddy was seven and Jason was five" (294). This chapter examines the eloquence and, conversely, the silence of the twenty-four-year-old Quentin that indicates that Nancy committed suicide.

There are prominent examples of the adult Quentin's intrusion into his tale about past events, including his accounts of Nancy's suicide attempt in prison (291) and the circumstances related to the Lovelady family (308). Quentin's fluency in these episodes reflects his strong interest in the topic common to both: suicide. Quentin's (over)sensitivity to this subject can be explained if one considers the fact that he committed suicide in *SF*, and his retelling of Nancy's story that includes a reference to this topic suggests her eventual suicide.

It is notable that Quentin provides great detail as he recreates the scene of Nancy's suicide attempt in jail:

She had hung herself with her dress. She had fixed it all right, but when they arrested her she didn't have on anything except a dress and so she didn't have anything to tie her hands with and she couldn't make her hands let go of the window ledge. So the jailer heard the noise and ran up there and found Nancy hanging from the window, stark naked, her belly already swelling out a little, like a little balloon. (291-92)

Since the episode also exists in the original manuscript, the reader might presume that Faulkner wanted to characterize Nancy as having a tendency to kill herself from the beginning. However, things may not be that simple in the later version when the narrator is a twenty-four-year-old Quentin. The original manuscript also demonstrates that her suicidal

behavior was understood in terms of white people's common belief that "no nigger would try to commit suicide" (291). His descriptive and lengthy explanation of Nancy's hanging in jail shows that he disagrees with the townspeople about black people not attempting suicide. In other words, Quentin attempts to signify Nancy's intention of killing herself in the jail episode.

Unlike Nancy's suicide attempt in prison, the episode about the Loveladys appears in the magazine version and leaves a lasting impression on readers at the end of the fifth section. It seems appropriate for Nancy to bring up the topic of her "coffin money saved up with Mr. Lovelady" (308) when she becomes aware of her imminent death. In this episode, however, Quentin adds details about Mrs. Lovelady and the daughter that are unnecessary and unrelated to the storyline: "He and his wife lived at the hotel. One morning his wife committed suicide. They had a child, a little girl. He and the child went away. After a week or two he came back alone" (308). Here, Quentin expands his account to include the wife and child of Mr. Lovelady and juxtaposes Lovelady's family relationship with that of Jesus, Nancy, and their unborn baby. Quentin's inclusion of Mrs. Lovelady's suicide and the child's disappearance insinuate Nancy's suicide and the subsequent death of her unborn baby.

Additionally, the physical features of Jesus, "a short black man" (290) who has a "razor scar on his black face like a piece of dirty string" (292), resemble that of Mr. Lovelady who is similarly described as "a short, dirty man" (308). In the magazine version, Mr. Lovelady "went to the Baptist church" (267) and shares a common feature with Mr. Stovall, "the cashier in the bank and a deacon in the Baptist church" (258). Mr. Lovelady's description of the Baptist church, however, is deleted in the final version, and the similarity between him and Jesus (instead of him and Mr. Stovall) becomes evident. Quentin not only contrasts the circumstances of the Loveladys with Jesus, Nancy, and the unborn baby but also displays their similar characteristics.

While Quentin's eloquence implies Nancy's suicide, his silence denies the possibility of her murder by Jesus. One compelling piece of evidence that indicates Jesus' return to Jefferson is the ominous "hogbone" that Nancy mentions in the fifth section. Nancy insists that she found a "sign," a "hogbone" (307), which evokes a Voodoo magical item and is proof of her husband's return (D. Kuyk, B. Kuyk, and Miller 46; Peek, "That Evening Sun(g)" 138; Towner and Carothers 157). She says, "I got it. It was on the table when I come in. It was a hogbone, with blood meat still on it, laying by the lamp" (307). Nancy's claim, however, lacks credibility and seems to be an expedient assertion to force the Compsons to stay in her cabin. There is no knowing whether the hogbone has actually existed.

Quentin, in fact, does not refer to this hogbone when he depicts Nancy's cabin in the third section: "Then we came to her house. We were going fast then. She opened the door. The smell of the house was like the lamp and the smell of Nancy was like the wick, like they were waiting for one another to begin to smell. She lit the lamp and closed the door and put the bar up" (301). Quentin watches and gives a full account of Nancy's actions throughout the story, and it is unlikely that he would fail to notice the hogbone while meticulously making observations about the room. Likewise, Caddy and Jason, who go to Nancy's cabin with Quentin, do not mention anything about the hogbone. Mr. Compson only repeats the word

“Nonsense” in response to Nancy’s fear of the darkness and Jesus’ revenge, explaining, “He went away a long time ago” (309). In spite of a rumor among blacks that Jesus “was back in town” (293), the Compsons’ attitudes contradict Nancy’s insistence on the presence of the hogbone and Jesus’ return to the town.

Furthermore, Quentin’s silence in the preceding episode denies the possibility that Jesus will kill Nancy. As Malcolm Cowley points out, the hogbone is instead intended to remind readers of Nancy’s bone that appears in the first section of *SF* (*PF* xiii; Whicher 253-55). He provides this quote to back up his claim:

“And when Nancy fell in the ditch and Roskus shot her and the buzzards came and undressed her.”

The bones rounded out of the ditch, where the dark vines were in the black ditch, into the moonlight, like some of the shapes had stopped. (*SF* 33-34)

When Caddy describes Nancy’s last moment, saying, that the buzzards “undressed her,” Benjy immediately associates Caddy’s story with Nancy’s bone and perceives Nancy’s death. Even though some details differ in *SF* and “TES”,⁶ there seems to be some kind of connection between Nancy’s bone in *SF* and Nancy’s ending in “TES.” Indeed, “the dark vines” and “the black ditch” that Benjy conceives in the previous passage have a significant association with the means and place of Nancy’s suicide in “TES.” These two motifs could further demonstrate the possibility of Nancy’s suicide.

3. The means of Nancy’s suicide

As previously stated, Nancy once attempted suicide by hanging herself in jail.⁷ According to David Lester, in 1933 black females used the following methods to commit suicide: 49 poisons, 4 hangings, 17 firearms, and 30 others (83). Among these methods, hanging may not be a workable alternative for Nancy’s suicide due to the possibility that she will repeat her past failure. In “TES,” we notice that there are several references to a razor used for wounding and killing. Thus, a razor might be the most familiar and effective tool Nancy would use to commit violent acts, including suicide. Quentin’s narratives in “TES” and *SF* support the possibility of her suicide with a razor.

There are two scenes in which cutting a stomach are mentioned in “TES.” The first, which is often referred to as the “vine business,” takes place when Jesus and Nancy quarrel in front of the Compson children about Nancy’s unborn baby. Their talk, quoted below, indicates that Jesus is not the baby’s father and that he is irate about Nancy’s pregnancy:

Jesus was in the kitchen, sitting behind the stove, with his razor scar on his black face like a piece of dirty string. He said it was a watermelon that Nancy had under her dress.

“It never come off of your vine, though,” Nancy said.

“Off of what vine?” Caddy said.

“I can cut down the vine it did come off of,” Jesus said. (292)

According to Quentin, Jesus always carries a razor “on that string down his back, inside his shirt” (295) and uses it as a powerful instrument in a fight. A razor scar on his face shows that he has encountered trouble with a razor. Nancy fears Jesus’ revenge, saying, “I aint seen him, and I aint going to see him again but once more, with that razor in his mouth” (295). She acknowledges the handiness and practicality of a razor.

Moreover, there is a close connection between the “vine business” of “TES” and the “dark vines” in *SF*. In the final version, Faulkner includes the word “vine,” which had been deleted at Mencken’s discretion in the magazine version. This revision shows Faulkner’s persistence in understanding the word “vine” as a synonym for genitals, since the context of the passage is clear enough through the description of cutting the watermelon (unborn baby) down in the magazine version. Faulkner’s preoccupation with the “vine business” in “TES” seems to correspond with *SF*’s “dark vines” of the ditch where Nancy is shot. Indeed, the color of the “dark vines” evoke not only the images of death and actual darkness at night but also the physical characteristics of Nancy’s “brown hands” (298, 303, 304, 305) in “TES.” To summarize, the vines suggest sexuality, death, and physical features for both characters named Nancy in “TES” and *SF*.

Another scene that deals with the topic of slashing a belly comes when Nancy discusses the love affair of Jesus. Nancy huffs over Mr. Compson’s casual comment on Jesus’ whereabouts: “Probably got another wife by now and forgot all about you” (295). In response to Mr. Compson’s flippancy, Nancy, consumed with jealousy, fiercely insists, “I’d stand there right over them, and every time he wropped her, I’d cut that arm off. I’d cut his head off and I’d slit her belly and I’d shove—” (295). What is notable here is her assertion that she would “slit her belly.” For Nancy, the abdominal region signifies sexuality and reproduction and, thus, needs to be damaged severely to the woman who takes her husband. It is, then, suggestive that Nancy’s swollen, balloon-like stomach becomes obvious when she attempts to commit suicide in prison. Quentin implicitly states that Nancy’s suicide is closely related to her pregnancy.

The description of Nancy’s extramarital pregnancy in “TES” resembles Caddy’s premarital pregnancy in *SF*. When Caddy’s sexual misconduct comes to his mind, Quentin associates it with a man who has cut his body (presumably his testicles) with a razor in the ditch. Quentin recalls these episodes when he tries to hide the flat irons under the bridge where he eventually commits suicide:

Have there been very many Caddy
I dont know too many will you look after Benjy and Father
You dont know whose it is then does he know
Dont touch me will you look after Benjy and Father. . . .

I’ve got to marry somebody Versh told me about a man who mutilated himself. He went into the woods and did it with a razor, sitting in a ditch. A broken razor flinging them backward over his shoulder the same motion complete the jerked skein of blood

backward and not looping. But that's not it. It's not not having them. (*SF* 115-16)

The significance of this passage in relation to the topic of this chapter is that Quentin evokes the previous episode of the mutilated man when he becomes aware of Caddy's pregnancy and his suicide. If Nancy's suicide deeply affects the nine-year-old Quentin in "TES," Quentin's more mature recollection of the mutilated man at the place of his own suicide in *SF* overlaps and raises the possibility of Nancy's suicide.⁸

As previously mentioned, the act of cutting a stomach bears a sexual connotation of castration in "TES." Nancy seems to strongly believe that severe punishment awaits those who have a wrongful sexual relationship. Because she feels guilty about carrying another man's (probably a white man's) baby, we can presume that Nancy eventually commits suicide by cutting her belly with a razor, similar to the "self-castration" (Ross and Polk 100) performed by the mutilated man in *SF*. The similar deaths of the mutilated man and Nancy must have been imprinted on the young Quentin's memory.

4. The place of Nancy's suicide

There is a revision in the fifth section of the final version that emphasizes the mystery of Nancy's final destination. When Nancy states, "When yawl walk out that door, I gone" (*CS* 307), Caddy asks, "Gone where, Nancy?" (*CS* 307) instead of, "Who's gone, Nancy?" (*AM* 266). Nancy, without answering Caddy's inquiry, repeats, "I gone" (307, 308) and foresees her dead body covered with blood, saying "the next morning there I am, and blood—" [307]). Nancy's obsessive tone becomes more intense and determined as the story moves toward the end. She fears that her husband, Jesus, is hiding in the ditch waiting for an occasion to take revenge on her. The "black ditch" where Nancy fell and got shot and the "ditch" where the man mutilated himself in *SF* provide evidence suggesting that Nancy's final place will be similar in "TES." There is a possibility that Nancy will commit suicide in the ditch after realizing that the Compsons will not help her.

Topographically speaking, ditches in "TES" and *SF* resemble gullies that are formed by water eroding the earth's surface. The studies of Charles S. Aiken and Calvin S. Brown show that the northern part of Mississippi, including Faulkner's Lafayette County, is one of the most severely damaged regions in the United States because of loess erosion and careless cultivation techniques used by the early settlers (Brown 96; Aiken 145). According to Brown, there used to be many sand ditches in Faulkner's hometown, Oxford, that were dry except during heavy rains (167).

The ditch plays a significant role in "TES." First, the short story begins and ends with Quentin's description of the ditch that lies between his house and Nancy's cabin. It is notable that Faulkner thoroughly revised the description of the ditch in the final version. He deleted characteristics of the ditch, such as "the thick vines" and "massed with honeysuckle" (*AM* 267), and he changed the expression "crossed the ditch" (*AM* 267), making it "went down into the ditch" and "went up out of the ditch" (*CS* 309). That Faulkner limited the use of "crossing the

ditch” to the third section corresponds to Nancy’s behavior in the first section and creates a kind of framing structure for the entire story.

Faulkner, however, did not straightforwardly use actual ditches in his works. The previous studies of “TES” show that the ditch symbolizes “a hell” and “a racial boundary that divides Jefferson’s white and black worlds” (Rosenman 12), “a literal and metaphoric space that dissolves social status and other distinctions in its darkness and natural fecundity” (Barnett 135), and “Nancy’s confusion and fear, as well as her lack of freedom and power” (Tamura 147, my translation). Since Nancy admits that her sinfulness is “hellborn” (298) and predicts, “I wont be nothing soon. I going back where I come from soon” (298), the previous interpretations of the ditch might somehow explain the likelihood that her life will end in the ditch.

This chapter explores another reading concerning Nancy’s final resting place by focusing on the relationships between the ditch and the Jordan River. Interestingly enough, Michael E. Williams states that the Jordan River, which runs through the Middle East, looks like a “meandering ditch” (173). If we recall that, in *SF*, Quentin drowns himself in the Charles River in Massachusetts, Nancy could have committed suicide in the ditch, or the figurative Jordan River, in “TES.”

The symbolic Jordan River, in fact, becomes an important place when we associate it with the ditch in “TES.” Negro spirituals include many songs about the Jordan River that originate from the stories of the Israeli’s suffering and liberation in the Old Testament, particularly Exodus and Joshua. One of the most well-known Negro spirituals that deals with the river is “Deep River,” which includes these lines:

Deep river, my home is over Jordan,
Deep river, Lord, I want to cross over into campground. [refrain]
Oh, chillun, Oh, don’t you want to go, to that gospel feast,
That promised land, that land, where all is peace?
Walk into heaven, and take my seat,
And cast my crown at Jesus feet.
Lord, I want to cross over into campground. [refrain]
Deep river, my home is over Jordan,
Deep river, Lord, I want to cross over into campground. [refrain] (Johnson 100-03)

When black people sing about “somewhere over Jordan,” the phrase often means the Promised Land (Canaan) and the North, as well as freedom from slavery. As LeRoi Jones notes, ““Crossing the river Jordan’ meant not only death but also the entrance into the very real heaven and a release from an earthly bondage” (40). In the past, Nancy has spoken about a lane in the same way that evokes the description of the Jordan River: “If I can just get through the lane, . . . I be all right then” (294). The figurative use of “crossing” could be the key to understanding Nancy’s final resting place.

In “TES,” two scenes of “crossing the ditch” occur at the end of the third section: one is

the scene where Nancy goes back to her cabin with the Compson children and the other is the scene where Nancy tells the story about a queen to the children at her cabin. The story of a queen corresponds with Nancy's behavior on returning to her cabin:

She came and sat in a chair before the hearth. There was a little fire there. Nancy built it up, when it was already hot inside. She built a good blaze. She told a story. . . . "And so this here queen come walking up to the ditch, where that bad man was hiding. She was walking up to the ditch, and she say, 'If I can just get past this here ditch,' was what she say . . ."

"What ditch?" Caddy said. "A ditch like that one out there? Why did a queen want to go into a ditch?"

"To get to her house," Nancy said. She looked at us. "She had to cross the ditch to get into her house quick and bar the door."

"Why did she want to go home and bar the door?" Caddy said. (302-03)

Since Nancy does not answer Caddy's question, we can only speculate about Nancy's inner feelings. The significant part of Nancy's story is that the queen only hopes to "cross the ditch." Keiko Wells points out that "no singers would cross the river and see the heaven in the songs [of Negro spirituals]" (52, my translation), which means that the queen is unable to cross the ditch in Nancy's story.

Therefore, we can find some similarities between "crossing the Jordan River" in Negro spirituals and the queen's "crossing the ditch" in "TES." The "house" the queen eventually reaches after crossing the river is not literally "Nancy's cabin" but rather a metaphorical "heaven" and "home," words included in "Deep River." Likewise, "fire" and "blaze" have a connection to the "campground" and "gospel feast" of "Deep River," and "bar the door" reflects Nancy's hope to remain in a glorious heaven. Considering that "cross the ditch to get into her house quick and bar the door" (CS 303) was originally "cross that ditch to get home" (AM 264) in the magazine version of "TES," we can see Faulkner's attachment to the queen's "crossing the ditch." Nancy's story of the queen, thus, has a close connection with words in the Negro spirituals about the longing for the salvation of God. The queen, or Nancy, tries to overcome the difficulties of her life by crossing the ditch.

Not many previous studies have dealt with this topic, but Negro spirituals, including "Deep River," are a strength in Nancy's life. Because the title of "TES" derives from the blues song "St. Louis Blues," most scholars have discussed its connection with blues music, for example, the use of "sexual double-entendre" (Bennett 41). To be sure, the relationship of Nancy and Jesus reflects the love-hate drama found in blues that focuses on the personal despair, anguish, inconvenience, and sorrow of daily life. As for Nancy's last moment, however, Negro spirituals that emphasize belief, salvation, and an afterlife (heaven) may appeal to her heart more than the secular messages of blues. She frequently speaks to God in the story. We know that the nine-year-old Quentin understands Nancy's appeal to "Jesus" when he explains to Caddy, "It's the other Jesus she means" (297). In this scene, the young Quentin

tries to interpret the double meanings of “Jesus” but does not go deeply into Nancy’s inner feelings. At the age of twenty-four, Quentin, at last, must have realized that Nancy, who intones the word “Jeeeeeeeeeeeeeeesus” (296) and repeats “God knows” (297), has longed for God’s forgiveness that often appears in spirituals. The short story, thus, connotes both blues and Negro spirituals.

At the same time, it is true that Nancy’s story about a queen displays her fear of the revenge of her husband, “that bad man” (302). Here, we must consider that her husband’s name is “Jesus” (his name was “Jubah” in the magazine version). After explaining that “Jesus” was “a valid name among Negroes in Mississippi,” Faulkner showed his sympathy toward Nancy when he wrote, “this Negro woman who had given devotion to the white family knew that when the crisis of her need came, the white family wouldn’t be there” (*FU* 21). Although the name “Jesus” is not common among blacks in Mississippi (D. Kuyk, B. Kuyk, and Miller 42), Faulkner made a good point that the help that Nancy asked for “when the crisis of her need came” would not come from the Compsons. Seeing that her time has come, Nancy seems to have lost her presence of mind and submits to her fate.

Nancy’s mixed feelings of distress and liberation become evident in her conversation with Mr. Compson that occurs at the end of the fifth section. In the following exchange, Mr. Compson tries to mitigate Nancy’s anxiety and fear, only to fail:

“Nonsense,” father said. “You’ll be the first thing I’ll see in the kitchen tomorrow morning.”

“You’ll see what you’ll see, I reckon,” Nancy said. “But it will take the Lord to say what that will be.” (308)

This passage indicates that Nancy has resigned herself into the hands of the “Lord,” that is, “Jesus.” For Nancy, who persistently insists that her husband is “waiting in the ditch yonder” (307), “Jesus” means both her husband and a being she calls “Lord” who bring despair (fear) and hope (salvation). Considering that Quentin’s silence implicitly denies Jesus’ return to the town, as a narrator, he places more emphasis on the Lord than on Nancy’s husband by the end of the story.

In general, Negro spirituals are classified as “sorrow songs” and “jubilees” (Oliver, Harrison, and Bolcom 14). The latter songs remind us of the Year of Jubilee and provide valuable implications related to the year 1913 and the present time of “TES.” As Oliver et al. state, “For the slaves, the year of jubilee was to be the year of freedom, and the songs that rejoiced in the prospect came to be called jubilees” (11). Furthermore, Charles A. Peek explains that Negro spirituals “often fall into two categories, those urging someone to stay in the bosom of nurture despite the pain of the circumstances . . . and [those] exhorting them to leave in hopes of a better chance (songs of crossing over the river)” (“That Evening Sun(g)” 144). Nancy, who carries heavy baskets of laundry, a symbol of life’s burden, eventually sings the jubilee songs in the dark ditch and tries to find light and hope in the future.

Nancy often sings to herself, but the nine-year-old Quentin can only comprehend her

voice as “the sound.” “Not singing and not unsinging” (300, 309) and “the sound” (296, 298, 300, 308) that Nancy often makes are, as Carol B. Gartner suggests, part of Negro spirituals that blacks sing in churches (53). We can also understand the reason that Mr. Compson does not employ his cliché of “nonsense” and responds with the spiritual word “damnation” (308) to “the sound” of Nancy. Unlike the young Quentin, Mr. Compson understands what Nancy is singing about—her death and afterlife. In Christianity, suicide is condemned as sinful and “viewed as an unacceptable solution, a sign of submission, and a certain route to eternal damnation” (Gibbs 74). Mr. Compson’s “damnation” thus suggests the general view concerning the consequence of committing suicide. He dissuades Nancy from killing herself so that she will not be cast into hell. However, he does not hold out a helping hand to Nancy just as he does not take Quentin’s threats of suicide seriously in *SF*, opining that “people cannot do anything that dreadful” (80).

On his way home, Quentin once again notices Nancy’s voice (“the sound that was not singing and not unsinging” [309]) and hears her saying (“I just done got tired” [309]), things that he cannot possibly hear in reality. Since her body becomes invisible in the brightly-lit cabin, we can presume that Nancy no longer stays in her cabin. This does not mean, however, that she attempts to catch up with the Compsons and spend a night at their house. She is totally exhausted and accepts her fate as a black woman (“I just a nigger. It ain’t no fault of mine” [309]). Hoping to be free from various hardships in her afterlife and to be safe in the hands of God, Nancy, singing Negro spirituals, heads down to the black ditch and kills herself with a razor.

Even in the Year of Jubilee of 1913, the present time of “TES,” blacks like Nancy are unable to “cross the Jordan River,” and there has been little progress to alleviate their difficult situations experienced fifteen years before. As Johnston points out, “TES” is “an account of the continuing bondage of the emancipated Negro in Jefferson, Mississippi” (95). Quentin’s last words, “Who will do our washing now, Father?” (309), suggest Nancy’s fate—her eventual death and, ultimately, suicide. Fifteen years after Nancy’s suicide, the twenty-four-year-old Quentin, who committed suicide in 1910, finally understands that Nancy endeavored to stride ahead to the “Jordan River” with a slight hope that the day of salvation would come in the near future. The adult Quentin now acknowledges that the only way for her to achieve God’s salvation is, ironically, the damnable act of committing suicide. He also thinks that her choice of suicide was the only means to come to terms with her present situation and to make her presence strongly felt by others.

In the New Testament, the Jordan River represents a state of rebirth as John the Baptist christens Jesus there. According to Nancy A. Clark, “The Jordan as a symbol of the passage to eternal life was extended, for it is only through baptism and repentance that salvation is attained” (728). When Nancy starts to “make that sound” in her cabin, Quentin notices “water began to come out on her face in big drops” (306). When he sees this impressive incident, he says decisively, “She is not crying” (306). He associates the water with the symbolic Jordan River and foresees her imaginary immersion in the ditch. Although Nancy cannot cross the “Jordan River,” she at least endeavors to regenerate herself by entering the “river.” Reflecting

on his own suicide, the adult Quentin recounts a story of the self-confessed “hellborn” black washerwoman, Nancy, who longs for salvation and ends up committing suicide. Both of their stories, which take place on their final days, produce a deep impression on readers’ minds and explain their efforts in establishing their own identity until the last moment.

Chapter 4
A Reconsideration of the Color Line:
Quentin's Awareness of Sam Fathers' Blackness in "A Justice"

1. Quentin's Early Objection to Sam Fathers' Blackness

"A Justice" has a multi-layered structure of a frame narrative and deals with the complex topics of slavery and the intermixture of cultures. In the frame stories of Sections I and V, Quentin looks back to his childhood and recalls the old story of his grandfather's carpenter, Sam Fathers, who narrates the stories of Sections II to IV. When Quentin visits his grandfather's farm one Saturday afternoon, he learns about the source of Sam's Choctaw name, Had-Two-Fathers. Because Sam's Choctaw background is emphasized throughout the short story, most critics have considered either the circumstances of Sam's "begetting and naming" or "Ikkemotubbe's [future Choctaw chief's] rise to power" as the core of the story (Towner and Carothers 180).

Although critics pay much attention to Sam's relationship with the Choctaws, this chapter reexamines his blackness, which is derived from his black mother. In Section I, the twelve-year-old Quentin is unable to figure out why Sam, who is actually part Choctaw, is primarily considered a "Negro," and tries to provide substantial reasons for opposition: "But he wasn't a Negro. That's what I'm going to talk about" (343). Having later internalized the rigid racial system of the "one-drop rule," however, Quentin eventually understands why everyone calls Sam a "Negro." Given that not many critics discuss the social conditions surrounding the adult Quentin early in the twentieth century,¹ this chapter ultimately discusses his inability to escape from the influences of his upbringing in white society and culture. What Quentin realizes in the end is a growing awareness of the "one-drop rule" in the South, in which even Sam is no exception. Sam's story about his mixed-blood origin makes the adult Quentin rethink about the difficulty of solving the identity issues.

2. The "One-drop Rule" in the South

The times of Sam's story and the adult Quentin's recollection coincide with the expansion of the "one-drop rule" in the South. Legally speaking, the rule considered "individuals with one-thirty-second part African American ancestry as 'black'" (S. Smith 189). However, what becomes the subject of discussion is more cultural than scientific. As a Mississippi sheriff in Edna Ferber's *Show Boat* (1926) insists, without reservation, "One drop of nigger blood makes you a nigger in these parts" (145). What this sheriff reveals here is that the question of race in Mississippi lies not in the body but in the mind. According to Joel Williamson, "[t]he animus against miscegenation and mulattoes seemed to reach a crescendo in the South about 1907" (94). When the discriminatory policy of the "one-drop rule" becomes popular and is legitimized in the twentieth century, the adult Quentin interprets Sam's old story through the

lens of his modern ideas about the South, which diverge from those of his youth.

From the 1850s onward, the South started to believe that it could compile all “Negroes” into one category, and this notion encouraged the conceptual emergence of the “one-drop rule.” People in Jefferson, in fact, know well enough that Sam is biologically part black and part Choctaw but classify him as a black according to social conventions. Williamson examines the minutiae of the “changeover” of the South:

By 1915 white America had come to the one-drop rule. . . . It was almost as if some people who had been adult men and women in the 1850s and reared to the old order had to die away and a new generation born to the one-drop rule come to maturity before the total changeover could occur. (108-09)

Williamson’s explanation corresponds with the relationship between Sam, a legacy of “the old order,” and Quentin, “a new generation born to the one-drop rule.” The social “changeover” influences Quentin’s perception of Sam as Quentin ages. Thus, Quentin, as an adult, not only looks back on Sam’s origin as a past-life memory of the antebellum days, which is told in a humorous and casual manner and concerns racial discrimination very little, but also senses a different meaning in his retelling of Sam’s story in the present day.

By contrast, the twelve-year-old Quentin seems to have had little knowledge about Sam’s earlier life and the “one-drop rule” because no references to the Choctaws and racial discrimination are made in Section I. Rather, Quentin only states that Sam sounds similar but looks quite different from other black people:

Then he would stop working and he would fill his pipe—he made them himself, out of creek clay with a reed stem—and he would tell me about the old days. He talked like a nigger—that is, he said his words like niggers do, but he didn’t say the same words—and his hair was nigger hair. But his skin wasn’t quite the color of a light nigger and his nose and his mouth and chin were not nigger nose and mouth and chin. And his shape was not like the shape of a nigger when he gets old. He was straight in the back, not tall, a little broad, and his face was still all the time, like he might be somewhere else all the while he was working or when people, even white people, talked to him, or while he talked to me. (344)

This passage indicates Quentin’s acute observation and his uneasiness with Sam’s contradictory appearance. Here, the young Quentin takes full advantage of his senses, such as hearing, seeing, smelling, and feeling, to observe Sam’s features. He knows that Sam creates a different atmosphere from other blacks but has no words to fully express the feeling of unfamiliarity.

Accordingly, Quentin attempts to clear away his early uncomfortable feeling by listening to Sam’s story about his origin from Section II. When the visual evidence of racial identity and color lines became less distinguishable at the turn of the century, heredity tests began to serve

as indices for one's legal social status (S. Smith 194). Mark M. Smith pays attention to the notion of invisible blackness and discusses other methods of defining race:

Because the one-drop rule meant that blackness was no longer visible, whites had to rely on history, contacts, and genealogies to help them ascertain blackness, which is why southern legal minds argued that if "it is known that an individual" has black blood, then he stands as black. Where genealogies are known, "it is almost impossible for person to 'pass for white.'" (101)

This passage demonstrates that the "one-drop rule" highly values heredity and genealogy. In this argument, genealogy that deals with "the history of fathers, mothers, great-grandfathers, a chronicle of color" (M. Smith 75) becomes an important factor in defining racial identity and in implementing the "one-drop rule" in the South.

When the eye becomes unreliable for establishing an individual's racial identity, people examine "local histories and known genealogies" (M. Smith 102) for further evidence. In this regard, it is always necessary to keep in mind that both stories of the young Quentin and Sam are framed by the adult Quentin's recollection in "A Justice." Although the young Quentin's primary purpose is to illuminate Sam's connection with the Choctaws, his attempt ironically results in signifying his blackness for the adult Quentin. In other words, the genealogical relationship, which proves that Sam is part Choctaw and part black, results in his being identified as a black under the "one-drop rule." Sam's genealogy at once fascinates and terrifies Quentin, for it raises the sensitive, controversial issue of racial discrimination.

3. Emphasis on Patriarchy, Disappearance of Choctaw Traits

When the frame narrator, Quentin, disappears entirely from the scene and becomes a perfect listener in Section II, Sam begins the story of his Choctaw background—which Sam had heard from Herman Basket in his youth. Herman Basket is a Choctaw friend of Sam's "pappy," Crawfish-ford, and tells the story of how Sam was given the Choctaw name "Had-Two-Fathers" by the Choctaw chief, Doom (or, in earlier times, Ikkemotubbe), in the 1820s.² In reality, having a mixed-race parentage, including the case of Sam, was not uncommon in the South. According to Williamson, "many Negroes were part Indian in view of the facts that mixture had begun so early and diffusion was always a function of time" (125). However, for the twelve-year-old Quentin, the internal story of "A Justice" is his first introduction to Sam's connection with the Native Americans and the Choctaw life before the emergence of the "one-drop rule" in the South. The adult Quentin reconsiders the impact of Sam's story and finds a different connotation in it, which might invalidate Sam's Choctaw origin.

The young Quentin learns that, similar to his white society, the Choctaws value paternal lineage. Sam's internal story starts with "Doom's Machiavellian seizure of the chieftaincy" (Bradford 267), resembling whites' ethics regarding control over others. Doom's usurpation of

Choctaw chieftaincy from his mother's brother signifies his disregard for the maternal line, and his winning of six slaves on the steamboat and "more black people in the Plantation than they could find use for" (345) suggests his power and authority as a slave owner. Doom's manner "in the white man's talk" (347), indeed, shows parallel movements in the Choctaw community: the development of a patriarchal social order and the progress of the slave culture. Sam's story emphasizes that he used to be part of Choctaw patriarchy and slavery: "I remember how I never saw but one white man until I was a boy big as you are; a whisky trader that came every summer to the Plantation" (344). This suggests that Sam spent his early life in the Choctaw community and assimilated into its culture.

At the same time, Sam's story demonstrates that the Choctaws deal with black slaves differently from how whites treat them. It is true that Doom "owned the Plantation, the Negroes" and that the Choctaws "would run the black men with dogs, like you would a fox or a cat or a coon" (344, 345). Nevertheless, the Choctaws take part in the physical labor with blacks and are under Doom's strict control. For instance, a black slave and Crawfish-ford engage in a fair competition for a black woman's love. Sam's presumed father, Crawfish-ford, tries to win a black slave's wife, who is Sam's mother, and resorts to every possible stratagem. When Sam was born as "a fine yellow man" (357), as part Choctaw,³ Doom mediates in the fight and orders Crawfish-ford and Herman Basket to build a palisade fence around the black slave's cabin. When the fence is complete, the black slave introduces a newborn baby—Sam's half-brother—who looks completely black. The twelve-year-old Quentin learns that, in the 1820s, the Choctaws acted as the ruling white people did but was generous enough to treat black slaves with "justice" in situations of unfair practices.

All of the Choctaw memories, however, have become history in Sam's mind by the time he tells his story to Quentin at around the turn of the century. In this regard, some critics examine the significance of the Indian Removal in the 1830s, especially during the Jacksonian era.⁴ With all of the inaccuracies and discrepancies in Faulkner's depiction of the Native Americans, "A Justice" corresponds with the disappearance of the Choctaws in Mississippi, which may include Doom, Crawfish-ford, and Herman Basket. Sam does not detail the consequences that these Choctaws faced, except that Doom "owned all the land that I knew of until I was grown" (344). Sam's story focuses on his birth, and the present situations of the Choctaws remain obscure.

As such, Sam's current position is the only clue for the consequences of the Choctaws. Sam tells the young Quentin that Doom "sold my mammy to your grandpappy" but "said I didn't have to go [with her] unless I wanted to, because I was a warrior too then" (344, 345). While there is no knowing when and why Doom sold Sam's mother to Quentin's great-grandfather, Sam's explanation shows that he made his own decision to go to the Compson house with her. Yet, at the same time, his assertion of following his mother with a will of his own might be groundless, considering the Indian Removal and the growing racial discrimination in those days. Sam seems to have maintained his Choctaw pride but might not have had other options to go against the South's racial policies and custom.

What brings back a vivid memory of Sam in the adult Quentin's mind, then, are the

difficult situations of non-white people under the “one-drop rule” and other discriminatory practices in the Jim Crow era during the early twentieth century. Although the rule was mostly concerned with cases of people “passing for whites,” the mixed black and Native American population also came under critical scrutiny. For the adult Quentin, the story of Sam’s Choctaw origin provides a sharp contrast with Sam’s current social status as a black. It is true that Sam runs the shop and manages to keep the Compson farm and the slave quarters “whole and sound” (343). He also “wouldn’t jump up and go back to work when Mr. Stokes or even Grandfather came along” (344). However, he can act at his own discretion only in limited spaces and has “lived with the Negros” (343) in the black quarters beyond the farm. Sam’s current social status is indicative of the racial segregation in the South in the twentieth century.

Additionally, Sam admits that his Choctaw name is no longer used these days: “It was my name once” (345). In this regard, Quentin’s initial reaction to “Had-Two-Fathers” is quite suggestive: “That’s not a name. That’s not anything” (345). Sam’s black neighbors call him “Uncle Blue-Gum” (344), meaning “a Negro whose gums are blue rather than pink” (Brown 33). Because white people, including Quentin, call him “Sam Fathers,” no one in the community calls him with his Choctaw name. Sam’s surrounding environment and given names imply that he has totally blended into the black community, willingly or not, when Quentin listens to and remembers Sam’s story. The young Quentin does not notice this, but the adult Quentin knows Sam’s position in the community and social conventions of the South.

Through the recollection of Sam’s story, the adult Quentin learns about the transition from earlier semi-acceptance of mixed-race persons to the outright rejection of them through the development of the “one-drop rule” in the South. Especially in the 1850s, “the South grew furiously intolerant of anything that was not distinctly slave or free, black or white, male or female” (Williamson 74). However, it was not easy to draw a line between blacks and whites due to the issue of miscegenation. Because “[b]lackness was not just seen—it could be smelled, heard, and felt” (M. Smith 47), the twelve-year-old Quentin initially makes the best use of his senses in order to capture Sam’s blackness. When he fails to do so, the story of Sam’s origin seems to have explained his perplexity.

Nevertheless, Sam’s disclosure of his Choctaw origin, which, in turn, sheds light on his mother’s black traits, results in reinforcing his current social (racial) status as a black for the grown-up Quentin. As stated previously, the act of telling one’s origin or genealogy at the turn of the century is often associated with the status-defining power of blackness based on the “one-drop rule.” The significance of “A Justice” lies in the mental development of the adult Quentin: he realizes that it is difficult to find the “justice” given to the black slaves in the 1820s in the present-day Southern society. No matter how Sam emphasizes his Choctaw paternal line, his mother’s blackness inevitably determines his social standing.

4. Neglected Maternal Line, Foregrounded Blackness

Although Sam’s mother hardly appears in person in “A Justice,” her presence is strongly felt when we think of Sam’s social status in the South. The significance of the story, as Arthur

F. Kinney states, lies in the fact that Sam's "Indian blood has been denied and his matrilineal black blood made the basis for his identity" (142). It is true that Sam's mother is totally nameless and voiceless throughout "A Justice."⁵ Her episodes in Sam's story are simple and dismal: she is sold to Doom with five other slaves on the steamboat from New Orleans, becomes entangled in a love triangle with her black husband and Crawfish-ford, and eventually has two babies, Sam (originally Had-Two-Fathers) and a black baby, who have the same mother but different fathers. She is later sold to Quentin's great-grandfather and, as Sam's current condition implies, probably spends the rest of her life in the black quarters. These episodes show that she is regarded as negligible, and Sam seems to take great pains to obliterate his black (slave) background. Yet, because of the "one-drop rule," the more he talks about his Choctaw origin, the stronger that his mother's presence becomes.

Considering the importance of each character's name in the story, nameless blacks—particularly the anonymity of Sam's mother—reflect Sam's mixed feelings toward blacks, who are nowadays his neighbors and call him "Uncle Blue-Gum." Sam's ambivalence is particularly evident when he refers to his parents. Sam calls his mother "my mammy" (344) only once in Section I and repeatedly takes a detached tone of "woman" (345, 347, 351, 354) when he addresses her in the subsequent sections. In contrast, Sam introduces his presumed father as Crawfish-ford. He even adds that "Crawfish-ford" is often shortened into "Craw-ford" (347) and always calls this supposed father "pappy" in the internal story. Such a clean contrast demonstrates that Sam puts a higher value on his father than his mother.

Furthermore, Sam seems to have mixed feelings for his mother not only because of her race but also for her recent arrival in town. Although his father's side, the Choctaws, "were part of the land and they did not become the white man's slaves" (Dabney 27), his mother was on the same steamboat from New Orleans with Doom as someone's slave. In the nineteenth century, New Orleans was "on the verge of becoming one of antebellum America's leading cities, a city to be compared to New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Charleston" and had "North America's largest slave market" (Johnson 1, 2). New Orleans took advantage of its convenient location at the mouth of the Mississippi River and became an important port city for immigration from the Caribbean, Latin America, and Africa as well as for domestic slave trade. Because Sam's mother most likely stayed in New Orleans temporarily due to the slave trade, identifying where she originally came from is difficult. Her life before New Orleans is left out of Sam's consideration and remains unknown. Because of her rootlessness, Sam relies on his Choctaw origin in order to prove his own identity.

Sam's entire story shows that he only wants the young Quentin to remember his paternal side and not his maternal origin. Through the recollection of Sam's past, which emphasizes Sam's Choctaw trait, the adult Quentin senses a distance in Sam's relationship with his black mother and learns that even the mother-child relationship is affected by the racial tensions that culminate in the "one-drop rule" of that era. Even though Sam shows his strong presence as a brave, "natural" man in "A Justice," Quentin seems to struggle with the discrepancy of such a heroic, nostalgic image of Sam as he gets older. As such, Quentin does not try to "free the old man from the social stigma placed upon the African descendants by the Yoknapatawpha

world” as Erskine Peters argues (*Black Being* 95). Rather, Quentin is immobilized in discovering Sam’s ambivalent feelings toward his silent black mother through the assertion of his Choctaw origin. The adult Quentin is unable to stand up against the racial principles of the “one-drop rule” in the white community, which he attempted to do when he was twelve years old.

5. Quentin’s Final Awareness of Sam Fathers’ Blackness

The grown-up Quentin understands Sam’s circumstances and reflects on his present situation in the strict racial society of the South. It appears as though Sam’s presence transcends time and space with his timeless, dignified manner of being “definite, immobile, and complete” (360); however, he is not exempt from the discriminatory social practices, including the Indian Removal and Jim Crow laws, which promoted racial segregation and inequality. Sam is, indeed, “forever elided between two Indian fathers, brought up in the house of a fictive African father, and doomed, as the son of an African mother, to suffer her fate” (Galloway 28). The adult Quentin construes Sam’s words with reference to the development of the “one-drop rule” and faces the harsh reality of identifying Sam as a black. Section I begins with the naive ideas of the twelve-year-old Quentin, who is only concerned with the factual evidence, whereas Section V ends with the recollection of the grown-up Quentin, who is old enough to understand the Southern social practices that identify Sam’s current social status as a black.

In Section V, the twelve-year-old Quentin is still attracted to Sam’s Choctaw background and ignores his grandfather’s first call to return to the surrency. Sam, as if to show the end of his story, pauses for a moment and “deliberately” (358) lights his pipe at his forge when his story reaches the climactic scene of how Doom came up with the name “Had-Two-Fathers.” However, Quentin tries to hear Sam’s subsequent story, which may further verify his initial assertion that Sam “wasn’t a Negro” (343). As such, Quentin listens to Sam until the story reaches the birth of Sam’s younger half-brother, whose father is black, unlike Sam’s. At this point, Quentin hesitates to hear the rest of Sam’s life story, not only because he is already quite familiar with the lives of blacks but also because he is instinctively aware that racial “changeover” would inevitably appear in Sam’s later story. Because the rest of Sam’s story shifts its focus from the Choctaw patriarchy to Sam’s relationship with his black mother, Quentin suspends his thinking and questioning about Sam’s life.

Therefore, when he hears his grandfather’s second call to return to the surrency in the final section, Quentin cuts short Sam’s story and leaves for the surrency, explaining, “I was just twelve then, and to me the story did not seem to have got anywhere, to have had point or end” (359). This comment is noteworthy because the change of the young Quentin’s attitude is described from the grown-up Quentin’s point of view. At the end of the short story, the young Quentin (in the recollection of the adult Quentin) even clouds the issue by replying, “Nothing, sir,” when his grandfather asks him, “What were you and Sam talking about?” (360). The adult Quentin eventually becomes aware of the consequence of the “one-drop rule” in Sam’s story, which

was impenetrable when he was a child, and discovers that such racial discrimination has come under considerable pressure these days.

Quentin's sensible manners in Section V demonstrate that he ultimately lives in conformity with white society's rules. He apologetically responds to his grandfather's second call in the middle of Sam's talk:

Yet I obeyed Grandfather's voice, not that I was tired of Sam Fathers' talking, but with that immediacy of children with which they flee temporarily something which they do not quite understand; that, and the instinctive promptness with which we all obeyed Grandfather, not from concern of impatience or reprimand, but because we all believed that he did fine things, that his waking life passed from one fine (if faintly grandiose) picture to another. (359-60)

Because Sam explains that Doom "sold my mammy to your great-grandpappy" (344), Sam and Quentin's grandfather are around the same age. Quentin's grandfather, like Sam, has lived through both the antebellum and postbellum periods, but unlike Sam, he has probably been a central player in the South's racial policy. The young Quentin "believed that [Grandfather] did fine things" and generalized (or justified) his idea that children "obeyed Grandfather" with "instinctive promptness." While sensing that his grandfather's picture is "faintly grandiose" after listening to Sam's story, Quentin no longer opposes society's general view of Sam's blackness and returns to the place where his family waits for him.

The twelve-year-old Quentin could "flee temporarily" but would soon be forced to confront Sam's words, particularly the untold part of his later story, as he gets older. Even at the present time, however, the adult Quentin cannot retell Sam's story in his own words. Instead of talking in his own voice, Quentin takes advantage of Sam's spoken words (via Herman Basket's story) to authenticate his account. The social rules of the South immobilize him so much so that all he can do is listen to Sam talk. The adult Quentin admits his inability to escape from the influences of white society and culture: "I was just twelve then, and I would have to wait until I had passed on and through and beyond the suspension of twilight. Then I knew that I would know. But then Sam Fathers would be dead" (360). Quentin's retrogressive commentary in the final section of "A Justice" signifies his inability to face the burden of the South until his early death.

Similar to how Quentin refers to the return journey "in that strange, faintly sinister suspension of twilight" (360), the last part of Section V is filled with the implication of impending death, or twilight. Quentin juxtaposes Sam and his grandfather by their deaths, which appear at the beginning and end of the story. In spite of the racial and economical disparity between them, shown in symbols such as his grandfather's expensive cigar and Sam's cheap tobacco and pipe, they are two sides of the same symbolic coin of the old days for Quentin. One (his grandfather) is transmitted as a story "passed from one fine (if faintly grandiose) picture to another," while the other (Sam) is only kept "in a preservative bath in a museum" (360). Having had a chance to look at the "preservative bath," Quentin eventually

learns the implication of Sam's blackness, and his sense of powerlessness over the color line deepens in spite of his earlier insistence ("But he wasn't a Negro" [343]). As a result, "A Justice" exhibits at once Quentin's mental development and his social limitation as a Southern white man. And, it is not until *Absalom, Absalom!* that Quentin actually faces the problems of miscegenation and genealogical relationships, which eventually become his own identity issues.

III. End: *Absalom, Absalom!*

Chapter 5

From Mother's Instrument to Father's Abandoned Son: A Story of Charles Bon

In *Absalom, Absalom!*, Charles Bon occupies a special place. All four narrators of the novel develop their imaginations and struggle to reconstruct his story because they have never physically seen nor encountered him. Critics have most often discussed Bon's mysterious figure along with the narrators' motivations and the father-son relationship as well as American expansionism, imperialism, and paternalism. Some argue that Bon's character serves to create narrative "tension between invention and discovery, between consistency and uncertainty of cause and reason and fact" (Price 335), while others focus on Bon's origin—born in Haiti and raised in New Orleans—and expand their argument into the issue of the color line.¹

This chapter aims to examine Bon's presence in relation to Voodoo, which was mainly introduced to Haiti and New Orleans by African slaves, particularly West African slaves. Since Bon is a grandchild of a planter in Haiti and is in a position to suppress and even reject Voodoo, it may seem odd or fruitless to connect Voodoo with Bon. As such, not many critics have paid close attention to the connection between Bon and Voodoo, even though Voodoo has been examined in conjunction with American imperialism and Hollywood's film industry in the *Absalom* studies.² What will be discussed here is that Bon's link to Voodoo begins when his mother, after her divorce, immigrates to New Orleans from Haiti with him. More specifically, the focus will be on Bon's transformation from a Voodoo trickster into an abandoned son as he fluctuates between the influences of his mother, Eulalia Bon, in New Orleans and his father, Thomas Sutpen, in Mississippi. Bon's sense of rootlessness and his search for selfhood could cast light on the identity issues of this dissertation.

1. Voodoo and Eulalia

Although the narrators of *Absalom, Absalom!* do not foreground Voodoo in their stories (most likely due to their—not Faulkner's—lack of knowledge and limited recognition of it), the recollection of Sutpen's Haitian days in chapter 7 includes suggestions of Voodoo. For instance, "the drums and the chanting" (202, 204) that Sutpen hears at night suggest the practice of Voodoo by Haitian black slaves because, as Alfred Métraux's study reveals, in Voodoo "[t]he drum is not only a musical instrument, it is also a sacred object and even the tangible form of a divinity" (182). Since the plantation owners did not officially permit drumming and dancing (which were accompanied by song), Voodoo rituals with drums and dances often took place in the middle of the night in desolate locations (Dash 67; Tateno 42). Although Sutpen can hear "the drums and the chanting" only in the house, Haitian blacks probably indulged in drumming, chanting, and dancing after their hard work on the plantation. First of all, this chapter examines the influence of Voodoo on Sutpen's first wife, Eulalia Bon, who moved from Haiti to New Orleans with her son, Charles.

The previous example of the plantation where Sutpen worked as a supervisor demonstrates that Haitian black slaves were the major practitioners of Voodoo during Sutpen's stay in Haiti in the early nineteenth century. Voodoo developed in the West Indies among West African slaves as a result of transatlantic slave trade after the sixteenth century. For Haitian black slaves, Voodoo was "a means of retaining a link to the past and establishing solidarity and communication" (Dash 51), and it also offered mental and spiritual sustenance. The ruling class of Haiti considered Voodoo's magic as national backwardness, and it was not until the late nineteenth century that members of the ruling class began to practice Voodoo (Dash 57).

While Voodoo provided Haitian black slaves with moral guidance and support in daily life, it also played a vital role in the Haitian Revolution. According to Dash, "Vaudou [Voodoo] became a systematic set of beliefs and practice by 1791 and acted as a unifying force during the war of independence, making communication possible across barriers of language and culture among the slaves" (67). In fact, the insurrection in the novel closely resembles the historical facts.³ As Calvin S. Brown points out (209), the objects left on the French sugar planter's pillow during the insurrection are likely Voodoo ritual items: "a pig's bone with a little rotten flesh still clinging to it, a few chicken feathers, a stained dirty rag with a few pebbles tied up in it found on the old man's pillow one morning" (203). These items arouse the planter's uneasy feelings of "fear, terror" (203) since he recognizes the stain as blood. In the end, Sutpen's suppression of the uprising is suggested by the disappearance of the drumming sounds: "[T]hen daylight came with no drums in it for the first time in eight days" (205). Given these examples, Sutpen's recollections often associate Voodoo with Haitian blacks.

During the Revolution, many whites and people of mixed blood of the ruling class, as well as their slaves, left Haiti (at that time, Saint-Domingue) for Louisiana (Dessens 15). Dessens emphasizes that "free people of color, especially those of mixed ancestry who either had family ties with the white colonists or had been politically allied with them . . . , could not remain [in Haiti], for they epitomized the old economic order, which the slaves understandably resented and wanted to end" (14-15). Since Eulalia—"[o]nly child of Haitian sugar planter of French descent" (307)—is said to be part black, it is no wonder that she and her Haitian family become involved in the insurrection. The dead body of the half-breed that Sutpen finds during the revolt and in which he "comprehend[s] that the situation might become serious" (204) illustrates the fact that people of mixed blood were the target of the Revolution.

Therefore, it seems probable that Eulalia left Haiti and moved to New Orleans with her son after the revolt. Shreve compares Bon with other children and points out that Bon "were not supposed to know when and why [he] left but only that [he] had escaped" (239). What is significant here is that Shreve implies that Bon and his mother "escaped" from Haiti. The reasons for Eulalia's migration to New Orleans with her son include not only her vindictive urge toward former husband Sutpen, who divorced her unilaterally for personal reasons, but also the reality of being forced to leave the homeland for survival during the Revolution.⁴

Considering the Haitian immigrants' influence on New Orleans Voodoo and the possibility of Eulalia's mixed ancestry, it is highly likely that she partook in New Orleans Voodoo, which was actively practiced during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Haitian

immigrants fleeing the Revolution exerted significant effects on the society of New Orleans, including development of Voodoo. While Haitian Voodoo was primarily practiced by black slaves, slaves and free people of color actively practiced New Orleans Voodoo from the eighteenth century—even at times with white participants from the community (Dessens 161-62, 166; Mulira 55; Tateno 115-17). Although the narrators make no direct reference to Voodoo in *Absalom, Absalom!*, the racial and economic diversity, as well as religious flexibility of New Orleans Voodoo, provide Eulalia with an opportunity to participate in its practice.

As Voodoo produced a revitalizing effect on people oppressed by slavery and other difficulties, it must have appealed to Eulalia on many levels.⁵ Unlike Haitian Voodoo, New Orleans Voodoo—also known as Hoodoo—focuses on the removal of one’s physical and mental distress and puts more emphasis on magic and medicine (e.g., conjecture, goopher, tricking, hexing, and fixing) than does Haitian Voodoo (Tateno 117). For instance, Zora Neale Hurston introduces in her *Mules and Men* (1935) the magic that places a curse on the target and causes him or her damage and harm, thereby gratifying the client’s needs and desires. In spite of her material affluence, Eulalia’s sorrow and anger at Sutpen’s cruel treatment do not seem to disappear; it is likely that she partakes in Voodoo after settling in New Orleans.

Although Eulalia wears “tufted camisoles” and is surrounded by “Florentine mirrors and Paris drapes,” she looks as though she were a dubious Voodoo practitioner (with “lank iron-colored hair”) rather than a wealthy, elegant Catholic (244). It is true that her character is mostly the product of Quentin Compson’s and Shreve’s imagination in chapter 8. Yet, her physical appearance “in the black dress that looked like a section of limp stove pipe and maybe not even a hat but just a shawl over her head, so that the only things missing would be the mop and the pail” (244) creates an eerie atmosphere of a witch with “the face filled with furious and almost unbearable unforgiving almost like fever (not bitterness and despair: just implacable will for revenge)” (239). As “the old Sabine” (243) or a “paranoiac client” (247), Eulalia relentlessly pursues her target, Sutpen in the distance, seeking revenge against him by taking advantage of Voodoo magic.

There are also other female characters who resemble witch figures. Quentin and Shreve imagine Eulalia’s mother (a supposed Spaniard but probably a mulatto) as “the slight dowdy woman with untidy gray-streaked raven hair coarse as a horse’s tail, with parchment-colored skin and implacable pouched black eyes which alone showed no age because they showed no forgetting” (268). They consider that Eulalia’s mystic character of a dark lady is handed down through generations. Mr. Compson also describes an old woman—who handles the wedding ceremony of Bon and the octoroon woman—as “a crone mumbling in a dungeon lighted by a handful of burning hair” (93). Here we notice that the place, “a dungeon” or “secret rooms at night” (93), is lit not by candles but “a handful of burning hair.” As hairs are often used in the rituals and spells of Voodoo, this lighting method suggests an occult Voodoo ritual rather than a Catholic-style ceremony.

Furthermore, this old woman (“a crone”) taking charge of Bon’s wedding ceremony corresponds to the high status of certain females in Voodoo rituals. Since it is uncommon to

have a female officiant for a Catholic wedding—particularly in the nineteenth century—the possibility of the wedding ceremony being Catholic is extremely low. The Catholic nature of marriage is further questioned by descriptions of it as “the morganatic ceremony” (80) (for Mr. Compson) or “the left handed marriage” (242) (for Quentin and Shreve), suggesting that Bon probably cannot marry in formal Catholic style.

The presence of the previous old, woman when Eulalia and Bon had their residence in New Orleans, demonstrates that the matriarchal structure was one of the prominent features of New Orleans Voodoo. As Robert Tallant notes, “Voodooism seems to have been a matriarchy almost from its first days in Louisiana” (21). Jessie Mulira adds that “throughout the period of slavery and for twenty years after the Civil War the most powerful figures among blacks in New Orleans were the voodoo queens” (49). Indeed, the matriarchal image of New Orleans Voodoo is reinforced by the reigning Voodoo queens, such as Sanité Dédé, Marie Saloppé, and Marie Laveau. Although it is disputable whether Voodoo in Africa and Voodoo in Haiti were both historically matriarchal, most critics support the argument that “never in Haiti or Africa did the Queen hold power as Laveau held power in New Orleans” (Jordan par. 14; Dessens 161). As Dédé and Laveau are said to have their mixed ancestral origins in Haiti (Dessens 160), their influences were strong among Haitian immigrants of mixed blood in New Orleans. Since the nineteenth century was “a time when women of all races and classes endured legally as well as socially sanctioned sexual oppression” (Duggal 163), the matriarchal system of New Orleans Voodoo stood out as anomaly during this time. Such a female-centered environment fits well with Eulalia, who raises her son by herself (with a help of a lawyer) after her divorce from Sutpen.

2. Bon as Mother’s Instrument

While participating in Voodoo practice for her own emotional support and vengeance, Eulalia uses her son, Bon, as a convenient and useful prop. The parent-child relationship of Eulalia and Bon in New Orleans is exclusive from the start due to lack of a father figure, and the matriarchal characteristic of New Orleans Voodoo would have strengthened her motherhood. Despite Deborah Clarke’s argument in *Absalom, Absalom!* that “literal mothers are curiously absent, replaced by aunts. . . . What’s missing in the book are mothers” (126, 147), Eulalia constitutes a large part of Bon’s life, as evidenced in chapter 8.

Even though critics pay close attention to the father-son relationship of Sutpen and Bon, Bon’s connection with his mother is barely examined. Eulalia is merely regarded as a woman vengeful toward her former husband, Sutpen, but her most significant role is as Bon’s mother rather than as a sugar planter’s daughter or Sutpen’s former wife. In chapter 7, Eulalia is just a sugar planter’s daughter, only acknowledged as “the girl whose christian name [Sutpen] did not yet know” (204). When chapter 8 starts with Bon’s childhood, however, she suddenly has a strong presence as Bon’s mother. Eulalia is repeatedly depicted as though she were an aggressive bird that ferociously makes a lunge for its prey (“swooping” [238, 239, 245]), whereas Sutpen’s second wife, Ellen, is likened to the “butterfly” (58, 63, 67). Eulalia’s weak

and nearly absent presence as a daughter and wife in chapter 7 changes into a powerful image as Bon's violent, oppressive mother in chapter 8.

When focusing on Bon's childhood, we find that it is neither the sugar planter nor Sutpen but rather Eulalia and her own mother who require close attention. According to Shreve, Bon assumes his mother's furious words and deeds "as a matter of course, as just another natural phenomenon of existence" and "as just another manifestation of mammalian love" (238-39). Here, he generalizes Eulalia's intense emotion as a biological trait of all mammals, including human beings. His indifference to and blind acceptance of the overwhelming presence and dominance of his mother is further illustrated in the following:

[H]e not even knowing maybe that he took it for granted that all kids didn't have fathers too and that getting snatched every day or so from whatever harmless pursuit in which you were not bothering anybody or even thinking about them, by someone because that someone was bigger than you, stronger than you, and being held for a minute or five minutes under a kind of busted water pipe of incomprehensible fury and fierce yearning and vindictiveness and jealous rage was a part of childhood which all mothers of children had received in turn from their mothers and from their mothers in turn from that Porto Rico or Haiti or wherever it was we all came from but none of us ever lived in. . . . (239)

This passage emphasizes physically aggressive mothers rather than the birthplace ("Porto Rico or Haiti") and intangible, shadowy fathers. Moreover, the vehemence of a fanatic mother's actions is the characteristic of both Eulalia and her own mother, since such a tendency can be handed down from mother to daughter for generations. Until Bon enters the University of Mississippi, he was reshaped ("new again" [245]) and raised under the strong influence of his maternal lineage—"made" and "created" as "rich and rotting dirt" by his mother and her lawyer (241, 245).

While not knowing exactly his mother's intention, Bon grows up to find himself as her "instrument":

He found out that she was up to something and he not only didn't care, he didn't even care that he didn't know what it was; got older and found out that she had been shaping and tempering him to be the instrument for whatever it was her hand was implacable for, maybe came to believe (or saw) that she had tricked him into receiving that shape and temper, and didn't care about that too. . . . (240)

Here, Shreve uses the word "trick" to describe Eulalia's manner of nurturing Bon as her "instrument" to have full control of his life. As indicated above, trickery is one aspect of the magic actively practiced in New Orleans Voodoo. After nurturing Bon as the "instrument" (240) to seek her revenge on Sutpen, Eulalia "sit[s] down and let[s] God finish it: pistol or knife or rack; destruction or grief or anguish: God to call the shot or turn the wheel" (238).

According to the Haitian popular saying that "Haiti is 90 percent Catholic and 100 percent

voudou” (Dash 51), Voodoo practices are intermingled with many Catholic rituals and saints. The same can also be said of New Orleans Voodoo. In reality, people felt no discrepancy in being at once Catholic and a Voodoo participant in New Orleans, where the Catholic influences of the city’s former colonial power (Spain and France) remain significant. The possibility of Eulalia’s being both Catholic and a Voodoo participant shows that “God”—in the previous passage of Eulalia’s wait-and-see situation—might be both a Catholic “God” and Voodoo “*Loa*” (“Gods”). If Eulalia exercises Voodoo magic as a means for Bon’s “shaping and tempering,” it is probable that Bon possesses certain properties of Voodoo magic.

Eulalia not only uses Voodoo in her vengeance against Sutpen, she also nurtures her son as Voodoo’s trickster Legba. According to Henry Louis Gates, Jr., the most important characteristic of the West African trickster known as Esu (or Legba in Haitian and New Orleans Voodoo) is its uncertainty and indeterminacy. Gates explains its literary role as follows: “Esu, god of indeterminacy, . . . is the god of interpretation because he embodies the ambiguity of figurative language. . . . Esu is our metaphor for the uncertainties of explication, for the open-endedness of every literary text” (21). Gates provides one example of Esu’s indeterminacy. Esu wears a hat that is white on the left and black on the right, and this confuses two friends: “Esu’s hat is neither black nor white; it is both black and white” (35). Esu, or Legba, is not the either-or existence but the both-and model of inclusiveness.

The obscure figure of Bon not only incorporates the ambiguous features of contradictory factors but also embodies Legba’s role of enabling the narrators to seek the inherent meanings from the text as much as possible. While calling Bon “a Catholic of sorts” (75), Mr. Compson explains Bon’s mystique as “shadowy: a myth, a phantom: something which they engendered and created whole themselves” (82). There may be an overstatement in Mr. Compson’s words as he has not physically seen Bon, yet Bon’s enigmatic presence, “hover[ing], shadowy, almost substanceless” (74) is quite certain throughout the stories.⁶ The narrators’ expressive interpretations of Bon indeed enhance his mystique. Rosa Coldfield romanticizes him as “*Charles Good, Charles Husband-soon-to-be*” (119). Mr. Compson considers him as “the handsome and wealthy New Orleansian” (62), dressed “in the outlandish and almost feminine garments of his sybaritic privacy” (76) but “the esoteric, the almost baroque, the almost epicene objet d’art” (81). Quentin and Shreve, following Mr. Compson’s impression of mysterious Bon, eventually conclude that he is Sutpen’s son from Haiti and is part black. Piecing together all the narrators’ stories, Bon’s elusive characteristics derive from his ambiguous sex, race, and location. His attractiveness, therefore, originates not only in his exoticism but also in his uncertainty—he displays various and contradictory features, yet, at the same time, is able to embrace them all.

Bon’s ambiguity, then, shows Eulalia’s success in nurturing him as Voodoo’s Legba. As in the case of other tricksters, Legba is full of curiosity, has a mischievous nature, breaks social taboos, and defies the authority and social order (Tateno 94). These characteristics of Legba enable Bon to play an appropriate role as Eulalia’s “instrument” to seek revenge against Sutpen. Planned by Eulalia and her lawyer, Bon at first approaches his classmate and half-brother, Henry Sutpen, at the University of Mississippi. According to Mr. Compson, Bon

“seduces” Henry and his sister Judith (73, 76) and even “corrupts” Henry (81, 87). Mr. Compson tells Quentin that Bon enters the alien Puritan society of Mississippi and seduces the Sutpens:

He came into that isolated puritan country household almost like Sutpen himself came into Jefferson: apparently complete, without background or past or childhood—a man a little older than his actual years and enclosed and surrounded by a sort of Scythian glitter, who seems to have seduced the country brother and sister without any effort or particular desire to do so, who caused all the pother and uproar yet from the moment when he realised that Sutpen was going to prevent the marriage if he could, he (Bon) seems to have withdrawn into a mere spectator, passive, a little sardonic, and completely enigmatic. (74)

Mr. Compson later adds that “it must have been Henry who seduced Judith, not Bon: seduced her along with himself” (79). Mr. Compson’s statement, however, is based on the attractiveness of Bon’s figure, and the fact remains unchanged that Bon has a very powerful influence on others, directly and indirectly.

The glamorous lifestyle of a sophisticated Bon is indeed the object of Henry’s admiration. Mr. Compson further explains Bon’s influence on Henry and Judith:

Bon who for a year and a half now had been watching Henry ape his clothing and speech, who for a year and a half now had seen himself as the object of that complete and abnegant devotion which only a youth, never a woman, gives to another youth or a man; who for exactly a year now had seen the sister succumb to that same spell which the brother had already succumbed to, and this with no volition on the seducer’s part, without so much as the lifting of a finger, as though it actually were the brother who had put the spell on the sister, seduced her to his own vicarious image which walked and breathed with Bon’s body. (85)

Bon watches and seduces Henry and Judith with “fatalistic and impenetrable imperturbability” (74) by taking advantage of his “spell.” Mr. Compson tells Quentin that Bon looks “as if he were a hero out of some adolescent Arabian Nights who had stumbled upon (or rather, had thrust upon him) a talisman or touchstone” (76). While Mr. Compson uses “Arabian Nights” to express Bon’s exoticism, the “talisman or touchstone” in the passage indicates Voodoo ritual items known as *gris-gris* if interpreted in the context of New Orleans’ culture at that time. Mr. Compson not only emphasizes the exotic and sophisticated New Orleans culture but also invokes magical factors—such as “a talisman or touchstone” and “spell”—to explain Bon’s inexplicable figure.

Furthermore, Bon’s “spell” on Henry and Judith reaches Ellen, Rosa, and other classmates of the university; Sutpen, too, cannot escape from the effects of Bon’s magical power. Whereas Henry identifies himself with Bon, Sutpen tries to avoid Bon’s presence. When Bon first visits

Sutpen's house, Sutpen feels "a potential threat to the (now and at last) triumphant coronation of his old hardships and ambition" (81). After being rejected at the door of Pettibone's house in his youth, Sutpen has invented his own "design" and succeeds in building a big plantation house of his own. He is aghast at Bon's name in Henry's letter: "Sutpen probably told himself it couldn't be, that there was a limit even to irony beyond which it became either just vicious but not fatal horseplay or harmless coincidence" (214). Sutpen knows by intuition that Bon is dangerous enough to ruin his "design" and secretly goes to New Orleans to confirm Bon's origin. According to Quentin and Shreve, however, Sutpen's encounter with Bon is planned by revengeful Eulalia and her lawyer and is not "fatal horseplay" or "harmless coincidence." Bon's mysterious actions appear as trickster's magic and throw the Sutpens into confusion, as Eulalia had planned.

At the same time, Bon does not necessarily play a trickster role as actively or as fully as his mother desires. From an early age, Bon exudes an air of nonchalance—"he didn't care" (240)—and does not fixate on anything. He is indeed passive in nearly every aspect of life because "all he would need to do would be to wait" (75). Despite his overwhelming passivity, he is deeply aware of and sensitive to the facts that his mother has her self-interested ambition and little or no affection for him: "[H]e got big enough to find out that it wasn't him at all she was washing and feeding the candy and the fun to but it was a man that hadn't even arrived yet, whom even she had never seen yet" (245). Bon recalls his childhood as being "created between this woman and a hired lawyer" (245)—here, he does not even call Eulalia his mother but rather "this woman." Similarly, according to Shreve, Bon tries to keep a distance from his mother by calling her "the woman who was his mother" (250) and "the sombre vengeful woman who was his mother" (263). Bon makes calm judgment on his mother's egoistic attitude to make the most of every opportunity (even her son) for her own purpose. Bon's seeming passivity and heartlessness, nevertheless, reflect his feelings of loneliness and emptiness. Finding out that his father was already gone when he reached an age of awareness, Bon cannot have a warm relationship with his mother.

In spite of the lack of parent-child attachment and emotional intimacy, Bon does not entirely resist his oppressive mother; rather, he vaguely but precisely acknowledges his given role and tries to fulfill it. When Eulalia and her lawyer instruct Bon to go to the University of Mississippi, he accepts it without deeply considering the implications; he promptly leaves his octoroon wife and child in New Orleans without saying goodbye and soon throws the Sutpen family into confusion. Shreve explains Bon's passivity toward his mother as follows: "Because maybe he knew now that his mother didn't know and never would know what she wanted, and so he couldn't beat her" (248). This passage shows Bon's awareness of his mother's self-righteousness and narrowness, as well as his reluctance to engage in a heart-to-heart exchange with her. The more Bon, as an instrument of his mother, adopts an indifferent attitude toward life and the more he, as a trickster, spoils his stable relationship with the Sutpens, the less enriched his feelings become. Instead, he accepts a feeling of resignation toward life and especially his mother, while enjoying the benefits of her material wealth.

Shreve's narrative further speaks Bon's understanding of his mother when Shreve

discloses Bon's general view of women: "[Y]ou cant beat them: you flee (and thank God you can flee . . .)" (249-50). While Eulalia instructs Bon to go to Mississippi, in the innermost part of his heart, he struggles with his mother's powerful control and endeavors to distance himself from her. Bon's departure for Mississippi, then, is in a sense an escape from the influence of his oppressive mother, even though he departs under her instructions to do so.

3. Bon as Father's Abandoned Son

As previously stated, Bon is ultimately the product of the narrators' imaginations, so we cannot fully understand his character since his figure and impression change according to each narrator's interpretation. Although Quentin and Shreve tend to follow Mr. Compson's image of Bon as a trickster, they do investigate Bon's more personal side in chapter 8. The two narrators attempt to provide an answer to the following passage by Mr. Compson, who considers Bon to be "the curious one" (74):

[T]his lover who apparently without volition or desire became involved in an engagement which he seems neither to have sought nor avoided, who took his dismissal in the same passive and sardonic spirit, yet four years later was apparently so bent upon the marriage to which up to that time he had been completely indifferent as to force the brother who had championed it to kill him to prevent it. (79-80)

Mr. Compson is confused not only by Bon's mysterious presence but also by a shift in his attitude toward his marriage to Judith at the end of the Civil War, especially because of Bon's previous passive attitude with little sign of attachment. To explain Bon's sudden change, Quentin and Shreve attempt to dramatize Bon's transformation from a detached trickster, or an instrument, into a real person who struggles with his origin and his relationships with his parents.

When the novel's setting moves to Mississippi, Quentin and Shreve change the focus from Eulalia's motherhood to Sutpen's fatherhood and, thus, further shed light on Bon's interior feelings. According to Quentin and Shreve, Bon acts like a trickster as his mother has trained him while revealing secret affection for his father:

[W]hat cannot I do with this willing flesh and bone [Henry] if I wish; 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 [Sutpen] bequeathed me sprang in hatred and outrage and unforgiving and ran in shadow—what could I not mold of this malleable and eager clay which that father himself could not. . . . (254)

Although Bon contrasts himself ("shadow") to Henry ("sunlight") as a half-brother, he does not want Sutpen's recognition at this point; his only wish is to encounter his father Sutpen

(“the physical tough even though in secret, hidden” [255]). After meeting Henry at the university and finding similarities in him (“*My brow my skull my jaw my hands*” [251]), Bon starts to pour out his feelings toward their father Sutpen. Revealing “*my father’s [face] out of the shadow of whose absence my spirit’s posthumeity has never escaped*” (254), Bon eventually makes his attitude clear that he has long wanted to have a father from an early age.

Still, he cannot make himself completely free from his mother’s control in Mississippi. For instance, when Bon conjectures about why his father Sutpen continues to ignore him, the presence of his mother is repeatedly recalled: “[M]e, I, not he who stemmed from that blood which we both bear before it could have become corrupt and tainted by whatever it was in Mother’s that he could not brook” (257); “*I would have done that, gone to him first, who have the blood after it was tainted and corrupt by whatever it was in Mother*” (263); and “[Bon] had stemmed from the blood after whatever it was his mother had been or done had tainted and corrupted it” (264-65). Bon instinctively knows that Sutpen’s neglect stems from Eulalia’s origin, and he feels bitterness toward his mother, who has selfishly nurtured and sent him to Mississippi. Yet at the same time, he is unable to fully escape from his mother admitting, “I am my mother’s son, at least” (255):

Bon, who had wanted to know, who had had the most reason to want to know, who as far as he knew had never had any father but had been created somehow between that woman who wouldn’t let him play with other children, and that lawyer who even told the woman whether or not each time she bought a piece of meat or a loaf of bread—two people neither of whom had taken pleasure or found passion in getting him or suffered pain and travail in borning him—who perhaps if one of the two had only told him the truth, none of what happened would ever have come to pass. . . . (271)

In this passage, Eulalia is once again called “the woman,” and her juxtaposition to the lawyer, who is not a family member, further exhibits Bon’s sense of remoteness. Moreover, Shreve’s retelling in this passage reveals a sense of empathy toward Bon’s deserted situation and Eulalia’s total lack of understanding of her son as her own flesh and blood. By doing so, Shreve further emphasizes Bon’s awareness of his mother’s innermost nature and speaks in a reproachful tone about Eulalia’s parenting—specifically of concealing the presence of Bon’s father and rearing him as her instrument to seek revenge against his father. Here, both Eulalia’s control and origin are considered as the root of Bon’s suffering and ignorance.

Eulalia and her lawyer recognize a change in Bon when he returns to New Orleans with Henry just before the Civil War; immediately after this scene, they are never mentioned again in Bon’s story. After their abrupt disappearance, Bon’s attempt to transform himself from a Voodoo trickster into a son becomes clear, as is highlighted in the following passage: “[T]here wont be anything left; . . . [n]ot God; evidently we have done without Him for four years” (278). This short retort reveals that Bon lived without the presence of God during the Civil War and acted in accordance with his own wish. We may recall here that, after nurturing Bon as the “instrument” for her revenge, Eulalia “sit[s] down and let[s] God finish it” (238). Although

Bon lived passively and did what his mother and her lawyer told him while in New Orleans, he begins to make voluntary choices and decisions, beyond Eulalia's intentions, after meeting Henry and Sutpen in Mississippi. Shreve further explains Bon's change from a detached trickster into a determined person by suggesting Bon's unforeseeable future:

Bon whom Mr Compson had called a fatalist but who, according to Shreve and Quentin, did not resist Henry's dictum and design for the reason that he neither knew nor cared what Henry intended to do because he had long since realised that he did not know yet what he himself was going to do. (268)

Bon's future action becomes unpredictable because he is no longer the instrument for his mother. Everything now depends on his own acting, his own will.

More importantly, Shreve demonstrates Bon's transformation through Bon's increasing ability to experience love. According to Shreve, Bon's presence not as an instrument but as an abandoned son is clear when Bon, who has been emotionless and impassive to everything, starts becoming concerned with the topic of love and feels neglected: "[N]othing mattered to him now, revenge or love or all, since he knew now that revenge could not compensate him nor love assuage" (274). While repeating that he has no intention of asking for Sutpen's recognition, Bon, at the bottom of his heart, longs for Sutpen's reaction, such as "*never look upon my face again; take my love and my acknowledgement in secret, and go*" (261). Contrary to his initial insensitivity, Bon appears to have a troubled mind and seeks his father's recognition and love. The more Bon allows himself to experience emotional attachments, the more he longs to make it clear who he is to the Sutpens.

It is at the end of the novel, when Henry shoots Bon at the gate of Sutpen's Hundred, that Bon reveals his identity as "*the nigger that's going to sleep with your sister*" (286). In addition to Bon's enigmatic figure, Henry's murder of Bon remains a mystery for the narrators. Rosa thinks Bon's murder is "the mad work of demonic [Sutpen's] forces" (Kartiganer, *Fragile* 76); Mr. Compson gives bigamy as the reason for its cause, while saying "It's just incredible. It just does not explain" and admitting "something is missing" in the incident (80); Quentin and Shreve reach the conclusion that Henry shoots Bon not for incest but for miscegenation. Although Henry's motivation for killing Bon is left up to the imaginations of the narrators and readers, it is undeniable that Bon is shot by Henry at the gate of the Sutpen plantation. On the surface, this appears to be a curious event because Henry once pointed a gun at Bon in Carolina on their way to Richmond. At that time, Henry could not shoot Bon, even though Bon handed his gun to Henry and encouraged Henry to shoot him.

Thus, Bon's murder at the gate emphasizes the significant meaning of borders, including gates and entrances, for Bon. As Mr. Compson points out, Bon is essentially "that mental and spiritual orphan whose fate it apparently was to exist in some limbo halfway between where his corporeality was and his mentality and moral equipment desired to be" (98). According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, "limbo" carries a connotation of a non-Christian region and suggests Bon's exoticism and paganism of New Orleans Voodoo. At the same time, gates and

entrances are also important locations for the Voodoo trickster Legba, who is known as the God of various borders, including entrance of houses and temples, fences, roads, and crossroads (Métraux 101, 360; Tateno 132). Although Bon's mother makes him stay at the border as a Voodoo trickster without a settled land, he later tries to relinquish his position as a trickster so he can gain his own place as well as his father's love and recognition as a son. However, he cannot cross the gate and enter Sutpen's house. Bon's death at Sutpen's gate suggests at once his presence as Legba, the guardian of borders, and his failure in seeking freedom from his mother's oppression.

Moreover, borders do not merely exist in material form for Bon. His ambiguous features of sex, race, and location, which resemble Legba's mythical characteristics, confuse existing social and cultural borders that have been considered self-evident in the South. In general, a trickster confuses social order and stereotypes, bringing about a new social order and cultural values after breaking through the stagnation of society and relativizing its fixed ideas. The trickster makes people conscious of the internal boundaries by which they articulate their social life, although they may consider such a trickster as a nuisance and destroyer of the community. What it comes down to is that Bon, as a Voodoo trickster, is closely associated with the meaning of borders, both physically and mentally.

Bon attempts to disturb the Sutpens and the Southern community, becoming "a potential threat" (81) not only as a trickster but also as an abandoned son. According to the narrators, Bon, as a trickster, exposes the problems of slavery, bigamy, incest, and miscegenation in the South. Henry, who is Sutpen's surrogate (Irwin 99), nevertheless puts Bon to death because he cannot fully face these issues, particularly miscegenation ("*So it's the miscegenation, not the incest, which you cant bear*" [285]). At the same time, we have seen Bon's internal change from a Voodoo trickster into a determined person as well as his hidden longing for his father's love and recognition. Bon's death at Sutpen's gate could be said to result from his challenges to reconsider the established social order as a trickster and enter the Sutpen plantation as an actual person—more specifically, an abandoned son, "*the nigger*" in terms of the "one-drop rule" of racial identification in the South. Ultimately, his mother's powerful control and his father's definitive repudiation prevent him from completing the transformation from his mother's instrument to his father's son—even as an abandoned son. Bon's inability to cross the border well explains his eventual failure.

At the end of the novel, Shreve concludes that "it took Charles Bon and his mother to get rid of old Tom, and Charles Bon and the octoroon to get rid of Judith, and Charles Bon and Clytie to get rid of Henry; and Charles Bon's mother and Charles Bon's grandmother to get rid of Charles Bon" (302). This passage demonstrates Bon's strong influence on every character as a Voodoo trickster. Given Bon's presence and demise within the novel, Faulkner seems to have taken advantage of the culture and history that are unique to Haiti and New Orleans. At the same time, we may feel odd when we note the intention of "Charles Bon's mother and Charles Bon's grandmother to get rid of Charles Bon" since Bon is eventually shot by Henry as the surrogate of Sutpen. Bon's mother and grandmother are the final suggestion of the significance of Bon's maternal background—miscegenation—when we think about his life. The contrast

between being his mother's instrument and being his father's abandoned son, in addition to the issue of his mixed-race identity, eventually produces a sharp image of Bon as a mysterious and ill-fated figure in the South.

Chapter 6

In Search for Identity: A Story of Canadian Shreve

In the latter half of *Absalom, Absalom!*, Quentin and Shreve reconstruct the story of Thomas Sutpen, who suddenly appeared in Jefferson, Mississippi, to accomplish his “design” of holding a plantation, a large house, and black slaves. Although Shreve plays an important role as the narrator in compensating for missing links of the Sutpen story and giving its context coherence, critics have considered him a mere outsider who exceedingly distances himself from the South.¹ Faulkner’s following words from the 1950s solidify Shreve’s position as an outlander: “Shreve was the commentator that held the thing to something of reality. If Quentin had been let alone to tell it, it would have become completely unreal” (*FU* 75). It cannot be denied that Canadian Shreve is geographically a distant outsider to the people of Yoknapatawpha County, Mississippi. However, Shreve’s active involvement in the Sutpen story implies that he was more than just a “commentator.” If we take into account Shreve’s Canadian background, his placement in the story should directly correlate to his regional identity.

Concerning the North, Hosam Aboul-Ela examines the regional similarity between the South and Canada by referring to Immanuel Wallerstein’s concept of “semi-periphery” (493). Nevertheless, Aboul-Ela only stresses the geographical location and economic dependency of these semi-peripheral regions and does not specifically discuss the relationship between Canadian history and Shreve. This chapter analyzes Shreve’s Canadian nationality and considers its impact on the significance of his reconstruction of the Sutpen story with Mississippi-native Quentin Compson at Harvard University in Cambridge. Shreve juxtaposes his own story to the stories of the South. This chapter aims to demonstrate how the reconstruction process led Shreve to reaffirm his Canadian identity.

1. History of Canada

According to the Genealogy attached to the end of *Absalom, Absalom!*, Shreve was born in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, in 1890, attended Harvard from 1909 to 1914, lived in France as captain of the Royal Army Medical Corps of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces from 1914 to 1918, and returned to Edmonton to become a practicing surgeon (309). His Genealogy indicates that Shreve lived in Edmonton, Alberta, throughout his life except for his time at Harvard University and during World War I. In this regard, Shreve shares a common feature of attaching importance to his homeland with Quentin, who was born and raised in Jefferson, Mississippi. If we consider that the foundation of Shreve’s characteristics and thoughts are shaped by Canada, particularly Edmonton, Alberta, it is reasonable that he could have overlapped and compared his country with the South when he learns about Sutpen’s life. Because the studies of Faulkner have hardly consulted Canadian history, this chapter begins by examining its brief summary, primarily up to 1936 with the novel’s first appearance, and its

influence on Shreve's life.

Even though the novel primarily focuses on Southern history, Shreve's homeland, Canada, has experienced remarkable transitions, creating an interesting history of its own. According to *The History of Canada*, the Colonial Era of Canadian history began when England laid claim to occupy Newfoundland in 1583 (Kimura 39).² While France later colonized Acadia, England held all of the French settlements under its control after its conquest of New France in 1760. After the establishment of the United Province of Canada in 1841, the Dominion of Canada formed in 1867, subsequently attaining a confederate system across the American Continent in 1873. At that time, Canadian society rapidly diversified due to expanding land and increasing immigrants. Since Canada greatly contributed to the Allies' victory in World War I, it gained recognition as a North American country and evolved into a substantial, independent nation by the Statute of Westminster in 1931 (Gough 14). Although the British influence drastically decreased, Canadians remained British subjects until the Canadian Citizenship Act was approved in 1946. Unlike the United States, which gained its independence in the late eighteenth century, Canada struggled to integrate its people and land until the first half of the twentieth century.

Having experienced the difficulties of transitioning from a dependent colony to an independent country, as well as a national integration of multiple races, Canada is no less unique than the South, which seceded from the United States and established the Confederate States of America during the Civil War (1861-65). Shreve does not refer to his country's history, but his reactions to the Sutpen story reflect his attitude toward his homeland. After summarizing the stories of Rosa Compson and Mr. Compson and hearing about Sutpen's early life from Quentin, Shreve comments on the South in a casual manner: "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" (176). According to *Reading Faulkner*, Shreve's "Ben Hur" is most likely "the first American stage version of *Ben Hur*, a large, spectacularly popular production in 1899 based on the 1880 novel by Lew Wallace" (Urgo and Polk 110). As the original title of the novel—*Ben Hur: A Tale of the Christ*—shows, the story includes the topics of love, of suffering, of the struggle of good against evil, and finally of triumph. As such, Shreve's use of an "American" analogy not only fits in with the peculiar story of the South but also implies the ups and downs of Canadian history.

The most important part of Shreve's comments, however, comes after his mention of *Ben Hur*. Shreve is simultaneously interested in the Sutpen story, not only for its novelty and entertaining factors, but also for its influence over Quentin to "come away now and then." Bearing the complexity of Canadian history in mind, Shreve understands and shares Quentin's mixed feelings toward a native land. Quentin and Shreve's dormitory room is "not only dedicated to [ratiocination] but set aside for it and suitably so since it would be here above any other place that it (the logic and the morality) could do the least amount of harm" (225). As it is for Quentin, the dormitory room is the place where Shreve is more or less free from "the logic and the morality" of Canada; therefore, at Harvard and far away from home, Shreve can reflect on his homeland Canada, which is achieving its national independence, and search for

his Canadian identity. Life at Harvard could give them an opportunity to see themselves objectively.

At the time when Shreve and Quentin reconstruct the Sutpen story in a dormitory room at Harvard in 1910, Canada was in a particularly difficult situation, as Canadian people were debating whether to encourage nationalistic feelings toward independence or to maintain a relationship with the British Empire (Kimura 213-15). This was the time when imperialism prevailed among world powers in Europe and the United States. At that time, Canada was trying to find its way out of a subordinate, colonial situation and establish its national position. In the end, Canada continued an existing relationship with Great Britain and eventually entered World War I on the Allies' side in 1914.

Shreve's course of life corresponds directly to Canadian history. Given that Shreve's surname McCannon is either Scottish or Irish, (MacKenzie in *The Sound and the Fury* [1929]), he must have fluctuated between the two opposing ideas of fighting for freedom or continuing the subordinate position to the land of his ancestors. In this regard, his entry in the Genealogy suggests Shreve's final decision. As the Genealogy dictates, Shreve joins the war as a captain of the Royal Army Medical Corps of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces in France the same year he graduates from Harvard. Although the reason for his entry into World War I is uncertain, the reconstruction of the Sutpen story could be a trigger. In the novel, Sutpen's sons, Henry Sutpen and Charles Bon, each participated in the Civil War as a "University Gray" (307, 308) when he was a student of the University of Mississippi. These "University Grays" (273)—university students who joined the Confederate army—likely aroused the morale of Shreve when he joined the war in 1914. The Genealogy and Canadian history demonstrate the connection between Shreve's entry into the war and the Sutpen story.

Since the start of the war in 1914, however, Canada gradually evolved into a more independent country and built their national identities, requesting autonomy. Faulkner must have known Canada's situation at that time by direct experience, for he enlisted in the Royal Air Force in Toronto, Canada, in July 1918 and stayed there until December (Blotner 61, 67). According to Joseph Blotner, Faulkner "had enjoyed the chance to absorb some aspects of the British culture which he admired" during his stay in Toronto (67). The same could also be said for his attitude toward Canada. Although Faulkner had no opportunity to fight and fly in the war, "his 179 days on active service with the RAF in Canada" taught him the importance of "imagination, observation, and experience" (Blotner 67). Faulkner used these experiences to become acquainted with the social conditions of Canada and its relationship with Great Britain at that time. Consequently, he drew up a Canadian character, Shreve, with whom he could reflect past experiences spent in Canada.

Instead of Toronto, Faulkner chose Alberta as Shreve's birthplace and home. Alberta was a newly developed area in Canada and became part of the Northwest Territories after the Dominion of Canada acquired the lands owned by the Hudson's Bay Company in 1870.³ With the interests of seeking free land and a rich, abundant life, many people moved to the Prairies, including Alberta, from Europe, the United States, and other parts of Canada. Due to increasing amounts of immigrants, the Canadian government later granted provincial status to

Alberta in 1905. In Alberta, American cattlemen and British ranchers operated the largest livestock industry in Canada since the second half of the nineteenth century. A wheat boom occurred at the end of the nineteenth century, developing new fast-maturing wheat in the early 1900s. Until a tremendous amount of oil was found at Leduc in 1947, agriculture had been Alberta's main industry.

Faulkner most likely chose Alberta as Shreve's homeland because the place resembles the agricultural society of the South. During the reconstruction of the Sutpen story with Quentin, Shreve overlaps the development of Alberta's new society with the farming land of the South, which was famous for its "King Cotton" before the Civil War. In the meantime, Alberta followed a different path from the South, for immigrants cultivated their own land. They did not introduce the plantation system of the South, with its basis on slavery and sharecropping. In spite of the differences in farming, both Alberta and the South are a significant distance from the center of their respective countries. After immigrating to the Prairies, farmers appealed to the dominant, central Canadian banks, railway companies, and manufacturing industry, organizing their own local political party (Francis 175-78). These independent farmers resemble the rebellious Southerners against the Northerners during the Civil War, both geographically and agriculturally.

Southern stories involving race, class, economy, and politics do not create an unrelated and exaggerated fiction for Shreve, who was born and raised in the developing multiracial and multicultural society of Alberta. Shreve's question to Quentin: "*Tell about the South. What's it like there. What do they do there. Why do they live there. Why do they live at all*" (142), then, is unlike the question of other classmates at Harvard, who merely desire an acquaintance with "another world" for entertainment. Shreve, on the contrary, sees the current, stagnant condition of the South as a foreshadowing of future Alberta and Canada. Around 1910, the South still struggled to recover from the Civil War: "the deep South dead since 1865 and peopled with garrulous outraged baffled ghosts" (4). Finding similarities between Alberta and the South, Shreve gains an understanding of the South's history.

While Alberta expanded with its agricultural development, its capital, Edmonton, had promoted urbanization and industrialization since its foundation in 1870. Edmonton, Shreve's hometown, was one of the five largest cities in the Prairies and the tenth largest city in Canada by 1921 (Gilpin 152-53). Cities of the Prairies, including Edmonton, held stores, factories, markets, governmental offices, health facilities, universities, and cultural facilities; these services were also available to surrounding rural areas (Francis 175). This urbanized living environment influenced Shreve's choice of career. The Genealogy suggests that he set his mind on becoming a doctor—specifically a "surgeon" (309)—at the university. He does not intend to become a farmer like the majority of people in Alberta. The contrast between doctors and farmers, as well as the difference between urban and rural, greatly affected Shreve's major at college. Edmonton's position as a provincial city nurtured his ambitious feelings to enter college and become a doctor.

Moreover, Shreve's choice of school is proof of his mixed feelings toward his homeland. Instead of entering the University of Alberta, a provincial university located at his hometown

Edmonton, Shreve chooses Harvard, one of the oldest and most prestigious private American universities. He can study abroad due to his wealth and intellect. (We may recall here that the Compson family had to sell part of their land to pay for Quentin's first year's tuition.) Yet, at the same time, as a Canadian studying abroad at Harvard, Shreve becomes self-conscious. Although the United States is a neighboring country and uses the same English language, the country is still foreign to Shreve. To be more precise, he is from a semi-peripheral region in Edmonton, Canada. Although Shreve does not explain his Canadian background to Quentin in the novel,⁴ his life course suggests his ambiguous attitude toward his developing homeland.

This reality instilled awareness in Shreve of being a rural student at Harvard.⁵ When Quentin says, "[Henry and Bon] were in the tenth graduating class since [the University of Mississippi] was founded," Shreve replies to Quentin, "I didn't know there were ten in Mississippi that went to school at one time" (288). Shreve considers the University of Mississippi, founded in 1848 in Oxford, Mississippi, where "wisdom herself would be a virgin or at least not very second hand" (249), as a small, anonymous university in the rural area of the South. Considering that the University of Alberta was established in 1908, however, his negative reaction toward the University of Mississippi appears to imply both his sense of inferiority toward his hometown and his sense of pride in attending the acclaimed Harvard. Canadian history as a whole, including the regional histories of Edmonton and Alberta, sheds new light on the reason why Shreve devotes himself to the Southern stories.

2. Influence of the Civil War

While setting his mind on becoming a doctor, Shreve displays his broad knowledge of the classics and history during the reconstruction of the Sutpen story with Quentin in the dormitory at Harvard. Quentin constructs his language by combining the words of Rosa, his father, and his grandfather with his feelings toward the South. Shreve, in contrast, makes a free use of metaphors—such as "Bayard" (142), "Guinevere" (142), "Agamemnon" (144), "Faustus" (145), "Beelzebub" (145), "Coke and Littleton" (243), the "Sabine" (243), "Lancelot" (256), and "Lorraine duke" (273)—that embellish his narrative. Moreover, Shreve is well informed about American history. When Quentin talks about Sutpen's early life, for instance, Shreve comments on Quentin's explanation that West Virginia did not exist in 1808 (179). One time, he even corrects Quentin's words by adding, "Or maybe even in Charleston" when Quentin describes Pettibone's blacks as "being housebred in Richmond" (188). Of American history, Shreve particularly has a thorough knowledge of the Civil War because his homeland also suffered from the heavy damage of the war. The main episode of the Sutpen story—the Civil War—attracts Shreve's attention because it makes him more aware of this historical fact.

Shreve is thoroughly acquainted with the American history of the Civil War because it relates to the Canadian history. The Civil War was not only the regional conflict between the Northern states (the Union) and the Southern states (the Confederacy) within the United States. Since both Great Britain and British North America—Canada—expressed a sympathetic

opinion toward the South during the Civil War, the Northern army felt hostile toward both of them (Kimura 170). Yet, at the same time, this was not the first time for Canadians to face the aggression of the United States. Before the Civil War, every time the American Army attempted to invade Canada during the American Revolution (1775-83) and the War of 1812 (1812-15), Canada reinforced its defense buildup along the American border (Gough 8). Likewise, the Civil War became a significant factor for Canada to establish its definite identity as a nation (“American Civil War” 68). As a result, Canada was exposed to the threat of the invasion of the Northern army, which had an intention of annexing Canada to the United States.

Indeed, the Civil War induced numerous border and diplomatic issues between the United States and Canada. American hostility toward Canadians continued after the war’s conclusion in 1865. When the United States purchased Alaska from Russia in 1867, further advancing the logic of Manifest Destiny for the territorial expansion, the United States repeatedly tried to invade Canada (Kimura 169-70). One purpose of establishing the Dominion of Canada in 1867 was, therefore, to reinforce Canada’s defense against the United States. The Civil War, in effect, provided an opportunity for Canadian people to cooperate with one another and strengthen the unity of each region.

Shreve’s sympathy and devotion to the Sutpen story and the Civil War may come from the fact that the North was the common enemy of both places. When Shreve recounted the Sutpen story with Quentin in the dormitory room of Harvard in early 1910, Canada was once again in international disputes with the United States. Subsequent to the Washington Convention in 1871, the relationship between Canada and the United States started to improve. When their relationship once again deteriorated at the end of the nineteenth-century, an American threat toward Canada arose and lasted until the early 1910s (Kimura 220). Canada always felt a sense of the crisis of merging with the United States until World War I. As such, the Civil War is not merely an old-time story for the turn-of-the-century Canadians. Rather, the war reminds them of Canada’s unity to defend its land.

In order to reinforce a defense buildup for the American border, Canadians in the 1900s and 1910s, including Shreve, must have kept the memory of the Civil War. It is true that Shreve discusses the mentality of the South—a sense of defeat from the Civil War passed down from generation to generation—as “something my [Canadian] people haven’t got” (289). He further explains to Quentin that Canadians “dont live among defeated grandfathers and freed slaves . . . and bullets in the dining room table and such, to be always reminding us to never forget” (289). This is, however, because Canada did not lose the Civil War—given that Canada protected the border with the United States and did not lose the land like the South, the country indirectly won the war. Moreover, Shreve seems to be concerned about the events related to the Civil War. He does not express his inner feelings about the war in the novel, but, in *The Sound and the Fury*, he watches a parade of the Grand Army of the Republic on Decoration Day (82). Despite the fact that this parade took place after his reconstruction of the Sutpen story, not to mention it celebrated the Union instead of the Confederacy, the scene demonstrates that Shreve was interested in commemorating the Civil War. As such, his

previous words about the mindset of the South are his paradoxical way of finding the profound meaning of the Sutpen story handed down from generation to generation as the legacy of the South.

In fact, the outcomes of the Civil War in the South and Canada are two sides of the same coin. Shreve at once learns another aspect of the war from the South and shares a sense of invasion from the North. In the 1920s, after World War I, Canada established itself as a North American nation (Gough 14). This decade sparked the British economy's decline, and trade between Canada and the United States grew active again. Faulkner deliberately set the present time of the novel as 1909 and 1910—before World War I—in order to demonstrate the difficult state of Canada and compare it with the South, pre- and post-Civil War.

3. Connection between Canada and New Orleans

Shreve's narrative about the Civil War stands out in relation to the mystery of "why Henry killed Bon." At the end of the Civil War, Henry shoots his sister's fiancé, who later turns out to be their half-brother, Bon, at the gate of Sutpen's Hundred. Because of Henry's sudden disappearance from town, his motive for the murder is unknown. With help from Quentin, Shreve attempts to reach the mystery's "true enough" conclusion. Shreve ardently tells about Bon's life because it is related to his Canadian identity.

One reason Shreve grows a strong attachment toward Bon's circumstances is due to the history of Canada and New Orleans, where Bon grew up. Canada and New Orleans have similar backgrounds, as both were colonies of France. In spite of their different colonial periods and geographical features, Jerah Johnson points out many "parallels" between the two colonies (30). According to Johnson, both of them took advantage of the river systems of Native America, were ignored by their colonial power, France, and continued to be under-populated and poor (30). Additionally, "Louisiana was founded mainly by Canadians, along with some Frenchmen and some pirates from the Caribbean" (Hall 61). The historical connection between Canada and New Orleans explains Shreve's devotion to Bon's story in chapter 8.

Since Shreve is familiar with American history and Canadian history, he knew of the close relationship between Canada and New Orleans. Compared to his casual reactions to other places, such as "Port Rico or Haiti or wherever" (239), "Texas or Missouri or maybe California" (244), and "'The University of Mississippi, at'—Where did you say?" (249), Shreve's description of Bon's family in New Orleans in chapter 8 is thorough and vivid. He even makes little of Bon's birthplace, Haiti. When he reconstructs Bon's early life in New Orleans, he "invented" (268) the stories of Bon's mother and her lawyer to produce dramatic scenes. His imagination is, indeed, surprisingly brilliant, if "Quentin did not even tell Shreve what his father had said about the visit [to New Orleans]" (268). This suggests that Shreve can narrate Bon's life in New Orleans without Quentin's help. Shreve's passionate adherence to Bon reflects Shreve's interest in New Orleans.

The other reason why Bon's story in chapter 8 has verisimilitude is in the presence of

Shreve's lively narrative grounded on historical evidence. Shreve's narrative, for instance, revives the scenes of the Civil War in a realistic manner:

[In 1861] Lincoln [was] elected and the Alabama convention [took place] and the South began to draw out of the Union, and then there were two presidents in the United States and the telegraph brought the news about Charleston and Lincoln called out his army and it was done, irrevocable now. . . . (272)

Other narrators, Rosa, Mr. Compson, and Quentin, refer to the period of the Civil War too, but only Shreve in chapter 8 primarily talks about Bon's story of those times with the historical evidence. As stated in the previous section, Bon has thorough knowledge of the Civil War because Canada, like the South, faced the invasion of the Union. Shreve's enthusiastic narrative of Bon's life reflects his search for Canadian identity.

Interestingly, the period from Henry's disappearance to Bon's killing almost corresponds to the period of the Civil War from 1861 to 1865. Chapter 8 chiefly covers the early years of Bon's life in New Orleans and the time of the Civil War when Henry renounces his birthright and disappears with Bon, ending with Henry's shooting Bon in front of the Sutpen house. Since it is mostly Shreve who takes the initiative in chapter 8, we can presume that Shreve's interests lie in New Orleans and the Civil War. And these two factors are greatly related to his Canadian identity.

4. Shreve as a Canadian Narrator

Based on Canada's history and the Civil War, this section will re-evaluate Shreve as a Canadian narrator. Quentin suggests in the latter half of the novel that Shreve's presence and narrative remind him of other characters. For instance, Quentin is aware of the similarity between Shreve's and Mr. Compson's narratives in chapter 6. Quentin repeatedly tells himself that Shreve "*sounds just like Father*" (147) and "*almost exactly like Father*" (168). Quentin considers the resemblance of Shreve, his father, and himself in chapter 7: "*Yes, 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*" (210). The resemblance of Shreve to Mr. Compson shows that Shreve is no longer an "outsider" in narrating the Sutpen story. As previously stated, however, it is Shreve that speaks of Bon in chapter 8. Although Shreve's narrative is frequently compared with that of Mr. Compson, his role in the Sutpen story resembles that of Charles Bon (as Quentin becomes similar to Henry Sutpen). In fact, Shreve's identification with other characters—his transformation—both in narrative and role-playing levels, becomes key for his connection to his Canadian identity.

In order to examine Shreve's transformation, Tzvetan Todorov's four phases of understanding the other will provide a helpful insight into Shreve's narrative and historical awareness. According to Todorov, the first phase of understanding the others is composed of:

“assimilating the other to oneself”; the second phase, in turn, results in “effacing the self for the other’s benefit”; the third phase follows the second “to establish a dialogue between myself and [others]”; in the fourth phase, “knowledge of others depends on my own identity. But this knowledge of the other in turn determines my knowledge of myself. . . . Since knowledge of oneself transforms the identity of this self, the entire process begins again: new knowledge of the other, new knowledge of the self, and so on to infinity” (14-15). Todorov’s four phases of understanding the others only provide a theoretical framework, and yet these four phases enable characters to develop a new self-awareness in the end.

While initially distancing himself from the Sutpen story, as John Middleton suggests (117, 123), Shreve gradually identifies with other narrators and characters (the others) and reconstructs the Sutpen story through dialogue. These “others” do not only mean the people of Jefferson as previously examined, but also Charles Bon, demonstrating the complexity of including a wide range of characters as the “others” for Shreve. A shift in Shreve’s attitude reflects that, bearing the histories of Canada and the Civil War in mind, he identifies with other characters while engaging in mutual dialogue with Quentin.

Most of the time, Quentin and Shreve are paired as “Quentin-Henry” and “Charles-Shreve” (267) as they delve into Bon’s life and the love-triangle relationship of Henry, Judith, and Bon: “[S]ave 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” (243). In the same chapter, Quentin and Shreve, who conduct “some happy marriage of speaking and hearing” (253), become “two, four, now two again, according to Quentin and Shreve, the two the four the two still talking” (276). Shreve and Quentin, off and on, assimilate themselves to Bon and Henry, respectively, so that they can experience the Sutpen story vicariously.

Furthermore, Shreve and Quentin eventually merge into one entity in chapter 8. By the end of this chapter, Shreve

had no listener . . . he had no talker either. . . . Because now neither of them was 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. (280)

These passages indicate that Shreve attempts to reconstruct the Sutpen story as if he were a Southerner of both past and present. In other words, Shreve starts to identify as a Southerner, beyond time and place, in the world of narrative, even though he and Quentin reconstruct the Sutpen story in “iron New England” (141), a place remote from the South.

At the same time, Shreve eventually returns to his detached attitude toward the Sutpen story at the end of the novel after speculating about the “real” reason for Henry’s murder of Bon—“*the miscegenation*” (285). Such a “transformation” of Shreve during the reconstruction of the Sutpen story results from his recognition as a Canadian narrator. In fact, the narrator has sometimes referred to Shreve’s personal attribute as a Canadian by comparing him with

Quentin, the Southerner, such as “the one in Alberta” (208) and “Shreve, the Canadian, the child of blizzards” (276). In chapter 9, Shreve makes use of the comparisons between him and Quentin to distance himself from the Sutpen story: “Wait. Listen. I’m not trying to be funny, smart. I just want to understand it if I can and I don’t know how to say it better. Because it’s something my people haven’t got” (289). Returning to the position as an outsider at the novel’s conclusions directly relates to the process of reassuring Shreve’s historical singularity as a Canadian through understanding the others.

Shreve’s identification with the Sutpen story comes to an end when he reflects on his own identity as a Canadian. When Shreve asks Quentin about the mentality of the South—a sense of defeat in the Civil War carried on from generation to generation—in chapter 9, Quentin replies, “You cant understand it. You would have to be born there.” When Shreve once again inquires, “Would I then?” and further, “Do you understand it?” Quentin answers, “Yes, of course I understand it,” but later admits that he does not. Concluding with, “Yes. You dont know,” Shreve gains a deeper understanding of others by relating the situations and values to himself and Quentin (289). After reconstructing the Sutpen story, Shreve comes to understand a larger “other”—the South.

At the end of chapter 9, Shreve predicts that “in time the Jim Bonds are going to conquer the western hemisphere” (302). Since Jim Bond is a “nigger Sutpen” (302), the unity implied does not infer an integration to conventional dominant cultures but, rather, to subordinate cultures. Moreover, considering Jim Bond’s mental disorder, the world reduces to a chaotic state rather than achieving cultural integration. Shreve’s references to Jim Bond and the new social system of the future demonstrate his new understanding of the world and himself. Despite the racial difference, Canadian history shows that the still-developing Canada around 1910 was more or less similar to subordinate cultures. Canada has been a multiracial country from the start. Shreve’s suggestion about Jim Bond reflects the situation of his multiethnic homeland. He may have dreamed of the coexistence and co-prosperity of Canadian people in the future, even though it may seem “chaotic” on the surface.

Furthermore, Shreve tells Quentin that even though “the Jim Bonds” will gradually “bleach out,” the conqueror of the western hemisphere “will still be Jim Bond; and so in a few thousand years, I who regard you will also have sprung from the loins of African kings” (302). This statement is significant because Shreve has acquired a broad perspective by the end of the novel. The one who “will . . . have sprung from the loins of African kings” is not “us” (Quentin and Shreve) but only “me” (Shreve). Shreve’s transformation suggests the opportunity of subordinate cultures, to which he more or less belongs, and the process of rediscovering his identity as a Canadian.

Reconsidering Shreve’s role as a narrator along with the historical context of Canada, he is not merely an outsider in *Absalom, Absalom!*, but a significant presence impacting the story development. As Faulkner later states, the novel is Sutpen’s story, but “every time any character gets into a book, no matter how minor, he’s actually telling his biography” (FU 275). Shreve’s presence as a Canadian supports the previous quote. In fact, Shreve’s words are “not flippancy . . . It too was just that protective coloring of levity behind which the youthful shame

of being moved hid itself . . . [the] flipness, the strained clowning” (225). At the time of reconstructing the Sutpen story, Canada was in a difficult situation, torn between national independence and colonial stability, and Alberta was rapidly developing as a multiracial province. Through the Sutpen story, Shreve not only deepens his understanding of the South but also revalidates his Canadian identity.

Given this perspective, Shreve’s inquiry to Quentin at the end of the novel, “Why do you hate the South?” (303), after saying, “The South. Jesus. No wonder you folks all outlive yourselves by years and years and years” (301), simultaneously imposes the same question on Shreve himself about his feelings toward Canada. Shreve might have made a counterargument in 1910, as Quentin did, by repeating “I dont hate it” (303), because of his mixed feelings toward his homeland. However, as he later returned to his hometown of Edmonton as a “practicing surgeon,” (309) his experience of reconstructing the Sutpen story with Quentin at Harvard proves invaluable and influential in reconfirming his identity as a Canadian, offering direction to his life.

Chapter 7
A Story for Future Generations:
The Legacy that Remains after Quentin's Death

1. "Tell about the South"

In *Absalom, Absalom!*, Quentin meets Rosa, Mr. Compson, and Shreve and reconstructs the story of Thomas Sutpen. The Sutpen story comes to light through the multilayered interpretation of these four major narrators, all of whom have their own needs and values like "a palimpsest of designs—plans, schemes, and narrative patterns" (Kuyk, *Sutpen's Design* 29). As "the vortex of all their talking" (Kartiganer, *Critical Essays* 395) and "the principal narrative consciousness" (Irwin 26), Quentin appears throughout the novel and plays a significant role in the storyline. Although he considered Sutpen to be the central character, Faulkner once stated, "It's incidentally the story of Quentin Compson's hatred of the bad qualities in the country he loves" (*FU* 71). Donald M. Kartiganer follows Faulkner's words and explains that Quentin builds his own interpretation of the past and "creates the history that culminates, however tragically, in his own identity" (*Critical Essays* 399). *Absalom, Absalom!* can be read as both a psychological novel in which Quentin sees the Sutpen story superimposed on his own story, and a historical novel in which he imagines and creates the history of the South in the course of his reconstruction.

The main concern of this chapter, then, is Quentin's incentive for introducing the Sutpen story when his Harvard friends ask him to "Tell about the South" (142). Quentin's talk with Shreve in the dormitory room of Harvard University seems deliberate because, according to the Genealogy at the end of the book, after relating the Sutpen story in early 1910, Quentin will soon be dead: "Born, Jefferson, 1891. Attended Harvard, 1909-1910. Died, Cambridge, Mass., 1910" (309). Not many critics, however, pay close attention to the implication of his eventual death in the Genealogy, probably due to an a priori assumption of his suicide. In *The Sound and the Fury*, Quentin drowns himself in the Charles River that runs through eastern Massachusetts on June 2, 1910.¹ Although the reasons for Quentin's death are not clearly stated in these novels, the Genealogy of *Absalom, Absalom!* implies that the reconstruction of the Sutpen story is not completely unrelated to his fate. According to Olga W. Vickery, Quentin kills himself "when he cannot recreate in his own life the principles and gestures which he admires in Henry" (101). While partly agreeing with Vickery about the influence of Henry, Sutpen's son, on Quentin, this chapter argues that Quentin already intended to commit suicide at the time he reconstructed the Sutpen story with Shreve in Cambridge. Quentin, in fact, decides to leave the Sutpen story as his will, or the legacy of the South, to his Canadian roommate, Shreve. Quentin identifies himself as the important successor of the Sutpen story and tries to perform his task of handing it over to the next generation.

2. "To die"

After several months as a Harvard freshman, Quentin receives a letter dated January 10, 1910 from his father, which informs him of Rosa's recent death. The letter reminds Quentin of "that dead summer twilight—the wisteria, the cigar-smell, the fireflies" (141) of Jefferson and takes him back into "the listening, the hearing in 1909" (23). After a few moments, he recalls the scene in which he and Rosa were about to enter Sutpen's Hundred, his large plantation, at midnight. The turning point of Quentin's decision to commit suicide occurs when he meets Sutpen's missing son, Henry, who returned four years ago "[to] die" (298) at Sutpen's Hundred.

In the first place, it is not difficult for Quentin to identify with Henry due to their many similarities. Both of them were born and brought up in Jefferson, Mississippi, and came from the town's famous families. Both attended university and demonstrate delicate and romantic sensibilities. During the reconstruction of the Sutpen story in chapter 8, Quentin sometimes becomes "Quentin-Henry," whereas Shreve turns into "Charles-Shreve" (267). While these four characters eventually merge into one entity ("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" [280]), they are essentially paired as "Quentin-Henry" and "Charles-Shreve" in the novel. Quentin travels back in time and sees himself in and through Henry.

The most important similarity between Quentin and Henry is that they show an unnaturally close attachment to their younger sisters. If *Absalom, Absalom!* is taken in context with *The Sound and the Fury*, Quentin's incestuous feelings toward his sister, Caddy, are juxtaposed on the relationship between Henry and his sister, Judith. Even though Caddy does not appear in *Absalom, Absalom!*, Quentin's feelings toward her cannot be dismissed. This is because his distraction and immobility often emerge when the Sutpen story comes to the relationship of Henry, Judith, and Judith's fiancé, Charles Bon.

This chapter follows Vickery's argument that Quentin shares Henry's obsession "with the idea of incest and with his own responsibility for his sister" (92). Henry becomes good friends with Bon at the University of Mississippi and invites him to his house. He introduces Judith to Bon, and, despite Sutpen's opposition, Judith and Bon soon get engaged. Henry later learns that Bon is his half-brother and is part black, and shoots Bon at the gate of Sutpen's Hundred. Quentin goes over Henry's sibling relationships with Judith and Bon and tracks Henry's emotional trigger for murdering Bon.

At the same time, "a day of listening" (23) in September 1909 is presumably not the first time Quentin learned of the Henry-Judith-Bon love triangle. Rosa's opening words in chapter 5, "*So they will have told you doubtless already*" (107), clearly suggest that Quentin has heard the story either from his father or the townspeople. Yet, the episode seems to put him off balance. For instance, it is difficult for Quentin to focus on Rosa's explanation of Henry's confrontation with Judith in her room after he killed Bon "because there was *also* something which [Quentin] *too* could not pass" (139, emphasis added). We also find Quentin's obsession with

the episode in Mr. Compson's account, which chronologically comes after Rosa's story. In Cambridge, Quentin admits to his inattentiveness to his father's story because "he had not been listening since he had something which he *still* was unable to pass" (142, emphasis added). His acknowledgement indicates that he is still shackled by the incident, even though he is now far away from his hometown.

Using the analogy of "getting through the door or passing it" and Quentin's "understanding and making sense of narrative," Heberden W. Ryan argues that Quentin "is caught up in his mind's replaying of the vital event, trying desperately to make some sense of the ambiguity which confounds him" (301). As previously noted, however, Quentin resembles Henry and understands his situation. Henry's murder of Bon—the central issue and mystery of the novel, to which the narration frequently returns—becomes Quentin's own concern when he tries to protect Caddy's virginity and Compson honor. Quentin is further devastated because the murder involves issues of miscegenation and racial discrimination that originate in slavery.

Quentin's immobilized state, then, is due to the fact that he overlaps this past event with the difficulties of the present and shares Henry's pain. As Robert Dale Parker argues, "'not listening' has become a metaphor for a different kind of listening that includes a repression rather than an absence of thought about what he listens to" (*Questioning* 101). It is significant that both chapters 4 and 5—the last chapters of the stories of Rosa and Mr. Compson—end with the same scene of Henry's murder of Bon and his confrontation with Judith. These similar endings signify both Quentin's mental block and his strong kinship with Henry.

The strong impact of Henry's appearance on Quentin is evident, for Quentin deliberately withholds his conversation with Henry until the last chapter of the novel. After listening to the Sutpen stories of Rosa and Mr. Compson in "the long still hot weary dead September afternoon" (3), Quentin accompanies Rosa to Sutpen's Hundred. In the upper room of the mansion, he meets Henry, who looks "as if he were already a corpse" (298). Quentin courageously talks to him:

And you are—?

Henry Sutpen.

And you have been here—?

Four years.

And you came home—?

To die. Yes.

To die?

Yes. To die. (298)

After killing Bon at the gate of Sutpen's Hundred, Henry disappeared from town and was never heard from again. Rosa seems to have predicted Henry's return when she says to Quentin, "Something living in it. Hidden in it. It has been out there for four years, living hidden in that house" (140). On their way home, she looks worn out but satisfied with what she discovered at Sutpen's Hundred. She casually says farewell to Quentin: "I'm all right. Goodnight" (297). By

contrast, Quentin is unable to hide his shock in finding the “wasted yellow face” and the “wasted hands” of Henry in the “bare stale room whose shutters were closed” (298). At the end of the novel, readers learn of the encounter and understand the background of Quentin’s personal involvement in the Sutpen story.

Although Quentin later recalls the previous scene and candidly admits, “Maybe my face looks like hers did, but it’s not triumph” (296), the encounter evokes his emotional climax. As Parker argues, “Quentin’s predilection to identify with the Sutpen story is enhanced and enforced by the old legend’s suddenly coming alive right before him” (*Novelistic* 135). After meeting Henry at Sutpen’s Hundred, Quentin feels closer to Henry and, as a witness, commits himself to the Sutpen story. Because the encounter with Henry serves as the catalyst for Quentin’s dedication, it is quite likely that Quentin has stronger ties with Henry than with other characters.

In addition to Henry’s ghastly appearance, Quentin is also shocked by the reason for Henry’s return: “*To die*” (298). From the beginning of the novel, Quentin is excessively sensitive to the notions of death and ghosts. For instance, Quentin becomes “two separate Quentins” in the middle of Rosa’s talk, and the two start “talking to one another in the long silence of notpeople, in notlanguage” (4-5). As the terms “notpeople” and “notlanguage” signify, both Quentins are equally haunted by the past, death, and ghosts:

[T]he Quentin Compson preparing for Harvard in the South, the deep South dead since 1865 and peopled with garrulous outraged baffled ghosts, listening, having to listen, to one of the ghosts which had refused to lie still even longer than most had, telling him about old ghost-times; and the Quentin Compson who was still too young to deserve yet to be a ghost but nevertheless having to be one for all that, since he was born and bred in the deep South the same as she was. . . . (4)

The passage shows that Quentin expects to become one of the ghosts that hover around the South since its defeat in the Civil War. Hearing the old tales as “a part of his twenty years’ heritage” and “a part of the town’s—Jefferson’s—eighty years’ heritage” (7), he is deeply immersed in the Southern environment and customs. Mr. Compson considers Rosa a living ghost and advises Quentin to behave politely to her: “Years ago we in the South made our women into ladies. Then the War came and made ladies into ghosts. So what else can we do, being gentlemen, but listen to them being ghosts?” (7-8). Mr. Compson takes the existence of ghosts for granted and generalizes Quentin’s visit to Rosa’s house as a duty for “us,” meaning white, male Southerners. As such, Quentin feels he is destined to live with ghosts, living or dead, and embraces the dead (defeated) South: “[H]is very body was an empty hall echoing with sonorous defeated names; he was not a being, an entity, he was a commonwealth” (7). Thus, Henry’s answer, “*To die*,” weighs heavily on Quentin. With a sense of affinity for Henry’s desperate situation, Quentin intuitively associates his future self with the dying Henry.

In the meantime, it would be impossible for Quentin to know the reason for Henry’s return, although Quentin’s hesitation to enter Sutpen’s Hundred suggests he was aware of

Henry's presence (143; 291-94). Henry's wish for death upsets Quentin, for it overlaps his obsession with death. In this regard, Quentin's prediction, "Maybe I shall be sorry tomorrow, but I must see" (296), becomes a reality when he eventually passes through "the last door" of the mansion and meets face-to-face with Henry (298). Afterwards, Quentin, "sweating, breathing fast and hard" (297), can no longer recover his presence of mind nor share a feeling of "triumph" with Rosa. Henry's corpse-like appearance haunts Quentin for the rest of his life, as suggested by the phrase "waking or sleeping it was the same and would be the same forever as long as he lived" (298).

Perhaps the only way for Quentin to overcome the memory of the dying Henry is to end his own life. The conversation between Quentin and Shreve at the end of the novel ominously suggests Quentin's death:

"I am older at twenty than a lot of people who have died," Quentin said.

"And more people have died than have been twenty-one," Shreve said. (301)

This passage comes immediately after Quentin's encounter with Henry and the subsequent destruction by fire of Sutpen's Hundred at the end of the novel. When Quentin overcomes "something which he still was unable to pass" (142) by opening the door of Henry's room, he confronts one of the South's ghosts and, ultimately, his own death. Just as Henry has waited for the opportunity "to die" for four years, and as Rosa has waited three months to revisit Sutpen's Hundred to rescue Henry, Quentin waits for his chance to end his life after the encounter with Henry.

3. "*He sounds just like Father*"

By the time of the reconstruction of the story with Shreve at Harvard in early 1910, Quentin has suicide on his mind and feels personally responsible for handing down the Sutpen story to future generations as a legacy of the South. It is true that Quentin does not allude to his suicide in this book. Considering that he is extremely careful in his preparations for his suicide on his last day in *The Sound and the Fury*, however, he could have acted in a similar manner in *Absalom, Absalom!* His drastic change from a mere listener in chapters 1 through 5 to both listener and speaker in chapters 6 through 9 can be explained through his emotional shift toward the suicide. As Parker states, "Quentin, who has largely been a participant only at our level, the level of listening and imaginatively retelling, suddenly becomes a participant at the Sutpen's level" (*Novelistic* 135). Now that Rosa is dead, Quentin is the dying Henry's only witness in the world. It was also Rosa's wish that Quentin would someday publicize the Sutpen story widely, including her version ("*she wants it told*" [5]). Quentin, thus, is not "the final recipient of all the accumulated knowledge, gossip, speculation, and theorizing about the Suptens," as Ruppensburg argues (87). He is willing to leave the Sutpen story to posterity.

Instead of his family members and neighbors in Mississippi, Quentin selects his Canadian roommate, Shreve, as the successor for the Sutpen story. In this regard, it is important that

Shreve “*sounds just like Father*” (147). Quentin’s choice of Shreve is not arbitrary, for the act of retelling includes the transmission of paternal authority through historical time. Becoming a father is essential in telling the old stories of the South.

Yoknapatawpha, Faulkner’s fictional county in Mississippi, is a patriarchal society in which power resides with men (usually the father or male elder) and the male line is highly valued. Just as the title of *Absalom, Absalom!* is an allusion to the Biblical account of King David and his favorite son, Absalom, the father-son relationship is an important subject in the book. The Sutpen story essentially overlaps with the stories of Old Testament patriarchs and deals with the conflicts between the dynastic father, Sutpen, and his sons, Henry and Bon. Faulkner often explained the novel as “the story of a man who wanted sons and got too many, got so many that they destroyed him” (*FU* 71). Indeed, the paternal authority of Sutpen is not handed on to his sons. Both of his sons eventually disappear from Sutpen’s sight: Henry renounces his birthright and leaves Sutpen’s Hundred, whereas Bon seeks to gain Sutpen’s recognition as a son and fails in all attempts. The story of Sutpen’s rise and fall presents the problem of how to acknowledge the father figure as the cultural authority of the South, one who assumes the role of handing down the narrative works of a family.

Despite Sutpen’s strong presence as a father figure, his ideas and actions do not necessarily correspond to the patriarchal ideology of the South. In the first place, Sutpen’s “design” is not in accordance with “the law of patrilineal succession” (Bleikasten, *Critical Essays* 158) that penetrated deeply into Southern aristocracy. In the patriarchal society of the South, a father and a son primarily construct family history and develop a sense of responsibility to preserve the past for future generations. But instead of relating the past to his sons, Sutpen talks about his early life to Quentin’s grandfather. No members of the Sutpen family, except Sutpen’s sister-in-law, Rosa, are capable of passing down the founder’s story for posterity. In this regard, Bleikasten succinctly points out that “what [Sutpen] aims at is not biological perpetuation, but ontological self-expansion” (*Critical Essays* 158). Because Sutpen’s design is “not the dynastic dream of a genealogy unfolding in time” (Bleikasten, *Critical Essays* 158), his sons are not expected to inherit the power and glory of his dynasty. In sum, Sutpen is a self-made man who is concerned with his fate and desires for his eternity. It is not surprising that people outside his family, including the Compsons, discuss Sutpen’s life and spread his legend.

In Cambridge, Quentin at first listens to Shreve’s summary of the Sutpen story to determine whether Shreve is a qualified successor for the story of this legendary figure. Some critics, such as Michael Millgate, point out Quentin’s passivity and consider him to be more qualified as a listener and audience, “an appropriate repository” of the Sutpen story, than a writer (Millgate 155). Although Quentin looks like “a reluctant listener to other’s narratives” (Lockyer 41), he possesses ample skills and talents when it comes to both listening and talking (and probably writing, as Rosa predicted [5]). Shreve’s brief summary of the Sutpen story in chapter 6 demonstrates that Quentin has quite accurately heard and transmitted the stories of Rosa and Mr. Compson. Shreve neatly recapitulates Quentin’s version of the Sutpen story, which traces back to the stories of Rosa and Mr. Compson, with some vital information not yet

disclosed to readers, including Sutpen's insult to Rosa about their marriage (144), as well as new information up to the time of Sutpen's death and burial.

Because what Quentin hears from Shreve is mostly what he heard from Rosa and Mr. Compson, the story's outline does not fascinate him; rather, he is more concerned with how it is recapitulated and retold by a non-Southerner. In spite of Shreve's facetious tone and playful attitude, his general overview of chapters 1 through 5 is right on target. Because Shreve's summary functions as an introduction to the new understanding of the Sutpen story, Quentin does not "[resist] Shreve's efforts to take it over" (*Novelistic* 127), as Parker argues. Shreve's explanation seems to satisfy Quentin, for he only answers "Yes" when asked to go along with Shreve's summary and "Miss Rosa" to correct Shreve's "Aunt Rosa." Quentin's repeated use of the word, "Yes," can be understood as his acceptance of Shreve as the successor of the Sutpen story.

Quentin's conviction of Shreve's aptitude for retelling the story comes to light when he notes that Shreve's voice resembles his father's: "*He sounds just like Father*" (147). Except for calling Sutpen "the demon" as Rosa has done, Shreve's summary of the Sutpen story takes on characteristics of Mr. Compson's figurative word usage and eloquent manner. Similar to Mr. Compson, Shreve speaks with a combination of sentimentalism about the past and cynicism about the present. In the face of this odd phenomenon, Quentin remains "quiet, reposed, curiously almost sullen" and placidly observes Shreve's "naked torso" and "the twin moons of his spectacles" (147). Quentin's calm and reassuring manner demonstrates that Shreve is capable of passing the Sutpen story on to others.

The phrase "*He sounds just like Father*" does not mean that Shreve is a "substitute" (Irwin 120) for Mr. Compson, because the voices of Mr. Compson and Shreve intermingle with Quentin's own. After repeating the phrase "*Just exactly like Father*" (148), Quentin's internal monologue and the words of Shreve and Mr. Compson coexist without conflict until the end of chapter 6. When this polyphonic narrative returns to its original state of the conversation between Quentin and Shreve, Quentin once again responds with a simple "Yes" (174, 175), as if to restate his acceptance of Shreve's interpretation. Chapter 6 introduces Shreve as a candidate for retelling the Sutpen story and ends with the notion that he is capable of doing so. Shreve's resemblance to Mr. Compson as the father figure demonstrates Quentin's approval of Shreve as his successor after his death.

4. "*Maybe we are both Father*"

In order to pass down the Sutpen story to Shreve, Quentin needs to become the father figure himself. It becomes important that the Sutpen story has been transmitted from Quentin's grandfather to his father. According to Mr. Compson, Rosa deems the Compsons "partly responsible through heredity for what happened to her and her family through him" (8). Since Quentin's grandfather, General Compson, was Sutpen's first and only close friend in Jefferson, Rosa believes the general assisted Sutpen, both socially and economically, on various occasions. Consequently, all of the Compsons are, for Rosa, part of the Sutpen story "through

heredity.” As Ruppensburg states, “the Sutpen story becomes a Compson family legacy, passed from grandfather to son to grandson” (87). Quentin is compelled to take the Sutpen story as his own, and it becomes a family duty for him to act like a father and pass on his version to the next generation.

Although some critics take Quentin’s telling as “revenge against his father, against time” (Irwin 120) and “a challenge to the Father” (Fowler, *Return* 112) to defy his father’s authority and time, Quentin does not seem to compete with his father over the control of the narrative. Rather, becoming a father during the reconstruction of the story suggests that Quentin and Shreve are both qualified to transmit it to future generations. Quentin’s internal monologue, “*Maybe we are both Father*” (210), in the middle of his explanation shows his resolution to pass down his version to Shreve.

Rosa emphasizes “heredity,” and the Genealogy² at the end of *Absalom, Absalom!* serves as a helpful source to identify Quentin’s and Shreve’s qualifications as tellers of the story. According to Pamela Dalziel, the Genealogy centers on the Sutpens, and Quentin “is defined not in terms of his own family but of his family’s relationship to Sutpen” (289). In fact, Quentin is “the only Compson accorded a genealogical entry” (Dalziel 289), and he is introduced as “Grandson of Thomas Sutpen’s first Yoknapatawpha County friend” (AA 309). It is noteworthy that Quentin’s father, Mr. Compson, does not appear in the Genealogy, even though he is, like Quentin, one of the major narrators of the novel. On the other hand, another important narrator, Shreve, is listed in the Genealogy, although he has no family relationship with Sutpen. The fact that Quentin and Shreve are the only characters in the Genealogy who are no kin to Sutpen demonstrates their capacity as keepers of the Sutpen story.

Shreve occupies a unique place among those listed in the Genealogy. Unlike Quentin, whose position is determined by his grandfather, Shreve’s description has little connection to the Sutpen story: “Born, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, 1890. Attended Harvard, 1909-14. Captain, Royal Army Medical Corps, Canadian Expeditionary Forces, France, 1914-18. Now a practising surgeon, Edmonton, Alta.” (309). The only connection is that he went to the same university as Quentin. What is notable about Shreve’s entry, then, is the description of his current status. With the exception of Jim Bond, whose current status is described as “[w]hereabouts unknown” (309), Shreve is the only person in the Genealogy who is still alive. Shreve’s entry, located at the very end of the Genealogy, shows that he has become part of the Sutpen story as its last successor.

It is actually Shreve who reminds Quentin of the importance of his genealogy, particularly the presence of his grandfather as a “reliable” (Pilkington 171) source of information. After going over the Sutpen stories of Rosa and Mr. Compson in chapter 6, Shreve concludes by saying, “So he just wanted a *grandson*” (176, emphasis added). While his succeeding comment that the South is “better than Ben Hur” (176) is frequently interpreted as flippant, Shreve’s remark about the grandson is often overlooked by critics. Shreve’s reference to the grandson needs further examination because Sutpen once disclosed his inner feeling to General Compson by saying, “You see, all I wanted was just a *son*” (234, emphasis added). Shreve’s comment on the grandson must have reminded Quentin of the relationship between him and

his grandfather, because without responding to Shreve's words, he abruptly begins to disclose new information derived from his grandfather about Sutpen's early life: "He told Grandfather about it" (177). Afterwards, Quentin introduces Shreve to what he heard from his father, who heard it from his father, who most likely heard it from Sutpen himself. Quentin begins his version of the Sutpen story as "Grandson of Thomas Sutpen's first Yoknapatawpha County friend" (309). For him, the Sutpen story is to be transmitted from generation to generation.

Quentin is fully aware of his role as the story's transmitter and unfolds "Quentin's version of Mr. Compson's version of Grandfather Compson's version of Sutpen's version" (Parker, *Questioning* 98). After finding similarities between Shreve and his father and confirming Shreve's ability as a teller, Quentin provides additional story details to his successor, Shreve, in chapter 7. Yet at the same time, he does not confuse himself with his grandfather and frequently adds the phrase "Grandfather said" as supporting evidence in his explanation. Unlike Shreve, who "*sounds just like Father*" (147), Quentin maintains a certain distance from his grandfather. Indeed, Quentin acts as an effective medium, telling the stories in the identical language used when they were told to him.

Quentin tells of Sutpen's early life as objectively as possible so that Shreve can have close access to the primary source to interpret the story. This is why Quentin's narrative in chapter 7 mainly deals with Sutpen himself, whereas "other characters concentrate on the ramifications of Sutpen's actions" (Egan 211). As Joseph W. Reed points out, Quentin seems to believe that his grandfather "is a transparent medium and speaks in his own voice only to comment on the quality of Sutpen's telling, enters the picture only as the narrative presence of a third-person narrative might, to comment on the process of narrative itself" (163-64). Quentin's reliance on his grandfather's testimony of what Sutpen told him, in fact, reveals that "none of the characters who pass [Sutpen's episode] along seem to doubt its authenticity" (Ruppersburg 120). Quentin's grandfather asserts a strong presence in *Absalom, Absalom!*, and Quentin at once repeats his grandfather's version of the story and incorporates it into his own version for further analysis. With the authority of his grandfather, Quentin "tells of what Sutpen *does*, but he always centers his narrative on what he *says*, how he says it, and what he does not say" (Lockyer 46, italics original). Quentin tries to make the secondary source of his story as trustworthy as possible.

This does not mean, however, that Quentin heard the Sutpen story directly from his grandfather. If the chronology of *Absalom, Absalom!* is understood in connection with "A Justice" (1931), it is true that Quentin's grandfather was still alive when Quentin was a young teenager. But at that age Quentin could not have fully understood what his grandfather meant, just as he was unable to comprehend Sam Fathers' story and thus escaped from his uncomfortable feelings in "A Justice." In the first place, Quentin does not seem to discuss the Sutpen story with his grandfather in depth. As Cleanth Brooks points out, "there is in the novel no cutback to a scene in which Quentin has a conversation with his grandfather" (*Yoknapatawpha Country* 436). We can also find the transmission process in Shreve's remark:

When your grandfather was telling this to [your father], he didn't know any more what

your grandfather was talking about than your grandfather knew what the demon was talking about when the demon told it to him, did he? And when your old man told it to you, you wouldn't have known what anybody was talking about if you hadn't been out there and seen Clytie. (220)

It is quite likely that Quentin heard about Sutpen's early life from his father and distilled the essence of it that seems so central to his grandfather's story. Quentin's direct mention of his grandfather is, in a way, an implicit statement that he is a true successor to the traditions of this telling. As an important reminder, Quentin insists that Shreve refer to his grandfather, his father, and himself when he tells the Sutpen story to others in the future. Quentin's interest is not only in the story itself but also in what it means to the listeners.

In the meantime, the presence of the father becomes stronger than that of the grandfather throughout chapter 7, as if to show that Quentin and Shreve take on the role of a father and become qualified successors of the Sutpen story. While Quentin repeatedly refers to his grandfather, Shreve sometimes interrupts him to mention his father. On one occasion, he even mocks Quentin's manner and says, "Go on. And Father said—" (214). When Shreve cuts in for the first time, "Don't say it's just me that sounds like your old man," Quentin admits to acting like his father as well:

Yes. Maybe we are both Father. 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 feeds, has fed, did feed, let this second pool contain a different temperature of water, a different molecularity of having seen, felt, remembered, reflect in a different tone the infinite unchanging sky, it doesn't matter. . . . Yes, 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. (210)

Quentin's internal monologue, "*Maybe nothing ever happens once and is finished,*" as well as the concentric metaphors of "*ripples*" and "*pebble,*" suggest that the Sutpen story is always incomplete, enduring for eternity. According to Quentin, the Sutpen story will continuously be passed down from generation to generation, expanding into surrounding places in a concentric fashion. The Sutpen story always starts from Sutpen and causes various repercussions in others.

Meanwhile, "*a narrow umbilical water-cord*" (210) in the previous passage evokes another part of the novel that explains the geographical relationship between Quentin and Shreve in chapter 7:

[T]he one in Alberta, the other in Mississippi; born half a continent apart yet joined, connected after a fashion in a sort of geographical transubstantiation by that Continental Trough, that River which runs not only through the physical land of which it is the

geologic umbilical, not only runs through the spiritual lives of the beings within its scope, but is very Environment itself which laughs at degrees of latitude and temperature. . . . (208)

In both passages, the term “umbilical” is the key element for the spiritual connection between Quentin and Shreve. Despite the differences in “degrees of latitude and temperature,” the “River” and “ripples” metaphors suggest that Quentin and Shreve are closely interrelated by the “Continental Trough.” Quentin’s story, the “ripples” of the “first pool” in Mississippi, moves to Shreve’s “second pool” that holds “a different temperature of water” in Canada. We may recall here that the Mississippi River means “Great River” and “Father of Waters” in the Ojibwa language (O’Brien 278) and is nicknamed as “Old Man River.” Of course, the “old man” stands for a father—it is quite suggestive that Shreve repeatedly calls Sutpen and Mr. Compson “old man” in the novel. Connected by the father-figure of the Mississippi, Quentin and Shreve share the essence of the Sutpen story both geographically and physically.

The more Quentin becomes obsessed with the Sutpen story, the more he becomes conscious of his relationships with his father and Shreve. Admitting that “*we are both Father*” (210), Quentin inserts his father’s point of view into his narrative as further evidence of his narrative authority. As Wendell V. Harris points out, “many of the father’s remarks floating in Quentin’s consciousness are ‘explanations’ introduced by the significant word ‘because’” (139). Meanwhile, Quentin discloses that his father did not know the entire Sutpen story, for “Grandfather didn’t tell him all of it either, like Sutpen never told Grandfather quite all of it” (214). As such, he decides to compile all versions of the Sutpen story into a “definitive edition,” which culminates in disclosing the conversation between Henry and Bon concerning the issue of miscegenation: “*So it’s the miscegenation, not the incest, which you cant bear*” (285). In the novel, becoming a father has a direct connection with the role of a storyteller.

Moreover, the role of a father can legitimize Quentin’s early death by suicide. Biologically speaking, fathers are born and die earlier than their sons. When Quentin insists “I am telling” and becomes preoccupied with his own talking, he realizes his eventual death: “*I shall have to never listen to anything else but this again forever so apparently not only a man never outlives his father but not even his friends and acquaintances*” (222). This passage indicates that he senses the prospect of his death during the reconstruction of the Sutpen story. Quentin, then, needs to be in the father’s position so as to end his life earlier than those of his contemporaries. As such, his later narrative in chapter 7 is filled with the topic of death: Henry’s murder of Bon and Wash Jones’ murder of Sutpen. He also conjures up the image of the ghosts of Mississippi in the “tomblike” (260) dormitory room of Harvard:

[T]he two of them back to back as though at the last ditch, saying No to Quentin’s Mississippi shade who in life had acted and reacted to the minimum of logic and morality, who dying had escaped it completely, who dead remained not only indifferent but impervious to it, somehow a thousand times more potent and alive. (225)

Quentin's obsession with death does not disappear during his interactive communications with Shreve. In fact, Quentin's emotional path toward death grows stronger as the novel comes to a close. Even in cold, snowy New England, he is constantly haunted by the ghosts of Mississippi, who are now "a thousand times more potent and alive." Sensing his end is approaching, Quentin uses all the strength he has left to transmit his version of the Sutpen story to Shreve as his will and a legacy of the South for future generations.

5. *"I dont hate it"*

Quentin intended to commit suicide after meeting the dying Henry at Sutpen's Hundred, and Mr. Compson's letter that informs him of Rosa's death is his deciding factor. The reconstruction of the Sutpen story by Quentin and Shreve in the latter half of the novel is neither interactive nor collaborative. It is, in fact, Quentin's guided conclusion rather than a "happy marriage of speaking and hearing" (253). After disclosing enough information about the Sutpen story, Quentin confirms that Shreve has all the makings of a storyteller and lets him "play" (224) his role. As such, Shreve almost entirely takes the initiative in reconstructing the Sutpen story, particularly Bon's life, in chapter 8. In his version, Shreve confirms details with Quentin to make sure his understanding is reasonable ("didn't your father say?" [256]) and soon realizes that Quentin has already predicted where his story ends ("But I know. And you know too" [286]). When Shreve at last asks Quentin if his story about Bon's inner feelings and his mixed blood is relevant ("Aint that right? Aint it? By God, aint it?"), Quentin quietly admits, "Yes" (287). Quentin finally acknowledges that Shreve has arrived at a "true-enough" conclusion.

Instead of delivering the story of the South from father to son, as his grandfather and father had done, Quentin leaves the Sutpen story to Shreve. In this regard, Quentin and Sutpen are alike; they both tell their stories to their close friends. This similarity is not completely unrelated to the fact that both family lines are destined to end in the near future. While there is no knowing whether Sutpen anticipated his fate, Quentin seems to have deliberately chosen a Canadian, who does not "live among defeated grandfathers and freed slaves . . . and bullets in the dining room table and such" (289), as his successor. Shreve is the only person alive in the Genealogy and capable of handing down and preserving the Sutpen story as a memory of the South. Quentin has selected as his successor someone who is completely exempt from the historical and moral burden of the South's roots in slavery yet can feel close to and identify with the Sutpen story.

Quentin's transmission of the Sutpen story to a non-Southerner poses a final question whether one "would have to be born there" (289) to understand the South. In response to Quentin's final answer of "I dont know" (289), Shreve speaks emphatically that Quentin "dont even know about [Rosa]. Except that she refused at last to be a ghost" (289). In a way, Quentin has also "refused at last to be a ghost," for he ultimately does not return to his native land of Mississippi. Whereas Henry goes back to his home, Sutpen's Hundred, to end his life, Quentin remains in Cambridge and dies there. As such, Quentin's response to Shreve's final question,

“Why do you hate the South?,” sounds desperate: “*I dont hate it!*” (303). Regardless of Mr. Compson’s encouragement in his letter (“*let it be hope*” [302]), Quentin can no longer find peace of mind and repeats the phrase of “Nevermore of peace” (298). His death in Cambridge, as well as his transmission of the Sutpen story to Canadian Shreve, demonstrates his mixed feelings of becoming a ghost of the South and his wish to preserve the legacy of the South as long as possible. Shreve, as Quentin’s successor, will surely add Quentin’s contradictory feelings toward the South and “his bitterness which he has projected on the South in the form of hatred of it and its people” (SL 79) to his version of the Sutpen story. Even when Quentin dies, the Sutpen story will continue to live. Quentin’s story about his search of identity is now embedded in a larger story of Thomas Sutpen and the South.

IV. Afterward: The Compson Appendix

Chapter 8

The Impact of Quentin's Death on Caddy: Re-reading *The Sound and the Fury*

Seventeen years after the publication of *The Sound and the Fury*, Faulkner wrote “a new section” (SL 220) of the novel entitled “Appendix: Compsons: 1699-1945” for Malcolm Cowley’s *The Portable Faulkner*. Faulkner considered the Appendix to be “the key to the whole book” (SL 220), but no consensus among critics has been reached regarding the treatment of this work. Some critics, such as Noel Polk, exclude the Appendix from the novel, while other critics, such as Philip Cohen, insist on including the work as part of the novel, placing it either in the front or back.¹ Either way, the Appendix offers an opportunity for a new understanding of the novel, although its description is at times problematic and confusing due to its inaccuracy and digression. This chapter focuses on the first half of Caddy’s entry in the Appendix, which explicates her special attachment to her brother, Quentin, in the novel, and examines the influence of Quentin’s death on her deep affection for her daughter, Miss Quentin, in her later life. Ultimately, it will discuss that Quentin’s death and Miss Quentin’s escape become the triggers for Caddy to start everything over in Europe, searching for a new life and identity.

1. Caddy and Quentin III

Even though the Compson ancestors, Ikkemotubbe, and Andrew Jackson, who actually do not appear in *The Sound and the Fury*, show a strong presence in the Appendix, Caddy stands out from all of the other characters. Her section accounts for the greatest proportion of the Appendix and provides substantial information on her later life, which includes not only her life after her divorce in 1911 but also a new story told by Melissa Meek, the librarian of Yoknapatawpha County. In 1943, the librarian found a magazine photograph of a woman, who looked like Caddy, with “a German staffgeneral” and tried to “save her,” only to fail (ML 339). Critics often examine this episode to explain Caddy’s absence in the narratives (Dickerson 322), her doomed life (Baum 43, 47-48; Messerli 23-24), and her rejection of becoming the object of the other narrators (Donaldson 36-37). Not many of them, however, discuss the first half of her account that concerns her inner feelings toward Quentin. While the story of Caddy’s later life in Europe leaves a profound impression on the readers’ minds, the first part of her entry is of equal importance as the latter part.

Caddy’s entry begins by recounting her love for her brother and disclosing her mixed feelings toward him and his philosophy:

CANDACE (CADDY). Doomed and knew it, accepted the doom without either seeking or fleeing it. Loved her brother despite him, loved not only him but loved in him that bitter prophet and inflexible corruptless judge of what he considered the family’s honor

and its doom, as he thought he loved but really hated in her what he considered the frail doomed vessel of its pride and the foul instrument of its disgrace; not only this, she loved him not only in spite of but because of the fact that he himself was incapable of love, accepting the fact that he must value above all not her but the virginity of which she was custodian and on which she placed no value whatever: the frail physical stricture which to her was no more than a hangnail would have been. (*ML* 336)

This passage emphasizes Caddy's insight into Quentin's nature and her strong will to love her brother at any cost. Some critics, however, have not taken this passage at face value, as Harold Bloom remarks: "Caddy's dispassionate love for her doomed brother, Quentin" (3). Furthermore, according to Cohen, Caddy's account of her love toward Quentin in the Appendix does not accord with her image in the novel as a girl who feels distressed about the interference of her three brothers (248). The only part that fits the novel may be the first sentence that foretells her unfortunate ending ("the doom") due to her promiscuity.

Yet, we can still find positive aspects of Caddy—her tenderness and affection toward others—throughout the novel. This is especially the case when it comes to the matter of family. Caddy has a baby whose father is unknown and tries to marry a prosperous banker, Herbert Head. Quentin and Caddy get into an argument over her pregnancy:

Have there been very many Caddy
I dont know too many will you look after Benjy and Father
You dont know whose it is then does he know
Dont touch me will you look after Benjy and Father (*SF* 115)

In this passage, Caddy is worried about her father's alcoholism and tries to prevent Benjy from being put into the insane asylum in Jackson. Even though she is condemned by Quentin for having many sexual relationships with different men, Caddy cares for her family and endeavors to protect them as much as possible. André Bleikasten notes Caddy's disposition as containing "the vitality, the courage, the capacity for love and compassion which her self-centered brothers and parents so sadly lack" (*Ink* 55). Catherine B. Baum also emphasizes "Caddy's unselfish love" and discusses that her life "represents love, compassion, pity, and sacrifice in a family which is destroying itself through its lack of these qualities" (41, 40). The novel at once reveals Caddy's unrestrained conduct with sexual urge and her mother-like manner prompted by compassion.

Her caring attitude toward her brother in the Appendix, then, is not entirely off the mark and explains her sentiment. The Appendix reveals that, of all the family members, Quentin is the one for whom Caddy has special affection. The technique used in Caddy's explanation to prove this is that it clearly suggests Quentin without mentioning his name. Readers know at once that this "brother" is Quentin, not Jason or Benjy (it is not "brothers"). Such speculation is possible because Caddy's entry immediately follows Quentin's, and the first parts of their descriptions correspond with each other. Like Caddy's entry, Quentin's account begins with

his attitude toward love:

QUENTIN III. Who loved not his sister's body but some concept of Compson honor precariously and (he knew well) only temporarily supported by the minute fragile membrane of her maidenhead as a miniature replica of all the whole vast globy earth may be poised on the nose of a trained seal. Who loved not the idea of the incest which he would not commit, but some presbyterian concept of its eternal punishment: he, not God, could by that means cast himself and his sister both into hell, where he could guard her forever and keep her forevermore intact amid the eternal fires. (*ML* 335)

Quentin's entry briefly summarizes his mindset around the time of his suicide in the novel and does not provide a new aspect of his life when it is juxtaposed with Caddy's entry. It is also noteworthy that, in the Appendix, Quentin becomes a minor character, whose description is the shortest in length of all his siblings. He no longer assumes the role of a spokesperson of his family and his native soil in the Appendix, just as he has done in "That Evening Sun" (1931), "A Justice" (1931), "Lion" (1935), and *Absalom, Absalom!* (1936). Critics, thus, have paid little attention to Quentin's entry and rarely discuss his position in the Appendix. Cohen, for instance, argues that "Faulkner's eloquent thumbnail sketch of Quentin in the Appendix simply does not do justice to the richness of his earlier characterization" (247). Quentin's account is no more than a repetitive story of the novel and serves as a support for Caddy's entry.

Indeed, the descriptions of Quentin and Caddy resonate with each other and add depth to an understanding of Caddy's inner feelings. As Steve Carter points out, Caddy's love for Quentin parallels Quentin's love for Caddy in that both represent "a love of certain concepts" (101). However, there is a critical difference in their love interest. Although the Appendix displays the similar attitude of Quentin and Caddy to the essence of love, Quentin's entry demonstrates that he loves the idea of Caddy's virginity more than he loves Caddy. Whereas Caddy puts her mind to both Quentin and "what he represents to her: the certain boundaries of law and tradition which the Compson family needs if it is to endure" (Carter 101), his love is more abstract than hers. According to her entry, Caddy is aware of Quentin's idealistic tendency toward love and honor and concludes that her brother is ultimately "incapable of love" (*ML* 336). Despite all this, she loves him and shares his conceptual love. A comparison of the two entries exhibits how she comprehends him accurately.

In the novel, Caddy's deep affection for Quentin is suggested by other characters. For instance, Mrs. Compson's words indirectly show the close relationship between Quentin and Caddy: "Candace and Quentin [are] more than friends" (*SF* 95). Explaining that "He seemed to be the only person she had any consideration for" (*SF* 261), Mrs. Compson senses the strong ties between Quentin and Caddy that the other brothers, Benjy and Jason, do not share. She complains to her husband, who also acknowledges their close connection, that "they were allowed too much freedom, to be together too much" (*SF* 261). Another example is the scene where Caddy's fiancé, Herbert, confesses to Quentin that he has felt jealous of Quentin

because she talks about him too much: “[S]he couldn’t have talked about you any more if you’d been the only man in the world husband wouldn’t have been in it” (*SF* 108). From the fragments of other characters’ remarks, we can find Caddy’s special fondness toward Quentin that conforms to the description in the Appendix.

What is indirectly stated in the novel is described as factual evidence in the Appendix. It is true that, to use Bleikasten’s expression, Caddy is Faulkner’s “ever-elusive Eurydice,” the wife of Orpheus whom he failed to recapture from Hades, and “exists only in the memories of her brothers” in the novel (*Ink* 49, 54). All we can do is to speculate on Caddy’s state of mind through the narrators’ words as “the absent center of her brothers’ stories” (Donaldson 31). The first half of Caddy’s entry, thus, reaffirms the significance of the close relationship between Caddy and Quentin in the novel and demonstrates how he holds a special place in her mind.

If Caddy loves Quentin more than any other family member, her reference to his notion of death in the Appendix would be of particular importance because her attitude toward his death is not clearly stated in the novel. According to the Appendix, Caddy understands that Quentin puts more emphasis on death than anything else, including herself and her virginity:

Knew the brother loved death best of all and was not jealous, would (and perhaps in the calculation and deliberation of her marriage did) have handed him the hypothetical hemlock. (*ML* 336-37)

As with the case of the topic of love, her appreciation of his obsession with death corresponds exactly with his own explanation:

But who loved death above all, who loved only death, loved and lived in a deliberate and almost perverted anticipation of death as a lover loves and deliberately refrains from the waiting willing friendly tender incredible body of his beloved, until he can no longer bear not the refraining but the restraint and so flings, hurls himself, relinquishing, drowning. (*ML* 335-36)

These passages reflect Quentin’s sentiment on his last day when he wanders around Harvard and the surrounding areas and drowns himself in the Charles River. While having been rather realistic in choosing the right timing and place for his suicide, the reasons for his suicide remain unsolved and are complicated in that he highly valued Compson’s honor and Caddy’s virginity and was totally preoccupied with his Southern white male identity. What is explicit in the novel is that he never changes his mind about killing himself and secretly carries out his plan without being noticed by others.

In Caddy’s account of Quentin’s interest in death, there is one discrepancy between the novel and the Appendix. If the Appendix is correct in that Caddy “would (and perhaps in the calculation and deliberation of her marriage did) have handed him the hypothetical hemlock,” it means that she has encouraged him to end his life before her wedding. The novel, however, shows no evidence of her doing so. It is true that she does not resist when he once tried to slit

his own throat after killing her with the same means:

it wont take but a second just a second then I can do mine I can do mine then
all right can you do yours by yourself
yes the blades long enough Benjys in bed by now (*SF* 152)

This suicidal attempt, nevertheless, ends in dismal failure. From this experience, Caddy realizes that Quentin has a suicidal intent but is incapable to move into action.

Caddy is aware that her brother suffers from her promiscuous behavior, unexpected pregnancy, and forced marriage, but does not expect him to kill himself. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, she actually asks him to take good care of their father and Benjy after she gets married: “*Dont touch me will you look after Benjy and Father*” (*SF* 115). Moreover, she hopes that he will make efficient use of the money obtained from selling Benjy’s pasture and graduate from Harvard: “*dont you see you’ve got to finish now if you dont finish he’ll have nothing*” (*SF* 124). While expressing her compassion toward him and comforting him by sometimes saying, “[P]oor Quentin” (*SF* 151) and “[D]ont cry” (*SF* 152), she does not reflect her concern for his suicide at all and becomes busy with her own business (“*I’ve got to marry somebody*” [*SF* 115]). Consequently, the news of his suicide must have been a great shock to her.

Although the timing of her actual realization remains uncertain, “the hypothetical hemlock” in the Appendix suggests that she is, at some stage in her life, quite aware of her potential involvement in his death. We may recall here that Quentin’s entry refers to Caddy’s wedding when it introduces his suicide:

Committed suicide in Cambridge Massachusetts, June 1910, two months after his sister’s wedding, waiting first to complete the current academic year and so get the full value of his paid-in-advance tuition. . . . (*ML* 336)

As if to answer Caddy’s earlier request, Quentin drowns himself after finishing his first year at Harvard. Since the money used to pay for his tuition is also allocated to her wedding costs, there is no problem to include the description of her wedding. The passage, however, needs further consideration to the discussion of his suicide. Her first account in the Appendix, “Doomed and knew it, accepted the doom without either seeking or fleeing it” (*ML* 336), demonstrates not only Caddy’s promiscuous sexual behaviors but also her pang of regret for possibly driving her dear brother to an early grave.

In the novel, Caddy’s influence on Quentin’s suicidal thought is implied by Mrs. Compson. In Mrs. Compson’s mind, Quentin’s suicide is interpreted in connection to their mutual relations: “And then when her troubles began I knew that Quentin would feel that he had to do something just as bad. But I didn’t believe that he would have been so selfish as to—I didn’t dream that he—” (*SF* 261). Although Mrs. Compson later admits that she is at a loss to understand why Quentin killed himself (“Under God’s heaven what reason did he

have?" [SF 299]), her words signify the mutual interaction between Quentin and Caddy. She considers Caddy one of the causes of Quentin's death.

Caddy's inner feelings toward her brother's death can only be inferred from the scene of Mr. Compson's funeral in the third section of the novel. Here, Caddy secretly participates in her father's funeral and talks to Jason when everyone has returned home. During their conversation, Jason notices the flowers on Mr. Compson's grave that seems "fifty dollars' worth" (SF 202) and finds another "bunch on Quentin's" (SF 202). From the price of the flowers, we know that Caddy puts them on these graves to express her condolence. The expensive flowers demonstrate that Caddy still cares about Quentin after his death and mourns the loss of his life.

The first half of Caddy's entry enables readers to reconsider the special connection between Quentin and Caddy and the significant impact of his death on her. While Quentin's mixed feelings toward Caddy and her virginity are perplexing, she eventually heightens her awareness of how much she has loved her brother. Feeling a twinge of remorse for what she has said and done to him, she is "not jealous" (ML 336) of his obsession with death but rather expresses her sorrow over his death. The Appendix provides ample room for further discussion of Caddy's inner feelings toward her brother and his death.

2. Caddy and Miss Quentin

Caddy's account in the Appendix implies that Quentin's untimely death has had a great impact on her later life. After mentioning his obsession with death, her entry moves on to introduce her daughter:

Was two months pregnant with another man's child which regardless of what its sex would be she had already named Quentin after the brother whom they both (she and her brother) knew was already the same as dead, when she married (1910) an extremely eligible young Indianian she and her mother had met while vacationing at French Lick the summer before. (ML 337)

What is notable here is that she has already made up her mind to name the unborn baby "Quentin" around the time of her wedding, which is two months before his suicide. Meanwhile, Miss Quentin's own entry suggests that Caddy could not name her baby "Quentin" in reality:

QUENTIN. The last. Candace's daughter. Fatherless nine months before her birth, nameless at birth and already doomed to be unwed from the instant the dividing egg determined its sex. (ML 346)

Actually, it was Mrs. Compson (and other members of the Compson family) who named Caddy's baby Quentin when she was placed in the custody of the Compsons in the novel. When Caddy finds out that her family named the baby Quentin as she secretly wished, she

must have felt the mysterious workings of fate. Even though Miss Quentin's future looks hopeless ("the same as dead") and dead-end ("doomed") from the beginning, the beloved image of Quentin continues to live in Caddy as Miss Quentin. After Quentin's death, Caddy tries to fill the void in her life by loving Miss Quentin.

Of course, the name "Quentin" is not the only reason Caddy devotes her affection to her daughter. She loves her daughter under any circumstances, even though Mrs. Compson prohibits her from meeting with Miss Quentin and other family members from speaking Caddy's name in the house (*SF* 196, 199). One time even, Caddy sends a letter to Jason to confirm if Miss Quentin has received her letter about the Easter dress and if she stays well. Miss Quentin's cost of living, "two hundred dollars a month" (*SF* 219), and other incidental expenses come from Caddy's own money, though Jason diverts them to his own pocket. She does not want her daughter to feel forlorn and small in her presence both in the family and town due to the absence of her parents ("You'll see that she has things like other girls?" [*SF* 210]). Her care for Miss Quentin once leads her to negotiate with Jason for the opportunity to have a reunion with her daughter, which ends in seeing her daughter in the hack for only a moment. On another occasion, she asks Dilsey to bring her together with her daughter, but Jason immediately discovers it and forbids their meetings. Every effort she makes to maintain a connection with her daughter is turned down by Jason.

Although things go against her, she does not give up hope and tries to support her daughter as much as possible. In this regard, Baum criticizes Walter J. Slatoff's argument about Caddy's lack of sufficient consideration toward her daughter and defends a series of her attempts to keep in touch with her daughter (46-47). According to Baum, there was no way but to leave her child in the care of her parents, for "it is the only thing she could do" (46). Having "no way to provide for her," Caddy wishes Miss Quentin's happiness from a distance so that she would not "become a mistress or a prostitute" like her mother (Baum 47). I would add to Baum's study and argue that Caddy enhances her affection toward Miss Quentin for the sake of her daughter's name. Caddy's sense of loss caused by Quentin's suicide has become one of the incentives for her to love her daughter, who has inherited her uncle's name.

Like other Compsons, Caddy internalizes the significance of her family's genealogy and thinks highly of the given names handed down from one generation to another. She occasionally (probably "once or twice a year sometimes" [*SF* 211]) returns to Jefferson and asks Jason to take good care of Miss Quentin like a gentleman worthy of his name: "Promise, Jason. You have Father's name: do you think I'd have to ask him twice? once, even?" (*SF* 209). Caddy brings up the genealogical continuity of the name "Jason" and asks her brother to act like their father, who used to be generous about the treatment of herself and Miss Quentin. Mr. Compson once proposed to allow Caddy to return to the house, but Mrs. Compson would not let Caddy re-enter the house. Even though Caddy's desperate appeals are ignored by Jason, her reference to the Compson lineage to be considerate of other family members' situation signifies her acknowledgment of the importance of the same given names.

The genealogical structure of the Appendix suggests that the given names play a significant role in the Compson family. In the Appendix, there are four Quentins, four Jasons,

and two Mauries (one of the Mauries is renamed as Benjy). Of all these names, “Quentin” has the longest tradition in the Compson history.² Before Quentin III, there are Quentin MacLachan I, the founder of the Compsons who crossed the Atlantic and settled in Carolina from Glasgow, and Quentin MacLachan II, who once served as the Governor of Mississippi. Quentin III and Miss Quentin follow these great ancestors as part of the Compson heritage.

The Appendix ends with the exceptional case of Miss Quentin carrying on the tradition of the given names of their ancestors. Miss Quentin is the only female character with the name “Quentin” to join the male line of the Compsons. The unusual application of “Quentin” to a girl exhibits a certain discontinuity that clearly draws a line between her and other Quentins. Although Walter Taylor and Charles Peek call her “Quentin IV” in their discussion (Taylor 66; Peek, *Teaching* 68, 69, 71, 72), her name is just “Quentin” in the Appendix without the suffix of “IV.” The lack of this historical continuity in her name indicates her minor presence in the male-dominant Compson lineage, and the fact that she is the “last” of the Compsons represents the ruin of this distinguished Southern family.

Furthermore, her anonymity in the other parts of the Appendix disagrees with the genealogical importance of the name “Quentin.” Interestingly, the treatment of Miss Quentin’s name differs in each entry of the Appendix. In Jason Lycurgus’ entry, for instance, she appears without a name and as “the old governor’s doomed lost nameless seventeen-year-old greatgreatgranddaughter” (*ML* 335). In the case of Jason IV, she is only referred to as his “niece” (*ML* 343, 344). Miss Quentin’s account that she is “[f]atherless” (*ML* 346) corresponds with her “nameless” situation in the Compson genealogy and signifies her rootlessness without strong family ties. The only Compson connection Miss Quentin has is Caddy, but she has been banished from the home and eliminated from the family memory.

Rather, Miss Quentin’s entry puts more emphasis on the relationship with her uncle, Quentin III, than with Quentins I and II. Because of the same name, readers get easily confused between the two Quentins—Quentin III and Miss Quentin—due to their feminine and masculine qualities in the first section of the novel (Abate 304-05). The name of Miss Quentin, however, is not intended to baffle the readers. The “[f]atherless” state of Miss Quentin suggests that her uncle wields an influence over her “doomed” life. In this regard, it is noteworthy that Mrs. Compson believes that Quentin “could have controlled [Miss Quentin]” (*SF* 261) better than Jason had. Mrs. Compson’s comment that implies the association of Quentin and Miss Quentin is indicative of his fatherly position, even though they have never met face-to-face.

In the novel, it is actually Jason who is in charge of Miss Quentin, but he treats her unkindly. Identifying her with her mother, he repeats the phrase that explains his bitterness toward both of them: “Once a bitch always a bitch, what I say” (*SF* 180). As a “doomed,” troubled child of Caddy, she resists Jason’s authority as the head of the family and repeats bad behaviors. Although Jason is in the position to act like Miss Quentin’s father, their familial connection remains superficial and ends in the catastrophe of her final flight.

When Miss Quentin eventually escapes from Jason’s supervision and runs away from home, Mrs. Compson instinctively recalls Quentin’s suicide and mistakenly perceives Miss

Quentin's flight as such. Mrs. Compson's assertion is premised on the assumption that they share the same given name and fate. She attributes Miss Quentin's alleged suicide to the issue of blood and heredity: "It's in the blood. Like uncle, like niece. Or mother. I don't know which would be worse. I don't seem to care" (*SF* 299). The ill-fated image of the name "Quentin" smolders in Mrs. Compson's mind because of his suicide. While having been dead for many years, Quentin still has a strong presence in the Compson family.

Indeed, Mrs. Compson's words demonstrate Quentin's influence on Miss Quentin. According to Mrs. Compson, Miss Quentin bears the burden of the Compson family because of her name: "But she has inherited all of the headstrong traits. Quentin's too. I thought at the time, with the heritage she would already have, to give her that name, too. Sometimes I think she is the judgment of both of them upon me" (*SF* 260-61). We notice that Mrs. Compson not only refers to Quentin but also blames Caddy for Miss Quentin's bad conduct and escape. As some critics consider Miss Quentin "Caddy's debased copy" (Bleikasten, *Ink* 49) and "the obverse image of her mother" (Milliner 71), there seems nothing to argue about the similarity between the mother and the daughter. As if expressing his assent, Jason once says to his mother, "She's too much like both of them to doubt that" (*SF* 262). What is significant here is that Mrs. Compson always returns to Quentin's characteristics to verify Miss Quentin's unfavorable traits. In the novel, her suggestions become a trigger to reconsider the relationship between Quentin and Miss Quentin.

If Mrs. Compson remembers her dead son, Quentin, through the presence of Miss Quentin, Caddy could have thought along the same lines. Contrary to the ominous image of Mrs. Compson, the name "Quentin" suggests love and affection in Caddy's mind. As the flowers on Quentin's grave show, Caddy does not forget about her brother; her memory is instead reinforced when she thinks of her daughter, Miss Quentin. Although Caddy cares about her daughter, she knows that she cannot take responsibility to raise her as her mother: "I can't take her. Keep her" (*SF* 209). Her life after Quentin's death and the separation from her daughter is "Nuh-nuh-nothing," and she admits, "No. I have nothing at stake" (*SF* 210, 209-10). Still, she continues to have connections with her daughter as much as possible.

We can presume that Caddy has tried to keep in touch with Miss Quentin until she escapes from the Compsons' house with whom Jason calls "a damn show man in a red tie" (*SF* 234) and Jason's hoarded money. Afterwards, there seems to be no connection between the mother and the daughter—the novel and the Appendix do not refer to their subsequent interactions. It may be when Miss Quentin gets away from the Compsons' house in April 1928 that Caddy made up her mind to leave for Europe: "Vanished in Paris with the German occupation, 1940" (*ML* 337). She feels that her connection with Quentin (in reality, Miss Quentin) is lost forever and tries to carve a new life for herself in the new environment. The Appendix provides tremendous implications for her inner feelings toward Quentin's death and its influence on her later life that the novel does not fully disclose. The first half of her entry displays the significance of his death on her identity formation and development.

Conclusion

It is almost impossible to ignore Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha when one deals with the South. His fictional world is particularly influential to the subsequent Mississippi writers and puts pressure on them to compose meaningful literature. It is told that Eudora Welty, who was born in Jackson, Mississippi, and spent most of her life there, once stated, "Being in the same state with the phenomenal Faulkner . . . was like living near a big mountain" (9). On another occasion, she added, "As a writer, . . . I can never be better than second best in my home state of Mississippi" (9).

Faulkner's literary fame, however, came in his later years. When he wrote what are now considered as his greatest books, including *The Sound and the Fury* and *Absalom, Absalom!*, he was experiencing serious economic difficulties—he even had to work as a screenwriter in Hollywood to make a living. It was not until 1946, when Malcolm Cowley published an anthology of Faulkner's works, *The Portable Faulkner*, that people started to pay attention to his writings. Despite such a rough stage in his life, Faulkner adhered to his focus on his native land and continued to write about his fictional world and its people.

Perhaps Faulkner could share his feelings toward the South with W. J. Cash, whose book, *The Mind of the South*, now "belongs in an honored category with William Faulkner's novels, Tennessee Williams's plays, and C. Vann Woodward's historical interpretations" (Wyatt-Brown vii). While admitting to the multifaceted nature of the South, Cash argues that there is still a moral conformity in society. Cash makes this statement:

[I]f it can be said there are many Souths, the fact remains that there is also one South. That is to say, it is easy to trace throughout the region (roughly delimited by the boundaries of the former Confederate States of America, but shading over into some of the border states, notably Kentucky, also) a fairly definite mental pattern, associated with a fairly definite social pattern—a complex of established relationships and habits of thought, sentiments, prejudices, standards and values, and associations of ideas, which, if it is not common strictly to every group of white people in the South, is still common in one appreciable measure or another, and in some part or another, to all but relatively negligible ones. (xlviii)

Cash's argument is based on the premise that his readers are "white people in the South"—especially Southern white males of his rather sophisticated class. Indeed, his point of view of the South is restricted to his own circumstances; his target audience does not include women and blacks (Wyatt-Brown ix). In spite of the limited readership, Cash's writing is still effective and influential even today for Faulkner studies when it comes to the identity issues. Faulkner faced similar problems and has often been criticized for his inadequate and one-sided treatments of the female and black characters. It is, indeed, difficult to escape the influence of the society and culture people belong to, but Faulkner and Cash were courageous enough to

face their limitations and shortcomings.

What Faulkner kept writing about in his stories was “people, using the only tool I knew, which was the country that I knew” (*FU* 10), and his focus on Mississippi and the South was apparent in each character’s search for identity. In particular, his works that include Quentin demonstrate Faulkner’s challenge in developing his own identity as a Mississippian after Anderson’s advice on the topics of his writing. Quentin’s struggles with both his family and Southern culture, which lead to his identity crisis and result in his suicide, enable us to reconsider the meaning of his existence in society and the significance of the place to which he belongs. Most of Faulkner’s characters, like Quentin, are related to Yoknapatawpha, but there are some who are from other places and play important roles in story development. Bon and Shreve in *Absalom, Absalom!*, for instance, are indispensable characters in reconstructing the Sutpen story, and their relationships with the South have a great impact on their later lives. Faulkner’s Yoknapatawpha is not necessarily a closed, fictional society; rather, it is interrelated to other regions that are depicted as the “actual” places with the real names.

Faulkner’s fictional Yoknapatawpha becomes the “reality” in his readers’ minds through their recognition of each character’s identity crisis. Faulkner’s characters both accept and reject the concept that there is “one South” as Cash has pointed out in his book (xlvi). In Yoknapatawpha, genealogy and history often become the characters’ burden and determine their identity and fate. Each character, however, tries to confront the difficulties in life and solve the problems he/she encounters. Whatever the result may be, Quentin, Nancy, Sam Fathers, Bon, Shreve, and Caddy—we can also include the “Faulkner” of the fourth section in *The Sound and the Fury*—make strenuous efforts to do what they think is essential in establishing their own identity. This dissertation has focused on the characters who have their own voice and need to show their presence in the world.

The attachment to a certain place can be described by Tuan’s “topophilia.” The term means “the human love of place” and explains “human being’s affective ties with the material environment” (*Topophilia* 92, 93). In his work, *Topophilia*, Tuan suggests that the word invokes “aesthetic” and “tactile” reactions that are “more permanent and less easy to express”:

Topophilia is not the strongest of human emotions. When it is compelling we can be sure that the place or environment has become the carrier of emotionally charged events or perceived as a symbol. (93)

His descriptions of “topophilia” and the “symbol” correspond with Faulkner’s act of “sublimating the actual into the apocryphal” (*LG* 255). However, Faulkner’s topophilia is complicated because of his ambivalent attitudes toward his hometown. His sense of place is not simple and straightforward, which is reflected in the complex words and behaviors of his characters. Their search for identity is, in a way, their pursuit of topophilia.

Faulkner’s mixed feelings toward his native land continued to last until his death in 1962. This was the time when the civil rights movement became more serious and violent. Two months after his death, James Meredith entered the University of Mississippi as a first black

student, which led to bloody riots on campus in Oxford. It is remarkable that Faulkner had dealt with the issues of slavery, miscegenation, and racial discrimination, along with concerns of family ruins and local exclusiveness, in his stories over thirty years before Meredith's entrance. Faulkner's works prove the difficulty of searching for our own identity and express the delight of finding our "own little postage stamp of native soil" (*LG* 255).

Notes

Introduction

¹ Faulkner added “u” into his real name when he started his literary career.

² For the discussion of symbolical significance of fictional Yoknapatawpha, see Aiken 37-38.

³ See, for example, Brooks, *Toward Yoknapatawpha*, 283-300.

⁴ This dissertation does not include “Lion” because the narrator was changed when the story was revised. The short story, which first appeared in *Harper’s Magazine* in 1935, was later drastically revised and then incorporated into the short story “The Bear,” found in *Go Down, Moses*. On this occasion, the narrator, “I” (presumably Quentin), was changed into the third-person narrator, and Isaac (Ike) McCaslin became the protagonist. According to Edmond L. Volpe and Joseph Blotner, there are a few other short stories of which Quentin was considered to be a narrator up to a certain point (Volpe 192-93; *US* 684-85, 691-92). They are “A Bear Hunt,” “Fool about a Horse,” and “The Old People.” There are two reasons for not including them in this dissertation. First, Quentin does not appear in their final versions of any of these stories. Volpe and John W. Hunt assume that Quentin is the narrator of “A Bear Hunt” (192), but Quentin’s name does not appear anywhere in the short story. Second, “Fool about a Horse” is incorporated into *The Hamlet*, whereas “The Old People” becomes part of *Go Down, Moses*. Like “Lion,” it is difficult to examine these short stories without consulting *The Hamlet* and *Go Down, Moses*. The revisions of the previous four short stories suggest that the necessity and importance of a “non-Quentin” narrator began to increase around the mid-1930s.

Chapter 1

¹ Charles Chappell argues that Faulkner either “overlooked” or “remembered incorrectly” the fact that Quentin committed suicide at “a remote bridge out in the countryside away from Cambridge and Boston” (par. 2, note 3). It can also be argued that Faulkner chose Cambridge as the setting in the Genealogy of *Absalom, Absalom!* because the dormitory of Harvard University is the only New England setting that appears in the novel.

² Strictly speaking, the center of the Charles River is the dividing line if the river is the boundary between the two municipalities. Half the river is part of each city or town.

³ Chappell agrees with James Watson that Faulkner made the most of his visits to Yale University in 1918 and 1921 so that he could write a story about Boston (note 4). It can, thus, be speculated that Faulkner gathered information and materials regarding Boston and Cambridge and created the second section within his own imagination.

⁴ Faulkner mistakenly translated the meaning of Yoknapatawpha as “water runs slow through flatland,” which contradicts the general understanding (“land divided” or “split land”) of the local people in those days (Doyle 24, 387). The Yoknapatawpha River is located to the south of

Yoknapatawpha County and is named after the actual Yocona (or Yockney) River (Doyle 24).

⁵ Faulkner does not explicitly identify where Quentin committed suicide. Takuya Niiro suggests that the place is probably the present Arsenal Street Bridge that connects Watertown to Allston in Massachusetts (“Chushaku” 147). According to Chappell, Quentin’s suicide place is not the Larz Anderson Bridge as Patrick Samway has specified, which is located very close to Harvard University, but rather it is “a fictional bridge created by Faulkner and placed in a remote area, away from the urban congestion of Cambridge proper or greater Boston” (par. 7). This chapter suggests that the area where Quentin wanders and hides the flat iron weights on his last day is Waltham, Massachusetts. Known as the “Watch City” (Mannon 8), which reminds readers of Quentin’s watch, Waltham is an old factory town famous for its textile and watch industries. Several trains and trolleys run to Waltham from Boston, including the electric trolleys that first appeared in 1895 (Mannon 11, 57; Shurr n. pag.). Mrs. Bland, Gerald, Spode, Shreve, and the two girls might have enjoyed canoeing, picnicking, and other recreational activities that were quite popular in Waltham at that time (Mannon 88, 91-93). Other than the Charles River, there are several ponds and reservoirs in Waltham where three boys could go fishing. The historical timeline of the town further shows that in 1910, “large numbers of Italian immigrants begin to arrive and to compete with Irish for work as unskilled laborers” (Shurr n. pag.), which could account for the racial tensions between the immigrants of the places where Quentin meets the three boys, the bakery woman, little sister, Anse, and Julio. For example, the bakery woman treats the little girl, who is probably from “one of them new Italian families” (129), rudely by making derogatory remarks, such as “[t]hem [f]oreigners” (126) and “[f]oreigners” (128). Likewise, Anse, the marshal, refers to “[t]hem durn furriners” (143), speaking to Julio, the little girl’s brother.

⁶ Henry Thoreau’s *Walden* (1854) can be one example of running water in American literature (“Time is but the stream I go a-fishing in” [98]; “The life in us is like the water in the river” [332-33]). It is not uncommon to consider the flow of time as the flow of a river across space and time, as indicated in Greek philosopher Heraclitus’ doctrine of perpetual flux and Kamo-no Chomei’s *Hojoki*.

⁷ As for *Absalom, Absalom!*, Cleanth Brooks says, “I find little in Faulkner’s narrative treatment that can be certainly attributed to Bergson’s influence. . . . Faulkner’s concern with time is closely related to his concern with history; and it is just here, I believe, that one could most plausibly make a claim for Bergsonian influence” (*Toward Yoknapatawpha* 264-65). This chapter follows Brooks’ argument for Quentin’s awareness of time in *Absalom, Absalom!* that “the past ‘exists’ only in the present and to a related matter: the past as a living force in the present, a force that moulds our sense of the present” (*Toward Yoknapatawpha* 265). This chapter, however, argues that it is this continuous historical perspective that Quentin in *The Sound and the Fury* tries to overcome, although he keenly acknowledges himself as a Southerner in New England.

⁸ Bergson’s duration emphasizes the continuous and seamless flow of time, whereas Gaston

Bachelard's duration is made up of a series of discrete instants that are multilayered, fractured, and discontinuous. According to Bachelard, the instant is solitude and isolated, always breaking with the past.

Chapter 3

¹ There are some critics, such as Hans H. Skei, who consult each of the Quentin-related works autonomously (179-80). I take position similar to that of John T. Matthews, who argues that such an approach "seems at the least counterintuitive to the conventions of reading, and it perversely disregards Faulkner's own remarks about the essential identities of the characters who appear in more than one of his works" (*Craft* 72). In the meantime, Nancy appears in *Requiem for a Nun* as Nancy Mannigoe twenty years after the publication of "TES." Although Faulkner later said, "She is the same person actually" (*FU* 79) in an interview, it is unlikely that he had been planning to write the novel in advance. In *Reading Faulkner*, Towner and Carothers conclude, "To what extent and in what ways we ought to read Nancy, Quentin, and others as 'the same' from appearance to appearance thus remain issues open for debate" (151).

² While critics have reached consensus on the date of Quentin's death as specified in *SF* (June 2, 1910), they disagree about his birth year. According to the Genealogy of *Absalom, Absalom!*, Quentin was born in 1891. Cleanth Brooks, however, examines other parts of *Absalom, Absalom!* and concludes that Quentin was born in 1890 (*Yoknapatawpha Country* 447). *Reading Faulkner* and *William Faulkner A to Z* agree with Brooks (Ross and Polk 3; Fargnoli and Golay 309), while *Fokuna Jiten* states that, in light of the descriptions in *SF*, Quentin was born in 1889 (674). Unlike Brooks, Johnston considers 1889 to be Quentin's birth year after the careful examination of *Absalom, Absalom!* (94-95). Whatever the case may be, it is reasonable to consider Quentin's death to have occurred when he was around twenty years old. This chapter takes the standpoint that Quentin was born in 1889. Because of the impact of Quentin's suicide in *SF*, some critics describe his appearance in "TES" as a "resurrection" (Perrine 295; D. Kuyk, B. Kuyk, and Miller 36) and one of the "postmortem performances" (Matthews, *Craft* 71). Likewise, the term "resurrection" is often used to describe Nancy's appearance in *Requiem for a Nun*. See, for example, Towner and Carothers 151.

³ There are four versions of "TES." They are a six-page manuscript fragment ("Never Done No Weeping When You Wanted to Laugh," hereinafter the "original manuscript"), Faulkner's typed manuscript, the version published in *The American Mercury* in 1931 with H. L. Mencken's editorial comments ("That Evening Sun Go Down," hereinafter the "magazine version"), and the version published in *These 13* and *Collected Stories* ("That Evening Sun," hereinafter the "final version"). While we know that Faulkner sent the manuscript of the magazine version to Scribner's in October 1930 ("Never" 461), it is difficult to specify the time when he conceived and wrote the earlier versions of "TES." There is uncertainty about whether the original manuscript was written prior to or at the same time as the short story

“Twilight,” which is considered to be the archetype of *SF*, written in the spring of 1928, or whether it was written after “Twilight” and *SF* (Ferguson 201-02; Minter 283; Morrison 43-44). Considering the similarities in the characters (the Compsons and the Gibsons), the motifs (twilight and honeysuckle), and place names (Jefferson and Negro Hollow), it is highly probable that Faulkner conceived and wrote some parts of “TES” and *SF* concurrently.

⁴ Concerning Eunice’s suicide, see Nishikawa. Although his focus is different from this chapter, his discussion provides helpful information and suggestions concerning black people’s suicide in general.

⁵ The major changes in the four versions are: the title, the deletion and reuse of Jesus’ name and the so-called “vine business,” the introduction of the adult Quentin as a frame narrator, the addition of the Loveladys’ story, and the division of the fifth section. Since one page is missing from the original manuscript, it is impossible to know whether Nancy’s story about a queen was added to or revised in the later versions.

⁶ In “TES,” Benjy does not appear. In *SF*, Nancy is shot dead by Roskus and is most likely a horse, paired with Fancy (Ross and Polk 25).

⁷ We cannot tell when she attempted to kill herself in jail. The size of her stomach in prison (“her belly swelling out *a little, like a little balloon*” [292, emphasis added]) shows that the incident occurred sometime before the “vine business” (“her apron swelling out,” “a watermelon” [292]). Quentin, however, mentions that Dilsey is ill in bed during the “vine business” scene and later adds “Dilsey was *still* sick in her cabin. . . . It was a long time” (292, emphasis added) when the story reaches the present time of the nine-year-old Quentin. Although Quentin vaguely states the time passage as “a long time,” it seems that the amount of time that passed between Nancy’s suicide attempt and the present time of the young Quentin is within the range of several months.

⁸ The connection between Quentin’s suicide in *SF* and Nancy’s last moment in “TES” does not necessarily mean that Quentin narrates from Nancy’s point of view in “TES.” Considering that the father of Caddy’s baby is left unsolved in the passage, the pregnant Nancy’s current circumstances are more similar to Caddy’s dead-end situation than Quentin’s circumstances. See, for instance, Barnett 134-39 and Matthews, *Craft* 80.

Chapter 4

¹ As examined by Kenneth G. Johnston (94-95) and in *Fokuna Jiten* (674), Quentin was most likely born in 1889. Then, it must be 1901 when the twelve-year-old Quentin hears Sam’s story. If we take into account Quentin’s suicide on June 2, 1910, in *The Sound and the Fury*, the present time would be around 1910 (or after 1910, considering the twenty-four-year-old Quentin in “That Evening Sun” [1931]).

² Quentin states that “they said he was almost a hundred years old” (343). While Quentin’s words suggest that Sam was born sometime around 1800, Malcolm Cowley’s *The Portable*

Faulkner places the short story in 1820. Sections II to IV probably took place after 1820, considering that the introduction of the steamboat occurred the 1820s (Moore 64). Towner and Carothers conclude that “Sam could easily be eighty years old, born in 1823” (184).

³ While Sam repeatedly calls Crawfish-ford “pappy” in the story, Elmo Howell argues that Doom is Sam’s father (149). Howell further states that “[t]he pleasant irony that neither of the men, Craw-ford nor the Negro husband, is actually the father becomes in Quentin’s brooding mind a source of fear” (152). Despite the fact that Doom is either the father or grandfather of Sam in Faulkner’s later stories, it is difficult to verify Howell’s argument for the case of “A Justice.” See also Note 5.

⁴ Critics have examined Faulkner’s historical sense for the Native Americans and reveal his inaccuracies in their depictions. Howard C. Horsford, for instance, argues that “on most counts—the role of chiefs, the treaties and conditions of land transfer, the role of the mixed-bloods, the actual chronology of early state history and its development—he either misrepresented or ignored the facts” (327). According to Gene M. Moore, “[t]he problem is not that Faulkner ignores chronology, but that his references to genealogy and to historical chronology are inconsistent and often contradictory” (51-52). As for Faulkner’s disregard for the historical accuracy of “Jackson’s Indian policy and the Choctaw removal,” see Hönnighausen. It should be noted that some Choctaws refused to be removed to Oklahoma in the 1830s and thus remained in Mississippi (Dabney 7, 25).

⁵ In the *Harper’s Magazine* version of “The Old People,” Sam’s mother is depicted as the “slave woman,” and Doom is his grandfather (419). In “The Old People” of *Go Down, Moses*, however, his mother turns out to be the “quadroon slave woman,” and Doom becomes his father (160, 159). Although a series of Faulkner’s revisions of characters is indispensable for Faulkner studies, applying these revisions to “A Justice” is difficult, as it was written about ten years before these works were published.

Chapter 5

¹ See Kartiganer, *Fragile*, and Price for the significance of the narrators in telling Bon’s story. See Peters, “[The Bon’s Lineage],” and McGinnis for Bon’s story in general. See Gerend and Yamamoto, among others, for American expansionism, imperialism, and paternalism in relation to Bon.

² See Gerend, Godden, and Owada for the reference to Voodoo and American imperialism in *Absalom, Absalom!* Faulkner worked in Hollywood on and off as a screenwriter to support a household from 1932 to 1954. Eiko Owada associates Faulkner’s unproduced script *Revolt in the Earth* with *Absalom, Absalom!* and finds the strong emphasis of Voodoo in the film version (139-75). Bruce F. Kawin also states that “*Revolt* is not even particularly about miscegenation; its main concern is with voodoo” (79). These studies show that the film is a loose adaptation of the novel.

³ There is a time discrepancy between Faulkner's description of the Haitian Revolution and the historical Haitian Revolution. While the novel's chronology shows that Sutpen married Eulalia in Haiti in 1827 and divorced her in 1831, the slave uprisings against the ruling class started in the late eighteenth century. Historically speaking, the Haitian Revolution took place between 1791 and 1803 (or 1804), and Haiti became the first independent black nation in 1804. See Godden, Folsom, Ladd, and Owada.

⁴ Tonya Folsom discusses Eulalia's motivations for her migration from Haiti to New Orleans. This chapter takes the position that both of Folsom's accounts for Eulalia's immigration (Sutpen's abandonment and the uprisings) are intermingled in Eulalia's mind, not an either-or choice.

⁵ Barbara Duggal argues that New Orleans Voodoo was not necessarily matriarchal but rather was based on "intrasexual cooperation"; that is, sexually oppressed women, being united beyond class and race, try to gain spiritual achievement through Voodoo (170-72).

⁶ Philip Weinstein argues that Bon's exoticism is "the product of Haiti, New Orleans, and Cambridge" (55). "He has been put together out of physical and spiritual traits not available in northern Mississippi" (Weinstein 55).

Chapter 6

¹ According to Cleanth Brooks, Shreve reconstructs the Sutpen's past as if he were playing a fascinating game (*Yoknapatawpha Country* 312-13). François Pitavy assumes that Shreve reconstructs a story of the South in a broad, logical way (192). Thadious Davis states that Shreve is the outlander whose knowledge about the South is the product of the melodramatic imagination and whose point of view is stereotyped and literarily overstated (*Casebook* 94-95, 101).

² In regard to Canadian history in this paragraph, see the following pages for further details. As for the conflict between England and France, see Kimura 92-108. As for the establishment of a federation and a transcontinental nation-state, see Kimura 169-92. As for Canada's independence, see Kimura 260-62.

³ As for Alberta history in this paragraph, see Gough 29.

⁴ If *Absalom, Absalom!* is taken in context with *The Sound and the Fury*, the latter novel contains reference to Shreve's Canadian identity. There are scenes in *The Sound and the Fury* where Shreve emphasizes himself as a Canadian. For instance, he says, "God, I'm glad I'm not a gentleman [of the South]" (101). In response to the comment of a Harvard friend, Spode, "You're not a gentleman," Shreve answers, "No. I'm Canadian" (148). Other characters also mention his Canadian nationality. Mrs. Bland calls Shreve "that fat Canadian youth" (106) two times. Shreve responds to her by saying, "I make it a point never to speak harshly of females, . . . but that woman has got more ways like a bitch than any lady in these sovereign states and dominions" (107). Here, Shreve uses a Canadian way of naming the country.

⁵ Susan Willis points out that both the Canadian (Shreve) and the Southerner (Quentin) go to “an elite Northern university,” which demonstrates their own dependent situations to the overriding North (97).

Chapter 7

¹ In reference to the two Quentins who appear in *The Sound and the Fury* and *Absalom, Absalom!*, Faulkner, in a question-and-answer session at the University of Virginia in 1958, said, “To me he’s consistent” (*FU* 274). This chapter considers that the Quentins are related to each other and share common ground. As the letter to Harrison Smith in 1934 shows, Faulkner surely had the intention of reusing Quentin in *Absalom, Absalom!*: “Quentin Compson, of the Sound & Fury, tells it, or ties it together; he is the protagonist so that it is not complete apocrypha” (*SL* 79). There are also other Quentins who appear in “That Evening Sun,” “A Justice,” and “Lion.” These short stories, it seems, are interrelated with the novels and add depth to the Compsons, even though the facts about each character and setting do not always correspond.

² There are inconsistencies with the text and Faulkner’s other works in the Genealogy, and some of them are corrected by Noel Polk in the new edition of the novel. In spite of its factual inaccuracies, the Genealogy provides valuable information for understanding each character’s position in the novel. See Dalziel 287-92 and Parker’s “Chronology.”

Chapter 8

¹ For arguments and evaluations of the Compson Appendix, see Cohen 255-60.

² Regarding the origin of Quentin’s name, Mary Jane Dickerson provides helpful sources. According to Dickerson, “the name ‘Quentin’ came from an early impression of that other young man, Quentin Durward [of Sir Walter Scott’s *Quentin Durward*], who left Scotland after his home was laid waste and his family slaughtered to go to France to make his fortune with his ability at arms” (325). As for the degree of given names’ influence on each character, see Ono, Par. 17-21.

Works Cited

- Abate, Michelle Ann. "Reading Red: The Man with the (Gay) Red Tie in Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*." *Mississippi Quarterly* 54.3 (Summer 2001): 293-312. Print.
- About-Ela, Hosam. "The Poetics of Peripheralization: Faulkner and the Question of the Postcolonial." *American Literature* 77.3 (September 2005): 483-509. Print.
- Agnew, John. *Place and Politics: The Geographical Mediation of State and Society*. Winchester, MA: Allen & Unwin, 1987. Print.
- Aiken, Charles S. *William Faulkner and the Southern Landscape*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 2009. Print.
- Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy*. Trans. C. H. Sisson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998. Print.
- "American Civil War." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. 2nd ed. 1988. Print.
- Bachelard, Gaston. *Shunkan no Chokkan [L'Intuition de L'Instant]*. 1932. Trans. Eiichiro Kakeshita. Tokyo: Kinokuniya Shoten, 1999. Print.
- Barnett, Louise K. "Caddy and Nancy: Race, Gender, and Personal Identity in 'That Evening Sun' and *The Sound and the Fury*." Hahn and Kinney. 134-39. Print.
- Baum, Catherine B. "'The Beautiful One.'" Bloom. 39-49. Print.
- Bennett, Ken. "The Language of the Blues in Faulkner's 'That Evening Sun.'" *Mississippi Quarterly* 38.3 (1985): 339-42. Print.
- Blanchard, Margaret. "The Rhetoric of Communion: Voice in *The Sound and the Fury*." *American Literature* 41 (January 1970): 555-65. Print.
- Bleikasten, André. *The Ink of Melancholy: Faulkner's Novels from The Sound and the Fury to Light in August*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990. Print.
- . "[Sutpen as Patriarch]." *Critical Essays on William Faulkner: The Sutpen Family*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. New York: G. K. Hall, 1996. Print.
- Bloom, Harold, ed. *Caddy Compson*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1990. Print.
- Bloom, Harold. "Introduction." Bloom. 1-3. Print.
- Blotner, Joseph. *Faulkner: A Biography*. 1 vol. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2005. Print.
- Bradford, M. E. "That Other Patriarchy: Observations on Faulkner's 'A Justice.'" *Modern Age* 18 (1974): 266-71. Print.
- Brooks, Cleanth. *William Faulkner: Toward Yoknapatawpha and Beyond*. 1978. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1990. Print.
- . *William Faulkner: The Yoknapatawpha Country*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1963. Print.
- Brown, Calvin S. *A Glossary of Faulkner's South*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1976. Print.
- Brown, May Cameron. "Voice in 'That Evening Sun': A Study of Quentin Compson." *Mississippi Quarterly* 29 (Summer 1976): 347-60. Print.
- Cash, W. J. *The Mind of the South*. New York: Vintage, 1991. Print.
- Chappell, Charles. "Quentin Compson's Scouting Expedition on June 2, 1910." *Essays in*

- Literature* 22.1 (1995): n. pag. *Literature Resource Center*. Web. 11 April 2011.
- Clair, Janet St. "The Necessity of Signifying Something: Quentin Compson's Rejection of Despair." *Mississippi Quarterly* 43 (Summer 1990): 317-34. Print.
- Clark, Nancy A. "Jordan (River, Land)." *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of African American Folklore*. Vol. 2. Ed. Anand Prahlad. West Port, CT: Greenwood Press, 2006. 728-29. Print.
- Clarke, Deborah. *Robbing the Mother: Women in Faulkner*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1994. Print.
- Cohen, Philip. "'The Key to the Whole Book': Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*, the Compson Appendix, and Textual Instability." *Texts and Textuality: Textual Instability, Theory, and Interpretation*. Ed. Philip Cohen. New York: Garland Publishing, 1997. 235-68. Print.
- Dabney, Lewis M. *The Indians of Yoknapatawpha: A Study in Literature and History*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1974. Print.
- Dalziel, Pamela. "Absalom, Absalom!: The Extensions of Dialogic Form." *Mississippi Quarterly* 45.3 (Summer 1992): 277-94. Print.
- Dash, J. Michael. *Culture and Customs of Haiti*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001. Print.
- Davis, Thadious M. *Faulkner's "Negro": Art and the Southern Context*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1983. Print.
- Davis, Thadious. "The Signifying Abstraction: Reading 'the Negro' in *Absalom, Absalom!*" *William Faulkner's Absalom, Absalom!: A Casebook*. Ed. Fred Hobson. New York: Oxford UP, 2003. 69-106. Print.
- Dessens, Nathalie. *From Saint-Domingue to New Orleans: Migration and Influences*. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2007. Print.
- Dickerson, Mary Jane. "'The Magician's Wand': Faulkner's Compson Appendix." *Mississippi Quarterly* 28.3 (Summer 1975): 317-37. Print.
- Donaldson, Susan V. "Reading Faulkner Reading Cowley Reading Faulkner: Authority and Gender in the Compson Appendix." *Faulkner Journal* 7.1/2 (Fall 1991/Spring 1992): 27-41. Print.
- Douglass, Paul. *Bergson, Eliot, and American Literature*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1986. Print.
- Doyle, Don H. *Faulkner's County: The Historical Roots of Yoknapatawpha*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2001. Print.
- Early, Kevin E. *Religion and Suicide in the African-American Community*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1992. Print.
- Egan, Philip J. "Embedded Story Structures in *Absalom, Absalom!*" *American Literature* 55.2 (May 1983): 199-214. Print.
- Erikson, Erik H. *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton, 1968. Print.
- Fargnoli, A. Nicholas and Michael Golay, eds. *William Faulkner A to Z: The Essential*

- Reference to His Life and Work*. New York: Checkmark Books, 2002. Print.
- Faulkner, William. *Absalom, Absalom!* (AA) 1936. *The Corrected Text*. New York: Vintage, 1990. Print.
- . "Appendix: Compsons: 1699-1945." (ML) *The Sound and the Fury: The Corrected Text with Faulkner's Appendix*. New York: Modern Library, 1992. 329-48. Print.
- . *Essays, Speeches & Public Letters*. (ESPL) Ed. James B. Meriwether. Rev. ed. New York: Modern Library, 2004. Print.
- . *Faulkner in the University*. (FU) Ed. Frederick L. Gwynn and Joseph L. Blotner. 1959. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1995. Print.
- . *Go Down, Moses*. (GDM) 1942. New York: Vintage, 1990. Print.
- . "An Introduction to *The Sound and the Fury*." *The Sound and the Fury: An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds and Context, Criticism*. Ed. David Minter. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1994. 228-32. Print.
- . "A Justice." *Collected Stories of William Faulkner*. 1950. New York: Vintage, 1995. 343-360. Print.
- . *Lion in the Garden: Interviews with William Faulkner 1926-1962*. (LG) Ed. James B. Meriwether and Michael Millgate. 1968. New York: Random House, 1980. Print.
- . "Never Done No Weeping When You Wanted to Laugh." ("Never") Ed. Gail M. Morrison. *Mississippi Quarterly* 36.3 (Summer 1983): 461-474. Print.
- . "The Old People." *Harper's Magazine* 181.1084 (Sep 1940): 418-25. Print.
- . *The Portable Faulkner*. (PF) Ed. Malcolm Cowley. 1946. Rev. and Expanded ed. New York: Penguin, 2003. Print.
- . *Selected Letters of William Faulkner*. (SL) Ed. Joseph Blotner. New York: Random House, 1977. Print.
- . *The Sound and the Fury*. (SF) 1929. *The Corrected Text*. New York: Vintage, 1990. Print.
- . "That Evening Sun." (CS) *Collected Stories of William Faulkner*. 1950. New York: Vintage, 1995. 289-309. Print.
- . "That Evening Sun Go Down." (AM) *The American Mercury* 22.87 (March 1931): 257-67. Print.
- . *Uncollected Stories of William Faulkner*. (US) Ed. Joseph Blotner. 1979. New York: Vintage, 1997. Print.
- Ferber, Edna. *Show Boat*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1926. Print.
- Ferguson, James. *Faulkner's Short Fiction*. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1991. Print.
- Folsom, Tonya R. "Eulalia Bon's Untold Story." *Critical Essays on William Faulkner: The Sutpen Family*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1996. 216-20. Print.
- Fowler, Doreen. *Faulkner: The Return of the Repressed*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1997. Print.
- . "Revising *The Sound and the Fury: Absalom, Absalom!* and Faulkner's Postmodern Turn." *Faulkner and Postmodernism: Faulkner and Yoknapatawpha, 1999*. Ed. John N. Duvall

- and Ann J. Abadie. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2002. 95-108. Print.
- Francis, Douglas. "Pureri Seibu to Shin-imin" ["The Prairies and New Immigrants"]. *Kanada no Chiiki to Minzoku—Rekishi-teki Apurochi* [*The Regions and People in Canada: A Historical Approach*]. Trans. Kazuo Kimura. Ed. Douglas Francis and Kazuo Kimura. Tokyo: Dobunkan Shuppan, 1993. 161-89. Print.
- Galloway, Patricia. "The Construction of Faulkner's Indians." *The Faulkner Journal* 18.1/2 (Fall 2002/Spring 2003): 9-31. Print.
- Gartner, Carol B. "Faulkner in Context: Seeing 'That Evening Sun' through the Blues." *Southern Quarterly* 34.2 (Winter 1996): 50-58. Print.
- Gates, Henry Louis, Jr. *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of African-American Literary Criticism*. New York: Oxford UP, 1988. Print.
- Geffen, Arthur. "Profane Time, Sacred Time, and Confederate Time in *The Sound and the Fury*." *Critical Essays on William Faulkner: The Compson Family*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1982. 231-51. Print.
- Gerend, Sara. "My Son, My Son!: Paternalism, Haiti, and Early Twentieth-Century American Imperialism in William Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!*" *The Southern Literary Journal* 42.1 (Fall 2009): 17-31. Print.
- Gibbs, Jewelle Taylor. "African-American Suicide: A Cultural Paradox." *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior* 27.1 (Spring 1997): 68-79. Print.
- Gilpin, John. "The Land Development Process in Edmonton, Alberta, 1881-1917." *Power and Place: Canadian Urban Development in the North American Context*. Ed. Gilbert A. Stelter and Alan F. J. Artibise. Vancouver: U of British Columbia P, 1986. 151-72. Print.
- Godden, Richard. *Fictions of Labor: William Faulkner and the South's Long Revolution*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.
- Gough, Barry M. *Historical Dictionary of Canada*. Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 1999. Print.
- Gutting, Gabriele. *Yoknapatawpha: The Function of Geographical and Historical Facts in William Faulkner's Fictional Picture of the Deep South*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang, 1992. Print.
- Haglund, Karl. *Inventing the Charles River*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003. Print.
- Hahn, Stephen, and Arthur F. Kinney, eds. *Approaches to Teaching Faulkner's The Sound and the Fury*. New York: MLA, 1996. Print.
- Hall, Gwendolyn Midlo. "The Formation of Afro-Creole Culture." *Creole New Orleans: Race and Americanization*. Ed. Arnold R. Hirsch and Joseph Logsdon. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1992. 58-87. Print.
- Harris, Wendell V. "[The Compson Legacy]." *Critical Essays on William Faulkner: The Compson Family*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1982. 139-40. Print.
- Hönnighausen, Lothar. "Faulkner Rewriting the Indian Removal." *Rewriting the South: History and Fiction*. Ed. Lothar Hönnighausen and Valeria Gennaro Lerda. Tübingen,

- Germany: Francke, 1993. 335-43. Print.
- Horsford, Eben Norton. *The Indian Names of Boston, and Their Meaning*. Cambridge: John Wilson and Son UP, 1886. *Wellesley College Library Digital Collections*. Web. 11 April 2011.
- Horsford, Howard C. "Faulkner's (Mostly) Unreal Indians in Early Mississippi History." *American Literature* 64.2 (Summer 1992): 311-30. Print.
- Howell, Elmo. "Sam Fathers: A Note on Faulkner's 'A Justice.'" *Tennessee Studies in Literature* 12 (1967): 149-53. Print.
- Hunt, John W. "The Disappearance of Quentin Compson." *Critical Essays on William Faulkner: The Compson Family*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1982. 366-80. Print.
- Irwin, John T. *Doubling and Incest/Repetition and Revenge: A Speculative Reading of Faulkner*. Expanded ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1996. Print.
- Johnson, James Weldon, and J. Rosamond Johnson. *The Books of American Negro Spirituals: Including the Book of American Negro Spirituals and the Second Book of Negro Spirituals*. 1925 and 1926. New York: Da Capo Press, 2002. Print.
- Johnson, Jerah. "Colonial New Orleans: A Fragment of the Eighteenth-Century French Ethos." *Creole New Orleans: Race and Americanization*. Ed. Arnold R. Hirsch and Joseph Logsdon. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1992. 12-57. Print.
- Johnson, Walter. *Soul by Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999. Print.
- Johnston, Kenneth G. "The Year of Jubilee: Faulkner's 'That Evening Sun.'" *American Literature* 46 (1974): 93-100. Print.
- Jones, LeRoi (Baraka, Amiri). *Blues People: Negro Music in White America*. 1963. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1999. Print.
- Jordan, Tatia Jacobson. "Hearing, Writing, and Reading Voodoo: Cultural Memory in Jewell Parker Rhodes' *Voodoo Dreams* and *Voodoo Season*." *Women Writers: A Zine*. (August 1995): n. pag. Web. 16 May 2011.
- Kartiganer, Donald M. *The Fragile Thread: The Meaning of Form in Faulkner's Novels*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1979. Print.
- . "'Now I Can Write': Faulkner's Novel of Invention." *New Essays on The Sound and the Fury*. Ed. Noel Polk. New York: Cambridge UP, 1993. 71-97. Print.
- . "Quentin Compson and Faulkner's Drama of the Generations." *Critical Essays on William Faulkner: The Compson Family*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1982. 381-401. Print.
- Kawin, Bruce F. "[William Faulkner's *Revolt in the Earth*]." *Critical Essays on William Faulkner: The Sutpen Family*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. New York: G. K. Hall, 1996. 77-82. Print.
- Kerr, Elizabeth M. *William Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha: "A Kind of Keystone in the*

- Universe*. New York: Fordham UP, 1985. Print.
- . *Yoknapatawpha: Faulkner's "Little Postage Stamp of Native Soil"*. New York: Fordham UP, 1969. Print.
- Kimura, Kazuo, ed. *Kanada-shi [The History of Canada]*. Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha, 2006. Print.
- Kinney, Arthur F. "Teaching Narrative as Meaning in 'A Justice' and *The Sound and the Fury*." Hahn and Kinney. 140-43. Print.
- Krieger, Alex, and David Cobb, eds. *Mapping Boston*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999. Print.
- Kuyk, Dirk, Jr. *Sutpen's Design: Interpreting Faulkner's Absalom, Absalom!* Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1990. Print.
- Kuyk, Dirk, Jr., Betty M. Kuyk, and James A. Miller. "Black Culture in William Faulkner's 'That Evening Sun'." *Journal of American Studies* 20.1 (April 1986): 33-50. Print.
- Ladd, Barbara. *Nationalism and the Color Line in George W. Cable, Mark Twain, and William Faulkner*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1996. Print.
- Lester, Cheryl. "Racial Awareness and Arrested Development: *The Sound and the Fury* and the Great Migration (1915-1928)." *The Cambridge Companion to William Faulkner*. Ed. Philip M. Weinstein. New York: Cambridge UP, 1995. 123-45. Print.
- Lester, David. *Suicide in African Americans*. Commack, NY: Nova Science Publishers, 1998. Print.
- Lockyer, Judith. *Ordered by Words: Language and Narration in the Novels of William Faulkner*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1991. Print.
- Mannon, Melissa. *Waltham (Images of America)*. Charleston: Arcadia Publishing, 1998.
- Matthews, John T. "Faulkner's Narrative Frames." *Faulkner and the Craft of Fiction: Faulkner and Yoknapatawpha, 1987*. Ed. Doreen Fowler and Ann J. Abadie. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1989. 71-91. Print.
- . *The Play of Faulkner's Language*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1982. Print.
- . *The Sound and the Fury: Faulkner and the Lost Cause*. Boston: Twayne, 1990. Print.
- McGinnis, Adelaide P. "Charles Bon: The New Orleans Myth Made Flesh." *Critical Essays on William Faulkner: The Sutpen Family*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1996. 221-26. Print.
- Messerli, Douglas. "Critical Extracts." Bloom. 22-25. Print.
- Métraux, Alfred. *Voodoo in Haiti*. Trans. Hugo Charteris. New York: Schocken Books, 1972. Print.
- Middleton, John. "Shreve McCannon and Sutpen's Legacy." *The Southern Review* 10.1 (January 1974): 115-24. Print.
- Millgate, Michael. *The Achievement of William Faulkner*. 1966. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1978. Print.
- Milliner, Gladys. "The Third Eye." Bloom. 68-72. Print.
- Minter, David. *William Faulkner: His Life and Work*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1980.

- "Mississippi River." *The Encyclopedia of the South*. Ed. Robert O'Brien. New York: Facts on File, 1985. 278. Print.
- Moore, Gene M. "Chronological Problems in Faulkner's 'Wilderness' Stories." *The Faulkner Journal* 18.1/2 (Fall 2002/Spring 2003): 51-67. Print.
- Morrison, Gail M. "The Composition of *The Sound and the Fury*." *William Faulkner's The Sound and the Fury: A Critical Casebook*. Ed. André Bleikasten. New York: Garland Publishing, 1982. 33-64.
- Mulira, Jessie Gaston. "The Case of Voodoo in New Orleans." Ed. Joseph E. Holloway. *Africanisms in American Culture*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990. 34-68. Print.
- Niuro, Takuya. "Fokuna *Hibiki to Ikari* Chushaku (2) [Annotations to Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury* (2)]" *Fokuna [Faulkner]* 7 (2005): 143-63. Print.
- . "*Hibiki to Ikari* Saidoku: Kuentin no Jisatsu wo Meguru Kosatsu. [Re-reading *The Sound and the Fury*: A Study of Quentin's Suicide]" *Fokuna [Faulkner]* 9 (2007): 40-49. Print.
- Nishikawa, Kazuhiro. "Problems of Black's Suicide and Christianity in *Go Down, Moses* [Ike Moze ni okeru Kokujin no Jisatsu to Kirisutokyo no Mondai]." *Fokuna [Faulkner]* 11 (2009): 163-171. Print.
- Oliver, Paul, Max Harrison, and William Bolcom. *Gospel, Blues and Jazz: With Spirituals and Ragtime*. New York: Norton, 1980. Print.
- Ono, Masako. "The Rise and Fall of the Compsons Portrayed in the Compson Appendix: Dynamism Seen in the Chains of Loser and Winner." *The William Faulkner Journal of Japan on the Internet* 6 (2004): n. pag. Web. 3 April 2013.
- Owada, Eiko. *Faulkner, Haiti, and Questions of Imperialism*. Tokyo: Sairyusha, 2002. Print.
- Parker, Robert Dale. *Absalom, Absalom!: The Questioning of Fictions*. Boston: Twayne, 1991. Print.
- . "Chronology and Genealogy: The Authority of Fiction and the Fiction of Authority." *Critical Essays on William Faulkner: The Sutpen Family*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. New York: G. K. Hall, 1996. 252-58. Print.
- . *Faulkner and the Novelistic Imagination*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1985. Print.
- Pearson, Norman Holmes. "Faulkner's Three 'That Evening Suns'." *Yale University Library Gazette* 29 (1954): 61-70. Print.
- Peek, Charles. "Order and Flight: Teaching *The Sound and the Fury* Using the Appendix." Hahn and Kinney. 68-72. Print.
- Peek, Charles A. "That Evening Sun(g): Blues Inscribing Space in White Stories." *Southern Quarterly* 42.3 (Spring 2004): 130-50. Print.
- Perrine, Laurence. "'That Evening Sun': A Skein of Uncertainties." *Studies in Short Fiction* 22.3 (Summer 1985): 295-307. Print.
- Peters, Erskine E. "[The Bon's Lineage]." *Critical Essays on William Faulkner: The Sutpen Family*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1996. 207-15. Print.
- Peters, Erskine. *William Faulkner: The Yoknapatawpha World and Black Being*. Darby, PA:

- Norwood Editions, 1983. Print.
- Pilkington, John. *The Heart of Yoknapatawpha*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1981. Print.
- Pitavy, François. "The Narrative Voice and Function of Shreve: Remarks on the Production of Meaning in *Absalom, Absalom!*" *William Faulkner's Absalom, Absalom!: A Critical Book*. Ed. Elisabeth Muhlenfeld. New York: Garland, 1984. 189-205. Print.
- Polk, Noel. "Trying Not to Say: A Primer on the Language of *The Sound and the Fury*." *New Essays on The Sound and the Fury*. Ed. Noel Polk. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 139-75. Print.
- Price, Steve. "Shreve's Bon in *Absalom, Absalom!*" *Mississippi Quarterly* 39.3 (Summer 1986): 325-35. Print.
- Reed, Joseph W., Jr. *Faulkner's Narrative*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1973. Print.
- Relph, E. *Place and Placelessness*. London: Pion Limited, 1976. Print.
- Rosenman, John B. "The Heaven and Hell Archetype in Faulkner's 'That Evening Sun' and Bradbury's *Dandelion Wine*." *South Atlantic Bulletin* 43.2 (May 1978): 12-16. Print.
- Ross, Stephen M. and Noel Polk. *Reading Faulkner: The Sound and the Fury: Glossary and Commentary*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1996. Print.
- Ruppersburg, Hugh M. *Voice and Eye in Faulkner's Fiction*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1983. Print.
- Ryan, Heberden W. "Behind Closed Doors: The Unknowable and the Unknowing in *Absalom, Absalom!*" *Mississippi Quarterly* 45.3 (Summer 1992): 295-312. Print.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. "On *The Sound and the Fury*: Time in the Work of Faulkner." *The Sound and the Fury: An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds and Context, Criticism*. Ed. David Minter. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1994. 265-71. Print.
- Schoenberg, Estella. *Old Tales and Talking: Quentin Compson in William Faulkner's Absalom, Absalom! and Related Works*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1977. Print.
- Shurr, Scott. "Key dates in the History of Waltham, Massachusetts." *Waltham Community Home Page*, 13 September 2010. Web. 11 April 2011.
- Skei, Hans H. *Reading Faulkner's Best Short Stories*. Columbia, SC: U of South Carolina P, 1999. Print.
- Smith, Mark M. *How Race Is Made: Slavery, Segregation, and the Senses*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2006. Print.
- Smith, Shawn Michelle. *American Archives: Gender, Race, and Class in Visual Culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1999. Print.
- Tallant, Robert. *Voodoo in New Orleans*. Gretna, LA: Pelican Publishing, 1983.
- Tamura, Rika. "'Ano Yuhi' no Jikogiseiteki na Katarite [The Self-sacrificial Narrator of 'That Evening Sun']." *Fokuna [Faulkner]* 11 (2009): 146-54. Print.
- Tateno, Junya. *Vudwu-kyo no Sekai: Haichi no Rekishi to Kamigami [The World of Voodoo: The History and Gods of Haiti]*. Tokyo: Kikkasha, 2001. Print.
- Taylor, Walter. "The Compson Appendix as an Aid to Teaching *The Sound and the Fury*."

- Hahn and Kinney. 64-67. Print.
- Thoreau, Henry D. *Walden*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2004. Print.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Morals of History*. Trans. Alyson Waters. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1995. Print.
- Towner, Theresa M., and James B. Carothers. *Reading Faulkner: Collected Stories*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2006. Print.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1977. Print.
- . *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974. Print.
- Urgo, Joseph R. and Noel Polk, eds. *Reading Faulkner: Absalom, Absalom!* Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2010. Print.
- Vickery, Olga W. *The Novels of William Faulkner: A Critical Interpretation*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1964. Print.
- Volpe, Edmond L. *A Reader's Guide to William Faulkner: The Short Stories*. New York: Syracuse UP, 2004. Print.
- Weinstein, Arnold. *Recovering Your Story: Proust, Joyce, Woolf, Faulkner, Morrison*. New York: Random House, 2006. Print.
- Weinstein, Philip M. *Faulkner's Subject: A Cosmos No One Owns*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1992. Print.
- Wells, Keiko. *Kokujin Reika ha Ikteiru: Kashi de Yomu Amerika [The Liveliness of Negro Spirituals: Reading America from Lyrics]*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2008. Print.
- Welty, Eudora. *On William Faulkner*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2003. Print.
- Wetherell, Margaret. "The Field of Identity Studies." *The Sage Handbook of Identities*. Ed. Margaret Wetherell and Chandra Talpade Mohanty. London: Sage Publications, 2010. 3-26. Print.
- Whicher, Stephen E. "The Compsons' Nancies: A Note on *The Sound and the Fury* and 'That Evening Sun'." *American Literature* 26.2 (May 1954): 253-55. Print.
- The William Faulkner Society of Japan, ed. *Fokuna Jiten [A Reader's Encyclopedia of William Faulkner]*. Tokyo: Shohakusha, 2008. Print.
- Williams, Michael E., ed. *The Storyteller's Companion to the Bible: Exodus—Joshua*. Vol. 2. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1992. Print.
- Williamson, Joel. *New People: Miscegenation and Mulattoes in the United States*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1980. Print.
- Willis, Susan. "Aesthetics of the Rural Slum: Contradictions and Dependency in 'The Bear.'" *Social Text* 2 (Summer 1979): 82-103. Print.
- Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. "Introduction: The Mind of W. J. Cash." Cash. vii-xli. Print.
- Yamamoto, Yuko. "A Phantom of American Imperialism: Charles Bon and Imaginary Landscapes in William Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!*" *The William Faulkner Journal of*

Japan on the Internet 8 (2006): n. pag. Web. 21 May 2011.