

Crisis, Community and Communal Violence in Faulkner's Sanctuary: A Girardian Analysis

©

Kevin G. Wilson
Télé-université

Introduction

Sanctuary stands apart from the novels of Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha cycle. Most notably, the focus is community and not the family. (Kerr, p. 15, p.19) Themes identified by the first generation of Faulkner scholars do not seem to apply. Signs of disorder and decline permeate the novel as bedrock institutions of family, social class, patriarchy, and the courts fail to secure peace and protection for the novel's protagonists. Southern myths are shattered. Hypocrisy is exposed as the righteous members of 'proper' society are shown to be lacking in Christian mercy, and the 'deviant' members of outlaw communities are shown to be caring and faithful. Novelistically, the work is also problematic. The characters do not grow. There is no salvation or redemption. Indeed, apart from the rape of Temple Drake and the lynching of Goodwin, nothing happens. (Tate, p, 426) Moreover, Faulkner provides few clues to the reader concerning the meaning of these violent events. For many readers they appear to be senseless. On the other hand, Faulkner's artistry and craftsmanship are superbly evident--making this novel difficult to ignore.

According to the Girardian thesis, the seeds of violence are sown when an individual or a member of a group enters into mimetic rivalry and this relationship becomes continuously doubled through repetition. (Ciuba, p. 8) In *Sanctuary* it is not the presence of Temple Drake and Ruby Lamar as objects of male desire that unsettles these communities. Rather it is the encounter between exclusive groups and the "stranger" (in the persons of Temple Drake and Ruby Lamar) that becomes the occasion for a series of mimetic responses that generate conflict and violence. When extremes of mimetic rivalry become generalized, they produce a crisis of differentiation in the social and cultural order of the group. It is our contention that *Sanctuary* portrays a such a world.

Early criticism: Temple Drake and the Problem of Evil

In one of the first attempts to make sense of this atypical work, George O'Donnell (1933) re-cast the novel as an allegory of Southern values in conflict with Northern Modernism.

In simple terms, the pattern of the allegory is something like this: Southern Womanhood Corrupted but Undefined (Temple Drake), in the company of the Corrupted Tradition (Gowan Stevens, a professional Virginian), falls into the clutches of a-moral Modernism (Popeye), which is itself impotent, but which with the aid of its strong ally Natural Lust ("Red") rapes Southern Womanhood unnaturally and then seduces her so satisfactorily that her corruption is total, and she becomes the tacit ally of Modernism. Meanwhile Pore White Trash (Godwin) has been accused of the crime which he, with the aid of the Naif Faithful (Tawmmy), actually tried to prevent. The Formalized Tradition (Horace Benbow), perceiving the true state of affairs, tries vainly to defend Pore White Trash. However, Southern Womanhood is so hopelessly corrupted that she wilfully sees Pore White Trash convicted and lynched; she is then carried off by Wealth (Judge Drake) to a meaningless escape in European luxury. (O'Donnell, 292-93)

According to this interpretation, *Sanctuary* is a morality tale about the 'corrupting' effects of modernity on traditional Southern values. More than thirty years later, Allen Tate, working out of the same interpretive tradition noted:

This old order, in which the good could not be salvaged from the bad, was replaced by a new order which was in many ways worse than the old. ... The cynical materialism of the new order brought to the South the American standard of living, but it also brought about a society similar to that which Matthew Arnold saw in the North in the eighties and called vigorous and uninteresting." (Tate, p. 425)

When applied to *Sanctuary* this tradition of Faulkner scholarship tended to understate the novel's unique, idiosyncratic position in the Faulkner canon. An example of the shortcomings of this critical tradition can be found in the work of Cleanth Brooks—one of the deans of Faulkner scholarship. Writing in 1990 John Duvall, noted that Brooks had gleaned the following truisms about the Faulknerian world:

1. The community is centered on the family ...
2. The family depends on the rigid maintenance of sharply divided gender roles ...
3. Female characters who do not fit the male/female dichotomy are deviants ...
4. There are no deviant male characters, only innocents ... (Duvall, pp. 7-9)

In his article Duvall, argues that Brooks' scheme does not "adequately account for newly disclosed facts about Faulkner's life." (p. 9 ?) In particular, Duvall questions how "a man whose own marriage was a shambles" could be turned into a "defender of the sanctity of the family?" (p. 9) More to the point, it is difficult to see how *Sanctuary* embodies the "valorization of community" (p. 7) so essential to Brooks' understanding of Faulkner's worldview. If *Sanctuary* is about anything, it is about the failure of family and community. In his efforts to regain *Sanctuary* for the canonical Faulknerian worldview, Brooks

undertakes what is essentially a character analysis of Horace Benbow and Temple Drake. Horace becomes another failed, overly intellectual, idealist—in effect, a kindred spirit of Quentin Compson.

Horace Benbow is the sentimental idealist, the man of academic temper, who finds out that the world is not a place of moral tidiness or even justice. He discovers with increasing horror that evil is rooted in the very nature of things. (Brooks, 1962, p. 695)

The focus on Horace is unnecessarily reductive given the magnitude of the corruption and violence that besets the world of this novel. Moreover, it is problematic given Faulkner's substantial revision of the *Sanctuary* manuscript in order to replace Horace Benbow as the central character of the novel with Temple Drake (Langford, 1972). When Brooks focuses on the character of Temple Drake, the resulting analysis is extremely problematic. Limitations of space prevent us from recapitulating this work here. The shortcomings of the first generation of *Sanctuary* scholarship have been keenly summarized by Diane Roberts:

For years we were told *Sanctuary* was about "evil" in the person of Temple Drake, a woman who "deserved" to be raped.¹ "Evil" is, of course, a Faulknerian code word for female sexuality. Cleanth Brooks magisterially stated that "evil" is equivalent to "the true nature of woman," and that knowledge of it constitutes a second fall from grace—for men (127-28). Leslie Fiedler was fascinated by what he calls Faulkner's "sexually insatiable daughter of the aristocracy," the young white "ladies" for whom conditioned repression of their sexuality later ignites a firestorm of "evil," decimating any man foolish enough to have anything to do with them (321). (Roberts, p. 22)¹

Before continuing our analysis it is important to note that the word "evil" only appears four times in the novel. Nevertheless, the first generation of Faulkner scholarship seized upon it as a focal point of interpretation.

In his 1954 study *The Tangled Fire of William Faulkner*, William Van O'Connor suggested that the novel depicted two sources of evil: "that inherent in the human creature, and that resulting from modern mechanism and our having lost an easy relationship with nature, the woods, the birds, the seasons..." (O'Connor, p.59) Robert Flynn writing in *Modern Fiction Studies* contrasted the novel's "good" and "evil" characters noting that the novel paired "good" and "evil" characters along an axis of "ineffectual" versus "effectual." The effectual pairing (Popeye and Goodwin) are killed. The ineffectual pair (Benbow and Drake) are "returned" to their normal social positions. For Flynn, "evil" is exorcized (from the perspective of the mob) with the lynching of Goodwin:

The tragic chain is finally brought to an end by a *deus ex machina*, the burning of Goodwin by the mob. In terms of the mob's thinking, the evil which beset society has been exorcised and harmony has been restored. (Flynn, p. 109)

¹ See also, Cox, p. 301)

Although Flynn attributes the notion of “evil” to the mob, he is more cautious when speaking in his own critic’s voice. He prefers the term “sick society.” In his analysis he attributes the malaise of *Sanctuary* to a decline of religious values—in effect, the decline of Christianity (Spengler):

The Christian code remains, but the spirit behind the code is gone. The sexual perversions, the lack of rebirth, the injustice of justice, and the false dawn of the resolution are all representative of a sick society. (Flynn, p. 113)

In his “The Quality of Evil in *Sanctuary*” (1959), Elmo Howell suggests that the particular focus of Faulkner’s depiction of evil in this work is that of Christian hypocrisy:

The world of *Sanctuary* is a black one, but there are dimensions in its evil. Faulkner is most severe on the "respectable" people, whom he often associates with the Baptist Church.²⁷ (Howell, p. 109)

The lesson of *Sanctuary*, according to Howell, is that the cruelty and hypocrisy of the Baptist congregation of Jefferson can be just as deadly as the “sins” of lust and murder. Moreover, Temple Drake is simply a vehicle for what transpires. Although some are more guilty than others (most notably, Narcissa (Benbow’s sister) and Eustace Graham (the District Attorney)), the entire community of “respectable” people are responsible and, therefore, culpable.

To return to Cleanth Brooks, the problem of “evil” is the centerpiece of two articles² from the early 1960s. For Brooks, “evil” is something that we “discover” along with Horace Benbow. The problem with Temple Drake is that “evil” does not exist for her. What matters in her life are social conventions that order behavior according to what is “proper” and “improper.” (Brooks 1963, p. 19) For Brooks, the “evil” in *Sanctuary* is something essentially enigmatic and potentially inscrutable. This is the case because at crucial moments in the narrative Faulkner refuses to enter the minds of his characters and, at other moments, chooses not to fill in gaps in the action. (Brooks 1963, p. 4) Most notable in this respect is Temple’s perjury: the events within the circle of her family which precede her testimony in court and the motivation behind her decision to falsely accuse Goodwin of her rape and Tommy’s murder do not figure in the narrative. Brooks’s inability to name the “evil” that is endemic to *Sanctuary* does not prevent him from expounding on the Faulknerian construal of evil. He states:

Evil for Faulkner involves the violation of the natural and the denial of the human. As Isaac's older kinsman says in "The Bear," "Courage and honor and pride, and pity and love of justice and of liberty. They all touch the heart, and what the heart holds to, becomes truth, as far as we know the truth." A meanness of spirit and a coldness of calculation which would deny the virtues that touch the heart is by that very fact proven false. Yet Faulkner is no disciple of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. He has no illusions that man is naturally good or that he can trust to his instincts and emotions. Man is capable of evil, and this means that goodness has to be achieved by struggle and discipline and effort." (Brooks 1962, p. 712)

² Brooks, Cleanth. "Faulkner's Vision of Good and Evil." *The Massachusetts Review* 3.4 (1962): 692-712;

Brooks' musings on "evil" appear to suggest that violent acts of rape, murder and lynching may be understood and addressed as opportunities for redemptive suffering and "struggle"; their root causes are to be found in a failure of individual "discipline and effort."

Writing in 1960 Douglas Cole considers the manner in which Faulkner challenges our assumptions about evil by juxtaposing the criminal underclass and proper society. In *Sanctuary* the usual perpetrators of evil are shown to be no worse than the "good," "respectable," members of proper society:

I have tried to indicate some of the more important parallels and contrasts Faulkner sets up in *Sanctuary* under the unifying influence of dominating ironic metaphors. It is a result of such technique that the reader is led to see that the chief perpetrators of evil and violence who appear in the early section of the book--the criminal Goodwin, blind Pap and simple-minded Tommy, the lustful Van and cruel Popeye--are really no worse than the "common, ordinary people" he will meet later on. The burden of responsibility for the crimes and evils that take place in the novel is brought back to responsible individuals who choose to act against justice and against love for the sake of selfish interests or utilitarian gain, or, just as bad, who choose not to act at all and remain locked up in themselves." (Cole, p. 297)

Echoing Brooks, Cole suggests that "evil" is what happens when "good" people choose not to act responsibly—that is to say in concert with the dictates of justice and love.

"Evil," according to this interpretive tradition, is a consequence of (individual) moral failure. It is tantamount to saying, "bad people will always do bad things until good people stop them."³ But *Sanctuary* embodies a more devastating critique. It is not simply that good individuals fail to act with courage and compassion, they actually conspire to ostracise and do harm to others. Moreover, the "evil" which afflicts the world of this novel appears to be systemic: core religious and legal institutions do not only fail, they appear to be corrupted. Moreover, to suggest that "evil" is something that lies within each of us, does poor justice to Faulkner's work as it fails to shed light on the more fundamental question: what is it about the society depicted in *Sanctuary* that has either failed to stem this human tendency toward violence, or even, generated and brought it to the surface?

Evil and Society: *Sanctuary's* Geography of Exclusive and Excluded Places:

By the late 1970s the study of *Sanctuary* had matured and broken free of moralistic interpretations grounded in individual responsibility. Arthur Kinney's comparison of Faulkner and Flaubert (Mme Bovary and Temple Drake) represents a significant shift from an analysis that foregrounds personal character to one that emphasizes social conditions. The shift to an emphasis on Temple Drake is accompanied by the suggestion that she may best be understood as emblematic of a sick society. Kinney notes:

The story of Temple Drake, like the story of Emma Bovary, traces the degradation of a woman whose own society, while attractive on its surfaces, is beneath appearances as degrading as any member of it." (Kinney, p. 229)

³ One is reminded of Gary Cooper's confrontation with evil in the Fred Zinneman film, *High Noon* (1952).

Kinney begins by drawing parallels between the two female protagonists:

Both Emma Bovary and Temple Drake refuse at first to surrender to the limitations of life; both are caught up in illusions of their own making. Both yearn for adventure; both assume that the man they wish to love will love them, that those they want want them in turn." (Kinney, p. 236)

But the real parallel between the two works lies with the static geography of place that mirrors the static consciousness of the female protagonists:

In both books despite the energies of imagination and the frenzied activities of the characters, life is disturbingly moribund, a short road at best which leads (as at Yonville) to the grave. (Kinney, p. 236)

Paying careful attention to the geography of *Sanctuary* Kinney notes that Faulkner has organized the novel according to narrative blocks that correspond to three locations: the Old Frenchman place, Memphis and Jefferson. The first third of the novel takes place almost entirely at the Old Frenchman place with the remainder divided between Jefferson and Memphis.

The narrative structure resembles a *triptych* with the first tableau (the Old Frenchman place) evoking the natural world. This natural world is home to the 'naturals' of the novel: Pap (the old man), Tommy (mentally challenged), Goodwin and Ruby (who are coupled in a common law marriage). But for the outsiders from Jefferson this natural environment is a jungle. It is "an essentially forbidding landscape and one that terrifies Temple and disorients Gowan and Horace." (Kinney, p. 233) Memphis, the third tableau represents the underworld. It is "a world of crime, violence, and prostitution, and its description as the Inferno is nearly classical in its dimensions." (Kinney, p. 233) In the middle tableau we find Jefferson:

Jefferson images society--home, business, church, courtroom. As a guardian of the best of civilized values, it is as heavenly an environment as the novel *Sanctuary* can supply. (Kinney, p. 234)

According to Kinney, these "dramatized environments" are distinct and exclusive of one another. In the language of the novel, they represent distinct modes of decay and corruption. The point of the triptych, however, is "the correlation of its panels." (Kinney, p. 235) Kinney notes:

The Goodwin family is formally constituted on the model of family life in Jefferson, and Ruby fears that Lee will be tempted instead to the ways of Memphis; while even at Memphis Miss Reba, Miss Myrtle, and Miss Lorraine ape the social customs and unknowingly parody the social conversation of // Jefferson. Since the Goodwins depend on customers from Memphis and Jefferson, their lawlessness is more disguised yet analogous to the lawlessness in the other two societies. Miss Reba's pretense of marriage is no more and no less real than Ruby's: their very names seem almost interchangeable. Red's funeral is a mockery not of its own means and ends, but of the formal occasion of Jefferson which it parodies just as Fonzo and Virgil, from Jefferson, parody Temple Drake in Memphis. Thus the decay that is so visible at the Old Frenchman Place

will also have its analogies in Memphis--and in Jefferson. No wonder Temple herself comes to resemble, to represent, only corruption and decay." (Kinney, p. 235-36)

We see that the principals of each environment are in different ways, and in varying degrees, mimicking one another. Kinney has just described a pattern of behavior that René Girard has described as "mimetic rivalry." It is the cornerstone of Girard's theory of communal violence that culminates in scapegoating. Because the principal protagonists of the novel, Temple Drake and Horace Benbow, move between these environments, it is possible to lose sight of the fundamental differentiation of place. It is as if Faulkner has begun with the premise that these three environments are essentially incommensurable. On the other hand, as Kinney observes, they are correlational with respect to the themes of decay and corruption.

Olga Vickery writing in 1980 takes up the theme of evil, but with an important nuance. Although her analysis identifies strongly with Horace Benbow's experience and point of view, she approaches *Sanctuary* on its own terms--resisting the temptation to regain it for the worldview of the Yoknapatawpha cycle. With Vickery's work we have one of the first attempts to view the novel in terms of social conflicts and the problem of the 'other.' Vickery notes:

"Furthermore, each group, marked by its own distinctive attitude and code of behavior, *is both exclusive and excluded*. The result is an uneasy antagonism flaring into violence whenever a member of one group intrudes into another. This pattern of intrusion and consequent violence is presented in its mildest form by the town boys gathering outside the college to watch the dance." (Vickery, p. 16) [Emphasis added.]

She continues:

"By attempting to impose their code on a group and in a situation where that code is not only meaningless but dangerous, Temple and Gowan generate violence which overwhelms them." (Vickery, p. 16)

In the early stages Temple's failure, although somewhat understandable given her age, inexperience, and social class, is a failure "to read" the new environment that she has been propelled into against her will:

"She [Temple] attempts to persuade herself that the two worlds are identical, or if not, that hers has the power of control. Her family, the guardians of public morality, the representatives of the forces of law and order--a judge, two lawyers, and a newspaper man--should certainly be sufficient to intimidate a Goodwin, a Van or a Popeye." (Vickery, p. 17)

When Temple Drake asserts, "my father's a judge," she either doesn't realize where she is, or she is assuming that the codes and systems of power and authority associated with her group effectively supplant those of the new group. Either she doesn't recognize difference, per se, or having recognized it, she fails to discern its true nature and scope.

As Olga Vickery suggests, the groups depicted in the novel, are “exclusive and excluded.” They are closed entities that far from welcoming the ‘other,’ derive their internal coherence and permanency by actively working to exclude other groups and their members. This is no less the case for the Old Frenchman place than it is for Memphis or Jefferson ‘society.’ The tragedy of Prohibition is not so much that it has brought these three world’s into existence, but that it necessarily prescribes the movement of goods and people between them. However, it is not the mere commerce of goods and people between the three worlds that spells violence. Horace Benbow moves with considerable ease between them without apparent consequence. Significantly, it is the movement of women, Temple Drake and Ruby Lamar, that becomes the catalyst for violence.

Temple Drake and Ruby Lamar: The First Mimetic Pairing

René Girard’s fundamental insight may be summarized in the following proposition: *we borrow our desire from someone else*. Human beings learn through imitation. However, we do not so much imitate gestures or behaviors as imitate other people. When we enter into a mimetic relationship with another we, in effect, borrow their desire. We do not so much desire things, or objects, as allow other people to mediate our desire. Our desire is mediated through the ‘other’ or ‘others’ we have chosen, or possibly, have been chosen for us. At a certain point this mimetic activity has the potential to become problematic since we cannot become the other: metaphysical desire. A confusion of self and other may occur. Or in the case of Temple Drake and Ruby Lamar, the borrowing transgresses social status and positioning.⁴

Once Temple has truly grasped where she is, her only recourse is to choose Ruby as mediator. She asks if she can hold Ruby’s child, and with the child in her arms, Temple tries to convince herself that these strange people are no different from her and her people. She states, more to herself than to Ruby: “I’m not afraid,” ... “Things like that dont [sic.] happen. Do they? They’re just like other people. You’re just like other people. With a little baby. And besides, my father’s a ju-judge.” (7 2/7)

Most important, the two women share stories. (7 3/7) A number of critics have suggested that Temple probably shares Ruby’s relationship with a jealous, incestuous father: the patriarch. (Duvall, p.64) Ruby becomes Temple’s model for the daughter who defies patriarchal authority. As a young woman, Ruby defies the father even under the threat of violence to herself and her lover, Frank. As Duval has poignantly noted, however, “*Ruby’s story inscribes a pattern of desire onto the younger woman.*” (Duvall, p. 62) [Emphasis added.]

When, in the middle of the night, Ruby commands Temple to “Get up” from the bed so that she can lead her to a safer place, Temple obeys. The narrative describes the movement of the two women towards the safety of the barn as if they were essentially one being, “On their bare feet they moved like ghosts.”

⁴ As Linda Dunleavy has noted’ “The differences between the men and women in the novel are not articulated as biological or gender differences, but rather as differences in social positioning.” (p. 172)

(9 2/3) Once they reach barn, Temple does not lie down. Rather the narrative states, “they knelt side by side against the wall” (9 2/3). When the narrative breaks off, we find Temple “crouched against the woman, shaking slowly, and they squatted there in the black darkness, against the wall.” (9 2/ 3)

Having passed the night safely with Ruby in the barn, Temple returns to the house where she retrieves her clothes and dresses. We know that Temple has solidified her mimetic relationship with Ruby when the narrator describes Temple’s emerging awareness in the following terms:

Long legged, thin armed, with high small buttocks—a small childish figure no longer quite a child, not yet quite a woman—she moved swiftly, smoothing her stockings and writhing into her scant, narrow dress. *Now I can stand anything*, she thought quietly, with a kind of dull, spent astonishment; *I can stand just anything*. (11 3/ 7) [Emphasis added.]

Temple feels that she is on the threshold of womanhood because she has come through a night of terror confident in the knowledge that she can endure anything. She believes that she has conquered fear. She has new measure of herself. More importantly, she has begun to conjoin her aspirations and world view with that of her mediator, Ruby.

On several occasions the previous day, Ruby questions Temple’s courage. In one of their first exchanges Ruby suggests, “You’re scared to go out there, aren’t you?” Temple’s, “No,” is hardly convincing. (7 5/ 7) Ruby continues to challenge and unsettle Temple with the words, “Nobody asked you to come here. Nobody cares whether you are afraid or not. Afraid? You haven’t the guts to be really afraid, anymore than you have to be in love.” Essentially, this is Ruby’s criticism and challenge to Temple: she doesn’t have the guts to love a “real man” (7 5/ 7) like Goodwin. She continues, “You poor little gutless fool, ... Playing at it.” When Ruby recounts the story of her life with Goodwin it becomes clear that having the “guts” to love entails a questionable blend of courage, fidelity, humiliation and submission. But Temple isn’t there yet. She is still focused on her apparent victory over fear.

Together in the kitchen in the morning, Ruby informs Temple that there is no bathroom; she will have to go behind the barn. While behind the barn Temple notices that she has been watched the whole time by a man, most likely Goodwin. (Arnold and Trouard, p. 91) Temple returns to the house and relates what has happened to Ruby. Ruby had mistakenly thought that all the men were gone. Shaken by the experience, and in a panic, Temple runs to the barn—presumably to hide from Goodwin. When Goodwin emerges in the house, Ruby confronts him with the fact that he is drunk. There is a violent confrontation between Goodwin and Ruby in the kitchen. After Goodwin has left, Ruby gathers the child and heads toward the spring. Popeye discovers Goodwin standing behind a tree in the orchard, staring at the barn. (12 3 / 4) He announces to Goodwin that he is returning to Memphis. Then, without Goodwin perceiving it, he enters the barn from the other direction, rapes Temple with a corncob and kills Tommy, who has been standing guard.

In effect, Popeye decides the matter for Lee Goodwin by asserting control over Temple Drake. In doing so, he claims Temple Drake with a violent act as the first step towards removing her from the community of the Old Frenchman place. This is not a benevolent act, *but it is a profoundly communal one*, because from the group’s point of view, what is most disturbing is the confusion of roles of Ruby

and Temple. The fact that Lee Goodwin in a drunken stupor should desire Temple is not surprising. In fact, as patriarch of the family, this is probably his due. What disturbs the order of the community is the possibility that *Temple should become Ruby*. Again, it is not so much the problem of someone superseding Ruby, but that someone *like Temple* could, either through lassitude, a persistence of effort, or happenstance, appropriate Ruby's desire and, ultimately, stand-in for her; this threatens the exclusive and exclusionary logic of the group. When desire converges in this manner, the received order of social differentiation is threatened to its core. Moreover, this interpretation is largely confirmed in an exchange that occurs between Popeye and Ruby by the spring, just moments before the rape.

After reiterating to Ruby comments he had made to Goodwin about allowing these outsiders to sit "around all night, swilling that goddam stuff," Popeye pronounces his judgement on what he has witnessed at the Old Frenchman place, stating "Goofy house. ... That's what it is." To illustrate his point, Popeye returns to the encounter with Horace Benbow, "It's not four days ago I find a bastard squatting here, asking me if I read books. Like he would jump me with a book or something. Take me for a ride with the telephone directory." His final words to Ruby are, "I'm clearing out. I've got enough of this." Popeye does not mention Temple Drake. And there is nothing to suggest that the act he is about to commit is motivated specifically by concern for Ruby. However, Temple has become a dogged intruder. If Horace's presence rendered the house "Goofy," Temple's presence threatens the very order of the place. Someone like Temple cannot become Ruby to the patriarch, Goodwin.

Narcissa Benbow (Sartoris) and Ruby Lamar: The Second Mimetic Paring

When Popeye murders Tommy as the first step towards the removal of Temple Drake, he sets in motion the second displacement. Lee Goodwin is accused of the murder and is jailed pending trial. In order to keep her family together, Ruby follows Goodwin to Jefferson. This movement represents an inversion of the previous encounter between the community of Old Frenchman place and Jefferson (in the person of Temple Drake). In this instance, Jefferson society encounters the Old Frenchman place in the person of Lee Goodwin and his family (Ruby and child). Far from welcoming Ruby, Jefferson society shuns her, perceives her as threat, and, ultimately, conspires to convict her husband of a murder he did not commit. The fact that the victimizers are the righteous members of the local Baptist congregation, has provided ample fuel to the lamentations of critics who, noting the obvious hypocrisy, seem universal in their willingness to identify the hypocrisy of the religious as the principle incarnation of "evil" depicted in the novel. (Howell, p.105)

Horace's sister, Narcissa, is first among the righteous. She works tirelessly to ensure that Goodwin is convicted, that Ruby is kept away from her brother, Horace, and, ultimately, removed from the town. Acting without apparent scruples, she reveals Horace's defense strategy to the prosecution in the Goodwin case. Her actions become key to Goodwin's conviction, which culminates in his mutilation and lynching in the hands of the Jefferson mob. Critics have generally assumed that Narcissa is acting out of an inordinate concern with "respectability." Cleanth Brooks states, "It is this kind of inordinate respectability that corrupts Narcissa, Benbow's sister, as well as Temple Drake." (Brooks 1963, p. 17) In our view, Brooks has failed to grasp the true nature of the "corruption" that taints Narcissa and

Temple Drake. But he is correct in his intuition that these are *paired characters*. However, they are not paired in relation to a hypocritical, corrupting influence of social propriety and respectability. If the Girardian interpretation is correct, Temple Drake and Narcissa Sartoris, *are paired in a mimetic relationship with Ruby Lamar*. Moreover, the key to understanding how Narcissa has become paired with Ruby Lamar is to be found in their relationship to Narcissa's brother, Horace Benbow. If we are to understand the mimetic relationship that develops between Narcissa and Ruby we must return to Horace and the story of his return to Jefferson.

Horace has returned to Jefferson by a circuitous path. In the first chapter we found him on foot, traveling with only a book in his pocket. Although Horace's passage through the Old Frenchman place is unscheduled and unwelcome, he is offered a meal and some moonshine. After several drinks, he begins to relate his story to Goodwin and the other men on the porch. He begins with the difficulties he is having with his stepdaughter, Little Belle. She is cavorting with a railway man of a lower social class, but most importantly, *she does not acknowledge his authority as titular head of the family*. Horace recounts that Little Belle insults him with the words: "You're a fine one to talk about finding things on the train! You're a fine one! Shrimp! Shrimp!" Of course, "Shrimp" is slang for a small, weak person, possibly lacking in courage. However, in point of fact, Horace is not a physically small man. As Arnold and Trouard have noted, Little Belle is drawing attention "to his weakness of character, and by implication, his questionable masculinity since he is a fetcher for her mother's whims." (Faulkner Reader, *Sanctuary*, p. 25)

Significantly, Ruby is just inside the door listening to Horace. The narrative reveals her thoughts which progress from "that fool", to "he's crazy" (twice), to "the fool", to "the poor fool." Discerningly she thinks, "He better get on to where he's going, where his women folks can take care of him." When the men leave the porch to load the truck, Horace enters the house. The narrative describes Horace as he appears to Ruby:

Then she saw him, in faint silhouette against the sky, the lesser darkness: a thin man in shapeless clothes; a head of thinning and ill-kempt hair; and quite drunk. "They dont make him eat right," the woman [Ruby] said.

Together and alone in the house a very brief, but surprisingly intimate, exchange occurs. Horace questions why a woman like Ruby who is "young yet" is living like this. Ruby does not respond but thinks to herself, "The poor scared fool." When she asks him why he has left his wife, Horace recounts the moment of illumination when he realized his revulsion at the very idea of fetching shrimp for his wife every Friday:

"Because she ate shrimp," he said. "I couldn't—You see, it was Friday, and I thought how at noon I'd go to the station and get the box of shrimp off the train and walk home with it, counting a hundred steps and changing hands with it, and it—". (25/9)

As a result of this exchange, Ruby confirms her opinion of Horace. While Horace seems to intimate that he could play some role as Ruby's *savoir*, Ruby sees through him noting that Horace is just another "poor scared fool"⁵ in need of a woman to take care of him.

Significantly, the only other time Horace recounts this story is to his sister, Narcissa, several days later. Again it is in response to the question, why have you left your wife? He states:

"No such luck," Benbow said. "It was Friday, and all of a sudden I knew that I could not go to the station and get that box of shrimp and—"

"But you have been doing that for ten years," his sister said.

"I know. That's how I know that I will never learn to like smelling shrimp." (15 2/ 5)

By recounting the same story to both women, Horace draws Ruby, the stranger, into the saga of his troubled relationships with the women of his family. He effectively pairs the two women as potential mediators of his desire. It is clear from Faulkner's narrative that Narcissa understands the pattern of Horace's relationships with women. She does not want to be a wife or mother to any man—least of all her brother. Her response to Horace's shrimp story and his sudden arrival in Jefferson is to return him to his wife in Stinson. It is one of the subtle ironies of Faulkner's narrative that Ruby intuitively grasps what Narcissa has gleaned from a lifetime of observation and experience with Horace. Were the two women to meet, they would, no doubt, discover that they are of one-mind with respect to Horace's *modus operandi* and prospects.

Most importantly, the narrative of the shrimp reveals Benbow's consuming desire to assert his authority as patriarch of both his family unit in Stinson and his ancestral family in Jefferson. His desire is clarified and heightened by the arrival of Lee Goodwin in Jefferson who, unlike Benbow, is a true patriarch. This is evident in Ruby's relationship to Goodwin. However, it is not the arrival of Goodwin in Jefferson, *per se*, that is the source of social conflict. It is the fact that Benbow has chosen Goodwin.

We will begin with Horace Benbow's 'professional' relationship with Lee Goodwin, and by extension with Ruby. Instead of Goodwin choosing Benbow to represent him, *it is Benbow who has chosen Goodwin*. This is fundamental to an understanding of the dynamic of mimetic desire as it unfolds in Jefferson. Goodwin accepts Benbow's offer stoically and rather fatalistically. But no one, including Horace, seems to think that he is the best choice as lawyer. For example, even his aunt Jenny queries:

"Do you mean to say a moonshiner hasn't got the money to hire the best lawyer in the country?" Miss Jenny said.

"It's not that," Horace said. "I'm sure he could get a better lawyer. It's that—"

A more telling exchange occurs between Ruby and Horace. After Ruby has spent her first night in Jefferson at the abandoned ancestral house, Narcissa succeeds in having her moved to the local hotel. When Ruby offers to exit the chauffeured car several blocks from the hotel in order to avoid rumors and scandal, Horace resists. Ruby reiterates her prudent request:

⁵ in Ruby's estimation Horace is not unlike Temple Drake.

"You'd better," the woman said. She sat back in the seat. Then she leaned forward again.
"Listen. You've been kind. You mean all right, but—"
"You dont think I am lawyer enough, you mean?"
"I guess I've got just what was coming to me. There's no use fighting it."

In a manner similar to her husband, Ruby fatalistically acquiesces to Horace's decision to represent them. But she is not confident of Horace's ability as lawyer to save her husband.

Clearly, Horace has chosen Goodwin as client and not the reverse. But he has chosen him in a more important respect. *Goodwin has become the mediator of his desire to affirm himself as family patriarch.* Goodwin is no 'fetcher of shrimp' for his woman. It is clear from Faulkner's narrative that Ruby accepts and submits to Goodwin's authority unequivocally. As Elizabeth Kerr has noted, Goodwin is the only "virile" male depicted in the novel. (Kerr 1979, p. 95) Horace's wife, step-daughter, and sister emphatically reject any aspirations that Horace may have to assert patriarchal authority.

The task for a Girardian analysis of *Sanctuary* becomes one of understanding how, in the context of the larger world of social relationships depicted in Faulkner's novel, Benbow's mimetic relationship with Goodwin escalates into mimetic rivalry and communal violence. In other words, how does the interpersonal relationship between self and other, between Benbow and Goodwin, become communal and find its expression in mob violence.

In his ground-breaking study, *Desire, Violence & Divinity in Modern Southern Fiction*, Gary M. Ciuba has neatly paraphrased the Girardian understanding of the process whereby mimetic rivalry escalates into a spiral of continuous doubling:

"This mimetic rivalry may convulse an entire community. Since desire is spread by imitation and imitation is spread by desire, the model-disciple relationship may expand beyond any single pair of doubles and get reproduced throughout a group. As desire circulates, the disciple copies the model, the copy, in turn, is copied by others, and the reduplication provides further models for further disciples. New or variant forms of imitative desire may generate their own family of doubles so that mimesis gradually becomes rampant. When selves increasingly come to resemble each other, the sheer multiplicity of the mimicry risks proliferating the same kind of envy that fuels individual antagonisms ... As the conflict between doubles becomes continually redoubled, the progression may eventually produce a mob in which everyone is fighting everyone else to prove that he or she is not everyone else but the sole truly sublime self."
(Ciuba, p. 8)

Benbow's choice of Goodwin transgresses social norms and expectations concerning the 'proper' order of mimetic relationships: respectable citizens do not appropriate the desire of outlaws and strangers. The matter is complicated by the fact that Benbow desires nothing more through his discipleship to Goodwin than to be a patriarch in a patriarchal society. As a model of effective patriarchy, Goodwin holds up a harsh and critical mirror to post-bellum, Jefferson society where the patriarchal order is in decline, if not in total crisis. However, if we follow the Girardian thesis, this is not the generative source

of violence. Rather, it is the doubling and redoubling of mimetic relationships that leads to a crisis of differentiation and, ultimately, communal violence.

To recapitulate, when the narrative shifts to Jefferson, we find Horace Benbow choosing Goodwin as the model for his desire. In effect, *Benbow seeks to be Goodwin to Ruby*. It is not so much that Benbow seeks to replace Goodwin, but rather, by winning Goodwin's freedom he hopes to validate himself as a man before the person who matters the most in the mimetic scheme, Ruby. Benbow's insertion of himself into the Goodwin family is an expression of his frustrated desire to be recognized as family patriarch. If the women in his own family unit stubbornly refuse to acknowledge his male prerogative as head of the family, then perhaps a woman, such as Ruby, who understands it and accepts it, will.

In order to move forward in our analysis, it is necessary to return briefly to an exchange that occurs between Temple Drake and Lee Goodwin at the Old Frenchman place. Together in the kitchen, Lee Goodwin confronts Temple with the words: "What are you doing in my house?". (6 7/7) Temple is afforded no opportunity to respond. Indeed, no response is required. Moreover, in recognition of this fact, Faulkner's narrative simply breaks off at this point. There is no ambiguity or equivocation: this is Goodwin's house. Goodwin, is the patriarch of the family, and Temple does not belong there.

When the action shifts to town, another house becomes the focus of the narrative: Horace's and Narcissa's ancestral home in Jefferson. Horace's return initiates a struggle between the two siblings for symbolic control of the house. In contrast to the house at the Old Frenchman place, this house has been abandoned for some time.⁶ It is a house without a viable family associated with a family that does not have a viable patriarch. When Benbow inserts himself into the Goodwin family, this has the collateral effect of introducing Ruby into the struggle for patriarchal authority that is occurring within house in Jefferson. This is evident in Narcissa's emphatic opposition to Horace's efforts to lodge Ruby in the ancestral house:

"Horace," his sister said. She had been watching him. "Where is that woman?" Miss Jenny was watching him too, sitting a little forward in the wheel chair. "Did you take that woman into my house?"

"Its my house too." ...

"The house where my father and mother and your father and mother, the house where I—I wont have it. I wont have it." (Chapter 16)

Moreover, the fact that Benbow has recounted the story of the Friday shrimp to both women suggests that Narcissa and Ruby have been cast in a rivalrous relationship with respect to Benbow's desire. It warrants mention that there is little evidence in the narrative that Ruby is aware of Narcissa as a potential model or obstacle; on the other hand, Narcissa is fairly obsessed with Ruby. Although it is a common place of many interpretations of the novel to assume that Narcissa is fanatical about

⁶ Narcissa now lives outside of town in her deceased husband's house with her young son, and her aunt Jenny. Horace lives with his wife, Belle, and his step daughter, Little Belle, in Kinston.

preserving the façade of social respectability, the Girardian analysis suggests that Narcissa, due to the actions of her brother, has been thrown into a mimetic relationship with Ruby.

It is surprising how much the two women share in terms of their relationship with Horace, their grasp of his behavior, and their understanding of gender relations. For example, although they come to it from different ends of the social order, the two women share a common understanding of gender relations when the woman is a member of the so-called outlaw⁷ (underclass) community. Although the narrator would have us believe that Narcissa is a rather “stupid” woman,⁸ her focus on Ruby suggests a keen understanding of the ways in which Horace’s social position has already determined a particular relationship with the ‘others’ from the Old Frenchman place now displaced to Jefferson.

At one point Narcissa offers to pay for Goodwin’s lawyer if Horace will drop the case, and, presumably, move on to Memphis with Ruby:

Hire a lawyer, if he still insists he’s innocent. I’ll pay for it. You can get a better criminal lawyer than you are. She wont know it. She wont even care. Cant you see that she is just leading you on to get him out of jail for nothing? Dont you know that woman has got money hidden away somewhere?

This exchange renders poignantly clear the fact that Narcissa does not so much desire Goodwin’s conviction as seek to removal of Ruby, her mimetic rival, from Jefferson. Moreover, Narcissa is essentially correct in her assessment of Ruby’s “moral” character.

On another occasion, several years earlier, Ruby sold her body to pay for a lawyer for Goodwin. (Chapter 27 ‘Leavenworth’) Of course, Narcissa cannot know this, but her assumption about Ruby is essentially correct: she is prepared to sell her body for her man. Moreover, Ruby appears to be working on the same assumption: she assumes that Horace will require sexual payment for his services. In the following exchange, Horace confirms Ruby’s thoughts on the matter:

“You would now, then?” She looked around at Goodwin. He was snoring a little. “Oh, I dont mean right this minute,” he whispered. “But you’ll pay on demand.” (Chapter 27)

To reiterate, it would appear that Narcissa’s concerns are not without foundation. She understands how gender relations between individuals from different social classes function in a patriarchal society. Moreover, she is keenly aware of how this relationship will be perceived in the minds of the citizens of Jefferson. Finally, although mistaken, Narcissa may be confident in her assumptions about Horace and Ruby, because in her mind Horace is repeating himself: once again he is enamored of a woman who belongs to another man and who has had a child by the other man.⁹

⁷ Duvall, J.

⁸ She is introduced to the narrative in the following manner, “Narcissa was a big woman, with dark hair, a broad, stupid, serene face.” (Chapter 3.)

⁹ This was the pattern of his relationship with his wife, Belle, who he took away from another man.

It matters little that Horace has no intention of consummating the relationship with Ruby, because the real issue, the issue which engenders violence, is the mimetic relationship. In the mimetic economy of *Sanctuary*, the issue is not so much that Horace has left his wife, or that he appears to be repeating himself with another woman; nor, surprisingly, is it the morality of sex in exchange for professional services. These are not communal concerns. The problem is that Horace has chosen to repeat himself *within the confines of the ancestral space with a woman who belongs to the 'other' place*. Ruby as excluded 'other' is the issue. Narcissa states:

I don't care how many women you have nor who they are. But I cannot have my brother mixed up with a woman people are talking about. I don't expect you to have consideration for me; I ask you to have consideration for our father and mother. Take her to Memphis. (20 5/ 8)

Ruby, the excluded 'other,' cannot be 'Belle' to Horace in Jefferson. But Ruby can be 'Ruby' to Horace in Memphis. In this instance, maintaining social differentiation is as much a function of the geography of exclusive and excluded places, as it is of personal morality. However, where social differentiation threatens to break down is the relationship between Narcissa and Ruby within the confines of Jefferson society.

In the course of the narrative we see that Narcissa views Ruby as both model and obstacle. Her mimetic relationship with Ruby is dictated by circumstance rather than a spontaneous desire to 'be' Ruby or borrow her desire. Once Horace chooses Goodwin/Ruby as a way of establishing a patriarchal presence, Narcissa cynically adopts Ruby as a model for resisting and manipulating male desire. Ruby offers sex in the knowledge that win or lose Horace is no substitute for Goodwin. Narcissa offers sex, vicariously through the person of Ruby, on the condition that it is removed to Memphis. (20 5/ 8) Neither woman believes that Benbow, should he win the trial, will assume the stature of a legitimate patriarch. What separates the two women, and what is most fundamentally at stake in their mimetic relationship, is their positioning with respect to the patriarchal order.

Ruby accepts the legitimacy of the patriarchal order but reserves the right *to choose her patriarch* as part of rebellious act against the incestuous father.¹⁰ Narcissa is the de facto matriarch of the Benbow clan. Ruby's implicit acceptance of patriarchy is an obstacle to a fundamental component of social differentiation that marks the divide between the Old Frenchman place and Jefferson. Modeling Ruby's desire threatens the new order of gender relations that allows women like Narcissa and Belle to sustain matriarchal family units within the larger order of "collapsed" patriarchy.¹¹ (Roberts, 27) In this regard it is significant to note that at least one critic has suggested that Narcissa's refusal of Gowan Steven's marriage proposal is the "prime mover" (Kerr 1980, p. 19) of the chain of events that sends Temple Drake to the Old Frenchman place, and, which by extension, provokes the other displacements that constitute the plot of novel.

¹⁰ The encounter between Ruby's father and her lover, Frank, is recounted as sharing of stories between Temple Drake and Ruby that occurs at the Old Frenchman place. (Chapter 7)

¹¹ David Williams in "The Profaned Temple" goes so far as to argue that the failure of patriarch is epitomized in Temple's desperate pray to an ineffectual "heavenly father" who is doubled in her prayer by appeals to her actual father, the Judge. (p. 101)

Narcissa's refusal of Steven's marriage proposal may be construed as an affirmation of matriarchal rights in defiance of the patriarchal order. Moreover, according to this interpretation, this act may be viewed as the generative kernel of novel's plot. Even more significantly from the perspective of mimetic analysis, it points to the fundamental importance of patriarchal vs. matriarchal positioning as essential components of social differentiation. Although Ruby's and Narcissa's respective behaviors and desires may converge on the problem of how to deal with Horace, there is a limit to mimetic convergence and borrowing. This limit is not dictated by the female protagonists, but is inscribed in the social order. Within the carefully crafted triptych of Faulkner's *Sanctuary*, someone like Narcissa, a widow from Jefferson, cannot be Ruby. For Narcissa to 'be' Ruby in her relationship to patriarchy would be an decisive affirmation of patriarchy. However, from the point of view of mimetic analysis, the issue is not social mirroring: the relationship between Faulkner's novel and what we have come to know about Mississippi (Southern) society during this period. For example, in is it possible that a person like Narcissa harbors a latent desire for a return to patriarchy . Rather, Faulkner's aesthetic rendering of a society in crisis (Mississippi in the throes of Prohibition) has chosen patriarchy as the definitive marker of social differentiation. This is particularly the case for the women protagonists of the novel. Within the aesthetic ordering of the novel, a woman's relationship to patriarchy has become the signifier of the difference between women who belong to the outlaw class (the Old Frenchman place) and women who belong to 'proper' society (Jefferson).

Indeed, within the aesthetic order of the Faulkner's novel, social positioning

In *Sanctuary*, the communal solution to the problem of mimetic doubling that threatens principles of social differentiation is to kill

Lee Goodwin as Scapegoat

the patriarch. Killing Goodwin, the only "virile male" (Kerr, p.) depicted in the novel, puts an end to the spiral of mimetic doubling.

Petesch mirroring the social order vs. aesthetic rendering of mimetic violence. and on merging of identities.

Bibliography

(Arnold and Trouard, p. 91)

(Brooks, 1962, p. 695)

(Brooks 1963, p. 19)

(Cole, p. 297)

(Ciuba, p. 8)

(Duvall, pp. 7-9)

(Faulkner Reader, *Sanctuary*, p. 25)

(Flynn, p. 109)

(Howell, p. 109)

(Kerr, 1980)

Kerr, 1979, p. 95)

(Kinney, p. 229)

(Langford, 1972)

(O'Donnell, 292-93)

(O'Connor, p.59)

(Roberts, p. 22)

Tate

(Vickery, p. 16)

Faulkner's thematics of self and other

Ironic contrasts and parallels

The novel begins with an unsettling encounter: a man with a gun in his pocket (Popeye) faces a man with a book in his pocket (Horace Benbow) across a country stream. Horace (a lawyer) is passing through and is in a hurry. Popeye is also passing through, but on business. (He's running moonshine to Memphis). Popeye is not in a hurry. For two hours they size each other up across the stream. Few words are spoken. Horace, who is Popeye's social superior, submits to the implicit power of the man with the gun. He stays put. Eventually, they move on with Popeye leading the way. At times the man with the gun and the man with the book walk side by side. They arrive at an abandoned mansion, the Old Frenchman's Place, where they find what can only be described as an unconventional family: a woman (Ruby) with a baby, her common-law husband (Lee Goodwin), Van (a local man), an old blind man (Pap), and a young man with a mental handicap (Tommy). Horace doesn't belong here. Under normal circumstances, this 'family' probably wouldn't be here, and Horace would not be welcome. But these are uncommon times. Prohibition is in effect. Men of Horace's social class and position regularly come here for liquor. Men who carry books of poetry in their pocket mingle with men who carry pistols. Men from town mix with men from the rural back woods. Men from small towns journey to Memphis for liquor and women. Memphis has become the murder capital of the United States. Prohibition has turned an apparently ordered world upside down. The rules and codes that work to differentiate self and other along lines of social class and social position have broken down.

Faulkner does not tell us what transpires between Popeye and Horace across the stream. We can assume that they discover that they are not rivals to one another. Their vectors of self-interest and desire do not intersect. They come to understand that they can walk side by side, each in a different world. When they arrive at the mansion, Popeye repeatedly refers to Horace as "the professor," in spite of the fact that Horace has told him that he is a lawyer. Lawyer or professor, it matters little to Popeye, once he has established that Horace is part of that other world. The distinction between lawyer and professor is only significant in Horace's world. Once the old rules of social differentiation have been re-established, the two men can

relate to one another across the divide. In a sense, they never leave their respective positions on opposite sides of the stream.

We see that Faulkner has begun his novel with a tense and dramatic meeting between strangers. Although violence is in the air, their contact does not produce a violent result. This chance encounter and its unfolding are significant because they stand in marked contradistinction to the violence and terror that will follow in the novel as social barriers dissolve and individuals find themselves in social spaces where they are not wanted and where they may not want to be.

Faulkner's *Sanctuary* is replete with encounters that challenge or defy established codes of social differentiation. Horace's step-daughter, Little Belle, is cavorting with a 'railroad man.' Gowan Stevens, a 'Virginia Gentleman,' drinks with moonshiners and criminals at the Old Frenchman's place. There is the comical scene where Virgil and Fonzo (two country-boy innocents) are introduced to a 'Negro' brothel in Memphis. Having found Temple Drake and heard her testimony of the rape Horace leaves the Memphis brothel thinking:

Better for her if she were dead tonight, Horace thought, walking on. For me, too. He thought of her, Popeye, the woman [Ruby], the child, Goodwin, all put into a single chamber, bare, lethal, immediate profound: a single blotting instant between the indignation and the surprise.

(Chapter 23: 20/23)

Finding himself, and his social equal, Temple Drake, in this 'chamber' with a cohort of unlikely strangers, Horace hovers between indignation and surprise.

Throughout the novel, Horace moves freely between 'proper,' Jefferson society and the underworld of criminals and the morally corrupt. Horace's mobility is in contrast to the two female protagonists of the novel: Temple Drake and Ruby Lamar. Temple's intrusion into the life of the 'family' of criminals and misfits at the Old Frenchman's place produces unspeakable violence in form of Tommy's murder and her rape. When Ruby follows her husband, who has been accused of Tommy's murder, to Jefferson, she is perceived by the good woman of the town to be a threat to moral order. Horace's sister, Narcissa, responds to the threat by conspiring with the prosecutor, behind the back of her brother, to ensure Horace's client, Lee Goodwin, is convicted of a crime he didn't commit. In the process, the people of the town, take matters into their own hands and brutally lynch him.

When the novel begins we find them with their respective social groups. When Gowan Stevens brings Temple Drake to the Old Frenchman's place and abandons her there, Temple is transformed into the quintessential intruder. She becomes the Other who upsets the equilibrium of the strange family that inhabits the space of the Old Frenchman's place. The problem of what to do with Temple Drake is resolved by Popeye when he takes her to Memphis. When Ruby Lamar follows her accused partner to Jefferson, she becomes the Other who threatens the equilibrium of proper society in Jefferson.

As social differentiation breaks down, produces suspicion and violence is always just around the corner.

"The confrontation of Horace Benbow and Popeye at the spring, in which their images are reflected, anticipates their opposition as hero and villain in the detective story plot, and differentiates nature and unnatural men, Horace at ease in this sylvan setting and Popeye terrified by a bird in flight." (Kerr 1979, p. 90)

"The complete inversion in Temple and Narcissa of traditional roles is confirmed in the other works in which they appear, ... " (p. 94)

But Lee is an ironic inversion precisely as Ruby is: his name, "Lee," is that of the greatest southern hero, and "Goodwin," which means "friend of God," may also be read as Good Win, signifying the hero's triumph. As the victim, convicted of crimes of which he was innocent, and as the scapegoat who suffered a horrible death. Lee is more nearly a hero than Horace. Lee resembles the romance hero, subjected to an unjust trial, but unlike such heroes as described by Northrope Frye, Lee had "no vision of liberation." (Kerr 1979, p. 95)

The stranger among us and the crisis of social differentiation

René Girard: communal violence and the restoration of order

Sanctuary's Vector of Desire: the Absent Father