

12-30-2011

Modern Man: Popeye as an Indicator of Movement Toward an Industrialized South in William Faulkner's Sanctuary

Kristen N. Arnett
Rollins College, karnett@rollins.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.rollins.edu/rurj>

Recommended Citation

Arnett, Kristen N. (2011) "Modern Man: Popeye as an Indicator of Movement Toward an Industrialized South in William Faulkner's Sanctuary," *Rollins Undergraduate Research Journal*: Vol. 5: Iss. 2, Article 1.
Available at: <http://scholarship.rollins.edu/rurj/vol5/iss2/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Rollins Undergraduate Research Journal by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

In popular culture, the name “Popeye” still has resonance. It brings to mind ideas of nostalgia, while still managing to remain contemporary. It is childhood and adulthood all wrapped into one successfully commercialized cartoon. Characterized by his addiction to spinach-in-a-can, Popeye (created by E.C. Segar) is seen by most to be a hero of modern times, heralding a shift in society towards production and consumption. This emphatic focus on modernity and industry can be witnessed in another character with the same distinctive moniker – though this particular individual lacks any of the original’s charm or sincerity. Developed in the midst of the cartoon’s heyday, William Faulkner’s *Sanctuary: The Corrected Text* (1931) features a Popeye that is emotionless, robotic, and completely lacking in empathy. Though he can’t be seen as a role model, this Popeye serves an important purpose for Faulkner’s novel: he represents the introduction of modernity to a South that is not fully ready to process this particular kind of cultural shift.

Through careful analysis, I will show that Faulkner utilizes Popeye as an agent for modernity and change within *Sanctuary*, specifically set against the backdrop of the South. Modernity here will be defined as the effect of change and industrialization/capitalism against a more traditional, post-war South. This is signified by the advent of “otherness” representing the introduction of minority subsets and the reconstruction of cultural identity within a larger social sphere. The “other” (as applied directly to Faulkner’s expressions of black versus white) will be documented here as what I call the Gray Man. As depicted by Popeye, the Gray Man is more machine than man; indicative of Northern industry and the South’s unwillingness to adapt to this intrusive modernization. This purposeful insertion of modernity happens in many of Faulkner’s novels (including *The Sound and the Fury* and *Go Down, Moses*), but the focus here will remain on *Sanctuary* and Popeye’s specific characterization. He is not only the indicator of change – he is the eye of the storm: encompassing the whole of the “other” and embodying industrialization within the text. It is through this representation of “otherness” that the second part of my paper will be introduced. If Popeye is the indicator of modernity, then Faulkner is making a statement regarding the impact of industry on the South, the problems inherent within this attempt, and he marks this kind of progress as tacitly unreachable for traditional society.

To really see modernity, it must be viewed against its counterpoint. Faulkner accomplishes this in *Sanctuary* by pairing up the robotic Popeye against the more traditional Southern gentleman, Horace Benbow. By having these opposites meet at the very beginning of the novel, Faulkner is placing extreme importance on the comparison between the two. He writes, “In the spring the drinking man leaned his face to the broken and myriad reflection of his own drinking. When he rose up [Benbow] saw among them the shattered reflection of Popeye’s straw hat, though he had heard no sound” (Faulkner 4). The reader is

immediately confronted by the differences between the two men. Staring at each from opposite sides of a stream, they each appear to embody traits that are particular to their specific sociocultural type. Benbow wears a tweed coat and carries a book; Popeye is the black man with a pistol. It is Benbow's perspective that is granted to the reader. His own reflection is "broken" in the water, symbolizing problems within himself and with the mentality of the traditional Southern gentleman. He sees that the reflection of Popeye's straw hat is "shattered," setting up an association with change that heralds trouble. These mirrors mark an important theme of intrusive progress throughout Faulkner's text.

The particular type of modernity underscored here is rooted in voyeurism, which is an activity that marks both Popeye and Horace's lives. American novelist David Madden has written literary criticism on this particular scene at the spring, and one of his essays deals with the idea of photographic imagery within the text of *Sanctuary*. About the spring scene he writes, "Popeye and Horace seem to be polar opposites in many ways ... what Faulkner develops throughout the novel is our awareness of similarities between Horace and the impotent, voyeuristic, possibly homosexual Popeye" (Madden 102). While the idea that Popeye is homosexual could be argued against, it is this vivid image of reflection that strikes the reader. It is symbolic of a self-indulgent future. For instance, Benbow freely admits to the men at Goodwin's place that "progress invented the mirror" (Faulkner 15), but this admission is given in relation to femininity, and it is presented through the listening ears of Ruby Lamar. The image is successfully refracted. The impression given is that though Horace might embody tradition, he is also affected by the advent of modernity – and he recognizes things within Popeye that are also a part of his own psychological makeup. It is not just Popeye watching Benbow at the spring. They are both voyeurs here.

Scenes of voyeuristic intent litter the text of *Sanctuary*. Sometimes these instances are readily apparent – Popeye's sexual proclivities in the bedroom (Faulkner 257) – while others are more subject to inference from the reader. The idea of watching another person instead of taking any direct action can be construed as voyeurism. This can be seen as an important indicator of tradition versus modernity in the portions of the novel where Benbow focuses on images of still- life. This is made especially apparent when he spends time alone looking at the photograph of Little Belle. The image itself is set up as an unchanging marker. Benbow sees the picture as a way to keep his stepdaughter as young and virginal, untainted by the passage of time. Her "sweet, inscrutable face" (Faulkner 166) is meant to symbolize a cathartic stasis of reality. It is a way to maintain the traditional social strata and cultural normativity. Madden characterizes this as Faulkner's way of marking "Horace's deeply psychic need for a way to stop time, to defy mutability" (Madden 108). However, Benbow cannot help but notice that despite his resistance to change, movement forward is inevitable. This is

symbolized through the alterations he sees in the supposedly-static photograph. As he shifts the image, he notes “a face suddenly older in sin than he would ever be,” and this is witnessed through what Benbow describes as “something familiar seen beneath disturbed though clear water” (Faulkner 167). This imagery ties back to the comparisons made between Popeye and Benbow at the spring. They are refracted mirror images of one another; tradition versus inherent progress. As Faulkner’s emblemized traditional Southern gentleman, this demarcation of refracted futures leads the reader to assume that Benbow understands that modernity is infiltrating every facet of his daily life – and there is absolutely nothing he can do to stop it.

If Horace Benbow is Popeye’s masculine mirror in regard to tradition versus modernity, then Temple Drake is his feminine counterpart. Like Benbow, she is meant to represent the more traditional ideas regarding Southern gentility, but because she is also a symbol of youth culture, her modernist personality traits are more easily brought to light when her characterizations are compared with Popeye. Like most of Faulkner’s female characters, Temple is placed on a pedestal of Southern femininity, but ultimately falls short of society’s expectations regarding her gender. Elizabeth Kerr’s book, *William Faulkner’s Gothic Domain*, discusses the darker tones of Faulkner’s work, and in the chapter entitled “The Persecuted Maiden,” she goes into greater detail regarding the similarities between Temple, Benbow and Popeye. Kerr states, “Artificial to the point of being unnatural, with a masklike face, Temple illustrates Horace Benbow’s analogy between the mirror, symbolizing Progress, and the grape-arbor, symbolizing nature” (93). Again, we have the idea of reflections as analogous with production and modernity. While Benbow waffles back and forth with regard to his “unnaturalness” in his Southern sensibilities (his voyeuristic tendencies with his stepdaughter, Young Belle; his inability to maintain a traditional home with his wife), Temple displays characteristics of modernity before she even meets Popeye. She is constantly using her mirror – symbolic of progress within the text – and she is discussed several times in scenarios that would place her in more industrialized situations. She rides in cars and on trains, and she is more interested in her appearance than in actually observing the “proprieties” that an idealized Southern lady would be concerned about.

When Temple is paired directly against Popeye, we can see similarities in the way that Faulkner describes their particular characteristics. She is pointedly artificial. She affects her speech patterns with regard to whomever she’s around – cooing nonsense at Ruby’s baby (Faulkner 56), whispering a seductive “Daddy” in Popeye’s ear (Faulkner 236) – and she prodigiously applies makeup to alter her “natural” appearance. In her 1972 essay, “The Self-Destructive Nature of Evil in Sanctuary,” American academic Joanne V. Creighton writes extensively about the specific role that evil plays within Faulkner’s novel. In regard to Temple and

Popeye's relationship, she states, "it is fitting that this monster of lovelessness should deflower the papier mâché lady in a synthetic seduction. With her irresponsible, egotistical, shallow coquetry, Temple is as deficient of the capacity for love as the grotesque Popeye" (Creighton 262). The "synthetic" attributes discussed here are entirely reminiscent of machinery and industrialization. Popeye abhors all that is organic. He routinely expresses his distaste for the natural environment. He is scared of animals, and he dislikes "all them trees" (Faulkner 7) in the forest near the spring. His attachment to doll-like Temple, with her faux-personality, becomes instantly understandable from this point of view. Temple's waxen features and masked face encompass much of the information we are given about Popeye. The more time she spends with him, the more "modern" she becomes- smoking, having sex and spending time with his thuggish counterparts in the corrupt city. Popeye's initial rape of Temple with a corncob becomes symbolic of the dysfunction shared between the natural environment and the industrialized alternative. This could signify the actual "rape of the land" by modern industry and the upcoming societal "other," represented by the mechanical Popeye. Creighton comments on this as well, stating, "Popeye's rape of Temple, then, effects a literal and figurative union with evil and Temple shares in Popeye's self-destructive irreverence for life" (264). Temple's artificial nature is "mirrored" in Popeye, perpetuating the distance between the natural environment, and the sterile, modernized world of industry.

The "irreverence for life" of which Creighton speaks pointedly marks the fact that youth culture shares in a collusion of corruption with modern industry. These young people are earmarked by many of the same characteristics within Sanctuary: they are facsimiles of one another in terms of physicality, and they eschew traditional Southern roles in favor of more modernized sensibilities. We can see this represented clearly in the text when Benbow rides the train (another symbol of industry) to go look for Temple. The young people he encounters are entirely reminiscent of this "new" culture. Because he is the embodiment of tradition, they make him pointedly uneasy. The young women are dressed as "artificial flowers" with "painted faces," and the young men all share similarly "cold" features (Faulkner 168-169). They are not just mirrors of Temple; they are mirrors of Popeye and modernity itself. Edwin T. Arnold, editor of *Reading Faulkner: Sanctuary*, provides a critical glossary and commentary guide for readers of this particular work. He goes into detail regarding Benbow's reaction to the college generation he encounters on the train and on campus, stating, "the emphasis is on loss – of youth, of love, of innocence. What Horace see is 'slow ruin' all around him" (Arnold 152). The association made between modernity and corruption here is striking. After all, this scene is also where Benbow encounters Temple Drake's name scrawled crudely on the wall of the men's bathroom. It is the traditional way of life breaking down, morphing into something refracted and

damaged. This mirror of modernity goes beyond how Faulkner sees Benbow and cultural custom; it sets up industry as his warped vision of the future.

Modernity is mirrored through Faulkner's characterizations, but it is also witnessed through place and setting within Sanctuary. The spaces discussed within the text maintain a curious lack of "natural" production. The homes are not inhabited by cultivators, yet they somehow still manage to provide a source of capitalistic industry, completely out of place within traditional society. An excellent example of this would be the Old Frenchman place owned by Lee Goodwin. It is run-down and overgrown, and the plantation is described as being in ruins (reminiscent of the more traditional modes of Southern industry – farming and cropping dying out and becoming moot). Populated by bootleggers and Popeye, the house maintains an air of decay with regard to "natural" aspects. However, industry still manages to thrive, despite a lack of traditional Southern labor. The distribution of illegal liquor maintains its foothold in local society (albeit on the outskirts) for quite awhile, keeping "production" completely within the spectrum of the artificial and unnatural.

The maintainers of the space might not be cultivating the barren fields, but there is still a good amount of non-traditional work going on at the Goodwin place. Kerr remarks on this manner of production, stating, "On the sunny afternoon when Temple and Gowan first saw [the Old Frenchman Place], 'nowhere was any sign of husbandry – plow or tool; in no direction was a planted field in sight.' In a realistic presentation of a locale, the description may tend toward the irrational or unreal, or, perhaps, even the surreal" (91). Here, Kerr's "surreal" embodies the idea that though the house is a plantation, meant to star as a stronghold of traditional industry and farming, it is slowly becoming the "other" that is housed within it – taking on the aspects of the modern characters that reside there. Once Popeye leaves this "unnatural" space, the "industry" that is taking place ceases entirely. Modernity is allowing the household to operate. Once modernity leaves, it ceases to function as a proper household. It collapses in on itself, returning to its traditional Southern roots, which had already been withering.

The process of industry in Sanctuary remains strongly fixed around the character of Popeye. Routinely throughout the text he comes across as sterile and robotic, and his role within the novel remains centered on these machinated ideals. The descriptions that Faulkner provides solidify this particular fact. Popeye is gray, composed seemingly of tin, and is without emotion. The first complete description of his character comes at the very beginning of the novel, from Benbow's perspective. Because we are given so much information about him so early on in the text, these characteristics can be taken as an indicator of the importance Faulkner places on Popeye's identifying traits:

He saw, facing across the spring, a man of under size, his hands in his coat pockets, a cigarette slanted from his chin. His suit was black, with a tight, high-waisted coat. His trousers were rolled 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 slanted straw hat and his slightly akimbo arms, he had that vicious depthless quality of stamped tin. (Faulkner 4)

Popeye is immediately identified here as something completely unnatural. He is set against the environment in such a way as to promote his “otherness,” as his face is pale and “bloodless,” and can only be described a color as viewed in “electric light.” Though covered in mud, he could not possibly be more at odds with what is around him – he embodies the aberrant. The “slanted straw hat” defines how ill at ease his character is with nature, marked as crooked and displaced. The “stamped tin” man is not only “vicious” here; he is without any kind of defined depth within the natural environment that he is depicted. His arms are “akimbo,” awkwardly aligned with his “black” body. The description can be summed up in a singular word with regard to Popeye as the societal outsider – he is “queer.” He is not like the traditional Southern man, like Benbow and his tweed coats and affinity with nature. Popeye is the “other,” and he appears frighteningly robotic to those he comes in contact with.

Contextually, the reading audience can only view Popeye as Faulkner wishes him to be seen. We are given this mechanized point-of-view from Benbow, who is the traditional mirror of the modern man played by Popeye. Literary critic Portia Weiskel comments on this phenomenon in her essay, “On the Writings of William Faulkner.” The work itself discusses how to look more closely within Faulkner’s text for meaning regarding plot and characterization, but here she talks specifically about the importance of viewpoint, stating, “Identity is reflexive in Faulkner’s work: his characters become as others see them. His most inhuman characters ... have eyes with the quality of ‘stamped tin’ or ‘stagnant water,’ incapable of seeing or reflecting life” (Weiskel 56). If we are given a description of Popeye as modern industry, it is because Faulkner wished for the audience to see him as a representative of something specifically inhuman. Benbow (the marker of tradition) becomes representative here of the South itself and how it views Northern industry. It is something scary and unnatural, heralding a drastic change to a traditional (if faulty) way of life. The idea of modernity as viewed through Faulkner’s characterization of Popeye ultimately signifies something unsettling and unwanted for the social norm.

The negativity aimed at modernity is not focused on Popeye’s character alone. If we dig further into the text, Popeye’s interactions become symbolic of a larger problem within a sociological sphere. If the introduction of change and industry is equated with something bad and unwanted, then it is seen this way because the South associates it with the North. Popeye symbolizes things that are

already happening within the South, but the way in which he displays them comes across as unnatural to traditional society. Rape, incest, and brutalization are all prevalent in this sociological construct – but they are kept secreted away behind closed doors. Popeye does not care enough about society's constrictions to hide his activities. John T. Matthews' essay, "The Elliptical Nature of Sanctuary," discusses the role that specific characterizations play in perpetuating historical significance. A prominent author on Faulkner, Matthews talks a great deal about the significance that Popeye plays as the societal "other" within the novel: "Popeye's blackness is the mark of his brutal disregard of prohibition; his behavior threatens the foundation of cultural order" (262). The upheaval marked by Popeye's character becomes emblematic of society's concern with the "other" as a troublemaker. His actions throughout the work do not correlate with what society has deemed appropriate, and therefore he is marked as the Gray Man, symbolizing traditional Southern culture's fear of change and industry. It doesn't seem to matter that Popeye himself doesn't imbibe liquor. The fact that he helps to manufacture and distribute it – instead of drinking it like a Southern Gentleman might (Faulkner 27) – automatically sets Popeye up as a social outcast. By aligning Popeye with other outsiders, Faulkner reinforces the idea of industry as an unwanted outlier.

Popeye's character is not just symbolic of the industry that creates such unease within Southern society; he is also representative of a Northern, modern lifestyle that the traditional South would find supremely disquieting. Though much smaller than the men around him, Popeye carries himself with a swagger that belies his actual size. Men – Southern men, particularly – are afraid of him. He is equated with the gun that he carries: cold, metallic, and deadly. This kind of description finds root in many of the gangster tales told regarding the North, especially when paired against the bootlegging that Popeye actively participates in with Lee Goodwin. Matthews talks more about this particular "urban" description of Popeye, stating, "another more familiar strand of imagery links Popeye to the underside of urbanization and modernism invading the South. Playing up his connections to gangsterdom ... Popeye straddles nature and culture" (263). This kind of "urbanization" manifests itself in modern methods of production, much like the aforementioned bootlegging. Because this method of production is not "natural," and because of its immoral roots in illegality and corruption, the societal associations put onto Popeye become effectively negative. This ultimately reflects back onto Southern ideas regarding Northern culture, manifesting "change" and "industry" into terms synonymous with vice and immorality.

The reader can clearly see this kind of change manifested through the introduction of re-gendering in the text. The introduction of gender-reversal is nothing new for Faulkner. What's important about its appearance in *Sanctuary*, however, is that the implication of gender-reversal in the work becomes

entrenched within ideas of modernity and industry. It is through the introduction of Popeye (as industry-manifest) that we see gender-reversal in Temple's character. She goes from flirtatious coquette to the Gray Woman (industry-manifests' counterpart) within the span of a few hundred pages. She becomes as robotic as Popeye, completely affected by the modernity that surrounds her. While this change can be blamed on her rape, it is important to note that the violation was enacted by the physical embodiment of modernity. It was Popeye's introduction to the text that forced immediate change on her. He is the catalyst. The process of gender-reversal becomes evident through the discussion of Temple's original molestation by Popeye. As she relays the events of his sexual assault to Benbow, she begins by talking about the original act in the bedroom at Goodwin's place. She imagines how she might have stopped this violation, and fantasizes about how she could actually do such a thing. The result of this is that she envisions herself as a man – breaking against her femininity and effectively emasculating Popeye. She states, “Then I thought about being a man, and as soon as soon as I thought it, it happened. It made a kind of plopping sound, like blowing a little rubber tube wrong side outward. It felt cold, like the inside of your mouth when you hold it open” (Faulkner 220). This is the ultimate in gender-bending. Temple doesn't just wish for the masculine characteristics that accompany manhood, like the ability to fight off her attacker with brute strength. She actually envisions the phallus itself taking shape on her body. This kind of “modern femininity” allows Temple to take back the power that Popeye is extracting from her, albeit only in her imagination.

Though seen through a contemporary lens as empowering, contextually it speaks of something else entirely. Matthews comments on this violation and its cultural impact, stating that, “Temple's hallucination of reversed gender further implicates her in her assault; to defend herself, she must imagine wielding her violator's weapon” (260). If Popeye is the aforementioned physical embodiment of modernity, then this statement would lead the reader to assume that industry's “violation” only leads to a cycle of greater subjugation. It is through rape that Popeye enacts change on Temple, so therefore reversed gender indicates that there is something substantially wrong with this concept. By essentially “becoming a man,” Temple serves to perpetrate the same kind of violation on the world around her. Within the same conversation with Benbow, she even discusses stabbing Popeye with “that French thing” with the “long sharp spikes,” to the point of drawing blood (Faulkner 218) – violently symbolic of the taking of virginity in a reverse-gender situation. Because of its innate brutality, this kind of modernity would imply greater problems within the social sphere, and would lead to change of an unwanted kind within traditional Southern culture.

The perpetration of Popeye's rape on Temple underscores gender-reversal, but it also leads to the idea of sexual aggression in women, and the previously

mentioned influx of voyeurism with regard to men. After Temple's rape, Popeye deposits her at Miss Reba's brothel. This series of events plays up the idea that Temple's rape by modernity ultimately sets her up situationally as a sexual aggressor. She goes from living with what Southern society deems "virginal" women in the college dorms to bunking in a house of harlotry. Matthews discusses the implications of this aggression, stating, "[Temple] collides violently with formerly unknown regions of adult sexual behavior ... Popeye's rape instigates in her an insatiable appetite" (258). The very act of prostitution – though often coined the oldest profession – implies a type of modernity in the context of women. It is a way to live without a man; it is production without an actual product. This idea falls in line with earlier concepts concerning industry without fertility (the bootlegging at Goodwin's "farm"), and amplifies the idea that this kind of production is in league with vice and immorality. This is a simplification of the industrial model, but it fits the situation.

Temple then begins to fulfill her role of "modern woman" in conjunction with Popeye's "modern man." The kind of sexual aggressiveness discussed can be viewed when the pair ends up at the club together. Temple behaves in a way reminiscent of the prostitutes she lives with. She calls Popeye "Daddy," affecting a sexually explicit tone. She then proceeds to reenact her original violation: "her hand stole toward his arm pit, touching the butt of the flat pistol. It lay rigid in the light, dead vise of his arm and side. "Give it to me," she whispered. Suddenly her hand began to steal down his body in swift, covert movement" (Faulkner 236). In order to achieve her goals, she becomes sexually aggressive with Popeye. As a "modern woman," she knows that behaving this way will get her what she wants, because she has seen it work at the brothel. She wants the gun – which could be viewed as phallic – and to get it, she will utilize her sexuality. Arnold's glossary and commentary discusses this content extensively. On the theme of Temple's sexual overtures, he states: "the provocative request (give it to me) invites a reading in which Temple is asking Popeye to use the pistol to arouse her" (Arnold 188). If taken at face value, this could mean that Temple wants the phallic representation of Popeye's modernity to give her sexual gratification. This kind of sexual perversion would lead readers to assume that this kind of change toward industry is meant to be unfavorable, as it doesn't actually entail natural procreation. The idea of violating someone with a gun implies exactly the opposite: it can only lead to death.

The theme of voyeurism ties in to the idea of a sexually aggressive woman because it alludes to the fact that this aggressiveness causes emasculation in men. Popeye is unable to perform sexually, so this leads to the idea that modernity is not feasible, because it ultimately does not bear offspring. Benbow – as symbolic of tradition – should therefore be the marker of production in fertility, but his sexuality has become refracted and warped by modernity. Little Belle (and

Temple, through association) have marked him as sexually ineffective and a “shrimp” (Faulkner 14). By trying to maintain stasis via his photograph of her, Benbow is ultimately emasculated by voyeurism as well, aligning himself very firmly in the camp of non-production. Popeye’s sexual conquests consist of outside implements (the corncob), or from watching someone else copulate with Temple (Red). Without an ability to procreate on his own, there can be no perpetuation of the modernity that Popeye embodies. Creighton discusses this in her argument on societal evils, stating, “[Popeye’s] impotence – an inability to “make love” and to create life – and his irreverence, finally, for even his own life are further evidence of the inherent self- destruction of evil of which Popeye is the macabre emblem” (260). Because Popeye is only able to watch others procreate, he cannot be symbolic of a “future” South. He can’t create life because he is the antithesis of it. His mechanical, industrial nature would disallow him the equipment necessary to put forth lasting permanence on his social environment. Temple therefore becomes the sexual aggressor, goading him into action, but he is still unable to perform sexually unless it is through the use of an outside implement. Contextually, Benbow is just as ineffective – his attempt to maintain stasis through static images only serves to uphold this lack of procreation. It is all talk; no action.

This stunted future of modernity is also visible in the representation of Ruby's baby. The descriptions offered of the infant are nearly identical to those that are originally given for Popeye. Both had mothers that were placed within the “other” category in society – there is an implication that both were forced to resort to prostitution in order to make ends meet. Both are essentially without Fathers, which places bearing on the lack of masculinity/virility that will accompany them both in life. Arnold comments on the physical descriptions that Faulkner provides for Ruby’s baby in his glossary and commentary, stating that, “its putty-colored face and bluish eyelids imply a physical connection between the helpless sick baby, Temple (who has been called ‘putty-face’), and the description includes Popeye” (72). This kind of comparison – the baby, Temple, Popeye – leads the reader to make inferences regarding the future of all three characters. If Popeye (and Temple, through association) were meant to be the physical embodiment of modernity, then this would make Ruby’s baby the only possible signifier of any kind of “future” lineage. The infant is unhealthy and lacks support from the traditional social community. Even Benbow – symbolic of tradition – finds himself unable to provide for its needs (Faulkner 290). The indicators of the baby’s future, or of modernity’s future, are invariably bleak. This bleakness can be viewed as a conduit of immorality and vice. It is presented explicitly in the character of Popeye, whose robotic and mechanical nature substantiates a complete lack of empathy for anyone around him, including himself. He does things without considering the consequences, and ultimately

doesn't care when he's killed for a crime that he didn't even commit. George Monteiro, editor and author, wrote a piece for *Modern Language Notes* in 1958 that specifically details this mechanical lack of emotions. Called "Initiation and the Moral Sense in Faulkner's Sanctuary," he goes on to state in the article that, "[Popeye] has little will, and he has no desire to choose and evaluate. He has will only for the small act of the moment. Popeye even makes the crime of murder a small, mechanical act of no personal significance. He dies as he has lived – for no good reason" (Monteiro 503). This complete disconnect allows for a dissociation from the physical act of violence. Popeye's character is the embodiment of modernity, but the changes that he is implementing on society have no guidance behind them. Change without structure cannot lead to permanence, and Faulkner accentuates this by making Popeye completely incapable of experiencing any kind of human emotion. His character cannot experience love (or intercourse, for that matter), but at the same time, he cannot experience real hate or anger. His actions demonstrate a complete lack of conscience. This is modernity without boundaries. It is industry perverted into a social evil.

When asked if he created Popeye to be symbolic of a capitalistic, consumer society, Faulkner replied that the character was simply supposed to be "another lost human being ... a symbol of evil in modern society only by coincidence" (Gwynn 74). If Popeye was merely supposed to be a "lost human being," then his portrayal throughout the novel would include some kind of tangible, human emotion to put forth as evidence. This is never given to the reader. Popeye displays sociopathic tendencies, which denotes a complete lack of empathy for anyone or anything. The incredibly symbolic act of destroying lovebirds by "cutting them up alive" (Faulkner 309) is included in the text, as well as other oddities – he doesn't grow hair until he's five, and a doctor tells his mother that, "he will never be a man" (Faulkner 308). These indicators give credence to the idea that Popeye is really more machine than man. Faulkner also specifically includes the information about Popeye repeatedly attempting to burn down his own home. These acts of arson serve as a specific disconnect from his roots; a total disambiguation of a self that would articulate anything other than an industrialized modernity.

The negative portrayal of Popeye is not the only indicator that Faulkner gives as evidence that the South remains unready for a modernized, industrial society. The vice evident throughout the novel speaks of decay from within the social structure. Creighton discusses the problematic nature of this in her essay on self-destructive evil, stating that, "Society itself is the destroyer and the implication is that society is the loser, since the meaningfulness of social institutions is undermined by the manipulative use of them by self-serving individuals" (260). The idea here is that modernity cannot flourish for two reasons: because the industry that is being inserted into society is without potency

or permanence, and because the society into which it would be injected is faulty and unable to be changed in a manner that would be healthy. If society is already destabilized by corruption from within, then attempting to “fix” the problem with a solution like industrialized modernity (which already carries a cache of its own symptomatic immoral issues) would only serve to create greater social ills. An excellent example of this from the text is when the so-called “Christians” turn out social “other” Ruby Lamar and her sickly infant from the hotel (Faulkner 180). Though our traditional element (Benbow) attempts to right this wrong, he is the minority among his peer group. The lack of empathy is not held strictly by Popeye – it is a social issue that modernity (with its own innate problems) cannot possibly address or correct. It can even be stated that Faulkner chooses to highlight Popeye’s death to display this apparent lack of justice within the cultural spectrum. Instead of writing a scene in which justice is appropriately served, he specifically focuses on instances in which people are wrongfully persecuted – and those who are condemned are the “others” who already exist on the outskirts of society. Creighton discusses this in terms of Popeye’s death, stating, “Popeye’s hanging is not a victory over evil since it too was a miscarriage of justice. He did not commit the murder for which he was convicted ... the legal system indiscriminately demands its victims and in the process the demand for the appearance of justice destroys Justice” (269). Though obviously not stating an opinion on Popeye’s (highly amoral) character, Creighton makes the point that justice without boundaries or truth cannot be seen as constructive for implementing values in society. In fact, it achieves the opposite goal. No lesson is learned in this situation. Instead, an unknown murderer gets away with a crime, and the idea that the cultural landscape is unready for modernity is strengthened. The phrasing used by Creighton (“miscarriage”) also serves to reinforce the idea that industry cannot promote fertility – the social sphere disallows this kind of production. The “indiscriminate” nature of justice within the South’s traditional cultural milieu mirrors the same kind of refracted relationship that Benbow shares with Popeye. The lack of defined boundaries and generalized corruption are set up by Faulkner within Sanctuary to serve as a buffer against lasting change or permanence.

Finally we must circle back to the perpetration of rape not only against Temple, but also against the man who has been falsely convicted of her assault. The “miscarriage of justice” previously related by Creighton fits well within this particular argument. The lawyer who serves to carry out this wrongful conviction even states, “this is no longer a matter for the hangman, but for a bonfire of gasoline” (Faulkner 284), clueing in the reader to inevitable outcome of the trial.

There can be no justice, because the system that works to enact it is corrupt. Socially speaking, the violation against Temple becomes emblematic of a much larger problem within the traditional South: the emasculation against men

by more “modern” Southern women creates a breeding ground for violence. Benbow tries to rectify this societal wrong, but ultimately his attempts only serve to place him as an outlier in his cultural group. Tradition has already been infected by modernity. The lack of empathy displayed within the text confirms this.

The “miscarriage of justice” perpetrated against Lee Goodwin merely serves to reinforce the idea that societal evils are disallowing the successful integration of modernity. Instead of correcting the mistake, the “white” – as opposed to the “other” as “black” – takes on a kind of mob mentality, re-perpetrating the rape against someone who is outside the cultural construct of traditional Southern society, and therefore symbolic of the intrusion of industry. The phrases uttered by the crowd to Benbow mimic this cyclical violation. By shouting, “Do to the lawyer what we did to him. What he did to her. Only we never used a cob” (Faulkner 296), the mob implies that it is not the violation of Southern femininity that is important to them, but rather the indiscriminate punishment of the person who would dare to violate their property. Arnold speaks of the importance of this assault on Goodwin within the context of Sanctuary in his glossary notes and commentary, stating, “the men in the crowd have thus raped Goodwin, sodomized him, proving themselves as capable of the unspeakable as Popeye ... the crowd is also, as their comments show, willing to do the same thing to Horace” (Arnold 230-231). The mob here represents a collective of society. The violation that has been done to Goodwin is not enacted in the name of justice, but rather as an attempt to quell the “other” that would infiltrate and disrupt their cultural construct. The fact that the crowd is willing and able to violate Benbow in the same manner is indicative of the faulty nature of this brand of “justice.” If Benbow is the refracted mirror of Popeye, then the fact that the crowd is willing to violate one of their own means that they understand that modernity has already managed to infiltrate the infrastructure of Southern society. Their attempt to “burn it out” only serves to illustrate how necessary progress is to this cultural construct.

Much of Faulkner’s work centers on ideas concerning the slow and inevitable death of the South. Sanctuary follows this same pattern, but with a twist – an insertion of modernity and industry through the characterization of Popeye signifies a change from the norm within this traditional infrastructure. The Gray Man represents an emotionless void; a machine incapable of refueling an already failing social structure. The way in which Faulkner presents these aberrations implies that this shift toward progress comes at a particularly hefty price. Readers are subject to viewing rape, corruption, and complete social injustice. Through the lens of industry, we are better able to see the ever-present cracks that line the social system of the traditional south. Paired against Popeye, both Benbow and Temple ultimately fold into refracted mirrors of progress. The insertion of gender

reversal, voyeurism, and impotence as well as a generalized lack of empathy and morality all indicate that Faulkner saw this initiation to modernity and industry as ill-timed and incapable of affecting lasting, permanent change on Southern society. Clearly, there can be no winners here.

Works Cited

- Arnold, Edwin T, and Dawn Trouard. *Reading Faulkner: Sanctuary – Glossary and Commentary*. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 1996. Print.
- Creighton, Joanne V. "Self-Destructive Evil in *Sanctuary*." *Twentieth Century Literature*. 18.4 (1972): 259-270. JSTOR PDF.
- Faulkner, William. *Sanctuary*. New York, NY: Vintage International Books, 1993. Print.
- Gwynn, Frederick L, and Joseph L. Blotner, eds. *Faulkner in the University*. New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1965. Print.
- Kerr, Elizabeth Margaret. *William Faulkner's Gothic Domain*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press Corporation, 1979. Print.
- Madden, David. "Photographs in the 1929 Version of *Sanctuary*." *Faulkner and Popular Culture*. Eds. Doreen Fowler and Ann J. Abadie. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 1990. 93-109. Print.
- Matthews, John T. "The Elliptical Nature of *Sanctuary*." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*. 17.3 (1984): 246-265. JSTOR PDF.
- Monteiro, George. "Initiation and the Moral Sense in Faulkner's *Sanctuary*." *Modern Language Notes*. 73.7 (1958): 500-504. JSTOR PDF.
- Weiskel, Portia Williams. "On the Writings of William Faulkner." *Bloom's BioCritiques: William Faulkner*. Ed. Bloom, Harold. Langhorne, PA: Chelsea House Publishers, 2002. 41-63. Print.