

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Exploration of Evil in Human Nature in Faulkner's *Sanctuary*

**A thesis submitted to the Central Department of English
in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts in English**

By

Mohan Prasad Pokhrel

University Campus Kirtipur

November 2006

Tribhuvan University

Faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences

This thesis entitled "Exploration of Evil in Human Nature in Faulkner's *Sanctuary*" submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Mr. Mohan Prasad Pokhrel has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head

Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to my teacher and supervisor Hem Sharma Paudel, Lecturer at the Central Department of English for his scholarly guidance and corrections that he made on the work. It would not have come into its present form without his help.

I feel very happy to express my sincerest gratitude to Prof. Dr. Padma Prasad Devkota, then Head of the Central Department of English, Kirtipur and other members of the Research Committee for granting me an opportunity to carry out this research work. Otherwise it would have never seen the light of day. Similarly, I am highly indebted to, Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Nagendra Prasad Bhattarai and Shankar Subedi for their invaluable suggestions.

I would like to express my deep sense of gratitude to my parents and brothers, Narayan, Shridhar, Ajaya, Madan, Shanta Raj and my dear wife, Srijana who made a lot of sacrifices for my higher studies.

Mr. Jitendra Nepali deserves my especial thanks for his kind help in preparing this work. Similarly, I am thankful to my friends, Kamal, Naresh, and Keshav, Kiran and Madhusudan. Lastly, I extend my thanks to my friends and M. M. Communication, Kirtipur for their help in bringing this research work into completion.

November, 2006

Mohan Prasad Pokhrel

Abstract

This research attempts to explore the evil human nature through William Faulkner's novel, *Sanctuary*. So, the study is an exploration into human nature with the concomitant discovery of evil because the protagonist of the novel, Horace Benbow, discovers in several other characters, with increasing horror, that evil is rooted in the very nature of human beings. In order to prove this hypothesis, different aspects of evil are discussed as methodology. As the characters go on killing, raping and other violent spree, darker side of human beings is explored.

Contents

	Page No.
I. Introduction	1-12
Life and Works of William Faulkner	
The Novel: <i>Sanctuary</i>	
II. Theme of Evil: A Theoretical Modality	13- 26
General Introduction	
Concept of Evil	
Kinds of Evil	
III. Exploration of Evil in the Text: Textual Analysis	27-42
IV. Conclusion	43-46
Works Cited	

Chapter I

Introduction

This research is a study of William Faulkner's famous novel *Sanctuary* published in 1931. The study is an exploration into human nature with the concomitant discovery of evil because the protagonist, Horace Benbow, discovers, with increasing horror, that evil is deeply rooted in the very nature of human beings.

To an earlier generation of Faulkner, the word evil, if it meant anything at all, meant a product, something spawned by economic forces or by society, something man created and incidental, certainly not one of the residual data of human nature. For Zola evil came from the political and social corruption of the Second Empire; it could not be controlled by suppressing the Empire. For Dreiser, evil was the system, the Great Machine: his social views aimed at its elimination by restriction of the effects of the Machine. The disparity between this and Faulkner's attitude towards evil in itself shows how far Faulkner is removed from the traditions of realism. Many characters in Faulkner's work carry evil with them or in them without being any way contrived. He presents harsh but realistic pictures of human world through the depraved and horrible characters.

The earlier generation of writers like Hawthorn and Melville were aware of the presence of evil in the world. Our renewed interest in these authors is to be explained in part by the fact that in our lifetime something very like a personification of evil has walked the earth. For a while, Adolf

Hitler made a very serviceable proxy for the Devil. We uncovered Buchenwald. And if we averted our eyes from the things like Buchenwald, it was not merely because the sight was unpleasant. Buchenwald institutionalized and organized something which was not exclusively German and which was far from unfamiliar to America. Between what happened to millions of Jews in the Nazi death camps and what has happened to a lynched and burned American Negro lies merely the numerical difference. We live being anxious of our own guilt. We find in ourselves traces of the same potentiality of evil, which marks the characters in Faulkner's novels.

Literary texts, mythical narratives and historical episodes frequently remind us that evil is very powerful phenomenon. It exists in the very heart of being. For good or bad this has become essential. In this essentialist metaphysics good is left out as a feeble reality: it is like a mask whose purpose is to hide the real, to cover up the inherent evil. What is shown is unreal and what is hidden is essence of man in this context.

William Faulkner's works suggest how good man's secondary trait is. Many characters in Faulkner's works carry evil with them or in them, without being in any way contrived. The essence is evil. Man's evil nature is his permanent quality and the mask is transient. Man is more on the side of Satan and he resembles his forces and his roles as the destroyer of harmony and the values of life. Modern man is very much influenced by what is behind the mask. He tears away the mask when he has no fear of

the society. Evil is man's sole confidence as Satan shows this in *Paradise Lost*.

What thought the field be lost?
All is not lost the unconquerable will,
And study of revenge, immortal hate,
And courage never to submit or yield:
And what else not to be overcome?
That glory never shall his wrath or might
Extort from me. (Milton 34)

It is unconquerable will that does not end. It always remains in the heart of human beings. Satan makes his evil intentions quite clear. Undying hatred for good and God and a desire for revenge perpetually prompt him to spread his rule. He goes on to express his inflexible antagonism towards God. He is not going to beg mercy from God. He claims to be equal to God in arms and superior to him in foresight. He resolves to wage war against God and never thinks of reconciliation with him; modern man is very much identical with such antagonism.

Life and works of William Faulkner

William Faulkner was born on September 25, 1897 at New Abany, Mississippi. He had joined the Royal Air Force in Canada when he became unable to join the American Army during World War I. After the World War I, he made his first visit to New York and worked in a book shop for a time. The only result was his friendship with Elizabeth Prall (wife of

Sherwood Anderson) and thus he was introduced to a really lively literary circle.

William Faulkner makes as many demands on his reader as do our more difficult modern poets. His experiment in perspective, in handling time, and in revealing character make it, extremely hard to tell what is happening in his stories. One has also difficulty in telling whether what seems to happen is a real event or merely the hallucination of one of the characters. W.M. Frohock has observed:

Ninety-nine characters out of hundred seem driven by obscure obsessive neuroses and tortured by anxieties which the reader does not share and which lead to actions taking place outside the normal order of events and at abnormal speed. And at moments there is an absurd disproportion between the stature of the characters and the overwhelming horror of the things that happen to them. (144)

Faulkner has never consented to become one kind of writer like Dos Passos and Hemingway. Consequently, criticism has had its troubles in giving a full account of his achievement. From a half dozen or so characteristics of the work as a whole it would seem less possible to draw some conclusion as to just what he has contrived to do with the American novel. Therefore, critics, instead of trying to come to a complete judgement of Faulkner, are likely to be satisfied with a tentative and highly circumspect enumeration of some peculiarities of his work.

Quite probably the most important of these characteristics is Faulkner's habit of seeing the action through the personality of one, or several characters in the particular story to which another novelist would be unlikely to entrust the "point of view." This may or may not make life difficult for the reader. In *Intruder in the Dust*, we get the action through the eyes of a single person, an adolescent boy, and once we have learned who and what he is there is no trouble; but it is necessary to read well into *The Sound and The Fury* that the incoherence of the first part is caused by the fact that the narrator is literally an idiot. In *As I lay Dying*. Faulkner complicates the task even further by passing the narrative round and round the circle of the dramatic persona; we see the characters through the eyes of each of the other characters in turn, so that the action moves forward in a sort of spiral. In *Sanctuary*, the whole effect of this action seems photographed three or four times, from different angles, with different lighting at different speeds.

For the characters that stand as Faulkner's agent are essentially vast recording machines of impressions. Through them, Faulkner's works come very close to the brute stuff of consciousness. Sensations are reported with extreme immediacy. But sometimes we have to wait, through whole pages and chapters to know their importance.

His style and the unusual treatment of the "point of view" are organically related to the characteristic treatment of time which marks so much of Faulkner's writing. For in the flow of impression which comes to us through the mind of the character, the ordinary distinction between past

and present is frequently missing. The character lives in and focuses his attention on the present but mixed in the surging sensations of his mind are reminiscences of the past brought to the surface by the stimulus of present which implying upon the present and became part of it.

Faulkner's private vision is essentially tragic. Robert Penn Warren has insisted:

Faulkner's people are Southerners only by geographical chance. Their lot as Faulkner sees it, is the lot of generality of men, man's fate; to be surrounded by evil, and inevitable out of their own natures to be both victims and workers of evil.

(164)

We can see that many characters of Faulkner carry the potentiality of evil with them. W. M. Frohock says:

Many characters in Faulkner's work carry evil with them or in them, without being in any way contrived. Even in *Sanctuary* Popeye is not the unique agent of evil; misfortune, catastrophe and death follow Temple Drake wherever she goes. Occurring mere frequently in Faulkner's work than characters like Popeye characters like Tempe Drake seem to carry the potentiality of evil with them merely because they are human and as human being, creatures of the absurd . . ."

(159)

Thus, Faulkner has very powerfully projected the darker aspect of human being. To make the reader's problem more difficult there has been a

feeling of improvisation in his later works. Consequently, the critics have to be satisfied with the peculiarities of the individual works.

The novel: *Sanctuary*

Published in 1931, *Sanctuary* is a tale in which no one triumphs and everyone fails. It was written when the World War I had brought America into a shocking cultural collision with Europe. For the South, the shock was even greater. It came into collision with not only Europe but with the North and the new order there.

His previous novels, *Soldier's Pay*, *Mosquitoes*, *As I lay Dying* and *The Sound and the Fury* had brought him a certain amount of critical praise but little financial reward: now he could write a book expressly designed to make money and that was *Sanctuary*. Faulkner says that he "invented the most horrific tale I could imagine" (10), wrote it out in three weeks or so though he had extensively revised the book before it was finally published by Cape and Smith in February 1931.

Sanctuary certainly shocked its readers – nowhere more obviously than in Oxford itself but it was undoubtedly a popular success. It made Faulkner the money he needed and a popular reputation of a kind he had never expected. Paramount bought the story and makes from it a film called *The Story of Temple Drake* and from this time dates Faulkner's long legendary and mutually profitable relationship with Hollywood.

The story is in two parts. In the first, a young college girl named Temple Drake is landed by her drunken escort Gowan Stevens in the hand of a group of moonshiners. Stevens abandons her there and after many

false alarms and episodes of terror, she is criminally assaulted by a member of the band named Popeye. Popeye is suspected of having some Negro blood and he is also sexually impotent and therefore must execute his purpose by indirect methods which are overwhelming, brutal and revolting. Furthermore, just before the assault, he shoots another member of the band, a kind, feeble minded fellow named Tommy, who is trying to protect Temple.

In the second half of the book, Popeye has carried Temple off to a brothel in Memphis. Godwin, the head of the moonshiners is accused of both crimes and is convicted on the false testimony of Temple herself despite the effort of a lawyer named Horace Benbow. Finally, the innocent Godwin is burned by a lynching mob, Popeye is hanged by accident for a crime he did not commit, Temple is taken abroad by her father and Horace Benbow, after some efforts to live a free life, goes back to his wife and sister. This is the skeleton of the story.

Lawrence S. Kubie gives his psychological interpretation which focuses on innate evil of the characters:

The tale is a dramatization of the impact between the focuses of instinctual evil and the forces of an evil and savage conscience, operating through the blind vengefulness of a misdirected mob. It represents graphically the struggle which is psychoanalytic shorthand, is known as the struggle between the Id and Super-ego. Between the two stands this weak and feeble effort at a realistic dealing with life embodied in the

figure of Benbow. He is the weak representative of the much battered 'Ego' that fragment of the personality which is so often ground to pieces in the battle. (142-43)

We find in *Sanctuary* that every 'respectable' man is in one way or another crippled, impotent or silly. This is true of the figures as Clarence Snopes or the lame district attorney, or Gowan Stevens. We see evil and weakness triumph over goodness and strength. In *Sanctuary*, Faulkner has made Benbow, a sentimental idealist and the man of academic mind, ineffectual in his contest with evil. But Faulkner has succeeded so well that many of his readers accord Horace something less than his due. He must have his due, for if Bonbow becomes a mere weakling, then one loses the very point of the novel, which is the horrifying power of evil.

Sanctuary is a very remarkable novel that presents and illustrates the different aspects of evil. The following short review of literature will help us to understand the novel clearly.

The title of the novel *Sanctuary* is very ironic in tone because it presents a world in which amoral power is almost nakedly present. Olga Vickery comments on the novel: "*Sanctuary* is concerned with the manner in which concepts of law and justice are established but with the way in which they function at a particular time and place" (128). So, he has viewed that the novel shows that the man-made concepts like law and justice are not universally true but are different according to time and place. Michael Millgate notices the novel as a portrayal of the failure of idealism in practical life. He says, "Sanctuary may be a metaphor for

rather gentle idealism untested by experience" (43). Leslie Fiedler holds that "*Sanctuary* is not just the darkest of the all the dirty jokes exchanged among men only at the expense of the abdicating Anglo-Saxon Virgin (332). Fiedler has paid attention to jokes which Faulkner used deliberately for sensational shock.

W.M. Frohock comments on *Sanctuary* that "Faulkner's achievement is to blend the Greek tragedy with the detective story" (164). This judgement of the part of mystery story seems to be true. As with the Greeks, the sign of evil is the violence it brings forth. Evil comes out of the past which man can not control. A man may struggle against it but he may not deny it or put it from him. William Van O' Connor interprets the novel as an "attack on modernism" (18). Thus, he observes the novel as an ironic picture of modern society in which sex is only lust and human relationship merely amoral engagement.

Joseph Reed observes the novel as: "*Sanctuary* moves in pattern borrowed from both deep and shallow sources; from the deep a pattern of mounting terror first at the fact of captivity, then at the failure to try to escape" (63). Reed points out Faulkner's narrative technique on the one hand and human condition on the other. The man tries to avoid the clutches of destiny but he is doomed to failure because the world itself is ruled by laws all irrational and illogical. Likewise, Lawrence S. Kubie says: "Sanctuary serves our purpose both because of the turbulent power of its imagery, the violent eruption of unconscious forces and also for the practical reason that it has been widely read" (138). He explores human

unconscious forces that motivate actions of human beings. Similarly, Carl Rollyson interprets the novel as: "Sanctuary explores the perverse attraction of humanity to violence and the self-torturing aspects of romantic love" (71). Thus, Rollyson has viewed the novel as an exploration of human nature that is inclined towards violence.

Cleanth Brooks observes the novel as: "*Sanctuary* is a novel in which the male's initiation into the nature of evil is experienced in its most shattering a disillusion form" (113). He has viewed the novel that male's discovery of evil and reality is bound up with the discovery of the true nature of women. Men idealizes and romanticize women, but the cream of the jest is that women have a secret rapport with evil which man do not have, that they are able to adjust to evil without being shattered by it, being by nature flexible and liable. Richard Ruland and Malcolm Bradbury view the novel implying the bad-tempered human nature. They say, "*Sanctuary* created a remarkable figure of contemporary evil . . . the depthless quality of stamped tin" (321).

Though different critics have interpreted the novel in their own views, the present research will be confined within viewing the novel as an exploration of human nature with the concomitant discovery of evil. Being a modern novelist, William Faulkner wants to show the man's crisis and the dark hidden streams of human nature. Faulkner is able to emphasize the brutally destructive effects of World War I and the evil it had brought in America. Throughout the novel, he has succeeded to show the modern man's instinct, cruelty, snobbishness, selfishness, pride, sin,

defilement, guilt and so on. He tries to show evil is very powerful and good is so feeble.

The present work has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter presents a short historical background to the novel, a short introduction to Faulkner a brief critical summary of *Sanctuary*. Moreover, it gives a bird's eye view of the entire work.

The second chapter tries to briefly explain the theoretical modality that is applied in this research work. It discusses shortly the evil," its type 'morality', and reference to the study of man's unconscious level.

On the basis of the theoretical framework out lined in the second chapter, the third chapter will analyze the text at a considerable length. It will analyze the activities of the major characters' wicked and immoral activities. It sorts out some extracts from the text as evidence to prove the hypothesis of the study – that human nature in general evil.

The fourth chapter is the conclusion of this research work. On the basis of the textual analysis done in the third chapter, it concludes the exploration and arguments put forward in the preceding chapter and show humans do have evil nature.

Chapter II

Theoretical Modality

Concept of Evil

Evil may be generally defined as "that which is opposed to the divine order of the universe; the notion is therefore strictly meaningless except to a believer in God." In a moral sense evil is contrasted with good" (*The Encyclopedia Americana* 731). If an orderly, rational universe is postulated, and particularly if it assumed that there is an omnipotent and beneficent creator, evil disrupts the order and result in sorrow, distress or calamity. In a derived sense evil is equated with any suffering or other misfortune. Its cause and what can be done about it are perennial philosophical and theological problems. Its presence is as obvious as its explanation is difficult; it takes the two main forms of pain and sin. Dualistic theories postulate the existence of two continually warring principle of good and evil, though in practice, as with the "Ahyra Mazadah and Ahriman of Zoroastrianism, it is usually held that finally good will prevail and evil be abolished" (493). In contrast, monistic theories have tended to belittle the reality or the gravity of evil in order to preserve the uniqueness of absolute, or God. Christianity teaches that sin consists in, and pain is the result of, the misuse of free will by angles and men; " that God permits sin and only indirectly wills pain, . . . " (*The Encyclopedia Britannica* 493).

Evil is one of the inalienable parts of human being. Man is rarely free from this inner quality. He seems to be a natural friend of evil. Both modern man and literature that reflects contemporary humanity are very much influenced by evil. Ethics is the theoretical study, which deals with the ideal, or with the standard of rightness, and wrongness, good and evil involved in conduct. This is on the whole a good world, and that man so on the whole happy. Yet he is confronted also with pain and sorrow and vice. More than often good turns to evil.

According to ancient Greeks, both good and evil are the creations of God. In this context of the concept of evil, Paul Ricoeur's ideas are remarkable:

The manner in which the Greeks represented their own past to themselves and expressed their beliefs is the unique contribution of Greece to the thematic evil. Greek philosophy was worked out in contact with myths, which are themselves interpretations, descriptive and explanatory exegeses of beliefs and rites relative to defilement. (39)

Human civilization and evil are like two lungs of a man. History has shown as civilization developed, evil has turned more powerful. Civilization ought to mean the arrangement of social condition. But civilization as it actually exists is partly a product of the vices than the virtues of mankind. It is also true that civilization creates more subtle form of evil so that evil too looks deceptively attractive.

Civilization is not arranged for the extinction of vice, but more vice may "lose half its evil by losing all its grossness," says John Burke (qtd. in Mackenzie 384). It is arranged not for the promotion of virtue but only for power. Among the rich, luxury is encouraged, wants are multiplied and go on multiplying themselves, and men are tempted to seek the satisfaction by dishonorable means. Though the poor, on the other hand, are exploited, they have their own forms of evil standards. Civilization itself is the root of evil. Dean Rashdall focuses that necessity and human natures are the roots of evil.

Societies may have their customs and their institutions so framed as to give encouragement to their citizens. But the ultimate power that rules seems to be of the evil, man's life is not so simple a struggle towards virtue and holiness; it is quite often a lapsing into vice and sin. Each man's moral life may be regarded as a universe in itself. This universe may be a broad one or a narrow one, but in the case of the majority of man, it is sufficiently narrow. This narrowness is a source of conflict. Evil is not sought as evil, but put under a mask called good.

Desire and will are other important factors that create evil thought. Desires are related to the will. In all desire there is some object. This object may or may not be fulfilled. The desires of a person are not isolated phenomena, but form an element of the totality. The desires of a human being form part of a universe, it is like a "universe of discourse."

Satisfactions of appetite are referred to simply as pleasure and good; while unsatisfied appetites are called pains and that create evil intention as a hungry lion.

Frank Kermode, Erich Forman and S.L. Washburn are the philosophers who give their view on evil. Frank Kermode is of the view that the civilized men are not the savages but corrupt. Civilized men are the evildoers because they are more corrupted than the savages are. Erich Forman says, "Destructiveness and cruelty are part of human nature" (129). Washburn identifies the carnivorous psychology with a drive for pleasure derived from killing. He says, "Man takes pleasures in hunting and killing others. In most cultures, torture and suffering are made a public spectacle for the enjoyment of all . . ." (150).

Washburn insists that man has a carnivorous psychology. It is easy to teach people to kill, and it is hard to develop customs, which avoid killing. Many human beings enjoy seeing other human beings suffer or enjoy the killing of animals. Public beatings and torture are common in many cultures. He implies that not only killing but cruelty as well, is part of human psychology. (175)

Kenneth Walker puts this matter in this way:

Freud's investigation of the contents of the submerged parts of the mind showed that these were of a very primitive nature. According to him, we are white sepulchers and are only outwardly decent and cultured. We all carry evil within us, locked in some dark cellar of the mind, not a

comparatively respectable skeleton but a full- boded and lascivious savage. In spite of our effort to isolate this unwelcome guest in his cellar, he sales our thoughts and actions. (50)

It appears that, in a sense, the most cultured among humans are accidentally so. Underneath is the same basic material. Such experience caused them to be ashamed because they reveal what we are. Thus, investigation of the unconscious done by psychologist is to bring to light evil and destructive forces which are subdued within. In this case Bible also agrees with it, "far from within out of the heart of man proceed evil thoughts, adulteries fornication, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness, all these evil things come from within and defile the man" (Mark 7: 21-23). But it is also necessary to know something about culture with respect to evil.

Rousseau defines culture as the restrains of natural conduct. He argues that if man were only free of all these constraints, he would not be nearly as wicked as he is now. Norms and values imposed upon them by society are the causes of repressions that are bad for the soul. A tremendous sense of relief a person experiences when he throws off these restraints. Freud's discovery of unconscious shows that man's basic nature is primarily made up of instincts which would, if permitted expression, result in incest, murder and other crimes. For other thinker culture is the sum total of the social constraints imposed upon its members to grant optimum happiness.

The concept of good and evil is very broad one. The distinction between right and wrong, good and evil depends upon the arbitrary will of God. John Locke, Rene Descartes and other hold the view that the divine law is the ultimate moral standard. Dr. Brunner says that rightness and wrongness are creations of the will of God. He says, "What God wills is good; all that opposes the will of God is bad. God's will controls absolutely everything" (77). The Christian text explains:

I believe in the remission of sins. When Lord God made the earth and the heavens, no shrub of the field had yet appeared on the earth. The lord God had planted a garden in the east, in Eden and there he put the man he had formed. And the God made all kinds of trees grow out of the ground in the middle of the garden were the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. (Genesis 1:30)

Adam is not an important figure in the *Old Testament*: the prophets ignore him, various other texts do. They name Adam the sons of Adam but without allusion to the story of the fall. Abraham, the father of believers, and Noah, the father of mankind as recreated after the flood, are more important figures. And even for the editor of the account in Genesis, it is no certain that Adam bears the entire responsibility for the evil in the world. He is perhaps only the foremost example of evil. In the *New Testament* Jesus himself never refers to the Adamic story. He takes the existence of evil for a fact, as the situation, which is, presupposed by the call to repentance.

David Hume states the problem of evil as follows:

If evil in the world is from the intention of the Deity, then he is not benevolent. If evil in the world is contrary to this intention, then he is not omnipotent. But it is either in accordance with this intention or contrary to it. Therefore, either the Deity is not benevolent or he is not omnipotent. (47).

Perhaps the most satisfactory solution or attempted solution has to do with human free will. According to this proposed solution evil is a consequence of the existence of human free will. It is argued that a universe in which there are beings who possess free will is richer and more varied and in some important sense better than one containing only kindly automata. If human beings were always good, that could only be because God had created them as hundred percent obedient to his laws, and in that case they would be like mere machines, doing good automatically. The existence of human free will, then, explains moral evil and the value of freedom justifies God's decisions to create free human beings who are creatures able to choose both good and evil. However, the proposed answer does not explain on the one hand the sheer quality of evil and on the other natural evils like floods, famines and diseases because they do not result from human choices, therefore, Hume's conclusion is that God's nature is not know to us and can't be known to us. We can't know God's attributes, nor does the relationship between those attributes.

Friedrich Nietzsche derives the meaning of good and evil from the Greek tradition. Evil is identified with weakness. So, the aristocratic, the powerful, the high-stationed, and the high-minded are good. The low, the mean minded, the vulgar, the plebeian are bad. He writes:

The concept of good and evil are based on biological or physiological considerations. Good is what enhances the feeling of power, the will to power and real power in man. Evil is what weakens power. It springs from weakness, pity and revenge. What furthers life is good, and what hinders life is evil. All virtues and vices depend upon physiological conditions. All that proceeds from power is good; all that springs weakness is bad. (133)

J. Brenham and J.S. Mill derive more laws from induction, from experience of pleasure and pain. They are advocates of impractical hedonism. The hedonism of Herbert Spencer, Leslie Stephen and Samuel Alexander is called Evolutionary Hedonism. They are of the opinion that good conduct produces pleasure and bad conduct produces pain.

Antisthenes of Athens was the founder of the cynic school. He laid stress on the idealistic teachings of Socrates. Virtue for the sake of virtue is the moral end. Pleasure is an evil. The wise man should rather be mad than feel pleasure. Virtue is sufficient for happiness, for it makes man the slave of fortune (qtd. in *Manual of Ethics*11).

Thomas Hobbs is also another important philosopher who gives his own views for good and evil. He says, "Good and evil are names that

signify our appetites and aversions. What so every is the object of any man's appetite or desire, that is it which he for his part called god" (80). He further says that what is desired by other is good to him. There is no good in general. This is a subjectivist doctrine or God; what one person desires is an object of another's version. Thus, the same object is both good and not good.

Mahatma Gandhi is an apostle of "Ahimsa." His basic principle of life is based on truth: "Hate the sin and not the sinner" (280), he says. He further adds that we should not try to crush the wrong doer nor try to resist evil by dissociating ourselves from it in all possible ways. Evil cannot stand by itself. None cooperates with evil, and it will die of inanition. But Faulkner seems to have a problem with Gandhian system.

Nietzsche's ethics of "Ahimsa" regards 'good' as equivalent to 'power' and 'evil' as equivalent to 'weakness' and treats good and evil as relative biological concepts. Gandhi regards 'good' as equivalent to 'truth' and evil as equivalent to falsehood (23).

Since evil is very dominant factor of human civilization, modern world is completely influenced by its power. Evil forces attract all modern men and all modern writings are very much influenced by its powerful consequence. In modern writings, evil has been abundantly used for various purposes: to thrill, to horrify, to satirize to expose the inner reality and so on. For example, William Faulkner has used evil to satirize as well as to excavate the nature of human being. What makes it significant to study Faulkner's *Sanctuary* from the perspective of the domination of evil

is the stunning defeat of Horace Benbow, the sentimental idealist, in his contest with evil.

Evil is one of serious and permanent natures of man. So, giving more consideration to it is absolutely remarkable and highly relevant in our present time.

Kinds of Evil

Jadunath Sinha and John Mackenzie talk about different kind of evils. They mainly talk about four kinds of evils: innate evil, fundamental evil (evil as action), physical evil and supernatural evil.

Evil cannot be separated from human heart. It is an inborn quality of human being. As soon as the child takes birth, evil influences him.

Thomas Hobbes in his essay, "Leviathan" tries to define human nature. He says:

In the nature of man, we find three principle causes of quarrel or evil: first, competition, second diffidence, thirdly glory.

The first make the man invade for reputation. They first use violence to make themselves masters of other men's parsons: second, to define them: the third, for trifles. (qtd in Abrams 53).

Hobbs further adds that these three principles bring war, and such a war is of every man against every man. Every man is enemy to every man. The society becomes worst and it suffers form continual fear and danger of violent death. Life of man becomes solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short. If any two men desire the same thing, which nevertheless they can't

enjoy, they become enemies, and in the way to their end endeavor to destroy or subdue one another.

Seven deadly sins lust, pride, sloth, covetousness, gluttony, anger and envy naturally influence man. These are not necessary to be taught but man learns them automatically. This is his innate ability. These sins become more and more powerful when a man wants to get more opportunities and high reputation. Man is naturally an ambitious creature and he wants to get fame. For that, he becomes envious of his friends and he does not fear to involve in crime. He fights with his friends and kills them and he also becomes suffers of evil consequences. If we look towards the human civilization, we can find lots of examples of this kind.

Secondly, man believes in the law of *Karma* 'as you sow, so you reap.' The Hindus, the Buddhists and the Jainas mainly believe on the law of *Karma*. They perform righteous and unrighteous actions freely. The Hindu sacred book Bhagawat Gita says, "May you foster Gods by the performance of sacrifice, in turn may the Gods foster you" (3:11). Thus fostering each other, people may attain the supreme good. The God is pleased by sacrifice will bestow upon them the object of their desire. "He who enjoys the objects given by the God without offering sacrifice to them is a thief . . . are verily the consumer of sin" (3:11-13). Though they have the freedom of the will, these kinds of freedom absolutely bring evil consequences. In this sense, we are responsible for our own fortunes or misfortune. Though the doctrine of *Karma* does not altogether undermine human freedom, it minimizes the conscious freedom of man because it

makes him a victim of merits. Thus, it comes to be misinterpreted as the negation of human freedom. The law of Karma is absolutely a root of evil. This makes us evildoers and we are superior to others. We think that others should respect us because we are Brahmins. In the name of religion also, crime and brutality have become dominant in the world. Men are hateful to others because of their caste discrimination class discrimination and religion.

Thirdly, physical evil is more dangerous than other kinds of evil. It is something that is separated by human nature because it is something physical. As long as our body remains we cannot escape evil. Physical evil is different from natural evil, moral evil and intellectual evil or error. Physical evil is a natural phenomenon, which is harmful to man. They are non-moral, for example, sex, hate and passions bring this type of evil. Glary Kelly's views are very remarkable in this context. He says, "Passion is the root of all evils: it isolates the individual from society, destroys the domestic affection and bring the individual to the edge of self-alliteration" (130). Jadunath Sinha says, "Physical evil a natural phenomenon which is harmful to man" (259).

The fourth, the concept of supernatural evil or the religious dimension is concerned with the *Bible*, Having realized the Bible (Geneses 1:30), God himself has created the knowledge of good and evil. On the other hand, Adam is only the first example of evil. In *Bhagawat Gita* also Bhagawan Sri Krishna says:

There are two types of created beings in this world. One is called ' Divine' and other ' Demoniac'. The demonic do not know the way of *Prakarti*- action and the way of *nivrity*-renunciation. Neither purity nor good conduct, nor truth is found in them. Talking shelter of insatiable just and filled with pride, false prestige and arrogance holding wrong views due to delusion they work with impure resolves. The demon says, "I have obtained this today." I will attain this desire as well. This much wealth is mine and this much wealth likewise shall be mine future. I have killed this enemy and others will also be killed by me. I am the God, I am the enjoyer. I am the perfect one, I am endowed with power and I am happy. (16:6-13)

The reverse of which are angels, says *Gita*. This emphasis on evil in all religion including *Bhagawat Gita* and the *Bible*, shows that evil is pervasive not only in human but the whole universe is in residence.

Historically speaking there are many evidences of wars that can be taken as proofs to show how humanity as a whole has undergone the nightmarish experience of evil. The condition since the beginning of recorded history and the results of it are universally the same that every generation brings evil with them. History is so consistently filled with war and evil that it compels to change the minds of those who agree against the idea of inherent nature of man to do wrong.

Human beings are evil by nature. If some humans have consciously become immoral and if this is a hostile environment, then it is no wonder because evil was there even before 'Fall,' it might have tortured Gods themselves that is why He hates it too much. Jesus' voluntary sacrifice itself shows the always- already existence of evil in the world. Serpent persuades Eve to eat the apple to be as Gods, knowing good and evil. (Genesis 3:5)

The theology offers the point that man is a sinner by deliberateness, by inheritance, and by imputation. Man chooses in his own heart to follow the things he wants. The remedy that the *Bible* shows is to be born again, to be "born of God (John 3.9). It says, when we are born from above, we inherit holiness, an idea with reproducing after his own kind.

The Bible declares that God will not allow the wicked to go unpunished (Proverbs 11:12) and their punishment will be measured by their actions. If God were to destroy all who violate His laws, none of us would remain. If a just God were to judge all the inhabitants of the world, then no one would escape his judgment because all are sinners by birth. For example, every parent wants their toddlers to have moral values; but one never needs to teach a child how to be selfish or how to hurt others' feelings. This is the problem of evil that dwells everywhere.

Chapter-III

Textual Analysis

Exploration of Evil in Human Nature in *Sanctuary*

William Faulkner's *Sanctuary* explores the pervasiveness of evil that the protagonist, Horace Benbow, discovers in human nature through different characters. Horace is a good lawyer. He is the sentimental idealist, the man of academic mind, who finds out that the world is not a place of justice and moral tidiness. The truth of the matters is that though he is a strong man and demonstrates a good deal of pertinacity, shrewdness and vigor, he receives a stunning defeat. So, *Sanctuary* is an exploration into human nature with the concomitant discovery of evil because Horace Benbow discovers, with increasing horror, that evil is rooted in the very nature of human beings.

In *sanctuary* Faulkner represents horrible characters and events, creates and violates conventional expectations, manipulates point of view, orders the representations of events and of the world in a disorienting way, and presents a virtually constant stream of peacefully disturbing images. Faulkner terrorizes the reader with the purpose of exposing innate human evil and creating a reading experience analogous to the main characters' experience of the world. The discomfort, even pain of playing the role of implied readers, is made to be like the pain of living in the fictional world of Temple Drake, a depraved girl and Popeye, a criminal. This technique is necessary because these characters are so deficient either in moral qualities or in perception as to beyond sympathy and understanding for a

reader who does not fully appreciate the world that produces them and their strategies of living.

In the very first chapter of the novel, Faulkner presents an encounter of Horace with the sinister black man, Popeye, besides a spring. He is an associate of Goodwin's "bootlegging operation" (29). Even from his outer appearance, Popeye looks a horrible person. Faulkner describes him:

His suit was black with a tight, high-waisted coat. His trousers were rolled up once and caked with mud above mud-caked shoes. His face had a queer, bloodless color as though seen by electric light; against the sunny silence, in his stand straw hat and his slightly akimbo arms, he had those vicious depthless qualities of stamped tin. (4)

Popeye is a black man and he prefers black color as he wears black suits. "Black" here symbolizes black nature of Popeye. He has a criminal behavior. Scott Yarbrough rightly remarks that "black is the color of evil in *Sanctuary* and it is the color of Popeye" (46). This man has really evil intention because he cannot think of something positive. His mind is occupied with evil things, so he suspects other good people of bad nature too. When he meets Horace, who is drinking water from the spring, he asks, "You've got a pistol in that pocket, I suppose" (4). The reality is that Popeye himself keeps a pistol of which Goodwin is terrified a lot. Temple once saw Popeye "step into the road, the one in a suit of tight black and a straw hat, smoking a cigarette, the other bareheaded in overalls, carrying a shotgun, his bearded face gaped in slow astonishment" (38).

Popeye is referred to as "the black man" by Temple Drake on several occasions, including her recounting of the rape by him that she tells Horace about, and Horace, in telling the story of his stay at Goodwin's. Miss Jenny, the maid at Horace's sister calls Popeye "little black man" (113). Black in this case is not meant to connote "negro' or "African- American," but rather darkness and evil in the same way that bootlegger's house is so obviously meant to be an extension of gothic space when it is described as a "stark square bulk against the failing sky" that lifts itself "above a black, jagged mass of trees" (17) .

Since Goodwin's Popeye and their other helpers Van and Tommy run the business of alcohol illegally, which is referred to as "bootlegging operation" (29) in the novel, they cannot be regarded as good and respected people in society. Moreover, these people run their business from a desolate and hiding place. The house where they work is described as:

The house was a gutted ruin rising gaunt and stark out of a groove of unpruned cedar trees. It was land mark; know as the old French man place, built before the Civil War; a plantation house set in the middle of a tract land; of cotton fields and gardens and lawns long since one black to jungle. Which the people of the neighborhood had been pulling down piecemeal for fire wood (8)

This shows that there is something unpleasant and awe- inspiring about this place. This seems to be fit for criminals; when Popeye brings

him to the Goodwin place. In "Old Frenchman's" place, Horace comes across a man called Gowan is a depraved person. He drinks alcohol all the time, which Temple does not like. She reprimands him, "You're drunk again. You pig. You filthy pig. You can't go any where like this. You haven't even changed clothes" (36). Faulkner describes his appearance. "He wore a cheap blue work shirt beneath his dinner jacket. His eyes were bloodshot, puffed, his jowls covered by black stables" (37). Temple again says, "He's going to drink some more, she thought; he's getting drunk again. That makes three times today" (49).

At the Goodwin place, Van considers himself Big Brother. He makes crude advance to Temple when Goodwin asks Van to stop touching Temple says, "Right on my lap here. Who'll make me? Who's big enough?" (63). When Tommy reports to Goodwin about it, Goodwin does not take it seriously. Rather he scolds Tommy saying: "Who is pestering her?" it's none of your business. You keep out of it. You hear?" (65).

Goodwin is tried in the court and the jury finds him guilty of Tommy's murder after Temple gives a false testimony. Benbow is devastated and taken back his sister's house. He wanders out of the house, distraught, in the evening, and goes to town, where he sees Goodwin's dead body burning in a gasoline bonfire. He has been dragged out to jail, tortured (perhaps sodomized), and then lynched by an angry mob:

He could see the blaze, in the centre of a vacant lot where on market days wagons were tethered. Against the flames black figures showed, antic; he could hear panting shouts; through

fleeting gap he saw a man turn en mass of flames, still carrying a five- gallon coal oil can which exploded with of rocket like glare while he carried it running. From one side for the circle come the screams of the man about whom the coal oil can had explode, but from the central mass of fire these came no sound at all. (288).

After lynching Lee Goodwin in an evil manner, the mob recognizes Horace Benbow in the crowd, whom it blames for the legal defense Goodwin. People in the mob say:

"it's his lawyer'.

'Here's the man that defended him. That tried to get him Clear." "Put him in, too. There's enough left to burn a layer."

"Do to the lawyer what we did to him. What he did to her.

Only we never used a corncob. We made him wish we have used a cob." (289)

This horrible behavior of the mob shows that human beings have innate evil which Benbow discovers, and he returns to his wife defeated the next day.

Popeye makes several crude advances towards Temple at the Goodwin place before he finally rapes her. Faulkner mentions: "Popeye stopped before Temple, his face turned a little aside. This right hand lay in this coat pocket. Beneath the raincoat on Temple's breast, Tommy could see the movement of the other hand, communicating a shadow of movement to the coat" (72).

Gowan does not care about what is happening to Temple. He involves himself in drinking alcohol. Rather, Gowan slinks silently away from the house abandoning Temple there. This shows his evil nature because he leaves her to be raped by other evil people.

Tommy shows concern for Temple and hides her in a room in order to protect her from Popeye, but this act of him brings his death at the hands of Popeye. After murdering Tommy, Popeye "waggled the pistol slightly and put it back in his coat" (99). Then he advances towards Temple to rape her with a corn stick as he is an impotent Faulkner describes her suffering while she is being raped:

"Something's is happening to me!" she screamed at him, sitting in his chair in the sunlight, his hands crossed on the top of the stick." I told you it was!" she screamed, voiding the words like not silent bubbles into the bright silence about them until he turned his head and the two plagues clots above her where she lay tossing and thrashing on the rough, sunny boards. "I told you! I told you all the time!" (99)

This shows how sexually perverse human begin can be and, how human beings take pleasure from watching others suffer.

As Temple lies beside a drunken unconscious Gowan Stevens, the rest of the men -- Popeye, Van, and Lee Goodwin enter the bedroom and subject Temple to various degrees of sexual assault, from removing clothes she is wearing to groping her breasts and genitals beneath her clothing. Temple is also subjected to a continued sequence of rapes in

Miss Reba's brothel where Popeye employs one of his henchmen, Red as a surrogate penis so that he can continue to violent Temple. Faulkner writes about Temple's rape by Red in the Reba's brothel:

His hand clapped over her mouth, and gripping his wrist, the saliva drooling between his fingers, her body thrashing furiously from high to high, she saw him. Crouching beside the bed, his face wrong above his absent chin, his bluish lops protruding as though he were blowing upon hot soup, making a high whinnying sound like a horse. Beyond the wall Miss Reba filled the house, with a harsh choking uproar of obscene cursing. (155).

Popeye uses Red to torture Temple, but feels disappointed at not being able to violate Temple himself. So, he murders Red as well. Finally, Lee Goodwin is falsely arrested for the murder of Tommy. In an attempt to deliver Justice, Horace takes interest in Lee Goodwin and his wife, Ruby. He tries to get his clients to talk. But Goodwin's own fatalism and his specific fear of the gangster Popeye's gun make it very difficult for Horace to get any help from his client. Benbow, an idealist and strong believer in truth and justice, tries unsuccessfully to get Goodwin to tell the court about Popeye. Goodwin feels that Popeye is capable of killing him even in jail, and that mentioning Popeye would mean his immediate death; he also has faith that the court will find him innocent, and this he refuses.

Even Temple, who had promised to tell the jury about the truth that it is Popeye who killed Tommy, breaks her promise to Horace and

commits perjury by accusing Lee Goodwin of the rape and the murder of which he was innocent. Faulkner mentions Temple's perjury when the District attorney asks her:

"Just a minute. Did you ask him not let anyone in?"

"Yes."

"And he locked the door on the outside?"

"Yes."

"But Goodwin came in."

"Yes"

"Did he have anything in his hand?"

"He had the pistol."

"Did Tommy try to stop him?"

"Yes, he said he."

"Wait. What did he do to Tommy?"

She gazed at him.

"He had the pistol in his hand. What did he do then?"

"He shot him." (28)

We are not told directly, not are we allowed to follow the play of her thoughts and emotions, either the time at which she decided to perjure herself or during the scene in which she actually gives her false testimony, instead, there is a powerful reporting of the trial scene as a spectator might have observed it. Detail after detail is picked out in a hard light. Some of Temple's response to the district attorney are given verbatim, by others are simply implied or are merely summarized, in his psychological study of

Sanctuary which appeared in 1934 in the *Saturday Review of Literature*) he wrote that Faulkner makes no effort to explain" why (Temple) scarifies Goodwin . . . to the furies of the mob and same Popeye, the impotent male factor" (13).

One theory which has won a considerable measure of acceptance holds that "Temple's perjury is the result of pressure from her family" (Lisca 5-7). According to this theory, Clarence Snopes, the corrupt State Senator, having discovered Temple's hiding place in a Memphis brothel, looks up Temple's father, Judge Drake, and "sells him this information for one hundred dollar" (226). Judge Drake then collaborates with the Disrtrict Attorney in forcing Temple to lie on the witness stand. The father's motive is the protection of family honors. At any cost, he wants to protect the honors. His concern is that the murder should be pinned upon another man .if Judge Drake is arranging this manner of the testimony in order to protect the good name of his daughter, then he is a corrupt judge.

Another interpretation about why Temple lied to the jury can be that she must have been influenced by Popeye's nature. As he kidnapped and kept Temple in the brothel for a long time, she has his influence and she was "corrupted by Popeye" (Brooks12).

Sanctuary is clearly Faulkner's bitterest novel ever written. It is a novel in which the male's initiation into the nature or evil is experienced in the most shattering and disillusioning form. After Horace has left Temple in the Memphis brothel, he thinks:

Perhaps it is upon the instant that we realize, admit, that there is a logical pattern to evil, that we die, he thought, thinking of the expression he had once seen in the eyes of a dead child, and of other dead: the cooling indignation, the shocked despair fading, leaving two empty globes in which the motionless world lurked profoundly in miniature. (214)

In the novel, *Sanctuary*, there are several female characters who are wicked and depraved. Horace's sister, Narcissi shows a depravity that the reader, and certainly Horace himself, finds shocking. She is much upset that her brother has concerned himself with such people as the Goodwin, and midway through the novel it becomes clear to Horace that it is his sister who has stirred up the "church ladies" (175) to see that Ruby is evicted from the cheap room in which he had found lodgings for her. When Ruby is evicted from the hotel room, Horace returns to his sister's house after trying to find another place for her. But she says, "Not into my house. I thought we settled that" (176). Horace argues with his sister defending Ruby who is destitute now with her common-law husband jailed. He says, "just because she happens not be married to the man whose child she is carrying about these sanctified streets. But who told them? That's what I want to know. I know that nobody in Jefferson knew it except . . ." (177). Miss Jenny puts in, "you were the first I heard it tell it" (177). Obviously, since only she and Narcissa have heard it from Horace, it is Narcissa who has arranged the eviction.

When Narcissa asks Horace who the District Attorney is on the very next day, she urges Horace to quit the murder case. This proves that Narcissa is actually a shallow and cruel person. With regard to the murder case, he exclaims: "I don't see that it makes any difference who did it. The question is, are you going to stay mixed up with it?" (179). At this point, next to Popeye, Narcissa is the most horrible and frightening person in this novel as she pitilessly moves on to her own ends with no regard for justice and no concern for the claims of truth.

Another important aspect of Horace's discovery of evil nature of women involves the picture of his step daughter, Little Belle. Her face "dreamed with that quality of sweet chiaroscuro" (3). But suddenly the room is filled with the order of invisible honeysuckle and "the small face seemed to swoon in a voluptuous languor" (15). Then "he knew what that sensation in his stomach meant" (17). He hastily puts down the photograph and hurries to the bathroom, but his stomach begins to retch, he has a terrible vision of little Belle. In the vision the car shoots out from the tunnel "in a long upward slant . . . toward a crescendo like a held breath, an interval in which she would sing faintly and lazily in nothingness field with pale, myriad points of light. For beneath her, she could hear the faint, furious uproar of the shucks" (216). In the last sentence little Belle can be fused with horrible Temple. And Horace's contemplation of his daughter in this way can be interpreted as his sexual feeling towards her. This reflects evil even in Horace as this thinking is apparently incestuous.

Horace's faith and idealism are shattered by the knowledge that Goodwin's common-law wife, Ruby, whom he had admired for degraded. She tells endurance and loyalty, when he finds her morally degraded. She tells Horace that she had once prostituted herself to raise money for her man when he was in jail. She makes it plain to Horace that she is willing to do so again and, indeed, she assumes that Horace means to demand her body as fee for his legal services. He cries out in exasperation. "O, hell! Can you stupid mammals never believe that any man, every man -- you thought that was that I was coming for?" you thought that if I had intended to, I'd have waited this long?" (165). The term that Horace uses in addressing Ruby is revealing: "You stupid mammals." Women are peculiarly mammals, those that give suck, and to Horace, the appalled and outraged idealist, these human beings whose function is so invincibly animal are nowhere more so than in their willingness to believe in ideals.

Temple's discovery of evil is horrifying enough, but it takes a very different form from Horace's. In spite of the terror and violent affront that the girl feels the experience is not so much of disillusionment as a discovery of her own capacities and resources and deepest drives and desires. There is enough evidence to support this view of Temple. Horace, for example, notices that, as Temple tells him, the story of the rape that there is a kind of detachment and even pride in her account.

Her story is overpowering in its vividness. In the telling, Temple seems to become a pure medium through which the sense of horror is being transmitted directly and with a terrifying immediacy. For example,

describing Popeye's touch upon her skin, the girl says: "and my skin started jumping away from it like those little flying fish in front of a boat. It was like my skin knew would keep on jerking just ahead of it like there wouldn't be anything there when the hand go there" (227). Yet this shattering story, as it seems to Horace, is told "in one of those bright, chattily monologues in which women like Temple Drake, as the name suggests some sacredness and purity, but her evil nature is horrifying enough can carry on when they realize that they have the center of stage" (229). Suddenly, Horace realizes that "Temple was recounting the experience of actual pride, a sort of native and impersonal vanity, as though she were making it up, looking from him to Miss Reba with quick, darting glances like a dog driving two cattle along a lane" (229). The skillful simile at the end beautifully describes what Temple is doing or at least what it seems to Horace that she is doing. The burning experience is already mixed up with posturing and histrionics.

After being raped, Temple is taken to Memphis by Popeye. She has been brutally raped and as they drive through the spring landscape, Temple begins to scream. But when the traffic thickens she is willing to keep quiet and when Popeye stops at a filling station in a small town, Temple does not scream. "She watched him go up the street and enter a door. It was a dingy confectionery" (235). When Popeye comes back to the car, however, Temple has gone. But she has not rushed down the street in order to escape. Instead, Popeye finds her in the filling station's yard, cowering between a barrel and the wall. She whispers in terror to Popeye:

"he nearly saw me he was almost looking right at me "When Popeye asks who the person was, Temple tells him," A boy. At school, he was looking right toward . . . "(136). The desire not to be seen in these circumstances by someone she knows apparently derives out of her head any notion of escape.

In Leslie Fiedler's words, Temple is the "sexual aggressor" in *Sanctuary* (91). "By her disobedience in going with Gowan and her refusal to leave the Old Frenchman Place, Temple initiated and stimulated the events leading to her rape" (Kerr 86). The [i]logic required to position Temple in this way initiates the [i] logic Gowan Stevens will later employ when he provides a causal link from the moment she steps down from the train to ride with Gowan in this car to the moment when Nancy Mannigoe murders Temple and Gowan's child in *Requiem for a Nun*. It also helps to uncover the way in which sexual violence functions to engender characters' positions in the novel, for to attribute agency to Temple requires the horror of the rape, itself to be, "naturalized" as indicative of Faulkner's revelation of the inner nature of Temple and the feminine. Thus image of defilement, soiling, stain, and disease are not perceived as emanating on the taint that the act of rape inscribes on the body of Temple, but as Temple's own propensity for evil she "discovers" through rape (Brown 51). Because Temple later expresses her sexual desire for Red, preferring the transgress and liberating of sexual choice to the imposed narrative of continued violation, critics can read- and have read-

her sexual interest backwards to help prove her culpability in her own rape:

A casual reader might see her as a run-off-the-mill "flapper" of that time, driven swiftly to nymphomania by the traumatic incident of unnatural rape . . . instead she is, as Flaubert saw Emma Bovary, "naturally corrupt," and like Emma comes to take the initiative with her lover and issues her sexual commands. Gowan Stevens, the French man place, Memphis simply help her to realize her potentialities, which are already indicated by her name on the lavatory wall.

(Guerard 69)

In Guerard's interpretation, rape is linked to sexual perversion on the part of the victim, and active sexually offers proof the Temple is "naturally corrupt." Temple's "natural" perversion absolves the rapist of his crime, because he was simply the vehicle used by Faulkner to reveal her "potentialities." Fiedler and Bassett extend and revise the logic even further, ultimately charging Temple with the responsibility for the deaths of Tommy, Lee, and Popeye (87, 97). From all these aforementioned interpretations, it can be gathered that Temple Drake has sexual perversion which can be taken as evil quality.

After all, man is an animal. He possesses all the animal qualities. As he has a rational capacity, he manages to suppress these wild and savage behaviors. And he lives with others in a harmonious and friendly manner in society. As long as his needs are satiated, the darker qualities remain

hidden below the surface. But when he finds in conflict with others, and his needs are not fulfilled there is always possibility that he turns into a savage beast for his physical requirements. So, when things do not bode well for him, he is bound to exhibit the darker aspect inherent in him.

In this way, the protagonist, Horace Benbow discovers evil nature in human beings through several wicked and perverse characters in the novel. The characters are very much influenced by evil. Their good qualities are shadowed by their instinct, which leads them towards wicked and savage activities. Thus, their lust for unnatural and extreme form of passion, wild desires and misanthropic activities reflects the innate evil nature existing in human beings.

Chapter IV

Conclusion

In *Sanctuary* William Faulkner exposes deeply rooted evil nature in human beings through the depraved and wicked characters. The central evil activities and events include the corn-cob sodomy of a teenage girl, Temple Drake, teenage nymphomania murder mob sodomy, immolation. These and other horrors are presented in ways calculated to maximize shock and thus to expose evil: the delayed revelation of the corn-cob and of Popeye, Temple-Red relationship, the revelation of how Lee Goodwin died, and Tommy's death. These events take place in an atmosphere of despair; few characters are interested in preventing the horrors, no one effectively opposes them. Conventions of humor are violated, promising relief only to lead the reader back to the "blackness" that dominates color in novel. The reader is promised a romance that will embody an idealized action, such as the rescue of fair maiden. The novel violates this expectation and reveals an incomprehensible world where villainy may be accidental and heroism in any conventional sense impossible.

Sanctuary is a very powerful examination of the evil that men and women possess. Faulkner uses constant heavy barrage of repulsive, shocking, and violent images of entrapment, meaningless motion, silent screams, and sudden death. It is presented most fully in describing the crime of a minor character that is in jail with Lee Goodwin, the man falsely accused of raping Temple Drake. There are images of decapitation,

stabbing, and threats with knives on at least a dozen different pages in this novel of about three hundred pages.

The novel involves subjection to disorientation, shock and constant repetition of the ugly sexual perversion, repulsive, violent murders. However, undergoing this experience helps to sensitize the reader to the terrifying quality of every day existence of the main characters. Thus the terror becomes a primary means by which Faulkner exposes the darker side of human beings.

Popeye is one of the most evil characters in the novel. As a lover of black clothes, Popeye really possesses black nature inside. Although he is impotent, he tries to compensate his impotency by rape with corn stick. He tortures Temple. When Tommy tries to stop this, he shoots him dead. He also shoots Red.

Strangely enough, Lee Goodwin is arrested and charged with rape and murder. Because of Temple's perjury against him, the mob inhumanly lynches him after carrying out sodomy. Horace Ben bow discovers this evil nature which lies hidden in human beings. He is even more shocked when the mob tries to lynch him as well for trying to defend Lee Goodwin legally.

In the novel, the man's discovery of evil is closely connected with his discovery of the wicked nature of woman. Men idealize and romanticize women, but the bitter reality is that women possess evil nature. Temple Drake, as the name suggests something sacred and pure, is wicked and depraved. She gives the false testimony in the court, which

leads to the death of Lee Goodwin by mob. As she is raped and abducted by the criminal, Popeye's, his influence is apparently seen on her. As Popeye is impotent, he stirs her sexual desire though he rapes and tortures her with corncob. So, a strong sexual desire grows in her. At the Goodwin place also she hangs around there despite Mrs. Goodwin's warning. She allows herself to be raped. She also expresses sexual desire for Red. Even while she is being raped, she does not oppose; she just expresses her pain. She does not consider rape as an immoral act. This shows that she is a sexually perverse girl.

This perversion can also be seen in Lee Goodwin's wife, Ruby. After Lee Goodwin is arrested, Horace tries to give her shelter as all reject her. But her attempt to tempt Horace sexually irritates him. She even reveals to him that she has already used her body in order to support her common-law husband. Horace finds this shocking and immoral. He also finds the sexual perversion in his step-daughter, Little Belle, whose face 'dreamed with that quality of sweet chiaroscuro.' Her image triggers Horace's sexual urge which he finds terrible.

Another horrible character is Horace's sister, Narcissa, who does not have any sympathy towards women. What she cares is only family and social honor. She does not let Ruby stay in her house when all reject her. Narcissa even conspires to evict Ruby from the hotel where Horace had put her. All these characters share a secret rapport with evil which Horace discovers with shock. The novel presents a real hidden picture of the human nature. Human beings may try to escape from the evil to

demonstrate them as moral, civilized and benevolent in society, but in reality they cannot do so because of the innate evil that exists within them.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M. H. *Norton Anthology of Literary Terms*. 5th ed. New York: W. Norton and Company, 1916.
- Brooks, Cleanth. "Faulkner's *Sanctuary*: A Critical Study." *The Sewanee Review* 71.14 (1963): 1-24.
- Brown, Calvin S. "From Confrontation to Peaceful Void." *Modern Critical Interpretations: Sanctuary*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publisher, 1988. (27-52)
- Faulkner, William. *Sanctuary*. New York: Vintage, 1931.
- Ferguson, Margaret and et. al., eds. *The Norton Anthology of Poetry*. "Paradise Lost." 6th ed. New York: Norton, 1996. 69-94.
- Fiedler, Leslie. *Love and Death in American Novel*. New York: Criterion, 1959.
- Forman, Erich. *Escape from Freedom*. New York: Rinehart, 1941.
- Frohock, W. M. *The Novels of Violence in America*. Expanded ed. Dallas: Southern Methodist UP, 1967.
- Guerard, Albert J. "*Sanctuary* and Faulkner's Misogyny ." *Modern Critical Interpretations: Sanctuary*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publisher, 1988. 63-80.
- Hobbes, Thomas. "The Leviathan." *Norton Reviews*. Ed. M. H. Abrams. New York, 2000. 137-149.
- Kerr, Elizabeth. "*Sanctuary*: The Persecuted Maiden, or Vice Triumphant." *Modern Critical Interpretations: Sanctuary*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publisher, 1988. 81-100.

- Kubie, Lawrence S. "William Faulkner's *Sanctuary*." *Twentieth Century Views on Faulkner: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Robert Penn Warren. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966. 137- 146.
- Mackenzie, J.S. *A Manual of Ethics*. 6th ed. London: University of Tutorial Press Ltd., 1929.
- Millgate, Michael. *William Faulkner*. Rev. ed. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1966.
- New World Translation of the Holy Bible*. Revised ed. New York: Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, 1984.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Beyond Good and Evil*. Trans. R. J. Hollingdale. London: Penguin, 1973.
- O'Connor, William Van. *William Faulkner*. New York: University of Minnesota press, 1959.
- Reed, Joseph J.R. *Faulkner's Narrative*, London: Yale University Press, 1973.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *The Symbolism of Evil*. Trans. Emerson Buchanan. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.
- Rollyson, Carl. *Encyclopedia of American Literature: The Modern and Postmodern Period from – 1915*. Vols. 3. New York: Facts on File, 2002.
- Ruland, Richard, and Malcolm Bradbury. *From Puritanism to Postmodernism*. New York: Penguin, 1992.
- Sinha, Jaduanth. *Introduction to Philosophy*. 4th ed. Calcutta; Sinha Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1964.

The Encyclopedia Americana. 30 Vols. Danbury: Grolier Incorporated,
1829.

The Encyclopedia Britannica. 15th ed. 29 Vols. Chicago: The University of
Chicago, 1768.

Vickery, Olaga. "Crime and Punishment: Sanctuary." *Twentieth Century
Views on Faulkner: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Robert
Penn warren New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966. 127-136.

Walker, Kenneth. *A Modern Analysis of Human Mind*. Chicago: Aldine,
1966.