Faulkner's Study Of Youth.

Faulkner's Study of Youth

by

Connie Ranck Kondravy

A Dissertation

Presented to the Graduate Committee
of Lehigh University
in Candidacy for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
English

Lehigh University
1975

Approved and recommended for acceptance as a dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Sept. 25, 1975
(date)

James R. Frakes
Professor in Charge

Accepted Sept. 25, 1975
(date)

Special committee directing the doctoral work of Mrs. Connie Ranck Kondravy.

James R. Frakes
Chairman

Table of Contents

Abstract

Faulkner's Study of Youth

This study of As I Lay Dying, The Unvanquished, Go Down, Moses, Intruder in the Dust, and The Reivers proposes that Faulkner believed that the movement from innocence to experience--the thematic center of his canon--could be delineated most clearly through the use of a child/adolescent as protagonist. In each of these novels (and in several short stories as well) Faulkner suggests that the youth's transition from boyhood to manhood captures the essence of mental, physical, and emotional innocence. Hence, each protagonist--Vardaman Bundren (As I Lay Dying), Bayard Sartoris (The Unvanquished), Ike McCaslin (Go Down, Moses), Chick Mallison (Intruder in the Dust), and Lucius Priest (The Reivers)--undergoes an initiation experience, replete with qualified testers, an initiation testing ground, and ritual in varying degrees. Usually Faulkner depicts this "coming of age" through a motif analogous to the journey of life; therefore, the initiation figure moves through stages of growing awareness until he reaches a threshold experience. Faulkner suggests that if the youth meets this crisis with intellectual flexibility, he acheives moral maturity and accepts adult

responsibility--Bayard, Chick, and Lucius represent this category; if the initiation figure fails because he cannot reconcile life's dualities to his code for living, he does not achieve his place in society--Ike McCaslin is one such doomed individual (although too young to comprehend the significance of his initiation experience, Vardaman exhibits his potentiality for moral maturity).

Hence, Faulkner has made the innocent child the archetypal symbol of man: the youth's journey to understanding suggests the incalculable exposures to unfamiliar situations that each adult encounters throughout his life. Thus, the child's initiation becomes applicable to all human experience. Faulkner's continuing interest in the "coming-of-age" process over a period of thirty-two years indicates the complexity he found in this subject. Moreover, his overwhelming absorption with the young protagonist, especially the youth who successfully adjusts to life's dichotomies, demonstrates in the earlier works as well as the later ones an optimism many critics have failed to recognize.

Chapter I

Introduction

The history of Faulkner scholarship reflects the complexity of themes and literary techniques found in the author's nineteen novels and dozens of short stories; indeed, after the publication of Cowley's Portable Faulkner in 1946, critics began to write full-length studies of individual novels, and between 1954-1957 MLA bibliographies included more entries on Faulkner than on any other living figure writing in English--a total of 160 items for Faulkner compared to 185 for Chaucer and 225 for Milton during the same years. After 1957 the volume of criticism continues to increase, and Mississippi Quarterly's "Annual Checklist" (1974) includes fifty-eight entries of Faulkner scholarship. Thus, in 1968, Olga Vickery surveying the accomplishments of the criticism to that point, perhaps wisely suggested that nothing more could be gained from any more general studies of Faulkner's fiction, that in the future significant criticism would come from critics who reinterpreted the canon from their particular points of view.[1]

One such point of view, advanced by Edmond Volpe, proposes that "[t]hough Faulkner is too complex a writer to explain in terms of a single idea, much of his work can be understood by recognizing that at the center of the fiction is one crucial

experience: the transition of a boy to manhood. In novel after novel he returns to the theme, and it is possible to trace the development of his ideas and the alterations of his moods and attitudes by examining the experiences of his young heroes."[2] Both Brooks and Reed likewise see the significance of the child in any interpretation of Faulkner's ideas.[3] Hence, since none of these critics has offered an extended study of this subject, it may be profitable to enlarge upon their initial suggestions and determine why Faulkner was so interested in the young person as a main character.

In his brief discussion of the young protagonist, Volpe includes Bayard Sartoris III (Sartoris), Quentin Compson (The Sound and the Fury), Bayard Sartoris II (The Unvanquished), Ike McCaslin (Go Down, Moses), Charles Mallison (Intruder in the Dust, The Town, and The Mansion), and Lucius Priest (The Reivers). Moreover, he includes Horace Benbow (Sartoris and Sanctuary), who, he claims, is only chronologically older than many of the others, and Gavin Stevens, whose kinship to the other characters is apparent in The Town, where his young manhood is recounted.[4] To this list Reed adds the characters of Temple Drake, Joe Christmas, and Shreve MacKenzie (McCannon).[5] Superficially, such a listing supports Volpe's point, for almost all of Faulkner's major works involve then the subject of the young protagonist. Yet does Faulkner really delineate the "crucial experience"--boyhood to manhood--of all these

characters? Certainly the reader learns little if anything about the childhoods of Bayard Sartoris III, Horace Benbow, Shreve MacKenzie, and Temple Drake. Moreover, if the childish and childlike characteristics and actions of Horace and Gavin are to link them to the other young protagonists, the relationship is problematic. And, although the reader learns much about the childhoods of Quentin (indeed, about the childhoods of all the Compson children) and Joe Christmas, the transition to the adult world is almost completed by the opening of The Sound and the Fury (1929) and Light in August (1932).

While the Volpe-Reed list wrongly includes too many adults who have passed beyond the "crucial experience" by their first appearance in the Faulkner canon, it would be equally misleading to include in this study some of the child characters who never reach the beginning of this movement toward manhood, e.g., Georgie in "That Will Be Fine," the boy in "Shingles for the Lord," or the boy in "Uncle Willy." Nevertheless, since the depiction of the child's physical, emotional, and mental make-up is vital to the "crucial experience," it is useful to consider how clearly Faulkner understands the child's world.

When he is not studying the transition of a boy to manhood, he most often employs the child character, the naive observer, to control the focus of a story.

Thus, in "Shingles for the Lord" (1943) the boy-narrator reconstructs the story with a "familiar acceptance"[6] that offers an almost unbiased ("[t]he only thing he lacks is a clear view of his father's excessive pride"[7]) portrait of his father's foolishness. When the boy does offer his personal impressions of the episode, these reflections are almost exclusively restricted to objects or characters (Whitfield, the mixed hound, the men's work habits, and the old church) other than his father. Indeed, the one extended observation of his father's motive in the dog-swapping incident concludes with the boy basically confused: "I quit trying to stay up [mentally] with them; I jest stacked shingles."[8] The narrator's bewilderment shifts the responsibility of character interpretation to the reader.

A contrasting use of the naive observer occurs in "That Will Be Fine" (1935): unlike the boy's "familiar acceptance" of events in "Shingles for the Lord," Georgie has only a limited understanding of the adult world. Often the child merely recites facts (Georgie's reconstruction of his father's explanation of the money that Uncle Rodney had stolen and lost [pp. 272-273]), does not understand the implications of a situation ("the business" Georgie helps Uncle Rodney conduct with Mrs. Tucker [p. 268]), or totally misinterprets what he sees (the side of beef that he thinks is a Christmas present for Grandpa [p. 286]). In addition to the comic, yet pathetic, picture of Uncle Rodney, the story depicts Georgie as the child

with "scarcely a hint of dawning consciousness,"[9] as the child who is only able to verbalize his immediate obsession (in this case the dimes and nickels that he cons from friends and relatives).

A third use of the child character to modify a story's focus occurs in both "My Grandmother Millard" (1943) and "A Justice" (1931). "My Grandmother Millard" is essentially a tall tale of the Civil War; hence, the child-narrator with his tone of enthusiasm and excitement makes the nostalgic and sentimental elements of the story more acceptable as pure romance. The child-narrator also enables "A Justice," a story of the old days among the Chickasaw Indians, to move beyond mere legend. The story begins in a child's narrative style ("Grandfather and Roskus would talk, with the horses going fast, because it was the best team in the county. They would carry the surrey fast along the levels and up some of the hills even. But this was in north Mississippi, and on some of the hills Roskus and I could smell Grandfather's cigar"[10]), and, in part five, Quentin's refusal to hear Grandfather's call to depart reveals the child's fascination with Sam's remembrance. This frame likewise controls the reader's imagination. Hence, Quentin's sudden discard of the child's voice intensifies the story's impact as he, now the adult reflecting-narrator, evaluates the tragic isolation of Sam Fathers: " . . . Sam Fathers back there, sitting on

his wooden block, definite, immobile, and complete, like something looked upon after a long time in a preservative bath in a museum. That was it. I was just twelve then, and I would have to wait until I had passed on and through and beyond the suspension of twilight. Then I knew that I would know. But then Sam Fathers would be dead."[11]

In addition to Faulkner's use of the child as a modifier of point of view, he often includes in his studies of adult characters an analysis of childhood environment, or he singles out an extraordinary childhood experience that may have molded the adult psychologically (e.g., Thomas Sutpen's banishment from the wealthy white man's front doorstep). In Faulkner's novels this concern with social background often encompasses whole chapters (in Light in August the study of Joe Christmas' youth); it may provide a point of reference throughout a novel (the effect of Damuddy's death on the Compson children in The Sound and The Fury); or it may heighten the significance of the actions of a minor character (in The Hamlet [1940] the explanation of Jack Houston's desperate need as a child for freedom from school, home, and work accounts for his raging grief over the death of his wife, to whom he was devoted, and his disdain for all human contact thereafter). Indeed, in The Hamlet, Faulkner devotes a complete paragraph[12] to the youth of so minor a character as Hoake McCarron, Eula Varner's first lover.

Moreover Faulkner occasionally depends on a sketch of children to counterpoint the qualities that he wishes to imply also exist in adult characters. Thus, phrases such as "scuttle toward the house," "huddled against her dress," "soundless and incorporeal in the dusk," and "snatch something from the ground"[13] that describe Mink's children also connote some of the "rather pathetic . . . strange, compelling innocence"[14] basic to Faulkner's delineation of Mink's character.

Certainly these more stylistic uses of the child character indicate that Faulkner recognizes the clear picture of life that could be created through the wide-eyed innocence of the child. Henry James, in a discussion of the child as main character in the preface to What Maisie Knew, labeled this value as a freshness of tone and idea; it is the key dividend to be gained from "the small expanding consciousness."[15] Or, as Leslie Fiedler proposes, the value lies in "the child's fresh vision as a true vision, a model of the artist's vision."[16] Johnson believes that the child character contributes only sentimentality if this quality of freshness is missing.[17] The fictional youth must have, rather, "a point of view at once intensively emotional but objective, critical but receptive, curious but apprehensive."[18] James sees much the same benefit to be gained from the natural literary tension created by the limited consciousness: "The one presented register of the whole complexity [plot] would be the play of the child's

confused and obscure notation of it, and yet the whole, as I say, should be unmistakeably, should be honourably there, seen through the faint intelligence . . . and still advertising its sense."[19] The child will also provide natural irony, for a great deal of what the child sees he will misunderstand or not understand at all.[20] Joseph Reed further subdivides James' two categories of natural irony: the child "can see without knowing ('That Will Be Fine'), know without seeing (Vardaman), feel without experiencing (Benjy), or experience without feeling (Joe Christmas)."[21]

Through these narrative benefits the author captures the child's ability to sweep aside the complexities of life and perceive the essential reality of a situation. As the child matures, this ability ultimately leads to a specific maturation experience--initiation. Hence, the innocent child becomes an archetypal symbol of man: the child's journey to understanding represents the incalculable exposures to unfamiliar situations that each adult encounters throughout his life. Thus, if the author narrows his focus to a single episode of life, the child's initiation, and dramatizes its essential meaning, he will have captured a situation that becomes applicable to all human experience. And if, "as is commonly granted, Faulkner's two great themes are history and heritage in their effects on the present and the inheritors,"[22] then Faulkner's study of the child's maturation as

it relates to the adult adjustment to his society is the epitome of those themes. Further, the child's initiation may embody the plight of modern man, as Johson suggests in relation to The Catcher in the Rye: "the turbulent atmosphere of adolescence [becomes] a microcosmic twentieth century world."[23]

Historically, the initiation experience is basic to most primitive cultures; yet Mordecai Marcus believes that the initiation story in literature relates only tangentially to the anthropologist's use of the term. "The anthropologist's ideas about initiation would suggest that an initiation story shows adult society deliberately testing and indoctrinating the young, or shows the young compelled in a relatively universal manner to enact certain experiences in order to achieve maturity. But only a very small proportion of works called initiation stories . . . show[s] adults testing or teaching the young. Ritual does occur in some initiation stories, but it is more often of individual than of social origin. Education is always important in an initiation story, but it is usually a direct result of experience rather than of indoctrination."[24] Marcus therefore modifies the anthropological definition of initiation to include three specific types found in literature. The first, the tentative initiation, leads only to the threshold of maturity and understanding, but goes no further. These stories usually

emphasize the shocking aspects of the experience, and the protagonist is clearly a child. The second, the uncompleted initiation, takes the subject across the threshold of maturity, but leaves the youth entangled in a struggle for certainty. Self-discovery is sometimes a part of these initiations. The third, the decisive initiation, brings the protagonist firmly into maturity, or at least portrays the youth as decisively on the road to maturity. These stories usually are based on self-discovery.[25]

Marcus' classifications are indeed helpful in an examination of Faulkner's initiation stories. Vardaman Bundren of As I Lay Dying apparently experiences a tentative initiation, while Lucius Priest in The Reivers undergoes the uncompleted initiation. Ike McCaslin in Go Down, Moses, Bayard Sartoris in The Unvanquished, and Chick Mallison in Intruder in the Dust experience various degrees of the decisive initiation. That Faulkner chose to explore each of these types of initiation and to study the decisive initiation more than once suggests the depth of meaning, the chiaroscuro of life's paradoxical elements that he discovered could be depicted in such a ritual.

Specifically, Volpe believes that this struggle, generated by the contrast of innocence and experience as the protagonist matures, can be derived from three major causes; "Born in the South just before the turn of the century, they [the young protagonists] are oriented during

childhood toward the past, toward a mid-nineteenth-century world. Unfortunately for them, they come to maturity in the twentieth century. Secondly, like their literary contemporaries, the young heroes of Hemingway and Dos Passos, they are both idealists and puritans. Finally, they are intelligent, sensitive, and introspective."[26] Usually the youth's first reaction to these contradictions is shock, followed by a rejection of his world, and concluded by reconciliation to his family or community after painful self-scrutiny. Even though each of the novels to be examined in the following chapters generally fits this initiation pattern, each experience--because of its depth and intensity--deviates from Volpe's formula in one or more aspects. "Barn Burning" (1939), brief yet closely allied to all points of this pattern, provides a useful preface to the more complex studies.

Although "Barn Burning" is not told from the first-person point of view, Sarty's intense reactions (combined with a third-person point of view, "rhythmic interruptions of objective narration, and dramatic dialogue, and all of this . . . set within an elaborate series of time devices"[27]) to his situation capture the freshness, which James and Fiedler praise. At the beginning of the story Sarty's ability to interpret what his father and the townspeople expect is severely limited ("'Get that boy up here. He knows.' For

a moment the boy thought too that the man meant his older brother until Harris said, 'Not him. The little one. The boy.' . . . he saw the Justice, a shabby, collarless, graying man in spectacles, beckoning him. He felt no floor under his bare feet; he seemed to walk beneath the palpable weight of the grim turning faces"[28]); but, by the story's conclusion the boy's growing awareness is established symbolically in the development of the "weight-image." Repeatedly, Faulkner shows that Sarty is becoming increasingly aware of his own self: in the initial courtroom scene he twice feels totally weightless; two days later, after his father strikes him and Sarty begins to sense his familial ties, he experiences, "the light weight of his few years, just heavy enough to prevent his soaring free of the world . . . but not heavy enough to keep him footed solid in it"[29]; ultimately, Sarty discovers his full weight as he wishes for wings to carry him away from the pursuing hoofbeats but finds he can only roll his body to one side of the road as Major de Spain gallops past.

This imagery complements Sarty's emotional awakening, for Sarty finds himself pulled two ways: his sense of truth and justice versus his ties to family.[30] The apocryphal story of Abner's heroics in Colonel Sartoris' calvary symbolizes to Sarty the sacrifice and allegiance that he owes his father. After the shots are fired at Abner because

Sarty, choosing truth, has warned Major de Spain, the boy consoles himself with a romantic memory of his father: "'He was brave!' he cried suddenly . . . . 'He was in the war! he was in Colonel Sartoris' cav'ry!' not knowing that his father had gone to that war . . . wearing no uniform, admitting the authority of and giving fidelity to no man or army or flag, going to war . . . for booty."[31] Hence, Sarty, like the other young men in Faulkner's initiation stories, vacillates between the legendary South of the Civil War and the barren, poverty-strickened South in which his family lives. In addition, the boy's idealism ("If I had said they [the Judge and townspeople] wanted only truth, justice, he [Abner] would have hit me again'"[32]) makes his final decision more complex: he must totally reject his former way of life. In the end Sarty stands alone, cold and exhausted; yet Faulkner suggests that Sarty will succeed, will reject all of Abner's traits ("He was a little stiff [Abner's key physical characteristic], but walking would cure that too"[33]), and will find a better life ("and soon there would be the sun"[34]). As Joseph Reed proposes, the story's impact lies in "the sense 'Barn Burning' gives of the process of becoming: initially the boy is an object moved by his world, then he becomes sentient, capable of understanding some of the world. Eventually he breaks free."[35] It is this process of becoming that Faulkner regards as a

kind of moral maturity; however, this maturity "does not consist in any particular achievement, but rather in acceptance of this necessity to keep moving," to adjust to life's dualities, to maintain an intellectual flexibility. Sarty's ability to walk away from his past links his initiation to the more complex experiences that appear in the following chapters--in order of their publication, the initiation experiences of Vardaman Bundren in As I Lay Dying, Bayard Sartoris in The Unvanquished, Ike McCaslin in Go Down, Moses, Chick Mallison in Intruder in the Dust, and Lucius Priest in The Reivers.

Chapter II

Vardaman Bundren and the Tentative Initiation

In As I Lay Dying (1930), Faulkner employs multiple point of view to create the most comprehensive treatment of a literary theme--the ritual of death in contrast to the process of living. Each character of As I Lay Dying, through chapter monologues, presents a focus on this theme: Cash's literalness, Jewel's fury, Anse's selfishness, Darl's super-perception, Dewey Dell's fear, Cora Tull's hypocrisy, and Vardaman's shock. Although scholarly criticism on Darl, Cash, Jewel, and Anse is plentiful, only one or two articles are devoted wholly to Vardaman. Only a dozen or so other essays pay any direct attention to Vardaman as a major character even though the boy controls ten of the novel's fifty-nine monologues (Darl is the voice in twenty, and none of the other characters appears in more than five). Recognizing the special position of the innocent child in the Bundren saga, Floyd C. Watkins and William B. Dillingham, in "The Mind of Vardaman Bundren," offer the most complete study of the boy. Their careful review of the number of critics who fail to consider Vardaman mentally normal[1] and their firm proposal that critics "have confused childhood

with idiocy"[2] suggest the need for re-examination of Vardaman's place in the Faulkner canon.

Vardaman's role is that of the one child character who experiences the tentative initiation as defined by Mordecai Marcus. This initiation, the most limited type, "leads only to the threshold of maturity and understanding but [does] not definitely cross it."[3] The story developed around the tentative initiation emphasizes the shocking effect of the experience on a character who is extremely young. The trauma usually leaves the child violently disturbed while the adults around him do not understand him and are unsympathetic.[4] Since this type of initiation reveals only a brief phase of the child's maturation, the author is delineating a "small expanding consciousness," one that is severely limited in vocabulary and thinking. As James states, "Small children have many more perceptions then they have terms to translate them; their vision is at any moment much richer, their apprehension even constantly stronger, than their prompt, their at all producible, vocabulary."[5] Hence, the writer either must supplement the partial, inexact observations of the child character with authorial intrusion (James describes his solution to this problem, which he encountered in What Maisie Knew, in much the same terms: "Amusing therefore as it might at the first blush have seemed to restrict myself in this case to the terms [Maisie's own vocabulary] as well

as the experience, it became at once plain that such an attempt would fail. Maisie's terms accordingly play their part . . . but our own commentary constantly attends and amplifies"[6]) or may present only what the child sees and hears. Even James admits that this second method has special merits, for these confused reactions by the child may help create the richest presentation possible of a literary subject.[7] In the Vardaman sections of As I Lay Dying Faulkner remains faithful to the child's point of view while he allows other characters to supplement the irrational ramblings of Vardaman.

Although much scholarship insists that Vardaman is an abnormal child, a defense for him as an emotionally and mentally normal child can be advanced (Irving Howe, Harry M. Campbell, J. Russell Reaver, and Walter Fuller Taylor label him an idiot; Roma King calls him a moronic child; and Richard Chase calls him surrealistic[8]). Again it is the Watkins and Dillingham article that establishes that Vardaman is indeed a child: " . . . it is hardly conceivable that he should be more than six to eight years old."[9] Indeed, hints as to Vardaman's age occur throughout the novel. Cora Tull is the first to suggest Vardaman's age: "'Not one of them [Addie's children] would have stopped her [from visiting her own family], with even that little one almost old enough now to be selfish and stone-hearted like the rest of them.'"[10]

The big fish that Vardaman catches is "[d]urn nigh long as he is" (AILD, p. 29), and according to Vernon Tull, the boy curses "it like a grown man" (AILD, p. 30) as he carries "it in both arms like a armful of wood, it overlapping him on both ends, head and tail" (AILD, p. 30). Both Cora and Peabody refer to Vardaman as tyke ("'The poor little tyke'" [AILD, p. 32] and "The durn little tyke is sitting on the topstep, looking smaller than ever" [AILD, p. 43]). Anse also implies Vardaman's youth: "Well, I reckon I aint no call to expect no more of him than of his man-growed brothers" (AILD, p. 37). And several times Armstid calls Vardaman "a boy" (AILD, pp. 178-179).

Mentally as well as physically, Vardaman is characterized as a small child; although he is old enough to realize a death has occurred, he is not old enough to accept it without profound shock and confusion. That such a small boy must face alone his first encounter with death while a group of uncaring adults make a mockery of obsequies accounts for his initial emotional responses; he reveals both fear ("'From behind pa's leg Vardaman peers, his mouth full open and all color draining from his face into his mouth, as though he has by some means flashed his own teeth in himself, sucking. He begins to move slowly backward from the bed, his eyes round, his pale face fading into the dusk like a piece of paper pasted on a failing wall, and so out of the door" [AILD,

p. 48]) and grief ("Then I begin to run. I run toward the back and come to the edge of the porch and stop. Then I begin to cry" [AILD, p. 52]). Darl, Peabody, and Vernon all record Vardaman's extreme reaction to his mother's death. Thus, those critics who have overlooked the shock Vardaman suffers have misread him as an idiot.

Furthermore, Vardaman's words, like his emotional reactions, bespeak psychological shock. Since Vardaman's little-boy vocabulary limits his ability to verbalize his situation, he must attempt through reference to past experience to explain to himself the meaning of Addie's death. Vardaman's constructed analogies are limited to sensations--he is not able to move from the concrete to the general and abstract.[11] It is the reader's task, as James would suggest, to fill in the gaps of experience. The best example of Vardaman's thought-process appears in his approach to Addie's incarceration in the coffin:

> When they get it finished they are going to put her in it and then for a long time I couldn't say it. I saw the dark stand up and go whirling away and I said "Are you going to nail her up in it, Cash? Cash? Cash?" I got shut up in the crib the new door it was too heavy for me it went shut I couldn't breathe because the rat was breathing up all the air. I said "Are you going to nail it shut, Cash? Nail it? Nail it?" (AILD, p. 62)

His senses prompt him to fear the coffin; as Cash apparently upends the coffin, its "dark inside" triggers an association with a dark and fearful incident of his past. Thus, Addie's

coffin becomes Vardaman's suffocating experience in the corn crib. He recalls his physical struggle to breathe, and his final question to Cash reveals his fear that his mother will suffer in the same horrible way. This logical equation in the little boy's mind requires a reaction that will stop the dark's encroachment and the struggle for breath, hence his repeated opening of the window above Addie's bed to allow the wind and rain to fall on her face and his boring of holes in the top of her coffin. His limited vocabulary precludes the formulation of questions he would need to ask to arrive at some understanding of death; moreover, even if he could phrase the questions, where would he find a sympathetic listener? At the end of this journey dotted with grotesque treatments of Addie's corpse and Cash's living body, Vardaman is still struggling to verbalize his interpretation of his mother's death:

> I put my ear close [to Addie's coffin] and I can hear her. Only I cant tell what she is saying.
> "What is she saying, Darl?" I say. "Who is she talking to?"
> "She is talking to God," Darl says. "She is calling on Him to help her."
> "What does she want Him to do?" I say.
> "She wants Him to hide her away from the sight of man," Darl says. (AILD, p. 204)

Only Darl, whose psychological balance is more adversely affected than Vardaman's, continues to console the boy. Therefore, Vardaman's attempts to help Addie breathe are "right from his point of view at that time"[12] because there

is no one to guide or comfort him in a rational manner. In terms of his abrupt initiation into the horrible but unmistakable truth of man's mortality,[13] Vardaman, indeed, expresses his love through an extreme but humane act.[14]

The most complex of such sense-association reactions for Vardaman, the fish-mother identification, is likewise based on past experiences. Some hours before Vardaman is brought to Addie's deathbed, he has had another unique experience--the catching of the unusually large fish. Vardaman's "'I aim to show it to ma'" (AILD, p. 29) reflects his special pride in this catch. Hence, as Vardaman flees the sight of his dead mother, "the handful of rotten bones" (AILD, p. 48), with Dewey Dell flung across Addie's knees, he stops abruptly before the place where the fish lay and contemplates its death. The coalescence of the fish and the mother, two virtually contemporary dramatic experiences, is psychologically realistic.[15]

His musings at the edge of the porch lead him to realize that if the fish died when he "cut [it] up into pieces of not-fish" (AILD, p. 52), then someone is responsible for Addie's death. Again, this is the logic of the immature child. Now he must find that guilty person; Vardaman concludes that Dr. Peabody, the only new person in the house, is the criminal: "I can hear the bed and her face and them and I can feel the floor shake when he walks on it that

came and did it" (AILD, p. 52). Since the boy does not know how to exact vengeance upon the doctor, who is surrounded by the Bundrens, Peabody's horses become plausible targets:

> They watch me as I run up, beginning to jerk back, their eyes rolling, snorting, jerking back on the hitch-rein. I strike. . . .
> "You kilt my maw!" (AILD, p. 53)

After punishing the horses, Vardaman escapes to the barn, where he curses and runs at the cow, finds the ability to cry, and senses peace and security by caressing Jewel's horse. Within a brief space of time, the boy has had four separate experiences with animals--the fish, Peabody's horses, the cow, and Jewel's horse. In these traumatic hours, irrational encounters with animals represent the only successful communication the boy has had. The cow, begging to be milked, follows Vardaman, who senses her needs:

> The cow is standing in the barn door, chewing. When she sees me come into the lot she lows, her mouth full of flopping green, her tongue flopping. . . .
> I hear her turn when I pass. When I turn she is just behind me with her sweet, hot, hard breath. . . .
> She nudges me, snuffing. She moans deep inside, her mouth closed. . . .
> "Git, now."
> I stoop my hand to the ground and run at her. (AILD, p. 54)

To Vardaman she must symbolize the warm-sensual, the life-essence. Indeed, she may suggest many of the mother-sensations that his subconscious, at least, associates with Addie. Thus, as he moves to hit her, he rejects that which is maternal and begins to accept, on one level, Addie's death.

Now the boy is able to cry, not out of hysteria as before, "quiet now, feeling and hearing [his] tears" (AILD, p. 55). In fact he finds peace and security as he studies Jewel's horse, perhaps because the horse is virile and strong, "strong bones within which, detached and secret and familiar, an is different from my is" (AILD, p. 55). Although Vardaman's emotions have been released, he has not received any logical explanations about death.

Hence, the boy's elemental ability to function exists, in the novel's remaining chapters, through the simple conviction asserted in the shortest chapter of the novel: "My mother is a fish" (AILD, p. 79). This belief enables him, on the funeral day, to observe his own ritual while the Bundrens pray for Addie's journey to immortal life. By fishing in the slough, Vardaman attempts to bring Addie back to life. Although Vernon explains that there are no fish there, Vardaman is obdurate:

> "It's one [fish] in here," he said. "Dewey Dell seen it."
> "You come on with us. The river's the best place."
> "It's in here," he said. "Dewey Dell seen it." (AILD, p. 87)

In the boy's logic, were he able to catch the fish, he would return Addie to life (the fish was "not-fish" and associated with Addie's death only when it had been cut, cooked, and eaten; therefore, the whole fish equals Addie before her death). Thus, when Addie's coffin does fall into the

rain-swollen river, Vardaman's indictment of Darl is reasonable: "'Where is ma, Darl?' . . . 'You never got her. You knew she is a fish but you let her get away'" (AILD, p. 144). To the child's confused mind the mother who is a fish has now escaped the family. Apparently Darl reinforces this illusion, for Vardaman claims that Darl said they might see Addie when they come to the water again. How easy and convincing, then, for Vardaman to claim over Addie's malodorous coffin: " . . . when we come to the water again I am going to see her. My mother is not in the box. My mother does not smell like that. My mother is a fish" (AILD, p. 187).

In treating Vardaman's fish-mother associations and experiences, Faulkner avoids the words "dead" and "death," for Vardaman cannot comprehend the ideas they connote. Rather, Addie becomes "not flesh" and "not mother."[16] Unlike James, who colors Maisie's limited vocabulary with his own commentary, Faulkner seldom lapses into adult language in the Vardaman sections. This faithfulness to the child's language and the clear depiction of emotional shock and cruel isolation, which Vardaman sustains after Addie's death, confirm Watkin's and Dillingham's belief that this single seemingly idiotic thought ("My mother is a fish") is not abnormal for an emotional child.[17]

As the Bundrens cross the river and journey towards town, Vardaman faces new emotional trials: his attempted

adjustments to the corpse's stench and to Darl's attempt to cremate Addie. Once more animal figures keynote the boy's comprehension of these bizarre events. With the smell come buzzards, who daily circle the coffin in "little tall black circles on the sky" (AILD, p. 187). At first they provide distraction for the boy on the monotonous journey; then, as he associates their constant presence with the nauseating smell, Vardaman chases them. Next he discovers that, although he cannot escape the smell, the buzzards disappear at night. Hence, he begins a nocturnal search for their hiding place only to see Darl set fire to the barn. This surprising act, in conjunction with Jewel's injury, the half-burnt coffin, and Dewey Dell's admonishment to Vardaman to remain silent intensifies the boy's need to escape.

For Vardaman, animals have become instrumental in his thought and articulation processes--targets of his emotions and sources of comfort and strength. Yet they do not represent a progressive step in his readjustment to the rational world. They promise neither happiness nor the ability to communicate with humans. Ultimately his irrational train of thoughts leads him to an emotional dead end. The image of the circling buzzards who do periodically escape the malodorous coffin merges with his longing to see the showcase toy train which "goes round and round on the shining track" (AILD, p. 206). Consequently, his discovery that the train is "gone" from

the window until next Christmas reinforces his desire to flee. This series of sense-associations culminates in his realization that even Darl is able to leave, significantly, to leave on a train for faraway Jackson.

Perhaps Vardaman's future, more so than that of any other character affected by Addie's revenge,[18] most nearly approximates the tragic. Faulkner allows him only one empathetic companion, Darl.[19] Like Vardaman, Darl is not limited to the logical world of reality. The older brother has an intuitive understanding of the ludicrous promise Anse makes to Addie, and he best shares these feelings with Vardaman. As Reed suggests, the boy's last soliloquy reveals "an almost perfect continuation of style and substance"[20] between the two brothers. This attitude Vickery likewise supports: " . . . their sections [Vardaman's and Darl's] are juxtaposed five times. The two of them have reached an understanding which is beyond logic and reason."[21] Hence, in this last monologue, Vardaman punctuates his love for his brother with a mental chant: "Darl, Darl is my brother. Darl, Darl" (AILD, p. 242). Vardaman will be emotionally alone without Darl, whose awareness the boy explains as "Jackson is further away than crazy" (AILD, p. 242). Indeed Darl's perception transcends the sensory "crazy" to a place objectified by his brother as "Jackson." The boy's sensing that Darl is the wisest of the Bundrens reinforces the special relationship the brothers share. As the boy continues to follow

Dewey Dell through the streets of town, his one word Darl builds to a scream, symbolic of all the suffering both young men have endured.

With this sad vignette Faulkner concludes Vardaman's portrait. The reader is to see neither Vardaman's release from trauma nor the effect of the initiation on his maturing-process; hence, the Vardaman sections of As I Lay Dying constitute an example of the tentative initiation as defined by Mordecai Marcus. Vardaman's function in the novel is to reveal a single focus, the reaction to death by the young, and to complete Faulkner's multiple-point-of-view study.

Chapter III

The Unvanquished: The Decisive Initiation

Since the major concern in this chapter is Bayard's initiation, which, as Mordecai Marcus suggests, is the "passage from childhood or adolescence to maturity and full membership in adult society,"[1] the seven stories of The Unvanquished will be considered as phases of Bayard's mental and emotional journey from youthful unstructured motion to decisive adult action. Cleanth Brooks offers strong support for such a reading: " . . . it ['An Odor of Verbena'] completes the novel by drawing together the themes of the preceding sections and by making the culmination of Bayard's development in one significant dramatic action."[2] Such study may be based on Bayard's growing awareness or coming of age; the decisive initiation may serve as the frame that allows the reader to discover what Bayard learns by the final scene of the novel. The decisive initiation, as Marcus has suggested, carries the "protagonists firmly into maturity and understanding, or at least show[s] them decisively embarked toward maturity. These initiations usually center on self-discovery."[3] It is the plan of this study to establish that the initiation in The Unvanquished is not only the frame for the seven stories

but indeed the thematic statement, the central point, of the novel.

With this purpose in mind, it is possible to regard the opening story, "Ambuscade," as a kind of microcosm suggesting the complex real world Bayard will "grow into." The events described in this story are dealt with as past: "Behind the smokehouse that summer, Ringo and I had a living map"[4]; the narrator, Bayard Sartoris, is remembering events of the distant past.[5] Thus, the language is not that of a child (e.g., " . . . the two of us needing first to join forces and spend ourselves against a common enemy, time, before we could engender between us and hold intact the pattern of recapitulant mimic furious victory" [Unvanquished, p. 4]). Yet the situations are vividly presented through the mind of the then twelve-year-old Bayard.[6] Since the latter point of view operates closest to the surface in "Ambuscade," the reader discovers both plot and meaning through a relatively unstructured focus. Bayard reacts to many stimuli but understands little about the action occurring around him. The reader receives both the story and the world through the eyes of a child.

Faulkner immediately establishes this world of the child with Bayard and Ringo, the twelve-year-old companions, absorbed in a game of war. Their imaginations are charged with the reality of their construction, a "living map"; although this map is merely a patch of scratched dirt, "it lived . . . against which the most brilliant of victories and the most tragic of

defeats are but the loud noises of a moment" (Unvanquished, p. 3); to Ringo and Bayard, "it lived, if only because of the fact that the sunimpacted ground drank water faster than [they] could fetch it from the well" (Unvanquished, pp. 3-4). Thus, three times in the first ten lines of the story the reader discovers that the children's point of view is controlled by a game that "lives."

The reader also must admit that the game "lives" for him by the time the scene has been set, for he is the victim of the children's absorption in their play. Hence, the surprise act by Loosh, which occurs next, is dramatically heightened:

> . . . suddenly Loosh stooped before Ringo or I could have moved, and with his hand he swept the chips flat.
>
> "There's your Vicksburg," he said.
>
> (Unvanquished, p. 5)

The reader, because he has been a participant in the game, shares the astonishment of the boys. The immediate question is why a grown man would wish to spoil the children's fun, and the reader's momentary uncertainty concerning Loosh's motives complements Bayard's and Ringo's problems in understanding Loosh. First, the boys do not see him arrive; when, next, Philadelphy, his wife, calls him to leave the children alone, Bayard senses something is wrong but cannot verbalize his feeling: "'Come on here, Loosh,' Philadelphy said. . . . There was something curious in her voice too-urgent, perhaps

frightened. . . . I didn't have time to wonder or speculate, because suddenly Loosh stooped before Ringo or I could have moved, and with his hand he swept the chips flat" (Unvanquished, p. 5). Finally, after Loosh has destroyed their mock Vicksburg, Bayard cannot interpret that expression on Loosh's face: "Loosh squatted, looking at me with the expression on his face. I was just twelve then; I didn't know triumph; I didn't even know the word" (Unvanquished, p. 5). The children's inability to understand Loosh's motives for his actions reinforces the generalized point of view Faulkner seeks to establish through the war-game that engrosses their attention.

Yet, in the quotation above, Faulkner also defines the narrator's point of view as separate from that of the twelve-year-old. For narrator-Bayard says, "I was just twelve then; I didn't know triumph; I didn't even know the word" (Unvanquished, p. 5); now, as an adult, reflecting on the past, he, of course, has experienced triumph--the revenge for Granny's death and the decision not to kill Redmond. Faulkner wants the reader to bear in mind that a mature narrator tells this story. Indeed, because of his ability to judge with dispassion both Drusilla's hysterical plea and the traumatic scene in Redmond's office, narrator-Bayard is probably re-examining his experience several years after the last events of "An Odor of Verbena." The twenty-four-year-old Bayard of the final story would find it difficult to offer a logical development of the childhood events that shaped his early manhood. However, the keen

understanding of the child's reaction to his world that is revealed in the early stories does not suggest that narrator-Bayard is an old man nostalgically remembering his youth. Nevertheless, the child's uncomplicated, unprejudiced point of view is the primary filter through which the reader must view the events of "Ambuscade" for the theme of awareness to have value. Therefore, the next action taken by Bayard pulls the reader back into the child's world:

> We stood there above our ruined Vicksburg, our tedious hoe-scratch not even damp-colored now, looking at one another quietly. "What?" Ringo said, "What he mean?"
>
> "Nothing," I said. I stooped and set Vicksburg up again. "There it is." (Unvanquished, p. 6)

Of course, it is not that simple to re-establish the real Vicksburg, but in the uncomplicated world of the child it indeed is that easy, and not a moment later Bayard and Ringo have forgotten all about Loosh's angry act and are once more playing in a whirl of dust.

In summary Faulkner carefully establishes the world of childhood in this first vignette. The action and drama are so vivid that the reader forgets to remember the narrator is relating past events and, further, forgets to remember to analyze the significance of the scene: "We move through the book on the surface in a narrative which is not so much shallow as it is too swift to have the leisure to allow depth or distractions."[7] Louvinia, by ending the children's game

and directing their attention to Colonel Sartoris riding up the lane, causes Bayard to offer one clue to show the reader where he, the reader, has been in this first scene: "We--Ringo and I--ran as one, in midstride out of frozen immobility . . ." (Unvanquished, p. 8).

In their re-creation of Vicksburg the children have stopped time. What they have built is a representation of the world Bayard will face as he grows. Just as the South attempted to arrest time after the Civil War and hold onto the code and traditions of the past, so the boys, as they struggle to keep their mud city in shape, fight "against a common enemy, time" (Unvanquished, p. 4). Just as Granny, Colonel Sartoris, Drusilla, and the women who attempt to marry Drusilla to the Colonel define the Southern code with their every act so do the boys, with hoe, delineate the "river, city, and terrain" (Unvanquished, p. 3) of their Vicksburg. Just as Bayard must put aside Uncle Buck's advice concerning Grumby, Aunt Jenny's indifference to the defense of the Sartoris honor, and the Colonel's method of facing Redmond, so the boys must put aside what they cannot understand in their innocent world:

> "What?" Ringo said. "What he mean?"
> "Nothing," I said. I stooped and set Vicksburg up again. "There it is."
> But Ringo didn't move, he just looked at me. "Loosh laughed. He say Corinth too. . . . What you reckon he know that we ain't?"
> "Nothing!" I said. "Do you reckon Loosh knows anything that Father don't know?" (Unvanquished, p. 6)

Perhaps the first vignette suggests in miniature all the key themes of the novel. As Waggoner states, the scene "lives for us, too, in this magnificently vivid evocation of a child's innocent awareness of things vaguely portentous but not understood."[8]

"Ambuscade" offers many examples of Bayard's innocence. After Loosh leaves, Bayard attempts to recapture the spirit of fun of the mock Vicksburg. Suggesting that they pretend to be Civil War officers, he shouts, "'I'm General Pemberton!' . . . 'Yaaay! Yaay!'" (Unvanquished, p. 7). But Ringo has been disturbed by Loosh's statements and will not pretend and play. Bayard in his childhood innocence sees the need to sacrifice his pride, to sacrifice his playing the role of General Pemberton: "'All right!' I cried. 'I'll be Grant this time, then. You can be General Pemberton.' Because it was that urgent, since Negroes knew. The arrangement was that I would be General Pemberton twice in succession and Ringo would be Grant, then I would have to be Grant once so Ringo could be General Pemberton or he wouldn't play anymore" (Unvanquished, p. 7). He reveals the complex set of rules Bayard and Ringo follow in their childhood society, a system that reflects the adult world, which they cannot always understand.

Although a set of elaborate rules binds Bayard to Ringo, the game of Civil War officers reveals a more subtle relationship: "But now it was that urgent even though Ringo was a

nigger too, because Ringo and I had been born in the same month and had both fed at the same breast and had slept together and eaten together for so long that Ringo called Granny 'Granny' just like I did, until maybe he wasn't a nigger anymore or maybe I wasn't a white boy anymore" (Unvanquished, pp. 7-8). Further, Ringo and Bayard are bound together in boyhood friendship, understanding, and an unspoken love. Narrator-Bayard indicates kinship as he describes the boys' actions when they see Colonel Sartoris: "We--Ringo and I--ran as one, in midstride out of frozen immobility . . ." (Unvanquished, p. 8). Throughout "Ambuscade" Bayard continues to use we and us to show the oneness between Ringo and himself. This oneness will reach a test of strength in "An Odor of Verbena" when Ringo and Bayard disagree on the handling of Redmond.

Further, Ringo's and Bayard's idolization of Colonel Sartoris reveals some of this brotherhood. The kind of eager greeting they paid the Colonel on one of his homecomings presents a tableau of utter devotion: "In the spring, when Father came home that time, Ringo and I ran down the drive to meet him and return, I standing in one stirrup with Father's arm around me, and Ringo holding to the other stirrup and running beside the horse" (Unvanquished, p. 9). Together they viewed him as a hero: "He was not big; it was just the things he did, that we knew he was doing . . . that made him seem big to us" (Unvanquished, p. 10).

Yet, as Bayard and Ringo from that moment of "frozen immobility"--the mock Vicksburg--run this time to meet the Colonel, Bayard is moving toward a new level of awareness. It is not that the boys are no longer devoted to their hero to the same degree but that real time, which has moved forward, has created change. This time the boys stand in front of the house and watch the Colonel approach: "We watched them--the big gaunt horse . . . and Father damp too from the ford, his boots dark and dust caked too, the skirts of his weathered greycoat shades darker than the breast and back and sleeves where the tarnished buttons and the frayed braid of his field officer's rank glinted dully, the sabre hanging loose yet rigid at his side as if it were too heavy to jounce . . . " (Unvanquished, p. 9). They still knew him as "big," but the twelve-year-old Bayard consciously or unconsciously (the reader never learns), must overlook the mud and dust that covers his hero, the tarnished buttons and frayed braid, and the sabre hanging loose. However, narrator-Bayard reveals he now knows that the Colonel returned less than heroic: "Then I began to smell it again, like each time he returned, like the day back in the spring when I rode up the drive standing in one of his stirrups--that odor in his clothes and beard and flesh too which I believed was the smell of powder and glory, the elected victorious but know better now: know now to have been only the will to endure . . . " (Unvanquished, p. 11).

Here Bayard is admitting that in his childhood he had mistaken the will to endure for altruistic heroism. Of course, in Drusilla's temptation in "An Odor of Verbena" he once again will have the chance "to smell powder and glory." Almost seduced by these suggestions of greatness, Bayard will, with struggle, reject Drusilla's promise of heroism in the glamorous Southern tradition; this rejection is what allows him to say he now knows that the concept of the smell of powder and glory disguised what actually was the will to endure. However, faith in the father's heroism, Waggoner believes, places Bayard at the first level of awareness in terms of the Southern code of ethics, for "Bayard as a small boy lives with the code without recognizing it as a code, seeing his father as the embodiment of heroism."[9]

In the second section of "Ambuscade" indications that times have changed for the Colonel occur repeatedly from his appearance ("his trousers were not Confederate ones but were Yankee ones," [Unvanquished, pp. 12-13]) to his physical actions as he directs the building of the stock pen: "Father was everywhere, with a sapling under each arm going through the brush and briers almost faster than the mules" (Unvanquished, p. 13). Yet, it is not the sweating, motley-clad farmer building the stock pen to hide his animals from the Yankee army that Faulkner allows the reader to remember. Rather it is the mythical commander of troops on dashing charger silhouetted against the sky, magically transforming "the chosen

saplings" into rails by the power of his heroism: "He was on Jupiter now; he wore the frogged grey field-officer's tunic; and while we watched he drew the sabre . . . the sabre flashed and glinted; he cried, not loud yet stentorian. 'Trot! Canter! Charge!' Then, without even having to move, we could both watch and follow him--the little man . . . standing in the stirrups above the smoke-colored diminishing thunderbolt, beneath the arcy and myriad glitter of the sabre from which the chosen saplings, sheared trimmed and lopped, sprang into neat and waiting windrows, requiring only the carrying and the placing to become a fence" (Unvanquished, p. 14). Notice how cleverly Faulkner has tricked his reader by the careful placing of passages dependent on differences of point of view. First, the reader learns from narrator-Bayard that Father worked hard and long to build the pen; then the reader hears the boy, Bayard, remembering his reaction when the Colonel told the family they were going to build the pen: " . . . when he said that [they would build a stock pen], Ringo and I probably had exactly the same vision. There would be all of us there--Joby and Loosh and Ringo and me on the edge of the bottom and drawn up into a kind of order--an order partaking not of any lusting and sweating for assault or even victory, but rather of that passive yet dynamic affirmation which Napoleon's troops must have felt--and facing us, between us and the bottom, between

us and the waiting sap-running boles which were about to be transposed into dead rails, Father . . . " (Unvanquished, pp. 13-14). Therefore, the romantic rather than the realistic scene is what the reader will remember.

Occasional glimpses of the reality of the Southern situation in 1863 are flashed before the reader's mind to prepare him for the eventual growth of perspective Bayard will achieve by "An Odor of Verbena": "The activities of the adults are mysterious and exciting and only faintly ominous. Reality impinges hazily upon the child's world...."[10] "Ambuscade" is the world of innocent childhood, and Faulkner wants the reader to move and react primarily in that world. Thus, scenes like the stock-pen building create natural enthusiasm characteristic of innocence: "The boy wants to tell us everything at once, and one measure of Faulkner's skill in impersonation of this eagerness is that he can arrange the narrative to accomplish this in such a way that we are never bored, never indifferent, but tend not to notice what he's doing to us."[11]

As Reed indicates, Faulkner's skill in presenting Bayard's eagerness does not seem artificial. An example of this freshness maintained by tone occurs as Bayard returns from building the stock pen. He sees the big trunk brought down from the attic; he notes the difficulty with which Father performs the task. Although the reader wonders why Father did not wait

for evening, when Joby and Loosh could have helped in this task, Bayard does not question the action. The child's mind is not stimulated by domestic duties but rather again by the romantic evocation of war that his father's presence reasserts. Bayard and Ringo are waiting for the Colonel to sit down once more and tell of his adventures: the places he has been, the men met, the scandals brought on by war. Of what they hear the boys choose to remember that which has meaning to the child's world: "But we were just twelve; we didn't listen to that [all the aspects of the war]. What Ringo and I heard was the cannon and the flags and the anonymous yelling" (Unvanquished, p. 17). They cling to the romantic qualities of the war, and, in this mood, they have no doubt that Father will tell more stories tonight. No critical situation imposed on the family by reality can supersede the telling of the tales. Perhaps Bayard's and Ringo's minds are so easily drawn to the extravagant and fictitious in war because of the abundance of romantic fiction in the family library, where "there was one bookcase . . . containing . . . a thousand and ninety-eight page treatise on astrology, a History of Werewolf Men in England, Ireland and Scotland and Including Wales by the Reverand Ptolemy Thorndyke, M.A. (Edinburgh), F.R.S.S., a complete Walter Scott, a complete Fenimore Cooper and paper-bound Dumas complete . . . " (Unvanquished, p. 18). Youthful appetites fed on such a

literary diet intensify the desire for night to come so that the dramatic gallantry might live before the boys' eyes as their own hero tells of "true" experiences. Because of the boys' eager anticipation of the storytelling, the reader registers the shock the boys must have felt when, as Bayard finally ventures to request a story, Father abruptly orders them to bed.

Thwarted, but with the sound of yelling in their ears, they obey Father and go up the stairs but hide halfway up to listen to what could be more important than the stories. Now as the trunk, which was merely a symbol of domestic activity offering no interest to the boys, is readied and Father commands shovels and lights, the boys realize its significance. They listen to Father explaining to Granny and Louvinia the fall of Vicksburg. But what the reader receives is Ringo's literal impression of what Father said: "'Vicksburg?' Ringo whispered. . . . 'Vicksburg <u>fell</u>? Do he mean hit fell off in the River? With General Pemberton in hit too?'" (<u>Unvanquished</u>, p. 20). The boys are overwhelmed by the state of the war, by Father's unusual action, and by their own exhausted state, for:

> . . . suddenly Louvinia was standing over us, shaking us awake. . . . She may have been listening as Ringo and I were, to what we thought we heard, though I knew better, just as I knew that we had slept on the stairs for sometime; I was telling myself, 'They have already carried it out, they are in the orchard

> now, digging.' . . . somewhere between waking and sleeping I believed I saw or I dreamed that I did see the lantern in the orchard, under the apple trees. (Unvanquished, pp. 20-21)

Thus, the reader once more learns only what filters through the twelve-year-old's mind; narrator-Bayard never corrects that vision.

This blending of the world of dreams with the world of reality becomes a motif of "Ambuscade," a motif Faulkner conceived to dramatize the freedom with which the child moves through the levels of awareness in life. The third section of "Ambuscade" further delineates this motif. Although in wartime Granny cannot bake some of the delicious pastries young boys crave, she and the boys discover they can treat their imaginations by reading recipes from the cookbook. Ringo always asks Granny to read about coconut cake, for he is trying to separate the dream from the reality, as did Bayard in his experience with the burial of the silver:

> He said coconut cake every time because we never had been able to decide whether Ringo had ever tasted coconut cake or not. . . . Now and then I used to try to help him decide, get him to tell me how it tasted and what it looked like and sometimes he would almost decide to risk it before he would change his mind. Because he said that he would rather just maybe have tasted coconut cake without remembering it than to know for certain he had not; that if he were to describe the wrong kind of cake, he would never taste coconut cake as long as he lived. (Unvanquished, pp. 21-22)

However, given the chance, the boyish imagination will always

choose the dream. It is safer to cling to the illusion that has structure than to face the reality that is unstructured.

This light-hearted incident offers counterpoint to the action Bayard convinces Ringo they must follow to safeguard the silver. He tells Ringo to watch Loosh, but Ringo wants to know how Bayard knows to be on guard: "'Bayard, did you dream hit?'" (Unvanquished, p. 23). Ringo doesn't hesitate when Bayard says "yes," but wants to know what else the dream told him: "'That's all. To watch him. That he would know before we did. . . . Because if we watched him, we could tell by what he did when it was getting ready to happen'" (Unvanquished, p. 23). Unlike adults, Ringo and Bayard accept without hesitation their inability to know exactly what they are waiting for--they don't even know when "it" will happen. Yet, Ringo verifies Bayard's source of knowledge: "'Then hit's so,' he said. 'If somebody tole you, hit could be a lie. But if you dremp hit, hit can't be a lie'" (Unvanquished, p. 23). Faulkner has carefully placed a dream-reality experience for Bayard, the silver burial, and a dream-reality experience for Ringo, the coconut-cake scene, to show the boys have verifiable past reasons to follow the new dream-reality sequence.

Accepting Bayard's understanding of what Father wants them to do, they make a pact to watch the road for Yankees. The reader sees them still unable to distinguish appearance from reality as they carry out their vigil:

> We watched the road for two days, lying in the cedar copse. . . . It was cool and shady there, and quiet, and Ringo slept most of the time, and I slept some too. I was dreaming . . . then Ringo made a choked sound and I was looking at the road, and there in the middle of it . . . was a Yankee. . . . and then we were crawling backward down the hill without remembering when we started to crawl, and then we were running across the pasture toward the house without remembering when we got to our feet. We seemed to run forever, with our heads back and our fists clenched, before we reached the fence and fell over it and ran into the house. (Unvanquished, pp. 27-28)

To the boys the situation seems unreal, and time once again stands still; yet this time, when they run out of "frozen immobility," they will also be running out of the world of childhood. In boyish camaraderie Bayard and Ringo rush back from the house with the musket: they carry it together, aim it together, shoot it together. Shouting now as Bayard had shouted as he played General Pemberton, Ringo cries, "'Shoot the bastud! Shoot him!'" (Unvanquished, p. 29). In the last seconds of the world of childhood, the boys experience, as Bayard notes, the "powder" and "glory" and "anonymous yelling" they believed to be the "stuff of heroes": " . . . then the sights came level, and as I shut my eyes I saw the man and the bright horse vanish in smoke. It sounded like thunder and it made as much smoke as a brush fire, and I heard the horse scream, but I didn't see anything else" (Unvanquished, p. 29). Behind all this noise Bayard hears Ringo wailing, "'Great God, Bayard! Hit's the whole army!'" (Unvanquished,

p. 29). From this moment on, the boys move one step beyond their unstructured and spontaneous level of awareness.

This time the boys run, not to the protection of the Colonel but to the safety offered by Granny's skirts. Yet they have run this time to an ephemeral protection, for, whether or not they understood what they were doing when they fired the musket, they are, in a very real sense, pursued by a Yankee sergeant who wants adult retribution: "'Send some of the boys upstairs,' he said. 'If you find any locked doors, you know what to do'" (Unvanquished, pp. 32-33).

The rapid-fire pace of indoctrination into some level of adult awareness quickens as Bayard and Ringo find that Granny is forced to break her most rigid moral rule: " . . . and maybe both of us thinking how Granny had never whipped us for anything in our lives except lying: how she would whip us first and then make us kneel down and kneel down with us herself to ask the Lord to forgive us" (Unvanquished, p. 32). As Granny replies to the sergeant, "'You are mistaken. . . . There are no children in this house nor on this place'" (Unvanquished, p. 32), Bayard realizes that she is lying for them. This is his first exposure to a breaking of the ethical code that has structured his life. For the first time Bayard registers comprehension of the need to deviate from an absolute. After Granny lies to protect her loved ones, he realizes the effort it has cost her: "It was that quiet; she didn't move

at all, sitting bolt upright and right on the edge of the chair, to keep her skirts spread over us" (Unvanquished, p. 32).

Since the sergeant may discover where the boys are hiding at any second, the scene has reached a critical point. Yet Faulkner is not ready to throw Bayard into a life-and-death situation. His aim is to have Bayard mature gradually through decisive mental and emotional struggles that will abundantly demonstrate life's complexities. Faulkner, with an adroit maneuver, turns the scene into a tall tale of the Civil War. What follows is hardly realistic but rather an example of Faulkner's functional romanticism. First, Granny and the reader learn that the boys are not murderers of a Yankee soldier:

> "Is he--it--the one who--"
> "Dead? Hell, yes! Broke his back and we had to shoot him!"
> "Had to--you had--shoot--" I didn't know horrified astonishment either, but Ringo and Granny and I were all three it.
> "Yes, by God! Had to shoot him! The best horse in the whole army!" (Unvanquished, p. 33)

Because of this turn of events, the gloom of the situation, if not the danger to the boys, disappears.

To further guarantee that his reader understands that Bayard and Ringo are still moving mostly in the child's world, Faulkner introduces the colonel, who brings to the situation empathy and heroism of the Colonel Sartoris style, "a colonel, with a bright short beard and hard bright gray eyes, who

looked at Granny sitting in the chair with her hand at her breast, and took off his hat" (Unvanquished, p. 34). Sizing up the absurdity of the situation, the colonel turns to Granny, comprehending everything in one sweeping glance:

> And Louvinia said how he looked at Granny now for the first time. She said how she could see his eyes going from Granny's face down to where her skirt was spread, and looking at her skirt for a whole minute and then going back to her face. And that Granny gave him look for look while she lied. "Do I understand, madam, that there are no children in or about this house?"
>
> "There are none, sir," Granny said.
>
> (Unvanquished, p. 35)

In an ironic speech that reveals the colonel's humanism, he attempts to let Granny know that he understands how the shooting incident occurred, is glad he has not found the boys, and appreciates her courage. In response to his compassion, Granny calls this Yankee officer a gentleman and offers him refreshment. In this brief encounter the colonel and Granny have shared understanding; hence, as he bids her farewell, he hopes she may suffer nothing harsher from his fellow soldiers.

Although the reader must view this scene primarily as Faulkner's attempt to palliate the jump to adulthood that Bayard has made by shooting the musket, the reader should also remember the scene for its examples of defiance of traditional codes. In this scene Bayard has two opportunities to hear rigid rules ignored: Granny lies, thus breaking her own personal moral code; the colonel ignores the rules of war to

protect a lady of the enemy and her two wards. Both these violations come about out of love and at great price. The colonel risks his military honor in admiration of and empathy for Granny, and Granny sins for love of the boys. How much of this scene Bayard consciously understands is questionable, for he clutches at Granny's lie to save himself. He attempts to avoid the punishment that Granny demands for the boys' use of obscene language:

> "You cursed. You used obscene language, Bayard."
> I didn't look at her. I could see Ringo's feet too. "Ringo did too," I said. She didn't answer, but I could feel her looking at me; I said suddenly: "And you told a lie. You said we were not here." (Unvanquished, p. 39)

However, Granny's personal sacrifice when she lies must have affected Bayard's subconscious. Perhaps it is as Waggoner indicates: "Bayard as a small boy lives with the code without recognizing it as a code. . . . Then he stands off and looks at the code in operation in Colonel Sartoris's actions. . . . it is not inevitable, but a possible way of acting."[12] For "An Odor of Verbena" to have meaning, Bayard's early experiences must be justified as, at least, subconscious stimuli to future acts.

Those critics who suggest that Bayard's actions in "An Odor of Verbena" are without foundation have not kept an accurate list from the earliest scenes of the number of times people Bayard can respect have broken traditional standards. This is what Reed seems to forget when he suggests that "'An

Odor of Verbena' is set apart, still only a segment, but somewhat out of sequence."[13] This is clearly what Howell is overlooking when he says that "[t]he Bayard of the last part of The Unvanquished does not act in the character of a Sartoris. . . . The most recent critics of the book find a thesis in the moral development of Bayard, from the crudities of his boyhood performance to his rejection of violence as a man . . . but, in the short compass of The Unvanquished, Faulkner is unable to integrate the concepts of honor which Bayard the boy and Bayard the man represent."[14]

Bayard is able to see from these scenes in "Ambuscade" not only the value of breaking a traditional code but also the price that must be paid for such an infraction. For Granny this propitiation assumes the form of honesty to her God: " . . . she asked the Lord to forgive her for telling the lie" (Unvanquished, p. 39). Typical childhood punishment follows for the boys: "'Go to the kitchen and get a pan of water and the soap'" (Unvanquished, p. 39).

Thus "Ambuscade" advances all the key motifs and themes relevant to a final interpretation of the novel in terms of decisive initiation. Bayard moves through patterns of action that may provide meaning that will last beyond his childhood world. The romantic world of "Ambuscade" has freed Faulkner's characters to act without adult reason or direction, and the reader has felt this intuitive, spontaneous action in Bayard

and Ringo. However, the totally unstructured world of childhood is past. Faulkner symbolizes this world in the final vignette, section V, of "Ambuscade":

> It was late, as if time had slipped up on us while we were still caught, enmeshed by the sound of the musket and were too busy to notice it; the sun shone almost level into our faces while we stood at the edge of the back gallery, spitting, rinsing the soap from our mouths turn and turn about from the gourd dipper, spitting straight into the sun. For a while, just by breathing we could blow soap bubbles, but soon it was just the taste of the spitting. Then even that began to go away although the impulse to spit did not. (Unvanquished, pp. 39-40)

Although Granny has exacted the childhood punishment of washing their mouths with soap for swearing, Faulkner symbolizes character change in the boys as well. First he suggests that time had passed Ringo and Bayard by while they were caught in the romance of war: "It was late, as if time had slipped up on us while we were still caught, enmeshed by the sound of the musket and were too busy to notice it." Now after attempting to kill a Yankee and definitely killing a horse, they confront reality, "the sun," and stand poised at the threshold of the adult world, "the edge of the back gallery." As they rinse and spit out the soap, the boys can, at first, "just by breathing . . . blow soap bubbles." These bubbles represent the playing and the romanticizing the boys have indulged in in their childhood--the mock Vicksburg, the Colonel's heroics and stories, and the boys' adventure with the musket. But, after a while they cannot blow soap bubbles, for only "the

taste of the spitting" survives. The romance of childhood adventure ("the soap bubbles") diminishes, but a hint of this world ("the taste") remains after the boys' indoctrination into the adult world by the sergeant, the Colonel, and Granny. Finally, however, even the taste of the soap is gone: "Then even that began to go away although the impulse to spit did not." Symbolically, the boys have moved out of their childhood in the horse-killing scene, but the reader will still see evidence of childish actions, "the impulse to spit," in future chapters. Faulkner will not fling his characters into complete maturity in the next chapter; this hesitation he clearly dramatizes in the last sentence of "Ambuscade": "But it [childish illusion] was gone now--the suds, the glassy weightless iridescent bubbles; even the taste of it" (Unvanquished, p. 40). Again it is Waggoner who succinctly explains the ultimate thematic importance of "Ambuscade": "The last sentence of the story defines all this [romanticism]. . . . The bubbles, the cloud bank resembling mountains, the sham battle--all are gone now except as held in memory through a deliberate effort to recapture them, to hold them up above the rush of time and the destructiveness of Loosh. Romanticism as conscious as this is not self-deception but an effort at definition."[15]

"Ambuscade" dramatizes Bayard's movement through the first level of awareness in his initiation into the adult world.

If he is to progress to a completion of the initiation pattern, he must, as Marcus states, experience a change of knowledge about his world which will "lead him towards an adult world."[16] Marcus postulates that this growth in the initiation sequence often takes the form of an "exploratory night journey."[17] This journey in "Retreat" fits Marcus's definition since a growth and an attainment of a second level of understanding are achieved. However, the journey to the essence of the soul is not reached until the events in "Vendée" are concluded. Even the title implies that the reader should consider this second incident a journey; but, at second glance, the title suggests an irony as well. A retreat is a loss of ground, a movement back, or a regression. Indeed, if the title, "Retreat," is to connote the nature of the journey Bayard, Ringo, and Granny begin, the reader, to be sure of the tone, must first analyze the basic plot.

This journey begins a year after the events of "Ambuscade"; Ringo and Bayard are now thirteen. Granny's belief that she and the boys and the family silver will be safer in Memphis than on the plantation is the motive for the trip. Further, she believes this is what Colonel Sartoris would want her to do since the Yankee army is looking for him. After much preparation, Granny, Ringo, Bayard, and Joby depart, stopping first in Jefferson, where they bid goodbye to Mrs. Compson and where Uncle Buck cautions Bayard to be careful. A group

of Confederate soldiers stop them and encourage them to stay put or return home since the roads are full of Yankee patrols. Undaunted, Granny decides to continue to their destination. Along the road a group of men surround them, cut and flee with the mules. Forgetting everything, Ringo and Bayard pursue on a "borrowed" horse. After hours of tracking, they fall asleep under a bridge and awake to find Colonel Sartoris looking down at them. Now they ride with the Colonel's men, help capture a Yankee outfit, and return home with Father to find that Granny and Joby have been riding behind them all along. The journey ends where it began, with the burial of the trunk of silver and Granny's threatening the boys with soap to wash out their mouths. The Colonel intervenes, explaining that the boys have behaved well while they were in his company.

Such a simplified plotline informs the reader that on a literal level the boys and Granny, ending where they began, have failed in their mission. Symbolically, however, for Ringo and Bayard, it has been a venture into the social world and into the reality of war; but, motifs of the childhood world dominate the rationale for the trip. Colonel Sartoris continues to wield his honored influence even though absent. No one protests the trip, for Granny says that she is "'following Colonel Sartoris' instructions as I believe he meant them'" (Unvanquished, p. 42). Further, Granny justifies the

digging up of the silver trunk the night before they leave because she "'had a dream about it last night'" (Unvanquished, p. 43). Louvinia reacts to this reasoning as Ringo had reacted to Bayard's motivation based on a dream in "Ambuscade." Indeed, once Louvinia understands Granny is acting on a dream, she agrees the trunk should be dug up immediately. Later Bayard and Ringo also accept Granny's dreams as truth as they had accepted Bayard's dream in "Ambuscade":

> "Which un you reckon she drempt about?" he said.
> "Why don't you ask her?" I said.
> (Unvanquished, p. 44)

Other salient elements that structured the world of childhood in "Ambuscade" and continue to exert some influence in "Retreat" include Granny's strict adherence to the Southern code of etiquette. Granny refuses to forsake her Sunday black silk dress and her hat for some more practical apparel for this long trip that will expose the travelers to dust, mud, and the elements. Similarly the boys wear their Sunday best, and Joby, the driver of the wagon, appears in frock coat and beaver hat. Moreover it is out of social formality that Granny stops in Jefferson, "to tell Mrs. Compson goodbye and to ask her to drive out home now and then and look after the flowers" (Unvanquished, p. 52). When Bayard and Ringo meet Granny at the Compsons' gate to continue their journey, Granny appears with some rose-cuttings in her hand. Although Granny has no idea when she will be able to plant these

clippings, she does not forget that Southern etiquette requires that she take them. If Mrs. Compson has given Granny a gift, Granny will value that gift. At every wagon stop, the boys find water for the rose-clippings; and after days of hardship, a fight with the men who steal the mules, and a return down Yankee-infested roads, Granny returns home "sitting thin and straight on the seat with Mrs. Compson's rose cuttings wrapped in a new piece of paper in her hand" (Unvanquished, p. 80). Finally, Granny demonstrates her adherence to the Southern tradition of good manners when she refuses to believe anything bad of the Yankee soldiers:

> "Good Lord, ma'am! You can't go a step farther. Don't you know that if they captured you and this boy, they could almost force him to come in and surrender?"
>
> Granny looked at him. . . . "My experience with Yankees has evidently been different from yours. I have no reason to believe that their officers . . . will bother a woman and two children." (Unvanquished, p. 64)

Hence, Bayard and Ringo have many chances to sense the same fixed order in "Retreat" that totally structured the childhood world of "Ambuscade." This time the structure functions to direct the actions of all the characters (not just the youthful actions of Ringo and Bayard as in "Ambuscade"). Perhaps, from this shift of emphasis the reader can see, as Bayard consciously or subconsciously experiences, that all life follows a set of rules. Again Faulkner, by the repeated accent on order, is laying the foundation for Bayard's ultimate handling of the code in "An Odor of Verbena."

At least two other important episodes occur before the boys and Granny are well into the journey. The first is Bayard's chance meeting with Uncle Buck McCaslin in Jefferson. On one level this meeting, as Volpe suggests, forces Bayard to recognize his role in society as Colonel Sartoris' son.[18] Uncle Buck, in the company of a Confederate captain, takes the opportunity to brag about the heroics of Colonel Sartoris:

> "By Godfrey, there he is! There's John Sartoris' boy!"
>
> The captain came up and looked at me. "I've heard of your father," he said.
>
> "Heard of him?" Uncle Buck shouted. By now people had begun to stop along the walk and listen to him, like they always did, not smiling so he could see it. "Who ain't heard about him in this country? Get the Yankees to tell you about him sometime." (Unvanquished, pp. 57-58)

Carried away by his exaggeration of Colonel Sartoris, Uncle Buck magnifies Bayard's and Ringo's adventure with the Yankee regiment: "'That's it! That's John Sartoris! He gets the horses; any fool can step out and get a Yankee. These two damn boys here did that last summer--stepped down to the gate and brought back a whole regiment, and them just--How old are you, boy?'" (Unvanquished, pp. 60-61). While the reader is cognizant of Uncle Buck's good humor and ability to glorify the war, he also hears Uncle Buck assign to Bayard an adult responsibility: "'Git on,' he said. 'You got a long road.' I turned the wagon. 'You take care of your grandma, boy, or John Sartoris will skin you alive. And if he don't, I will!'" (Unvanquished, p. 61). Bayard's next significant action seems

to imply that he feels some of the weight of the adult responsibility Uncle Buck has allotted him. As Ringo bids goodbye to Jefferson upon reaching the top of the first hill, he asks Bayard what they will do if the war never ends. Bayard sees no easy answer, no childish way of erasing the idea from the mind. His answer is adult ("'All right,' I said. 'Suppose it'"), and his action is maturely fatalistic ("I didn't look back [to home]" [Unvanquished, p. 62]).

This admonishment by Uncle Buck offers the first outside recognition of the responsibilities Bayard bears as the son of Colonel Sartoris and will bear in "An Odor of Verbena" when he faces Redmond. Uncle Buck is also another keeper of a code of ethics that Bayard may study to fashion his own position as a man (for he respects Uncle Buck). In "Retreat" the reflecting narrator notes that the system under which Uncle Buck and Uncle Buddy work gives their Blacks a great deal of freedom:

> . . .they kept their niggers in the manor house. It didn't have any windows now and a child with a hairpin could unlock any lock in it, but every night when the niggers came up from the fields Uncle Buck or Uncle Buddy would drive them into the house and lock the door with a key almost as big as a nose pistol; probably they would still be locking the front door long after the last nigger had escaped out the back. And folks said that Uncle Buck and Uncle Buddy knew this and that the niggers knew they knew it, only it was like a game with rules. (Unvanquished, pp. 52-53)

Yet they "drive" the slaves into the mansion and require that

a contest be waged to give them their temporary freedom. Here is a code that the young Bayard at least knew about. While its tolerance and humorous overtones recommend it, its casual handling of human beings puts its value much in doubt. Hence, the code lacks absolutes, the one item that helps define the word code itself. This is the first time Bayard discovers, as he will again in "An Odor of Verbana," that codes often contain dichotomies, which destroy their inherent value.

However, as Bayard notes, "[t]here was more to Uncle Buck and Buddy than just that" (Unvanquished, p. 54), for they also have a philosophy about land-ownership that might likewise fit into a code concept. The twins had established a system of bookkeeping by which a Black would gain his freedom by earning it for work done on the plantation. Uncle Buck and Buddy did not believe that anyone owned the land. Further, they had persuaded the hill people to pool their land with the Blacks' land and the McCaslin land so that their lot might be better. Narrator-Bayard is uncertain what was promised in return, but all these people, once poor, bettered their lot. This system obviously is beneficial, the awe with which the people regard the twins also suggesting the virtue of this code: "Anyway, they (the white men, the trash) looked on Uncle Buck and Buddy like Diety Himself . . . " (Unvanquished, p. 55). Here is a plan that, when strictly adhered to, will work to man's advantage; Bayard sees that some absolute codes can function well.

The other important episode that occurs before Granny and the boys are really well on their way is the vignette between Ringo and Bayard over some soil. During a noon stop when Granny sends Ringo and Bayard to wet the rose-clippings, Bayard observes Ringo pinching off a bit of the clipping's dirt and pocketing it. Their fraternity allows Bayard to immediately understand Ringo's action:

> Then he looked up and saw me watching him, and he made like he was going to throw it away. But he didn't.
>
> "I reckon I can save dirt if I want to," he said.
>
> "It's not Sartoris dirt though," I said.
>
> "I know hit," he said. "Hit's closer than Memphis dirt though. Closer than what you got." (Unvanquished, p. 62)

Symbolically, Ringo reveals the tie he feels to home and family. From Bayard's retort on the quality of the soil, the reader discovers that Bayard shares Ringo's homesickness, for Bayard has filled a snuffbox with soil. Indeed, Bayard has been careful to take the specific soil of their mock-Vicksburg to carry with him as he ventures from home. Ringo sounds pleased that Bayard thought to take the exact soil from behind the smokehouse. That they brought the soil shows how much their childhood experiences (the game of war, for example) offer them security. Ringo is even willing to swap his cherished saddle-buckle just to have some of the smokehouse dirt. When Bayard claims he brought enough soil to last, he is admitting that he does not wish to break all the ties to

the past. Perhaps this vignette is the strongest point that can help define the thematic purpose of "Retreat." The trip is a venturing-out--a beginning of the initiation--but it is not an example of the initiation-journey, or exploratory night-journey to the essence of the soul that Marcus sees as being integral to the initiation story. Rather Faulkner restricts the journey's significance with the ironic title and the literal return to the place of beginning.

To dramatize further the limited meaning of Bayard's travels, Faulkner, evoking more romantic heroics, has Colonel Sartoris come upon the boys as they chase the runaway mules. Before Colonel Sartoris can return them home and find Granny, the boys experience a skirmish with Yankee troops. Volpe sees this encounter with the enemy as "a taste of the war they have been playing at in their games."[19] The Colonel knows that Yankee soldiers are nearby. Putting Ringo's horse to flight and causing a general commotion that sounds like a whole army of Confederates descending on the Yankee party, Colonel Sartoris draws the boys into a histrionic war experience. At the moment of the greatest dramatic tension in the episode, Bayard catches a glimpse of his father that supports his childhood vision of a war hero: "When they reached the crest of the hill, I could see sky under them and the tops of the trees beyond the hill like they were flying. . . . It was like Father stopped Jupiter in mid-air on the top of the hill; I could see him

standing in the stirrups and his arm up with his hat in it . . ." (Unvanquished, p. 75). Bayard still sees his Father as a superhuman even in a real fighting stiuation. Faulkner ties Bayard's image of his father to Bayard's inability to relinquish his youth in the boy's next interpretation of the scene:

> There is a limit to what a child can accept, assimilate; not to what it can believe because a child can believe anything. . . . And I was still a child at that moment when Father's and my horses came over the hill and seemed to cease galloping and to float, hang suspended rather in a dimension without time in it. (Unvanquished, pp. 75-76)

Bayard cannot go beyond the "powder" and "glory" and "anonymous yelling," or to quote Volpe: "The reality turns out to be as they imagined it--glamorous and thrilling. Colonel John fools the Yankees. . . . The Colonel lives up to the image of romantic hero that Bayard has created."[20]

"Retreat," thus, is a story structured by the boys' vacillations between moments of maturity and moments of childhood. Although safely returned home by Colonel Sartoris and reunited with Granny, Bayard and Ringo almost immediately face a cruel and heartbreaking adult experience. Yankees arrive looking for Colonel Sartoris, and this time the Colonel appears trapped as he sits "in his shirt sleeves and his stockings, with his feet on the porch railing" (Unvanquished, p. 81). Stripped of his uniform, braid, and weapons, he hardly appears the hero that Bayard has repeatedly perceived. Indeed, after cleverly helping Father to get to Jupiter and to crash through

the barn door, the boys further learn that their hero had to play the idiot in order to reach the barn. Louvinia explains the Colonel faked deafness and acted "like he [was] born loony" (Unvanquished, p. 83). Like the boys and Granny, who have had to turn back on their journey because of obstacles, the Colonel has had to sacrifice his demeanor to save his life. The subsequent burning of the plantation by the Yankees brings to the Sartoris family the loss of home, silver, and slaves. By having Granny shout, with the boys, "'The bastuds! The bastuds!'" (Unvanquished, p. 86), Faulkner underscores the tragedy suffered by the Sartoris family in a series of rapid-fire reversals. The reader cannot help seeing these final incidents as punctuations of the title, "Retreat."

The third section, "Raid," likewise evolves from a journey-based plot. Even though this second journey also ends for the boys and Granny back at the starting point, they do reach some material and personal objectives. Symbolically, this third of seven stories serves as the exact center of the decisive initiation experience: for Ringo it is a coming into manhood and a joining in partnership with Granny to aid those hurt by the war; for Bayard it is a comprehension of the Southern tragedy[21] as it tarnishes the code he has unreflectively accepted. Obviously, as a result of maturity gained from these experiences, the boys are able to assume more responsibility; thus Granny's role as guardian and guide must change. Each boy experiences

a situation that has a special significance for him. The incident symbolizing Ringo's maturation is the viewing of the destroyed railroad at Hawkhurst; the baptism in the river in the midst of the black migration suggests Bayard's coming of age.

Initially, in "Raid," Faulkner emphasizes Ringo's mental and emotional growth as separate from that of Bayard's. Here Volpe sees this dramatization of Ringo's personal change as his entrance into manhood: "The fourteen-year-old Negro boy, whom the Colonel said was more intelligent than Bayard, begins his activities as Granny's partner."[22] Ringo's obsession about the railroad he has never seen begins to dominate the trip: "'Call me when we gitting nigh to Hawkhurst,' he said, 'so I can commence to look out for that railroad you tells about'" (Unvanquished, p. 91). Specifically, narrator-Bayard now knows that the locomotive typified in addition the drive Ringo's race felt:

> Only I know now it was more than that with Ringo, though neither of us were to see the proof of my belief for some time yet and we were not to recognize it as such even then. It was as if Ringo felt it too and that the railroad, the rushing locomotive which he hoped to see symbolized it--the motion, the impulse to move which had already seethed to a head among his people, darker than themselves, reasonless, following and seeking a delusion, a dream.. (Unvanquished, pp. 91-92)

Significance also resides in the engine, a symbol of motion, of progress. The reader needs only to remember "Ambuscade" to note that Ringo and Bayard were frozen in that immobility

that connotes the childhood world; only through a dramatic experience, the firing of the musket, did the boys thrust themselves outside their innocent realm. Now Ringo and his people need to escape their past and move to a new time, hopefully a time of freedom and independence.

Although Ringo cannot verbalize the eagerness he feels to see the locomotive, the cloud of dust they sight in the west underscores his desires: "They were coming up the road. It sounded like about fifty of them; we could hear the feet hurrying, and a kind of panting murmur" (Unvanquished, p. 94). At Hawkhurst the boys and Granny learn that this migration has been going on for days. Drusilla explains that nobody knows when these people have eaten and slept or where they have come from; they seem to have no specific goal except that they believe they are being drawn to Jordan. The panting, sobbing Black girl Granny helps on her way embodies the delirium of this movement. The girl cannot tell Granny whom she belongs to or what she wants, only that "'Hit's Jordan we coming to. . . . Jesus gonter see me that far'" (Unvanquished, p. 96). This delirium that pervades the migration is comparable to Ringo's changing attitude as he moves nearer to the railroad site: "'Hawkhurst?' he said, sitting up. 'Where's that railroad?' on his knees now and looking for something which he would have to recognize only through hearsay when he saw it: 'Where is it? Where?'" (Unvanquished, p. 97). Like the Black

girl's desires, Ringo's goals are ambiguous; he knows only that the railroad is his "Jordan": "'Seem like I been waiting on hit all my life . . . '" (Unvanquished, p. 98).

As Ringo's anticipation of the railroad parallels the Black girl's desperate fight to follow the migration, two other incidents concerning the railroad correspond with this weird movement of Ringo's people. The first set of events compare the welter of Blacks moving toward the river to Ringo's first sight of the destroyed railroad. So that Granny may retrieve her silver, mules, and slaves, Drusilla, acting as guide, attempts to get Granny and the boys through the migration to find the colonel who, in "Ambuscade," had saved the boys. Even the furious, strong Drusilla is unable to master the situation, for "they covered and hid from sight the road exactly as an infiltration of flood water would have" (Unvanquished, pp. 116-117). Drusilla's ineffectual attempt to help Bayard keep the wagon out of the river fails; the horses drown, Granny faints, and Ringo and Bayard must struggle to get the Yankees to help them to safety. The folk-migration that ends in the destruction of the bridge and brings death to man and beast matches Ringo's personal discovery of the railroad's destruction.

In Ringo's situation ten-year-old Cousin Denny, proving to be almost as useless a guide as Drusilla had been, directs Ringo to the site of the destroyed railroad. Having felt only

confusion about the railroad, Ringo finds that Cousin Denny's hysteria clouds his understanding further. Running and trying to listen to Denny shout while Granny tries to hold them back, Ringo excitedly races ahead to see the railroad tracks. When a glance reveals the "piles of black straws heaped up every few yards " (Unvanquished, p. 100), Ringo senses that something is amiss; yet, because he does not know what the scene should look like, he falls prey to Denny's technique, "and Ringo was hollering, too, now " (Unvanquished, p. 100), as if hollering will somehow make everything right. Overwhelmed, he cannot function rationally; rather, his actions resemble the Blacks' aimless wanderings to the water:

> They [Ringo and Denny] were back in the trees; it looked like four or five men had taken each rail and tied it around a tree like you knot a green cornstalk around a wagonstake, and Ringo was hollering, too, now.
>
> "What's them?" he hollered. "What's them?"
>
> "That's what it runs on!" Cousin Denny hollered.
>
> "You mean hit have to come in here and run up and down around these here trees like a squirrel?" (Unvanquished, p. 100)

Finally, that night Drusilla re-creates the episode that had brought about the railroad's ruin. For the boys the "powder" and "glory" motif they have played at and experienced deepens the story's impact. She invokes a vision of the railroad, "still pristine and intact and straight and narrow as the path to glory itself" (Unvanquished, p. 109), to portray the Southern people's symbolic attack on the Yankee invaders:

" . . . it was as if the gray generals themselves had sent the word, had told them, 'You have suffered for three years; now we will give to you and your children a glimpse of that for which you have suffered and been denied'" (Unvanquished, p. 111). Mesmerized by Drusilla's words, the boys envision the last running of the train--the Confederate engine with its "flaring and streaming smoke stack, the tossing bell, the starred Saint Andrew's cross nailed to the cab roof, the wheels and the flashing driving rods on which the brass fittings glinted like the golden spurs themselves" (Unvanquished, p. 112), while the Yankee engine races behind it. Once this colossal race is over, the Yankees destroy the trains and tracks, but the pride of achievement abides with the Southerners, "so long as there should be defeated or the descendants of defeated to tell it or listen to the telling" (Unvanquished, p. 112). Having convinced the boys by her story of the train's dramatic experience, Drusilla proves its significance is "not gone or vanished either" (Unvanquished, p. 112). Once Ringo realizes that the race's meaning continues to have significance for the Confederates, its import also continues to function for him:

> "I know what you thinking," Ringo said. . . .
> "I heard every word you heard."
> "Only I saw the track before they tore it up. I saw where it was going to happen."
> "But you didn't know hit was fixing to happen when you seed the track. So nemmine that. I heard. And I reckon they ain't gonter git that away from me, neither." (Unvanquished, pp. 112-113)

The sense of inadequacy Ringo felt at the start of the trip to Hawkhurst vanishes. By listening carefully, he shares the reality of the scene with Bayard. The destruction of the railroad and the conclusion of the Black migration are similarly important. The Blacks do not get to "Jordan" (their reality), but Granny's speech to the Alabama Blacks has meaning for them:

> "I suppose you all want to cross some more rivers and run after the Yankee Army, don't you?" Granny said. They stood there, moving their feet in the dust. "What? Don't any of you want to?" They just stood there. . . . "All right," Granny said. "Now listen to me. Go home." (Unvanquished, pp. 130-131)

Their silent agreement with Granny's demands indicates they will not try the adventure again. The hardships they have endured will affect, however, their collective psyche, in turn molding their future responses.

Because of Ringo's symbolic experience at Hawkhurst, he catches up to Bayard in social awareness; indeed, he may have surpassed Bayard. Thus it is valid to suggest, as Volpe does, that Ringo, having achieved manhood, may begin his activities as Granny's partner. In the remainder of "Raid," Ringo aids Granny in retrieving the silver, mules, and slaves. Then, on the return trip, Ringo even begins to make decisions for Granny when she hesitates: "'Well, what you wanter do?' Ringo said. 'You got to 'cide quick, or they be gone.' He looked at her; she didn't move. Ringo leaned out of the wagon. 'Hey!' he hollered. . . . 'Granny say come here!'" (Unvanquished, p. 131).

During the time that Ringo is moving to maturity in his search for the railroad, Bayard is learning that the code of war he has mimed, experienced in one skirmish, and believed in may lead to tragic consequences. Volpe sees the reality of the Southern tragedy piercing the legend that is a part of Bayard's heritage.[23] Once Loosh proclaims, "'I going. I done been freed '" (Unvanquished, p. 85), Bayard must begin to decide how he will deal with the Black race in general as a result of the Southern defeat. However, except for his dealings with Ringo, Bayard has little chance in The Unvanquished to evaluate his attitude to the freeing of the slaves. Rather, he has an opportunity as he deals with man in general (Drusilla and Redmond, for example) to consider tangentially Loosh's proclamation.

Since he has already seen the railroad and has ventured to some extent into the social world, his reactions to the race will be different from Ringo's. Narrator-Bayard now knows that Ringo at that time was more innocent; hence, the train's symbol was more mystical to Ringo than literal. Having seen the railroad before, Bayard does not anticipate the journey's conclusion at Hawkhurst; his interpretations of the destroyed railroad do not rest on abstracts. Faulkner is, therefore, able to turn Bayard's attention to Drusilla: " . . . we just had time to look when Bobolink came up the road out of the trees and went across the railroad and into the trees

again like a bird, with Cousin Drusilla riding astride like a man and sitting straight and light as a willow branch in the wind. They said she was the best woman rider in the country" (Unvanquished, pp. 100-101). This is one time the reader should not interpret the "we" to mean Ringo and Bayard. Bayard alone is drawn to Drusilla by her unique qualities. Thus, not two paragraphs later, emphasizing the awe her presence creates, he repeats, "She was not tall; it was the way she stood and walked. She had on pants, like a man. She was the best rider in the country" (Unvanquished, p. 101). Later, while Drusilla tells Granny about the Black migration, Bayard reveals his thoughts are elsewhere: "Her hair was cut short; it looked like Father's. . . . She was sunburned and her hands were hard and scratched like a man's that works" (Unvanquished, p. 103). Faulkner establishes Bayard's attraction to Drusilla in "Raid" to heighten the torture Bayard will feel when he decides, perhaps at the cost of Drusilla's sanity, to follow his own conscience in "An Odor of Verbena." This interest alters Bayard's translation of the railroad story. As Drusilla explains how the Southern people learned of the race, sensual imagery augments Bayard's remembrance of the telling: "She told it . . . the roundhouse in Atlanta where the engine waited; we were there, we were of them who (they must have) would slip into the roundhouse in the dark, to caress the wheels and pistons and iron flanks, to whisper to

it in the darkness like lover to mistress or rider to horse, cajoling ruthlessly of her or it one supreme effort . . . cajoling, whispering,caressing her or it toward the one moment" (Unvanquished, p. 110). Although narrator-Bayard is speaking, because the imagery is bound both at the beginning and at the end by "Drusilla told that too" (Unvanquished, p. 110), Faulkner wishes to have the reader accept the blending of the sensual motif with young Bayard's new-found physical fascination for Drusilla.

How appropriate then that Faulkner has Bayard characterize the two engines "like a meeting between two iron knights" (Unvanquished, p. 111), for the reader recalls the courtly-love tradition--yet another overtone of the sensual in relation to Bayard's compelling interest in Drusilla. The engines as "two iron knights" further epitomize honor and courage, which harken back to the "powder" and "glory" Bayard conceives to be the vision of his heroic father. The entire race becomes another incident like the mock Vicksburg and Father's skirmish with the Yankees, "the deed done not for the end but for the sake of the doing" (Unvanquished, p. 111). Yet, this time as the story of heroics concludes, Bayard learns that, although the defeated will be able to be proud of the way their people fought, these romantic ideas are destroyed, they have no value, "the next day they came and tore the track up" (Unvanquished, p. 112). Here, as Volpe notes, Bayard is now able to

see through the glamor of the tradition and discern "the cruel scars the war has left upon the land."[24] Before Drusilla's story, he has observed the young Black girl's plight as she struggles to keep up with the Black migration, has seen "the burned houses and gins and thrown-down fences on either side [of the road]" (Unvanquished, pp. 93-94), and has realized what a person can lose by war: "She was not tall; it was the way she stood and walked. She had on pants, like a man. She was the best woman rider in the country. When Granny and I were here that Christmas before the war and Gavin Breckbridge had just given Bobolink to her, they looked fine together. . . . But Gavin was killed at Shiloh and so they didn't marry" (Unvanquished, p. 101), (in a few short lines Faulkner gives the basic ingredients for Drusilla's happiness and then reveals the toll such loss incurs by delineating her mannish appearance). Prior to the burning of the Sartoris plantation, the journey through devastated land, and the Black migration, Bayard would have missed "the irony of Drusilla's bitter speech about how dull and stupid life was before the fathers and fiancés went off to war to be killed."[25] He would have seen only the heroic quality of Drusilla's present life. This growing understanding that war exacts a price on man's emotions and that the glory acts only as a salve for the mental wounds, takes Bayard to the edge of the second level of awareness. All of "Retreat" and "Raid" up to the wagon's plunge into the river constitutes Bayard's hesitant venture into the social world.

Now after these experiences in the Civil War, Bayard is almost ready to accept life's responsibilities; he is leaving the second level of awareness and moving toward the third--manhood. As Bayard and Ringo pull Granny from the river, Bayard suddenly understands how difficult this trip has been for Granny, who appears changed: "She looked old and tired; I hadn't realized how old and little she was" (Unvanquished, p. 123). Symbolically, it is as if Bayard's baptism into life allows Granny to be old and tired; Ringo and Bayard become equal partners with Granny as she seeks to recover her lost possessions.

Therefore, in "Riposte in Tertio" and "Vendée," the grim truth about war impels Bayard to the third level of awareness; in a given situation he will now recognize the responsibilities that manhood entails. In the decisive initiation framework these stories contain the deeds that permanently change the youth's character. Granny's and Ringo's long and complex maneuvering to trick the Yankees out of horses and mules to aid the poor Southern hill people concludes with Granny's death. Overcome by grief and guilt, Bayard, vowing revenge, embarks on a climactic chase that terminates in the calculated death of Granny's killer at Bayard's controlled hand.

"Riposte in Tertio," placing Bayard in the background, primarily reveals Ringo's and Granny's working relationship. Since the risks of Granny's and Ringo's war-time activities

revolve around life and death, Ringo soon learns to be cautious. Although there may be other Yankee officers like Granny's friend, Colonel Dick, the men who surround Granny's wagon the one time Ringo's plan fails do not seem to care that they are dealing with a woman and a youth. Only Ringo's calmness in the underbrush and clever diversion of the Yankees save Granny and Bayard. Volpe agrees that Ringo's role in this story is paramount: "The superiority of Ringo is dramatized in . . . 'Riposte in Tertio.' It is Ringo who understands the character of Ab Snopes whom Granny is forced to deal with, and it is Ringo who first realizes that Ab has sold them out."[26] This ability to perceive the person's internal nature persuades the reader that Ringo has matured beyond the impressionable boy who could not separate the defeated man from the hero in the picture of Colonel Sartoris in "Ambuscade" and "Retreat."

However, this dramatization of Ringo's maturation has created much scholarly dissension regarding the literary merit of this section. Cleanth Brooks reflects the feeling held by most critics of the Ringo-Granny mule-stealing section: "A disturbing problem of tone in this novel has to do with Miss Rosa's war against the Yankees. Could she possibly have managed to get the loot that she does get from them?"[27] Two other criticisms share Brooks' concern: Irving Howe and J. Gold represent those critics apprehensive about the folklore quality[28] of the mule-stealing section while Waggoner and Malin

are two of the scholoars who fault the section because it is divorced from reality.[29]

However, this example that other critics fault as a weakness really serves to underscore the absurdity of war that Faulkner stresses in the entire novel. Like the bizarre return trip from Hawkhurst, the mule-stealing scenes emphasize that the ridiculous may be mistaken (by Ringo, for example, as he sums up their efforts, "'We done damn well'" [Unvanquished, p. 168]) for the glamorous and heroically clever. Perhaps, Faulkner is also counting on the reader to note Ringo's reasoning for the positive results which accompany Colonel Dick's aid: "'Hit was the paper that lied; hit wasn't us,' Ringo said" (Unvanquished, p. 134). Words enable Granny and Ab Snopes to carry on their successful mule-stealing enterprise. If the reader will but look back to "Ambuscade," he will find that words, swear-words, get the boys in trouble with Granny; words, Granny's words to Colonel Dick, save the boys from Yankee retribution; and words, Colonel Sartoris' tales of war, make the war glamorous and romantic for Ringo and Bayard. Additionally, words, Ab Snopes' cunning words about success with Grumby, bring about Granny's death; words--this time Aunt Jenny's--offer Bayard comfort in his final action against his father's killer, but Drusilla's hysterical words demanding revenge only frustrate him. It is impossible to overlook the power rhetoric engenders in this novel, for it creates action the

results of which, as in the mule-stealing sequence, produce a snowball effect. Thematically the above suggestion lends strength to Faulkner's purpose in this section of the novel.

Indeed, as mentioned above, the scene that brings about Granny's death depends on the power of words. Granny has just recently borne public witness in the church, where she calls the hill people to receive the money and mules she has been able to acquire. This public confession, revealing Granny's awareness of the liberties she has taken in her interpretation of the Christian ethic, has been verbal: "'I have caused these children [Bayard, Ringo, and the naive hill people] to sin. I hereby take their sins upon my conscience'" (Unvanquished, p. 167). Whether the reader is to view Granny's death as the moral result of her recognition of her sin is doubtful; yet Faulkner does propose that the force of words that had worked so successfully in the past has killed Granny: "Ringo and I had just got back from Jefferson with the letter, and Ab Snopes was in the cabin, telling Granny about it [the chance to get Grumby's fine horses]. . . . [his] shadow leaping and jerking up the wall while he waved his arms and talked about that was all she had to do [to outwit Grumby]. . ." (Unvanquished, pp. 170-171).

If this reading of the power of words in The Unvanquished is correct, then the inability of Bayard and Ringo to hold Granny back from her meeting with Grumby and subsequent death ironically points out that, although words may be logical and

valid, yet they offer little comfort in the face of tragic events. Bayard knows he is correct when he says to Granny that he will physically hold her back from her meeting with Grumby; he also knows his words are valid when he says he tried to save Granny. However, he finds the accuracy of the words little solace: "We tried. I keep on saying that because I know now that I didn't. I could have held her, turned the wagon, driven away, holding her in it" (Unvanquished, p. 174).

Hence, guilt scars Bayard ("I could have stopped her"), and a sudden recognition of the nature of death equally scars him psychologically: "She had looked little alive, but now she looked like she had collapsed, like she had been made out of a lot of little thin dry light sticks notched together and braced with cord, and now the cord had broken and all the little sticks had collapsed in a quiet heap on the floor, and somebody had spread a clean and faded calico dress over them" (Unvanquished, p. 175). "Vendée," or the story of Bayard's initial act as a man, therefore, is the dark exploratory night-journey, which Marcus holds as a vital element to the decisive initiation. Bayard's guilt and grief sweep away the former three years of his romanticism, and now at fifteen he is bitterly realistic.[30]

This movement towards realism begins at Rosa's graveside. As Bayard views the hill people, abandoned Blacks, and Jefferson townspeople, he recognizes that while Granny has made their

burdens lighter ("they didn't have to walk in [to the funeral]" [Unvanquished, p. 178]) these people, especially the Blacks, have no one to care about them. His recognition of "the sum, the sharp serpent's fang, of bereavement and loss" (Unvanquished, p. 178) may be partially why Bayard pursues Grumby; he will not allow the memory of his grandmother to be forgotten--someone must care. In sharp contrast to the humble hill people standing in the rain in their cotton bagging and split flour-sack clothes are the townspeople, who depict with their umbrellas and concern for funereal ritual the well-bred respect for tradition. Bayard, along with Brother Fortinbride, the hill preacher, rejects this adherence to ritual. That narrator-Bayard so carefully includes Brother Fortinbride's sermon of truth at the end of the funeral and that the young Bayard follows the sermon's suggestion ("And what do you reckon Rosa Millard would say about you all standing around here, keeping old folks and children out here in the rain?" [Unvanquished, p. 180]) indicate Bayard's rejection of the townspeople's desire for ritual. Also heightening the realism is the imagery of gloom and desolation sketched by the steady rain as it meshes the turned earth with the surrounding terrain on the newly dug grave: "The earth was loose and soft now, dark and red with rain, so that the rain didn't splash on Granny at all; it just dissolved slow and gray into the dark-red mound, so that after a while the mound began to dissolve, too, without changing

shape, like the soft yellow color of the boards had dissolved and stained up through the earth, and mound and boards and rain were all melting into one vague quiet reddish gray" (Unvanquished, p. 181). This description suggests that life and death intertwine; now the boy finds nothing heroic or glamorous in Granny's courageous actions.

Spurred by this scene, Bayard does not hesitate in his next decision:

> "What you boys going to do now?" he said. . . .
> "I want to borrow a pistol," I said.
> (Unvanquished, p. 181)

At the beginning of Ringo's and Bayard's pursuit of Grumby, the boys, too inexperienced to know how to start, depend on Uncle Buck to reinforce Bayard's determination to ignore Ab Snopes and to concentrate on the real murderer, Grumby--as Uncle Buck states: "'By Godfrey, we're going to do this thing but by Godfrey we're going to do it right'" (Unvanquished, p. 186). Weeks of endless tracking of Grumby's horses follow under the worst possible conditions (rain, frost, snow), but the boys never falter. As nature's elements test their physical endurance, so Grumby's shrewdness (for long periods of time they merely ride in circles) taxes their mental tolerance. Thus, when Ringo accidentally comes upon Grumby's hiding place and is, himself, discovered, Uncle Buck must use all his power to keep the boys from stumbling off into the night to continue their search: "'They are flesh and blood, the same as we are.

And we ain't scared'" (Unvanquished, p. 189). The bizarre entrance of the stranger who puts a bullet through Uncle Buck's arm and the discovery of a penitent Ab Snopes tied and abandoned by Grumby's gang climax the boys' struggle. Figuratively, the boys have reached manhood so that they can handle alone (their guide, Uncle Buck, returns to Jefferson) the unpleasant initiation task.

This mission, however, is arduous. Their lack of fear and straightforward approach carry them successfully through the climactic encounter with Grumby. In this scene the boys, who have waited so long to catch Grumby, ironically at first, may be observers only, for the Black man who holds Grumby hostage keeps them at bay. They watch as the Black man brings Grumby before them, frees him, condemns him for killing Granny, offers Grumby one last chance as he throws a gun at Grumby's feet, and finally warns Grumby to stay away from Texas, the Black's next destination. While all these actions transpire between Grumby and the Black, the boys continue to be passive. Still watching Grumby fire after the fleeing Black, they dismount and stand inert, listening to Grumby try to talk his way around them. But Grumby's statement that he has emptied his pistol and stands defenseless does not trick Bayard: "'You shot three times. You have got two more shots in it'" (Unvanquished, p. 208). Once Bayard knows he is master of the situation, the boys' passive roles cease. The fight that follows pits

Grumby, first against Bayard and then against Ringo and Bayard. However, narrator-Bayard notes his failure to remember the sequence of events: "Then it [Grumby's initial lunge] happened. I know what did happen, but even now I don't know how, in what order" (Unvanquished, p. 208). Only after Ringo frees Bayard from Grumby's grip does Bayard indicate awareness of the arrangement of the final series of events: "Then I was free. I saw Ringo straddle of Grumby's back. . . . Then Grumby bucked Ringo off. . . . and then my arm began to come up with the pistol and he turned and ran. . . . now my arm had come up and now I could see Grumby's back (he didn't scream, he never made a sound) and the pistol both at the same time and the pistol was level and steady as a rock" (Unvanquished, p. 210). Bayard's final actions symbolize the determination he has exhibited since his request for Uncle Buck's weapon at Rosa Millard's grave.

However, this last act against Grumby prompts two key literary questions: is Bayard's shooting of Grumby in the back anything more than cold-blooded murder, and is the ending earned as a result of Faulkner's dramatization? That the hand holding the pistol was "level and steady as a rock" suggests a calculated effort. Yet the reader need only remember all the days of difficult pursuit, the bizarre complication that results from the Black's appearance, and what must be Bayard's persistent vision of Granny lying dead by Grumby's hand to

realize that, what Volpe calls, "Bayard's relentless determination"[31] justifies the final revenge on Grumby.

Secondly, Brooks worries whether the emotions Bayard reveals are sufficiently developed to merit the conclusion: "As Bayard describes the long chase and finally the killing of Grumby, there is very little in the telling to indicate the scarring of his psyche that evidently occurred. He narrates the story tersely and objectively, with few, if any, comments on his own emotions."[32] Here Brooks must be overlooking several strategically placed passages that, when read figuratively, do reveal Bayard's emotions during the long pursuit. The first key passage is the one in which Bayard recognizes the abandoned Blacks' true loss. In his pursuit of Grumby he proves his determination not to let Granny go unavenged. Next he stands grieving for Granny as the rain falls on the funeral "slow and cold and gray" (Unvanquished, p. 179). This image of rain becomes, as the burial scene ends, a motif synonymous with tears, pain, and grief. Watching the ground dissolve into the newly dug grave, Bayard in pain strikes out for revenge. Then, as Uncle Buck understands that Bayard will hunt Grumby down, Bayard captures verbally the deepening quality his grief will reach in the coming days: "It was changing all the time, with the slow gray rain lancing slow and gray and cold into the red earth, yet it did not change. It would be some time yet; it would be days and weeks and then months before

it would be smooth and quiet and level with the other earth" (Unvanquished, p. 182). Literally, he is speaking of the mound on the grave, but figuratively he is referring to grief, which is slow to change--something only time can ease. Ultimately the boys' actions after Grumby's death confirm Bayard's grief. Anger and love for Rosa Millard motivate the grisly nailing of Grumby's body to the door of the cotton compress, the severing of his hand, and the placing of it at Rosa's grave. Hence, these acts represent a sincere if grotesque expression of that grief: "We unwrapped it [Grumby's hand] from the jagged sqaure of stained faded gray cloth and fastened it to the board. 'Now she can lay good and quiet,' Ringo said" (Unvanquished, p. 211). And, these gestures produce a catharsis that attests to the boys' grief: "'Yes,' I said. And then we both began to cry" (Unvanquished, p. 211).

Even though clear revelation of Bayard's grief in Faulkner's dramatization is open to scholarly question, that Bayard is functioning beyond any ritual or code is not. This initial act of manhood anticipates the ultimate repudiation of codes and traditions Bayard makes in "An Odor of Verbena." Brooks is conservative on this point: "It is not primarily [italics mine] a question of the boy's personal commitment to a code of retribution . . . "[33]; Volpe is more positive: "Bayard's relentless determination to avenge the murder of his grandmother is not, however, simply a ritualistic observance of the

traditional code. . . . Bayard's pursuit is motivated by deep personal grief, by anger, and by shock . . . ."[34] Howell, seeing the dichotomies at work in Bayard's soul, is also positive: " . . . there is something generous and manly about it [his revenge]. His love for his grandmother is so blended with outrgae at the affront to his name that he acts not consciously by any code at all, but by the promptings of his own nature."[35] The boys' acts in "Vendée" have been almost exclusively spontaneous. Although the boys have seen codes at work, as this paper has noted above numerous times, it is not until they return home and are greeted by Colonel Sartoris, Drusilla, and Uncle Buck that any suggestion of traditional observance occurs:

> "The proof and the expiation!" Uncle Buck hollered. "When me and John Sartoris and Drusilla rode up to that old compress, the first thing we see was that murdering scoundrel pegged out on the door to it like a coon hide, all except the right hand. 'And if anybody wants to see that, too,' I told John Sartoris, 'just let them ride into Jefferson and look on Rosa Millard's grave!' Ain't I told you he is John Sartoris' boy? Hey? Ain't I told you?" (Unvanquished, p. 213)

Uncle Buck's suggesting that the responsibilities, begun in the journey to Memphis, are complete confers manhood on the tired and exhausted boys--Bayard is a Sartoris. It is conceivable that the subconscious effect of this scene on the exhausted, sleepy Bayard is permanent. Thus, when he struggles with his conscience whether to kill Redmond to honor the code or to avoid bloodshed to repudiate the code, Uncle

Buck's proclamation may have been efficacious.

But before the reader learns of Bayard's final personal struggle, Faulkner includes the chapter "Skirmish at Sartoris" to delineate the price the South paid in the Civil War defeat and to reveal Drusilla's character. Essentially "Skirmish at Sartoris" is about the Reconstruction, where men like Colonel Sartoris fight to keep the Carpetbaggers from destroying the South's traditions. Narrator-Bayard suggests that the young Bayard does not have a role to play in this effort, perhaps because his youth is not so dependent on traditions as are his father's set ways; the reader merely receives the action through narrator-Bayard's eyes.

The second key function of this transition chapter is to sketch more fully the characterization of Drusilla. "Skirmish at Sartoris" dramatizes the unsexing of Drusilla as she disappears and rides with Colonel Sartoris. The hysterical reactions of Aunt Louisa and her Jefferson cronies who force Drusilla back to her womanly appearance and Colonel Sartoris to marry Drusilla to preserve her honor constitute much of the present action. The bride of Colonel Sartoris literally, she becomes the bride of the South symbolically. By the end of "Skirmish at Sartoris," as Drusilla's wedding dress is torn, the wreath and veil crooked, so are the principles for which the South fought and died distorted in Colonel Sartoris' deeds. Brooks' suggestion is that "Skirmish at Sartoris" represents Drusilla

as a casualty of the war.[36] This character delineation prefigures the tragic developments in "An Odor of Verbena," particularly Drusilla's obsession with heroics.

The tragic situations of "An Odor of Verbena" assure the reader that Bayard has resolved the conflicts that have plagued his soul and has reconciled himself to his society. In the first six stories Faulkner has shown Bayard aware of the price the South paid in the Civil War defeat, cognizant of the uncertainty Granny's death and the killing of Grumby have created in him, and prophetic about the final demand Colonel Sartoris and Drusilla will make upon him. "Vendée" concludes with Uncle Buck's pronouncement that the boys' revenge on Grumby confirms that Bayard is the son of John Sartoris; "An Odor of Verbena" tests that claim. As Bayard had to find Grumby and avenge Granny's death, so must he now find Redmond and retaliate for the Colonel's death. And, although he does not doubt that he will confront Redmond, he does question whether his procedure will be adequate: "I had for some time known I was becoming [mature] and had feared the test of it. . . . At least this will be my chance to find out if I am what I think I am or if I just hope; if I am going to do what I have taught myself is right or if I am just going to wish I were" (Unvanquished, p. 248). Before Bayard turns his horse toward the Sartoris plantation, then, he knows how he will specifically deal with Redmond, "how if there was anything at all in the Book, anything of hope and

peace for its blind and bewildered spawn which He had chosen above all others to offer immortality, Thou shalt not kill must be it" (Unvanquished, p. 249). As Walker suggests, "Bayard knew what he had to do, knew what he hoped to be able to do even before he got all of the facts from George Wyatt. He must put an end to the violence which had defiled tradition."[37]

This task will be complicated by the heritage Colonel Sartoris leaves to Bayard. There is the killing of the two Burdens in the distant past. More recently, with only vague motivation, Colonel Sartoris has killed a hill man. Finally, in enmity, he nags Redmond ("Father continued to badger Redmond without reason or need" [Unvanquished, p. 261]) until Redmond kills him. The Colonel, ruthless and callous, has upheld, however, the Southern code into which he was born. Believing in the war in which he has fought and sacrificed for, the Colonel sees in the South's defeat one last hope--to rebuild what was good in the former society. Those who oppose this dream must be stopped; that the Colonel uses the "eye for an eye" code of ethics merely reaffirms his faithfulness to his heritage.

This matter of heritage prompts James Meriwether to propose that Colonel Sartoris gave Bayard courage and set an example for him to follow. Walker cannot accept this theory, for he believes Colonel Sartoris' ruthless, selfish motives would have no meaning to Bayard's honorable struggle to make

a decision.[38] However, the Colonel does follow his beliefs unflaggingly and also demonstrates his courage to allow Redmond to kill him. Bayard may not admire the bondage to useless tradition--he certainly does not agree with the Colonel's actions; yet he must know the intensity of the spiritual struggle that the Colonel waged to be able to renounce killing: "'Yes. I have accomplished my aim, and now I shall do a little moral house-cleaning. I am tired of killing men, no matter what the necessity nor the end. Tomorrow, when I go to town and meet Ben Redmond, I shall be unarmed'" (Unvanquished, p. 266).

Like the Colonel, Bayard must reflect upon his decision to uphold the fifth commandment. He knows that the killing of Grumby has matured him and knows, too, that he has evaluated life's meaning differently from Ringo: " . . . in a way he had changed even less than I had since that day when we had nailed Grumby's body to the door of the old compress. Maybe it was because he had outgrown me, had changed so much that summer while he and Granny traded mules with the Yankees . . . " (Unvanquished, p. 248). Perhaps Bayard is right the first time. He has changed more than Ringo, since the moment he shot Grumby. Ringo was not called upon to take a life, forced to ponder the morality of that act every day thereafter. Instead, Ringo's physical trials, the mule-stealing business, his race's tragedies, and his observations of Sartoris troubles have made him callous, not sensitive, have developed his instinct to act, not think: "'We could bushwhack him,' he said. 'Like

we done Grumby that day. But I reckon that wouldn't suit that white skin you walks around in'" (Unvanquished, p. 251). Ringo is still unable to distinguish the romantic, bushwhack, from the realistic: "and now I could see Grumby's back . . . and the pistol both at the same time and the pistol was level and steady as a rock" (Unvanquished, p. 210). Bayard's awareness outdistances Ringo's. Unlike Ringo, he has reached the exploratory night-journey to the soul's essence. Having wrestled with the first killing and having vowed never to kill again, he moves to face Redmond--the first serious problem he handles without Ringo's aid.

Bayard's simple no to Ringo's bushwhacking suggestion will buttress him to say no to Drusilla, who offers the remaining temptation for Bayard to break his resolution not to kill again. Bayard knows he can rationalize the townsmen's reaction to his decision: " . . . only the young could do that [condone] "Thou shalt not kill"--one still young enough to have his youth supplied him gratis as a reason (not an excuse) for cowardice" (Unvanquished, pp. 249-250). He is not so confident about his meeting with Drusilla:

> We rode on, toward the house where he would be lying in the parlor now, in his regimentals (sabre too) and where Drusilla would be waiting for me beneath all the festive glitter of the chandeliers, in the yellow ball gown and the sprig of verbena in her hair, holding the two loaded pistols . . . (the face calm, almost bemused, the head simple and severe, the balancing sprig of verbena above each ear, the two arms bent at the elbows, the two hands

> shoulder high, the two identical duelling pistols lying upon, not clutched in, one to each: the Greek amphora priestess of a succinct and formal violence). (Unvanquished, p. 252)

For one thing he knows she is strong: the festive room and her yellow ball gown connote joy, not sorrow, and the fragrance of the sprig of verbena, her personal symbol, overpowers him. She has transcended her grief to guarantee the revenge she expects to motivate Bayard to exact. However, Bayard is also aware that his reasons for rejecting Drusilla's seduction will give him strength. Unlike Bayard, who in "Ambuscade" and "Retreat" ran out of "frozen immobility," she stands motionless, immature and unaware of the change the South has experienced. Secondly, she represents "a succinct and formal violence" that Bayard has learned can result only in tragedy (the formal violence of Colonel Sartoris and the Confederates and the ritually executed showdown with the Burdens, for example). Indeed, the telling element missing in Bayard's chase and killing of Grumby was formality, ritual.

Although Bayard's ultimate rejection of Drusilla's code is never much in doubt, Faulkner strategically places Drusilla's and Bayard's second garden scene between the initial decision of Bayard to avoid bloodshed and the confrontation with Redmond. In the first garden scene Drusilla has suggested the glamor of Colonel Sartoris' dream, which in abstract terms is for the people and the land, explained that a good dream is worth "one

human life or two dozen" (Unvanquished, p. 257), and told Bayard the meaning of the sprigs of verbena she wears: "the only scent you could smell above the smell of horses and courage and so it was the only one that was worth the wearing" (Unvanquished, pp. 253-254). Four years later, realizing that she has lost control over Colonel Sartoris, she selects Bayard as her next standard-bearer of the formal violence she advocates:

> Now she was looking at me in a way she had never before. I did not know what it meant then and was not to know until tonight since neither of us knew then that two months later Father would be dead. I just knew that she was looking at me as she never had before and that the scent of the verbena in her hair seemed to have increased a hundred times, to have got a hundred times stronger, to be everywhere in the dust in which something was about to happen which I had never dreamed of. Then she spoke. "Kiss me, Bayard." (Unvanquished, pp. 261-262)

Overwhelmed, Bayard attempts to relate this scene to his father but soon realizes that the Colonel does not even hear him, that his eyes "in the last two years had acquired that transparent film which the eyes of carnivorous animals have" (Unvanquished, p. 266). Bayard's realization of the Colonel's loss of will comes when he tries a second time to tell his father about Drusilla: "I looked at him, watched him fill both glasses and this time I knew it was worse with him than not hearing: it didn't even matter" (Unvanquished, p. 266).

Now, as Walker proposes, Bayard knows the true extent of Drusilla's power: "she was the 'eternal snake,' and it was in the garden where the temptation took place. John Sartoris's

dream was her dream; it was she that kept him marked for 'power and glory,' symbolized after the war by the odor of verbena, 'horses and courage.' She would not let him leave Redmond in peace. And Bayard recognized her for what she was, just as Colonel Sartoris came to recognize her as a perpetuation of violence . . . ."[39] Yet, Drusilla's power traps even her, for, as she greets Bayard in her ball gown, she is "quite as mad as Medea. She is acting out a ceremony but is so completely caught up in it that she becomes something rapt and terrible."[40] Or, as Page states, "Faulkner makes it very clear that Drusilla's behavior is the product of her grief. Nevertheless, the more she is involved in violence the more she is committed to it. . . . Drusilla urges him [Bayard] into battle, for she wishes to achieve through him the only fulfillment she has ever known--the experience of the courage it takes to meet death."[41] The critics, therefore, generally agree that the pre-war Southern code obsesses Drusilla, who ultimately becomes a warped, lost character in "An Odor of Verbena." Perhaps, one additional point may be offered to show just how dramatically Faulkner wished to debase the Southern code. By introducing the adultery motif in "An Odor of Verbena," Faulkner denotes the true frailty of the code the Colonel and Drusilla held to be inviolable. Nothing has been sacred if Drusilla is willing to even speak of committing adultery. The word itself would demean the original purpose of Drusilla's and the Colonel's

joint effort "to hurt Yankees, not [hunt] women" (Unvanquished, p. 227). This attempted seduction, more than anything else, may cause Bayard to repudiate Drusilla and her code. He is finished with killing, empty ritual, and falseness to one's self. Having placed the pistols in Bayard's hands and told him of the glamor and heroism of revenge, she discovers this repudiation:

> She had bent and kissed it before I comprehended why she took it. Then she stopped dead still, still stooping in that attitude of fierce exultant humility, her hot lips and her hot hands still touching my flesh . . . staring at me with intolerable and amazed incredulity which occupied her face alone for a whole minute while her eyes were completely empty. . . . Then her eyes filled with an expression of bitter and passionate betrayal. "Why, he's not--" she said. "He's not--and I kissed his hand," she said in an aghast whisper . . . . (Unvanquished, pp. 274-275)

Only the meeting with Redmond remains to conclude the complex journey Bayard has taken in his initiation into life.

In this final incident, Aunt Jenny, serving as surrogate for Granny, "a counter to Drusilla,"[42] supports Bayard; she comforts him the night before he faces Redmond by telling him that she will think well of him even if he remains hidden all day in the stable loft. Her anecdote about the heroic blockade-runner and his dependence on "No bloody moon" symbolically reminds Bayard that courage often hinges on chance. Here Aunt Jenny, to sustain Bayard's own beliefs, verbalizes one of the many examples of reality deflating pseudo-heroism in The Unvanquished. As Waggoner suggests, "Bayard wants to

exhibit a courage that can stand the light of greater awareness and broader and deeper sympathies."[43]

The brand of courage Bayard does exhibit complements his high ideals:

> So we did not speak; I just walked steadily toward him as the pistol rose from the desk. I watched it, I could see the foreshortened slant of the barrel and I knew it would miss me though his hand did not tremble. . . . I still watched that foreshortened slant barrel which I knew was not aimed at me and saw the second orange flash and smoke and heard no bullet that time either. Then I stopped; it was done then. (Unvanquished, pp. 286-287)

Recognizing that the bloodshed must end with him, Bayard faces Redmond unarmed and relives in a dreamlike state the same kind of numbed courage he experienced against Grumby. The simplistic way he accepts the two explosions from Redmond's gun and the ironic understatement revealed in his line, "it was done then," show that it is Bayard "who is unvanquished. . . . He is the promise of a new generation of understanding."[44] George Wyatt commends this responsibility: "'Maybe you're right, maybe there has been enough killing in your family without--Come on'" (Unvanquished, p. 289). Drusilla echoes Wyatt's praise in the sprig of verbena she leaves on Bayard's bed. Most critics agree with Brooks, who calls the act "a token that she too has accepted his act as brave and honorable."[45] Aware of Drusilla's tribute to him, Bayard simultaneously recognizes that her brand of honor is vanquished: "without looking she would pinch off a half dozen of them [sprigs] and they would be all of a size,

almost all of a shape, as if a machine had stamped them out" (Unvanquished, p. 293). Her code of heroism has become meaningless and mechanical--an almost automatic process lacking thought and feeling.[46]

However, these tributes have cost Bayard an excessive price. From the moment he and Granny and Ringo were called upon to save the Sartoris plantation and aid the abandoned Blacks and hill people, he was dealing with moral problems any teen-ager would fear. Although he wavers in his decisions and often retreats to his childhood world, he faces each successive test with a new level of maturity. Several times the reader wants to cry, "enough"--specifically with the killing of Grumby. Yet Faulkner, looking toward a decisive initiation, cannot conclude Bayard's trials in "Vendée." If Grumby's death were Bayard's last act, the reader would be left with the image of a bitter, troubled young man. The reader would have to assume that only a tentative initiation was intended; Bayard would not be reconciled to life.

"An Odor of Verbena" delineates Bayard's decisive initiation when he defends the Sartoris honor. Brylowski suggests the significance of this decision: "The Unvanquished is important in the history of Faulkner's publications in that it represents his first attempt to work out a reconciliation with society on the part of his central character. . . . all his novels have presented a form of alienation from society resulting in defeat

or a reaffirmation of the stasis of the wasteland. In The Unvanquished we have the first true initiation pattern, true in the sense that the mythic rites are meant to assure the integration of the subject into adult society."[47] The dramatization of this reconciliation to society occurs in the creek-bottom scene after Bayard has faced Redmond, the very creek bottom where the boys hid the Yankee mules (near the site of the boys' shooting of the Yankee horse and the smokehouse where the boys played their Civil War games): "I lay in the pasture on my back, I thought Now it can begin again if it wants to. But it did not. I went to sleep. I went to sleep almost before I had stopped thinking. I slept for almost five hours and I didn't dream anything at all yet I waked myself up crying, crying too hard to stop it" (Unvanquished, p. 290). This catharsis is reminiscent of Bayard's tears at Granny's grave but with a significant difference. Then overjoyed by the boys' safe return, Drusilla, the Colonel, and Uncle Buck, by embracing, praising, and holding the boys as a parent fondles a lost child, draw them back to their dependent roles in the Sartoris family. Now Bayard leaves the creek bottom and meets Aunt Jenny, who discovers that Bayard is a man no longer to be treated as a child. Frustrated in her attempt to caress him, she cries out, "'Oh, damn you Sartorises!' she said. 'Damn you! Damn you!'" (Unvanquished, pp. 291-292). He walks alone to his room and discovers the sprig of verbena now serving as the emblem of his manhood.

Chapter IV

Go Down, Moses: The Failed Initiation

The primary justification for the long and detailed analysis of The Unvanquished (highly dependent on plot) was the absence of any such scholarly study. Unfortunately, the opposite problem faces the student who wishes to make a thorough study of Go Down, Moses (1942) which "has become increasingly a focal point of Faulkner criticism."[1] Almost every aspect of content, style, and theme has been discussed and debated. Basically, critics agree that the seven stories, finding their principal unity in theme, function as a novel. Critics, however, fail to agree in their interpretation of that theme. A fair sampling underscores this point: the theme of the wilderness (O'Connor and Millgate), white-Negro relationships (Backman, Millgate, Muste, Sultan), a study of the myth of the Negro (Vickery), the theme of innocence (Reed), the fate of the McCaslin family (Sultan), the theme of injustice to the Negro (Taylor and O'Connor), and the white man's failure to love (Muste). Yet, regardless of this disagreement, critics recognize the decisive initiation of Ike McCaslin as basic to the novel. Therefore, this search for theme must center on "The Old People," "The Bear," and "Delta Autumn."

First, then, the reader must decide the consequences of Ike's initiation. The epiphany occurs late in "Delta Autumn" when Roth's Black mistress asks McCaslin, "'have you lived so long and forgotten so much that you dont remember anything you ever knew or felt or even heard about love?'"[2] Ike does not even know that his repudiation of his heritage fails to end the evil his family has created; he must do good through love in order to prevent future evil. Suddenly, if the reader perceives the nature of Ike's failure in "Delta Autumn," the other stories in the novel echo generalized aspects of Ike's specific mistake. Faulkner, weaving patterns of love-hate experiences into each of the other stories that surround the initiation trilogy, proposes that love could have saved Ike. If Ike has failed to understand the humanistic essence of man, the reader need not. In "Was" Faulkner begins an investigation that by the conclusion of the novel will have examined a variety of love-hate relationships to extract every possible reading from this theme. John Muste has, in part, analyzed this theme:

> . . . it is nevertheless my belief that a careful study of Go Down, Moses reveals that this is a structured work of fiction, unified not only by the presence of the McCaslin family, the consistent concern with white-Negro relationships, and the presence in each of the stories of some kind of hunt, but also and most importantly by the theme of the white man's failure to love. . . . This theme developed painstakingly by Faulkner through all of the seven stories in the book is that in his human relationships, the white man has not known or felt anything about love, and has been unable to understand what he has heard.[3]

However, Muste's theory requires expansion to account for all that is said about love in Go Down, Moses.

In the first lines of "Was" Faulkner begins his study of the nature of love: "Isaac McCaslin, 'Uncle Ike', past seventy and nearer eighty than he ever corroborated anymore, a widower now and uncle to half a county and father to no one" (Moses, p. 3). The reader learns that, although married, Ike McCaslin has no children, the natural products of love, and can only be an "uncle" to the many offspring that Ike's relatives have created out of their personal relationships. Since the reader will cover over one hundred fifty pages before he reaches Ike's own story, and indeed will move through another two hundred pages of complex narrative before he probably understands why Ike has become only Uncle Ike, is it not possible that this first sentence in "Was" is the kernel of the entire novel's plot? From the position of the idea, is it not possible that Faulkner wishes to emphasize this primacy? After all, the next thought requires a group of words reaching over a page in length, without beginning capitalization or end punctuation. Stylistically, then, the simple fact of Ike's "uncleship" stands in marked contrast with the stream-of-consciousness rambling of Ike's remaining history. In fact after the first three paragraphs, Ike disappears from "Was."

Instead "Was," set in a time long before Ike's birth, is the story of his mother, father, uncle, and Cass Edmonds. As

the title indicates, the time "was" different then; a history is being recounted. What the reader perhaps should do therefore is compare the past in "Was" with the more recent events in the stories that follow. Any analysis of the story however must first account for point of view--that of nine-year-old Cass Edmonds. Indeed, as Vickery notes, "The only reason for having the story told from the point of view of the child, Cass Edmonds, is that he is being initiated into the plantation world with its various duties, responsibilities, and adventures."[4] Faulkner has created a limited initiation study that prefigures Ike's complex experience. It is further important to remember that Cass will become Ike's social mentor and keeper of the McCaslin tradition in the trilogy section.[5]

Although the story is told from the young child's point of view, Faulkner employs James' method of authorial commentary, which "constantly attends and amplifies" the youthful perspective. Never does the reader forget that a maturer omniscient narrator controls the story's entire frame. At some time in the past the man Cass has told these events to the omniscient narrator (one hesitates to suggest that the omniscient narrator is an older Cass, for it is difficult to document Cass' existence beyond October to November of 1888 [the commissary conversation and, later, the payments of the monthly pension to Ike]; it is even more difficult to establish a new voice for "Delta Autumn" and "Go Down, Moses"); moreover, no one would attribute much of

the vocabulary and thinking in section one to a nine-year-old boy (e.g., " . . . his wife had willed [the house] to him at her death and which he had pretended to accept, acquiesce to, to humor her, ease her going but which was not his, will or not, chancery dying wishes mortmain possession or whatever" [Moses, p. 4]). However, sections two to four maintain wide-eyed enthusiasm through Cass' limited point of view--what he has seen and the dialogue he has heard.

The story in which Cass participates is different in its light-hearted mood and tone from Ike's tragic failure; yet the love-hate theme may be detected. Essentially Cass recounts the chase of Tomey's Turl, who runs away to Mr. Hubert Beauchamp's plantation to court a Black girl, Tennie. Uncle Buck and Cass give chase; but, when Uncle Buck creates a compromising situation for Mr. Hubert's sister, Uncle Buddy must rescue them. A card game saves Uncle Buck from marriage to Sophonsiba, and Tennie returns with Tomey's Turl to the McCaslin place. Such a straightforward plot would hardly hold the rapt attention of a nine-year-old; yet Reed correctly suggests that Cass "is having a whale of a good time."[6] Faulkner colors the simple plot with slapstick comedy, ironic twists of fate, and the boy's limited perception. As Vickery, Muste, and Reed agree, the boy's innocence affects the tone: "McCaslin Edmonds is perfect as the vehicle for making this a humorous story, and for allowing Faulkner to introduce his [love] theme indirectly."[7] Cass

is unaware that phony sophistication underlies Miss Sophonsiba's efforts to call the Beauchamp place "Warwick after the place in England that she said Mr Hubert was probably the true earl of only he never even had enough pride, not to mention energy, to take the trouble to establish his just rights" (Moses, p. 5). Nor does Cass register shock either at the chase of Tomey's Turl and Tennie, who are human quarry, or at the card game, which raises human lives as ante. Reed's explanation of just this limited point of view further suggests Faulkner's control of the story:

> The headlong involvement, centering in Cass's consciousness, keeps the surface consistent but does not prevent the same narrative from suggesting to us some darker hints beneath the surface. . . . This is an innocence which persists in the face of myth-destroying fact. That the board on the porch of Warwick is rotten, that Sophonsiba is keeping up appearances with a horn-boy atop the gate, that it "would sound as if she and Mr Hubert owned two separate plantations covering the same area of ground, one on top of the other" (p. 9), all this can maintain its own innocence, but let us know what's going on.[8]

In an initial reading of "Was" the child's enthusiasm limits the reader's awareness of the criticism leveled against the McCaslin way of life. Cass does not note, as mentioned above, that Tomey's Turl and Tennie are caught in a hunting chase where humans are the bait, as the adult males do not reveal they see anything wrong with resolving arguments by a hand of cards.

Here also the casual treatment of human beings in "Was" demonstrates one aspect of the love-hate theme. Further, the

reader learns of Miss Sophonsiba's relentless pursuit of Uncle Buck, whom marriage terrifies; their love relationship becomes a farce of the courtly-love tradition. Tomey's Turl and Tennie, however, may represent the real or natural love relationship. Turl's ongoing devotion to Tennie, while disguised by the story's humor, is admirable. Indeed, Uncle Buck's and Buddy's concern for each other is a kind of fraternal devotion, and Cass's good humor in the face of the trials Uncle Buck creates reveals the boy's faithfulness to his uncle. These subtle suggestions that more is occurring in "Was" than just some humorous good fun anticipate the human dilemmas that grow in the more modern times of the McCaslin clan and culminate with Ike in "Delta Autumn." Since the McCaslin troubles are sinister, complex, and irrevocable, Faulkner may have chosen the light-hearted tone and slapstick events of "Was" to ease the reader into the darker heart of Go Down, Moses.

Although humor is occasional, the innocent narrator non-existent, and the plot more complex, "The Fire and the Hearth" extends the love-hate relationships of Lucas and Molly, Roth and Henry, and Zack and Lucas. As critics have noted, Lucas, functioning as the principal Black character, offers readers a point of contrast to Ike.[9] In "The Fire and the Hearth" Faulkner juxtaposes Lucas' urge to find gold to his love for Molly, for he cannot sustain both, and delineates the intensity of that love in the symbol of the fire on the hearth in the

house "which old Cass had built for them when they married, keeping alive on the hearth the fire he had lit there on their wedding day and which had burned ever since" (Moses, p. 46). In the distant past Lucas had almost destroyed his marriage and the symbol of its love:

> But there had been that half-year almost [when Molly lived at Zack's house caring for the motherless Roth] and himself alone keeping alive the fire which was to burn on the hearth until neither he nor Molly were left to feed it, himself sitting before it night after night through that spring and summer until one night he caught himself standing over it, furious, bursting, blind, the cedar water bucket already poised until he caught himself and set the bucket back on the shelf, still shaking, unable to remember taking the bucket up even. (Moses, pp. 46-47)

Only the courage to face Zack in a life-and-death struggle and to demand Molly's return averts disaster. Great mental torture has led Lucas to allow the fire to continue to burn.

Therefore when Molly, in the present time of the story, asks Edmonds to help her leave Lucas, the reader wonders why Lucas does not resolve this anti-climactic conflict immediately. Surely Roth's suggestion to continue an occasional search for the gold must have occurred to Lucas as a way of avoiding divorce. Thus an old man's stubbornness maintains the dramatic tension. The comic final scene between the proud Lucas and the angry court clerk, the terse exchange between Lucas and Roth, and the peace offering to Molly from Lucas--

> He was carrying a small sack--obviously candy, a nickel's worth. He put it into Molly's hand.
> "Here," he said. "You aint got no teeth left but you can still gum it"--(Moses, pp. 129-130)

vivify the natural love-relationship between Molly and Lucas.

In this restatement of his love for Molly, he reveals his interpretation of the nature of Ike's failure. Lucas explains this understanding to Zack as they struggle for the gun with which Lucas attempts to regain Molly:

> "You knowed I could beat you, so you thought to beat me with old Carothers, like Cass Edmonds done Isaac: used old Carothers to make Isaac give up the land that was his because Cass Edmonds was the woman-made McCaslin, the woman-branch, the sister, and old Carothers would have told Isaac to give in to the woman-kin that couldn't fend for herself." (Moses, p. 56)

Unlike Ike, Lucas sees the need to place his individual integrity before his family heritage (Brooks prefers Lucas' "pride and integrity for his own rights"[10]); he will instigate action, affect the future, and accept responsibility for murder. And in the plowing scene Faulkner reveals the peace and love that result from the willingness to act: " . . . the dinner smoke stood weightless in the bright air above his chimney and then at the old time she came along the fence with the covered pan and the pail. He did not look at her. He plowed on until the plantation bell rang for noon. He watered and fed the mule and himself ate--the milk, the still-warm biscuit--and rested in the shade until the bell rang again" (Moses, p. 58). The language of domesticity, of physical satisfaction, and of peace suggests that Lucas has restored order to his home; the supper that Molly leaves on the hearth dramatizes the survival of their love. Indeed Lucas can now use the restored love to offer

charity to others. When Molly reassures Lucas that she will return after having put Roth to bed, he encourages her to continue the care of Zack's son. Hence Lucas' dangerous and potentially tragic actions do create good. Lucas, in these commitments to action, negates the value of passivity to which Ike clings. Lucas' final question indicates a wise, realistic resolution of the dilemma: "'How to God,' he said, 'can a black man ask a white man to please not lay down with his black wife? And even if he could ask it, how to God can the white man promise he wont?'" (Moses, p. 59). He realizes the inherent conflict between man's weak nature and his ideals. By the conclusion of Go Down, Moses, the reader should see that Lucas' resolution offers a pattern for living in the world; Ike's does not.

As the thrown pebble creates a continuing series of enlarging circles on the water, so does the basic love pattern in "The Fire and the Hearth" produce increasingly complex human relationships. Molly's and Lucas' love deepens Roth's ability to love:

> Still in infancy, he [Roth] had already accepted the black man as an adjunct to the woman who was the only mother he would remember, as simply as he accepted his black foster-brother, as simply as he accepted his father as an adjunct to his existence. Even before he was out of infancy, the two houses had become interchangeable: himself and his foster-brother sleeping on the same pallet in the white man's house or in the same bed in the negro's and eating of the same food at the same table in either, actually preferring the negro house, the hearth on which

> even in summer a little fire always burned, centering the life in it, to his own. (Moses, p. 110)

This sense of security in Molly's home remains undiminished when he consciously notes that he has no mother; " . . . he knew that his own mother was dead and did not grieve" (Moses, p. 110). He finds contentment in being able to act as a child does, "only to love, to question and examine unchallenged, and to be let alone" (Moses, p. 111). Through Roth, Faulkner reaffirms that love is vital to man's peace of mind. Roth destroys love, however, by denying Henry the right to sleep with him and by refusing to justify his denial. Momentarily his heritage has overwhelmed him: "Then one day the old curse of his fathers, the old haughty ancestral pride based not on any value but on an accident of geography, stemmed not from courage and honor but from wrong and shame, descended to him" (Moses, p. 111). Although Roth suffers remorse, he never again eats or sleeps with Henry. Indeed Roth's story is another limited initiation which Faulkner uses to counterpoint Ike's initiation: Faulkner does not analyze the effects of this initiation, but this experience does color Roth's actions as they concern Ike in "Delta Autumn." Later Roth understands that his experience was not unique, for Lucas and Zack, in their youth, have had much the same relationship. Likewise their brotherhood was destroyed by the curse of their heritage. In "The Fire and the Hearth" Faulkner emphasizes that, no matter where one looks in the

McCaslin family history, love-hate emotions guide the human relationships.

Its total dependence on the love theme links "Pantaloon in Black" to the other stories (the only literal link to them is that Rider rents his house from Carothers Edmonds). Rider dramatizes one intense aspect of love--the experience of mourning. Unable to verbalize his grief, the ignorant Black rampages through the countryside using liquor, work, and dice as opiates for his emotions. Finally he kills. Captured, Rider accepts guilt but not imprisonment: his grief, a psychological bondage, will merge with the physical bondage to destroy him. Indeed the jail does not hold Rider for long: he rips the cell apart, fights off a group of chain-gang Blacks who attempt to control him, and, once prostrate, continues periodically to fling his subduers across the room. Faulkner's final picture of Rider sketches a grotesque caricature of grief: " . . . he [the sheriff] could see him laying there under a pile of them, laughing, with tears big as glass marbles running across his face and down past his ears and making a kind of popping sound on the floor like somebody dropping bird eggs, laughing and laughing and saying, 'Hit look lack Ah just cant quit thinking. Look lack Ah just cant quit'" (Moses, p. 159).

The reader is able to view "Pantaloon in Black" as both a tribute to the elemental beauty of love (" . . . and they

married and he rented the cabin from Carothers Edmonds and built a fire on the hearth on their wedding night as the tale told how Uncle Lucas Beauchamp, Edmonds' oldest tenant, had done on his forty-five years ago and which had burned ever since"[Moses, p. 138]) and a sermon on the power of love in the scene where Rider, in the depths of his grief, takes the largest log his co-workers have ever seen and throws it down the incline: " . . . and they saw the crack and gap of air, watching the infinitesimal straightening of the braced legs until the knees locked, the movement mounting infinitesimally through the belly's insuck, the arch of the chest, the neck cords, lifting the lip from the white clinch of teeth in passing, drawing the whole head backward and only the bloodshot fixity of the eyes impervious to it, moving on up the arms and the straightening elbows until the balanced log was higher than his head" (Moses, p. 146). That Faulkner avoids any verbalization of Rider's love crowns his statement that human love must be spontaneous and emotional to be real. The sheriff's opinion that Blacks "might just as well be a damn herd of wild buffaloes" (Moses, p. 154) climaxes the symbolism of this story: the white man (Ike for one) often lacks the ability to understand the essential nature of love.

These examples of love offer links to the initiation trilogy (especially "The Old People") which further confirms that Ike has had ample opportunity to feel and to see acts of

love in his community. As "The Old People" serves as a preface to the decisive initiation experience in "The Bear," the first story may fit Marcus' definition of initiation because it establishes the dichotomies of life that Ike must confront to reach maturity. On the first page of the story Sam's touching Ike's shoulder dramatizes the understanding Ike will need for the journey to awareness. Thus the reader sees not only the strength Sam Fathers projects but also the subtle understanding Sam and Ike have established. A touch tells the boy that the buck is present even though he cannot see it.

Despite Sam's support, his first words, "'shoot quick, and slow'" (Moses, p. 163), are surprisingly cryptic. Then the omniscient narrator adds, "The boy did not remember that shot at all" (Moses, p. 163). The scholar might be hard-pressed to find a more succinct statement of Faulkner's view of man's condition than these words. Life is not based on absolutes ("'quick, and slow'"), and the man who tries to wrestle the duality to its conclusion loses sight in the end of the original reason for the struggle ("did not remember that shot at all"). Call these lines symbolic or simply subtle foreshadowing, they are portentous of the error Ike will make in both "The Bear" and "Delta Autumn."[11]

The setting for this action is the annual hunt at McCaslin's and Major de Spain's camp. This expedition has had meaning for Ike long before he was allowed to accompany the men: "But

before the wagon was even loaded the boy would find that he could watch no longer. He would go away, running almost, to stand behind the corner where he could not see the wagon and nobody could see him, not crying, holding himself rigid except for the trembling" (Moses, p. 169). He is able to control these emotions only when he repeats, "'Soon now. Soon now. Just three more years' (or two more or one more) 'and I will be ten. Then Cass said I can go.'" (Moses, p. 169). Thus Ike actively seeks his initiation, seeks the companionship of Sam, who becomes his mentor. Long before the moment when Sam ritualistically stains Ike with the blood of his first deer, the boy has been under his guidance: "He taught the boy the woods, to hunt, when to shoot and when not to shoot, when to kill and when not to kill, and better, what to do with it afterward. Then he would talk to the boy. . . . talking about the old days" (Moses, pp. 170-171). Ike is most impressed by Sam's stories of the old days, for through them he experiences a mystical transcendence of time and place: " . . . gradually to the boy those old times would cease to be old times and would become a part of the boy's present, not only as if they had happened yesterday but as if they were still happening, the men who walked through them actually walking in breath and air and casting an actual shadow on the earth they had not quitted" (Moses, p. 171).

Although in "The Old People" Sam Fathers exerts the primary influence on Ike's youth and functions as a spiritual guide at the killing of the deer, few critics have evaluated Sam's ability to be a teacher. A sampling of critical opinion suggests that Sam Fathers is generally regarded as a virtuous teacher: Thompson believes Sam has helped liberate Ike from the practical matters that restrict Cass' usefulness[12]; calling Sam "priest,"[13] "magician" who teaches Ike how to retain his purity and be in harmony with the forces of nature, Lydenberg salutes him[14]; Utley labels Sam master of the hunting rite "who knows the destinies and teaches craft and wisdon to Ike, his fosterling"[15]; and Vickery claims Ike gains a possible alternative to plantation life from Sam.[16] Only Kinney makes a specific mention of Sam's limitation.[17] Yet a study of textual evidence strongly supports Kinney's interpretation.

The first clue to Sam's questionable influence has been suggested in the paradoxical command to shoot both quick and slow. Moreover that Sam Fathers is childless and that his father called himself Doom announce a motif of decay and vacuity that culminates in the loveless and childless Ike of "Delta Autumn." In addition, Sam's past emotional experience has not been healthy: his own father denies him his birthright by selling his mother and him to Carothers Edmonds; Cass suggests that Sam is caged like a lion because of his drop of Negro blood; and Sam himself is an example of studied control: " . . . Sam Fathers,

the negro, who bore himself not only toward his cousin McCaslin and Major de Spain but toward all white men, with gravity and dignity and without servility or recourse to that impenetrable wall of ready and easy mirth which negroes sustain between themselves and white men" (Moses, p. 170). If Sam Fathers assumes his role as Ike's tutor, his pedagogical method, too, is questionable, for the boy could never question him: "Sam did not react to questions" (Moses, p. 171). Again, when Sam leaves to live permanently in the woods, he does not indicate that he misses his pupil: "If he was glad to see them, he did not show it. And if, when they broke camp two weeks later to return home, he was sorry to see them go, he did not show that either. . . . It was only the boy who returned, returning solitary and alone to the settled familiar land . . . " (Moses, p. 175). Finally, when the boy kills his first deer, Sam's evaluation of Ike's ability lacks depth: "'He done all right'" (Moses, p. 165). The sheer number of negative qualities in Ike's guide cannot be brushed aside as accidental. They demand a new reading of "The Old People."

This new reading must suggest that "The Old People" is really Sam Fathers' story (Ike's initiation being only preliminary to his initiation with Old Ben). Furthermore, Sam's extending of the love-hate theme links all the stories together. Unlike the other non-whites, Tomey's Turl and Lucas and Rider, Sam Fathers denies love for any fellow human being. Only the

wilderness, a thing, and the life he spills there are worthy of love. Thus, when Sam wipes Ike's forehead with the blood of the slain deer, the boy is also symbolically marked with his mentor's philosophy: "They were the white boy, marked forever, and the old dark man sired on both sides by savage kings, who had marked him, whose bloody hands had merely formally consecrated him to that which, under the man's tutelage, he had already accepted, humbly and joyfully, with abnegation and pride too; the hands, the touch, the first worthy blood which he had been found at last worthy to draw, joining him and the man forever . . . " (Moses, p. 165). Sam's heritage, the drop of Negro blood, controls the direction of his life--"betrayed through the black blood which his mother gave him" (Moses, p. 168). Therefore once Jobaker dies, Sam renounces the world and asks Cass to allow him to live in the wilderness. It is the renunciation of life within the community that Sam wills to Ike. Ike has learned the continuity of time from Sam and is aware that "old events as 'still happening,' [are] what prepared him to see the deer."[18] Sam's marking thus binds Ike forever to the white man's curse of slavery.

With the new reading of "The Old People" must come a re-evaluation of Sam's salute to the buck and McCaslin's judgment of that scene. On the one hand, that Sam directs the boy to the heart of the forest to witness the running of the buck is another act of mystical transcendence. Sam has mesmerized the

boy with stories of the old people; he has baptized Ike with the blood of his slain deer to link him to the wilderness and life and death; now he places before Ike's eyes the mystical link with the old people in his salute: "'Oleh, Chief,' Sam said. 'Grandfather'" (Moses, p. 184). On the other hand, that Cass reveals he has had a similar youthful experience with Sam, destroys the profoundness of the situation. Cass has not been overwhelmed by the experience: "'That's right,' McCaslin said. 'Suppose they dont have substance, cant cast a shadow--'" (Moses, p. 187). Cass is able to live with the memory; for him the buck is no enigma. However, because of his special vassalage to Sam, Ike will attempt to wrestle the absolutes to their conclusion--here is the genesis of Ike's failure.

Subsequently, Ike's decisive initiation experience in "The Bear" depends upon a cluster of emotions and upon a group of figures who individually demonstrate various kinds of love relationships. To control the complexities of the lessons to be dramatized, Faulkner employs a series of tableaux set against the wilderness to produce a more formal tone and detached point of view. In the first paragraph the figures of Sam, Boon, Old Ben, and Lion (and, although unmentioned in this paragraph, Cass and the little fyce) are brought into focus. These figures will be developed against a primeval wilderness that offers the opportunity for man to experience the verities of the human heart. Here is a pristine testing ground for man: "It

was of the men, not white nor black nor red but men, hunters, with the will and hardihood to endure and the humility and skill to survive, and the dogs and the bear and deer juxtaposed and reliefed against it, ordered and compelled by and within the wilderness" (Moses, pp. 191-192).

Because the wilderness setting provides so many possible experiences for the human life within it, Old Ben must be the interpreter. The bear is enslaved neither by man, "not even a mortal beast" (Moses, p. 193), nor by the wilderness, "an anachronism indomitable and invincible out of an old dead time" (Moses, p. 193). Yet Old Ben suggests the ultimate mystery the land offers, for Ike believes his previous hunting with Sam was preparatory to "his novitiate to the true wilderness" (Moses, p. 195). Only after Ike has served his apprenticeship in the woods will he learn to distinguish Ben's tracks. The boy views this annual hunt as a yearly ritual whose purpose is the chase, not the capture or the killing of Old Ben. Indeed Old Ben and the woods are so synonymous that when Ike hears the dogs yapping and sees Sam's eyes fill with "a quality darkly and fiercely lambent" (Moses, p. 198), he knows the bear is present though unseen. When one of those hounds, wounded, returns to camp, Ike realizes that the bear is like "no living creature but only the wilderness which . . . had patted lightly once her temerity" (Moses, p. 199).

From this union of bear and wilderness Ike learns "an eagerness, passive; an abjectness, a sense of his own fragility and impotence against the timeless woods" (Moses, p. 200). This unity is symbolized in the old decayed log gouged by the bear's enormous paw. Further, waiting on the poorest stand in the hunting range teaches Ike humility and patience. Finally Ike signifies his readiness to learn the lesson of purity by leaving his gun at camp. Nine hours later, however, he realizes that he is still "a child, alien and lost in the green and soaring gloom of the markless wilderness" (Moses, p. 208). To be worthy to see Old Ben, he must also relinquish his watch and compass. In so doing he becomes lost: he makes a cast to cross his backtrack; then he recasts with a larger circle; finally, with heart beating more rapidly, he resorts to the last trick that Sam has taught him. He is, however, dramatically interrupted in this final attempt by the sight of the fresh crooked-print. Instinctively he pursues the tracks, "keeping pace with them as they appeared before him as though they were being shaped out of thin air just one constant pace short of where he would lose them forever and be lost forever himself" (Moses, p. 209). Now he gladly risks being lost forever for a sight of the bear. His choice of such a pure position prompts the wilderness, through Old Ben, to return to him all that he has surrendered in pursuit of his dream: " . . . the wilderness coalesced. It rushed,

soundless, and solidified--the tree, the bush, the compass and the watch glinting where a ray of sunlight touched them" (Moses, p. 209). There in tableau-fashion Ike sees the bear: "It did not emerge, appear: it was just there . . . looking at him" (Moses, p. 209). Then with unhurried step Old Ben crosses the glade and fades into the woods. It would be difficult to deny that Old Ben transcends his animality: he has led Ike out of the forest and given Ike the opportunity to see himself, Old Ben, and the wilderness as one. As he looks at Ike, he is offering, in lesson form, the symbol of purity.

The other two climactic scenes in which Old Ben stands before Ike are also sketched in tableau-fashion. The second occurs when the little fyce races at the bear. Interestingly, however, Faulkner, choosing to becloud the picture of Old Ben (the bear only looms and towers), clearly depicts the dog. But the final tableau recaptures the earlier vividness. Here as Old Ben, Lion, and Boon grapple in the death struggle, arms, paws, throat, and belly dominate. Then in the ultimate second of death the trio "resembled a piece of statuary: the clinging dog, the bear, the man stride its back" (Moses, p. 241).

By use of the tableau technique Faulkner simulates the effect created when one frame of motion picture film is frozen. New learning situations, any one of which might emotionally confuse or overwhelm a teenager, bombard Ike. Yet these tableaux give Ike time to comprehend their significance.

Hence, the three tableaux of Old Ben are Ike's three encounters with the unknown. Sam's mocking of Ash's story that Old Ben comes down to camp each year to chase the little bears away suggests the colossal and dynamic in nature--a force neither kind nor malevolent: "'He dont care no more for bears than he does for dogs or men neither. He comes to see who's here'" (Moses, p. 198). And Faulkner's delineating of "the old bear, solitary, indomitable, and alone; widowered childless and absolved of mortality--old Priam reft of his old wife and outlived all his sons" (Moses, pp. 193-194) connotes the classic or most sublime characteristics of the wilderness now "doomed . . . whose edges were being constantly and punily gnawed at by men with plows and axes" (Moses, p. 193). Even in death Old Ben remains both emotionally superior "with his eyes open too and his lips snarled back from his worn teeth" (Moses, p. 247) and symbolically immortal, "the single almost invisible slit under his the bear's left shoulder where Boon's blade had finally found his life" (Moses, p. 247). Old Ben's last motion also suggests the emblematic: "It didn't collapse, crumble. It fell all of a piece, as a tree falls, so that all three of them, man dog and bear, seemed to bounce once" (Moses, p. 241). Unlike the wilderness that is collapsing bit by bit, Old Ben's purity enables him to transcend the wilderness he represents; this lesson of purity Old Ben wills to Ike.

In his initiation experience Ike also receives legacies from two other animals--the fyce and Lion. From the fyce Ike learns courage.[19] As the fyce, so named for his bravery which borders on foolhardiness, races after the bear, Ike understands that this act is courageous, not rash. The dog's frantic, straining eagerness wins Sam's grudging praise: "'You's almost the one we wants. . . . He will need to be just a little bigger than smart, and a little braver than either'" (Moses, p. 212). Ike's rejection of his opportunity to shoot Old Ben (Sam says that Ike couldn't have missed him this time) in order to save the fyce affirms that he has caught some of the same "kind of desperate and despairing courage" (Moses, p. 211) Sam's hounds sensed in the dog. In his repudiation of his heritage, Ike might have done well to imitate the fyce's spontaneous commitment to action. Philosophic speculation, however, destroys Ike's common sense and negates action.

From Lion Ike receives the legacy of pride and endurance. Like Old Ben, Lion, whose parentage and earliest history are unknown, is untainted by civilization (Dussinger, Warren, and Gold support this position[20]). Moreover, despite his training to hunt, Lion preserves his original nature: endurance is there, for after two weeks of starvation, the dog returns to hurling himself against the door "as if the two weeks of starving had never been" (Moses, p. 219), and pride is there in "the indomitable and unbroken spirit" suggested in the yellow eyes, which

contain "a cold and almost impersonal malignance like some natural force" (Moses, p. 218). To the hunters Lion becomes almost human in his effort to corner Old Ben: he receives a name, maintains his dignity: "'We dont want him tame. We want him like he is'" (Moses, p. 219), and earns the ministrations of the sawmill doctor. In addition ritual surrounds his act of dying: "They moved Lion out to the front gallery, into the sun . . . . He [Boon] took a crowbar and loosened the floor boards under his pallet bed so it could be raised, mattress and all, without disturbing Lion's position, and they carried him out to the gallery and put him down facing the woods" (Moses, p. 247), and obsequies accompany his burial: "Boon carrying Lion, and the boy and General Compson and Walter and still almost fifty of them following with lanterns and lighted pine-knots . . . and then General Compson stood at the head of it [the grave] while the blaze and smoke of the pine-knots streamed away among the winter branches and spoke as he would have spoken over a man" (Moses, pp. 248-249). In the final analysis Lion attains the sublime stature of Old Ben and "'dont care about nothing or nobody'" (Moses, p. 220) except the wilderness "while from time to time the great blue dog would open his eyes . . . as though to look at the woods for a moment before closing his eyes again, to remember the woods or to see that they were still there" (Moses, p. 248).

If the virtues of the fyce are not reflected in Ike's adult decision, those of Lion are. Pride motivates Ike's repudiation of the land; pride brings about his awareness that some men must purge themselves of the evil in their background, or as Utley says, "Transcend the cultural environment into which they are born, and make the gesture which casts off the tainted heritage."[21] Endurance is asserted on a literal level in the first sentence of the novel and is dramatized on a symbolic level in the stoic picture of Ike in "Delta Autumn." Defeated by the knowledge of his inability to arrest the evil his family has created (Roth's treatment of his black mistress), Ike lies trembling in his tent; undestroyed, however, because of his sheer ability to endure (to see hope for man if he survives another thousand or two thousand years), Ike attempts to control the trembling by lying rigid.

Three key human characters in "The Bear"--Sam, Boon, and Cass--provide Ike's other lessons in the initiation experience. As priest of the hunt,[22] Sam Father's role as Ike's mentor becomes more complex, for he introduces Ike to the most dramatic experience this wilderness offers--the bear hunt. This hunt, going beyond the sighting of the game and the shooting of the gun, indeed encompasses eight ritual epiphanies before Old Ben meets his fated end.[23] Sam, the priest, guides the hunters into the wilderness, directs Ike to be prepared to shoot so that men and dogs are not accidentally killed, convinces Ike

that he must renounce the weapons of civilization in order to see the bear, trains Lion to corner Old Ben, and leads in the final chase. Having accomplished his task as guide and priest of the hunting-ritual, Sam collapses, and, although the doctor can find nothing physically wrong with him, he dies. Sam's "'Let me out, master. . . . Let me go home'" (Moses, p. 245) symbolizes the cause of death, for with Old Ben's and Lion's deaths Sam's role in the hunt is concluded. As early as the spring when Old Ben kills Major de Spain's colt and breaks the rules ("'We gambled the dogs against him; we gave each other warning. But now he has come into my house and destroyed my property, out of season too. He broke the rules'" [Moses, p. 214]), Sam has a foreknowledge of his death: "There was something in Sam's face now. It was neither exultation nor joy nor hope. Later, a man, the boy realised what it had been. . . . It had been foreknowledge in Sam's face that morning" (Moses, pp. 214-215). The ritual is almost over, and Sam is glad. Like Lion and Old Ben before him Sam appears to look beyond life to something greater "than the death of a bear and the dying of a dog" (Moses, p. 245). As Warren suggests, "Under the tutelage of Sam Fathers, Ike has come to possess a deeper understanding of nature than any of the other hunters, and the events of the last bear hunt provide him with some insight into the eternal continuity of nature."[24]

Sam's lessons of wisdom and honor offer both negative and positive contributions to Ike's manhood, as did his confusing order to shoot both quick and slow. Ike employs wisdom to comprehend the ledgers in the commissary and to determine a course of action to rectify the McCaslin sins against Tennie's Jim, 'Fonsiba, and Lucas. Therefore, once aware of the McCaslin evil, Ike is devoted to the honor his blood brothers deserve. At great physical sacrifice he pursues Tennie's Jim and later 'Fonsiba to give them their legacy. However, Ike's faithfulness to Sam's two lessons distorts his balanced view of life. In his wisdom he perceives that the land was never any man's to own; therefore, he cannot repudiate it, merely relinquish his hold on it. Yet this passive gesture is ineffectual; wise management and control of the land are the only ways to cancel the injustice done to the McCaslins' victims. In Ike's demand to honor those who have been hurt by Old Carothers McCaslin, he does not see, as Cass does, that his repudiation is isolated and insignificant: "'And it took you fourteen years to reach that point [the understanding that he must renounce the evil connected with McCaslin's name] and about that many, maybe more, for Old Ben, and more than seventy for Sam Fathers. And you are just one. How long then? How long?'" (Moses, p. 299).

If Sam's complex ideals confuse Ike, Boon's simplistic demonstration of love, expressed in "the utter selflessness

of Boon's love for Lion,"[25] need not. Boon's closeness to Lion harkens back to his intuitive understanding of Sam's plan for Lion: "'We just want him to find out at last that the only way he can get out of that crib and stay out of it is to do what Sam or somebody tells him to do. He's the dog that's going to stop Old Ben and hold him. We've already named him. His name is Lion'" (Moses, p. 219). As he touches Lion for the first time, Boon demonstrates a sensual attraction to the dog: " . . . Boon touched Lion's head and then knelt beside him, feeling the bones and muscles, the power. It was as if Lion were a woman--or perhaps Boon was the woman" (Moses, p. 220). And this love grows until Lion no longer sleeps or eats with the other dogs. Surprised one night by McCaslin, Major de Spain, and the boy, the pair's secret is exposed: " . . . the little, tight, airless room rank with the smell of Boon's unwashed body and his wet hunting-clothes--where Boon, snoring on his back, choked and waked and Lion raised his head beside him and looked back at them from his cold, slumbrous yellow eyes" (Moses, p. 221). Even at work they act as a team: "Again Boon and Lion hunted as far down one bank as they dared" (Moses, p. 225). Thus, when Boon fails to shoot Old Ben at twenty-five feet with five shots, he feels he has failed his partner:

> "But I missed him," Boon said. "I missed him five times. With Lion looking right at me. . . ."
> Then McCaslin said, "Where is Lion, Boon?"
> "I left him at Sam's," Boon said. He was already turning away. "I aint fit to sleep with him." (Moses, p. 226)

That he has failed Lion once prompts Boon to risk his life to save the dog that Old Ben catches "almost loverlike" (Moses, p. 240). It is sheer love and devotion that send Boon "leap[ing] among the hounds, hurdling them, kicking them aside as he ran, and fling[ing] himself astride the bear as he had hurled himself onto the mule, his legs locked around the bear's belly, his left arm under the bear's throat where Lion clung, and the glint of the knife as it rose and fell" (Moses, p. 241). Having killed the bear, Boon turns frantic in a desire to get medical help for Lion. Finally, Boon's vigil beside Lion's deathbed and his grief at the graveside are echoes of Rider's primitive expression of grief in "Pantaloon in Black."

Although Boon's character is based on simplicity, devotion, love, and steadfastness, he is a fully developed figure. He is dull-witted, cannot cope with civilization[26] (the whiskey-buying trip proves this), and cannot handle man-made devices ("He had never hit anything bigger than a squirrel that anybody ever knew, except the negro woman that day when he was shooting at the negro man" [Moses, p. 235]). In addition, as a half-breed, childless, and wifeless, Boon reveals his social limitations. On the other hand his love for Lion compounded with an "absolute and unquestioning fidelity to Major de Spain and the boy's cousin McCaslin" (Moses, p. 228), a protectiveness toward Ike (the wild pony ride where he saved Ike's life), and an empathy for those who suffer (Lion and Sam,

for Boon apparently helps Sam take his own life) delineate his virtues. Finally Faulkner's comic treatment of Boon precludes an evaluation of him as a stock or foil character.

Perhaps in the complexity of Boon's nature lies the clearest pattern for living that Ike could have chosen to follow. Filled with dualities comparable to those that Ike struggles with and fails to resolve in Part IV, Boon is blissfully ignorant of their tragic import; he stakes all on love. This love for Lion is Boon's unwitting achievement of the sublime that Sam, Ben, and Lion share in death. Ike might have shared this fraternity had he subordinated the inevitable dichotomies of life to love.

In contrast to those figures who see beyond this earthly mortality, Cass offers Ike a sense of reality. Like Sam's, Cass' place in the stories of Go Down, Moses extends back to the old times: he has seen first-hand the ravages of the Civil War and the resultant changes in this land. Moreover his limited initiation in "Was" places him as side-kick to and trouble-shooter for the childish Uncle Buck and Uncle Buddy and inaugurates him into plantation life. For these reasons Cass' maturity has been rapid ("brought [the land] still intact by McCaslin, himself little more than a child then, through and out of the debacle and chaos of twenty years ago where hardly one in ten survived, and enlarged and increased and would continue so, solvent and efficient and intact and still

increasing so long as McCaslin and his McCaslin successors lasted" [Moses, p. 298]) and his sense of reality keen ("'Suppose they [the mysterious deer Cass and Ike have both seen] dont have substance, cant cast a shadow--'" [Moses, p. 187]).

Ike, however, cannot accept Cass' legacy: " . . . himself and his cousin juxtaposed not against the wilderness but against the tamed land which was to have been his heritage" (Moses, p. 254). Indeed again in the tableau-fashion of Part IV of "The Bear," this conflict occurs: Ike and McCaslin argue their intellectual way through the history of the McCaslin sins from Old Carothers to the present to a stalemate. This deadlock concludes with Ike's preaching in poetic strain abstract idealism: "'Courage and honor and pride, and pity and love of justice and of liberty. They all touch the heart, and what the heart holds to becomes truth, as far as we know truth. Do you see now?'" (Moses, p. 297). Yet Faulkner makes Cass' cynical smile, filtered through Ike's memory, be the final impression the reader remembers: " . . . and he had only to look at McCaslin's eyes beyond the thin and bitter smiling, the faint lip-lift which would have had to be called smiling" (Moses, p. 297). And the argument fails to alter their intellectual relationship; they remain "juxtaposed and alien now [note the addition of words, in my italics, suggestive of an even greater rift in their relationship] to each other against

their ravaged patrimony" (Moses, pp. 297-298).

This cluster of emotions, willed to Ike by the central figures, assuredly makes overwhelming psychological demands on human nature. In addition, to establish the absolute nature of the legacies is impossible. The fyce's courage or Boon's love is not the figure's single attribute; the reader merely need remember the enigmatic nature of Sam Fathers in "The Old People" to realize that the tidy cataloguing of qualities assigned in the previous paragraphs offers only a limited analysis of Ike's initiation experience. Perhaps, then, Ike's failure occurs because of the profundity of the lessons he is to study and apply to life. The complete and successful initiation of Bayard Sartoris differs significantly in this aspect: Bayard views or participates in various experiences where the lesson of honor dominates. From these situations he is able to create a viable brand of honor for his life; the cluster of the verities that confront Ike dooms him to at least partial failure.

Indeed the history of scholarship dealing with Go Down, Moses reflects the limit of Ike's initiation. As Gloria Dussinger suggests, until the late nineteen fifties Ike was venerated as a contemporary saint. Those critics who held this view were generally concerned with Ike's purity. Two examples, chosen at random from this group of pre-sixties scholars, support this point: Lydenberg states, "Ike has developed and

retained the requisite purity. He has learned to face nature with pride and humility."[27] And R. W. B. Lewis echoes: "He can do so [understand history] because he is free--or rather, because he has achieved freedom. He is even, we may say, innocent."[28]

Certainly there is strong evidence to support these readings of Ike's mastery of the virtue of purity. Like Sam, Ben, Lion, and Boon, who achieve some union with the sublime, Ike transcends the McCaslin evils by his repudiation of the land and by his isolation from civilization. If purity, then, were to have been Ike's only lesson, he would have reached the same healthy maturity that Bayard Sartoris enjoys in The Unvanquished. However, the complexity of Ike's initiation experience has evoked all the critical theories of Ike's failure. Whether his failure arises from his lack of stewardship (Thompson, O'Connor, Fisher, and Gelfant) or from a rejection of humanity (Vickery, Bradford, and Dussinger) or from a refusal to continue the struggle by begetting a son (Adams and Longley) or, finally, from an inability to handle evil (Waggoner), Ike has refused to commit himself to any love relationship. In his own marriage he rejects natural love when he discovers the evil (his wife's ambitious desires) that accompanies it. When Ike chooses the wrong key to unlock the relationships of the verities to humanity, purity not love, his decisive initiation stalls.

Therefore "Delta Autumn" dramatizes the failure of Ike within Marcus' definition of decisive initiation. Ike is not in harmony with the community; instead he feels that "his life was drawing inward, until now he was the last of those who had once made the journey in wagons" (Moses, pp. 335-336) to the wilderness. Indeed he has lost his simplistic relationship with nature, for in "Delta Autumn" he leads young weekend-hunters who need automobiles to traverse the raped landscape to the wilderness now two hundred miles from Jefferson instead of thirty. Moreover he has not achieved a complete understanding of self necessary to the decisive initiation. He has misunderstood Cass' legacy of reality and Boon's legacy of love. Cass' sense of reality would have led him to offer the baby, who unites the McCaslin slave and white blood-lines that Ike has symbolically tried to redeem, something more useful than the hunting horn. Further, the reality would have made him aware that this baby makes ludicrous his belief that maybe in two thousand years the fusion of the white and Black races can be accomplished. Ike should have realized his responsibility to provide for the baby's future. In this case Ike lacks the compassion inherent in Boon's simplistic love: Ike demands that the girl deny love by marrying someone of her race and forgetting Roth. The girl's response epitomizes Ike's role in the Go Down, Moses stories of love: "' . . . have you lived so long and forgotten so much

that you dont remember anything you ever knew or felt or even heard about love?'" (Moses, p. 363).

Perhaps a return to the final tableau of "The Bear" will best demonstrate Ike's specific plight. His journey of tribute to the graves of Sam and Lion is instinctive, and because the graves themselves are unmarked, Ike uses Sam's method of taking bearings on trees to find them. This time he experiences his moment of the sublime: " . . . then he stood on the crest of the knoll itself . . . lifeless and shockingly alien in that place where dissolution itself was a seething turmoil of ejaculation tumescence conception and birth, and death did not even exist" (Moses, p. 327). The wilderness eclipses time, and the gifts Ike brings to Sam are "translated into the myriad life which printed the dark mold of these secret and sunless places with delicate fairy tracks" (Moses, p. 328). The perception that death is no longer a reality stems from this experience--Sam and Lion and Old Ben, also, will mix with the earth to become similar to the shade-like buck he saw, as a boy, with Sam. These companions, in addition, transcend the miseries of life that have confronted and will confront Ike: " . . . no heart to be driven and outraged, no flesh to be mauled and bled" (Moses, p. 329). If only Ike had been able to capture that moment and translate it into living beyond the pale of the forest, then Roth's mistress might have found love and understanding from the elderly Uncle Ike. Faulkner

does not resume the action with Ike's noble inspiration however. Instead the next minute finds Ike within the tableau, frozen before the snake, "the old one, the ancient and accursed about the earth, fatal and solitary . . . and something else which had no name, evocative of all knowledge and an old weariness and of pariah-hood and of death" (Moses, p. 329). Saluting this creature with "'Chief' . . . 'Grandfather'" (Moses, p. 330), Ike is hailing evil, recognizing that despair, anger, pain, and death cannot be cancelled out of life. Thus, in this transcending moment Ike is trapped, trapped like the figures on Keats' urn, another tableau. This tragedy Ike had previously overlooked as he and Cass argued Keats' meaning. In his frozen moment between the suspension of death, connoting the absence of evil, and the salute to the snake, connoting the presence of evil, Ike experiences the tragedy of the transfixed moment: Keats' girl will be forever young and lovable, but Keats' boy will never embrace her. In life there can be no absolutes; only in the wilderness is the pristine "lift of the heart" possible (Moses, p. 233).

What, then, of "Go Down, Moses"? After the somber, tragic import of "Delta Autumn," Faulkner must have felt the necessity to conclude, as he had begun in "Was," with a lighter tone. Although "Was" on the literal level is a comedy, "Go Down, Moses" does not attain its levity. The account of Butch's burial evokes the reader's pity, because of Molly's love and concern for the boy; the sketchiness of the delineation of Butch as a

living character fails to elicit the reader's empathy, however. Indeed the surly, gaudily dressed Butch on the day of his execution renders reader identification impossible. Further the picture of Gavin Stevens--Phi Beta Kappa, Harvard; Ph. D., Heidelberg--becoming Chairman of the Funeral Fund for Butch Beauchamp, cop-killer, is humorous. And that the entire town contributes, although grudgingly, and watches with interest the bizarre funeral procession consisting of the hearse "followed still by the two cars containing the four people--the high-headed erect white woman, the old Negress, the designated paladin of justice and truth and right, the Heidelberg Ph. D." (Moses, p. 382) mitigates the grief.

Further, the acts of love offered in "Go Down, Moses" complete the circle of love-hate theme that encompasses Ike's passive commitments. As Millgate suggests, "Molly's concern for a murderer's burial . . . is another aspect of that intensity and longevity of family loyalty and love."[29] Moreover, Miss Worsham's offering of time, money, and love to Molly and her brother dramatizes her empathy: "'It's all right. . . . It's our grief'" (Moses, p. 381). And the community's united desire to ease Molly's difficult experience complements the individual gestures of love. Finally, although Ike fails to love, although the baby who unites the slave and white McCaslin lines is banished to the North, and although the last McCaslin worthy to receive love is a cop-killer whom the town remembers

out of pity and embarrassment, Faulkner returns to the love symbolism of the fire and the hearth (" . . . the Old Negress sitting in the only rocking chair beside the hearth on which even tonight a few ashes smoldered faintly" [Moses, p. 379]) to reaffirm that love endures.

Chapter V

Intruder in the Dust: Decisive or Uncompleted Initiation?

Intruder in the Dust (1948) offers two subjects for reader and critic: The initiation story of Chick Mallison and a sermon on how to provide equal rights in modern society for the Southern Black. Hence, to deal effectively with Chick's experience, the reader must also respond to the "sermon." Severe critical reaction labels the novel about the "real" South and the plight of the modern Black a tract or propaganda. Reed specifically fears that Faulkner has been convinced by critics such as Cowley that he has been telling of the "real" South all along, "or worse, that he was becoming what the second Time cover-story said he was: sociological delineator, social critic, conscience of his land."[1] From a typed note found between pages eight and ten of the original draft of Intruder, Faulkner himself apparently believes the Southern theme primary:

> These characters and incidents are fictional, imaginative, and ---some will say---impossible. In which case let them be accepted not as the puppet-play of a whodunit but as the protagonist-pattern of belief that not government first but the white man of the South owes a responsibility a responsibility [SIC.] to the Negro, not because of his past since a man or a race if it be any

> good can survive his past without having to escape from it (and the fact that the Negro has survived his in the way he has is his proof) but because of his present condition, whether the Negro wishes to accept it or not.[2]

Both the historical time, 1948, and the statements he had made about the Black in Go Down, Moses may have necessitated, in his mind, a clarification of his position. In Intruder in the Dust this link to Go Down, Moses is found in the problem of white-Negro relationships, in the main character of Lucas Beauchamp, and in "the figure of Gavin Stevens serving as an active and thematic link between the two."[3]

However, despite the importance Faulkner attaches to the civil-rights theme, despite the book's faulty structure, the story of a boy's growth to manhood is another significant and successful treatment of the initiation figure. Perhpas Lytle suggests the best way to view the novel: the reader must forget both the civil-rights issue and the whodunit theme (the targets of the key adverse criticisms) and realize that the story "is about a sixteen-year-old boy's education in good and evil and his effort to preserve his spiritual integrity."[4]

The boy's education takes the form of a journey to understanding, and the novel's point of view complements this development. By creating a central consciousness through a third-person omniscient narrator, Faulkner enables the reader to move gradually into the completed action (Chick's first encounter with Lucas Beauchamp), to relate that to the present

situation (Lucas' arrest for the murder of a white man), and to learn how these situations prompt Chick to act on the Black man's behalf. That the central consciousness happens to be the boy himself, as Millgate proposes, "forces us to view the events of the novel in terms of his own experience of them, an experience which we are apparently intended to see as a progressive initiation into manhood."[5] Indeed, like the growth of the boy's awareness, the reader's awareness develops within this point of view. Accordingly, unlike the faithful reproduction of Vardaman's limited vocabulary and erratic thought processes, Chick's teenage understanding has been "attend[ed] and amplifie[d]"[6] by Faulkner with sophisticated vocabulary and complex thought patterns (e.g., in chapter one, the central consciousness may attempt to capture the twelve-year-old boy's basic response to the landscape, but the words and imagery are those of a maturer narrator: "by nightfall the whole land would be hung with their [the butchered hogs'] spectral intact tallowcolored empty carcasses immobilised by the heels in attitudes of frantic running as though full tilt at the center of the earth"[7]). Perhaps, because Faulkner wants the "sermon" in Intruder clearly understood, he goes "'behind' the facts of [Chick's] spectacle . . . [to] simply take advantage of these things better than [Chick himself]."[8]

The story itself begins with such amplification, for the sixteen-year-old Chick, on that Sunday noon when the sheriff

reaches the jail with Lucas, is remembering his first encounter with the Black four years earlier. Because of that initial meeting, Chick believes that he knows and understands Lucas "--as well that is as any white person knew him" (IITD, p. 3). Yet that confusing meeting created only antipathy to Lucas. Initially, as Aleck Sander tries to pull Chick out of the ice-bound creek, Lucas' command "to desist with the pole which had been the one token toward help that anybody [would have] made" (IITD, p. 6) startles Chick. Further, the man's lack of emotion ("watching him [Chick] without pity commiseration or anything else, not even surprise" [IITD, p. 6]) for the "half-frozen" boy causes Chick to label him "intractable." Chick does perceive that the man considers him a silly child; the boy submits to Lucas' command to follow him home.

After receiving Lucas' hospitality--a warm fireside, dry clothing, and dinner, Chick feels more confused than he did at the creek bank. In an attempt to relieve his disquietude, he offers money to Molly: the twelve-year-old considers this action merely Southern etiquette; the sixteen-year-old realizes that it was Lucas' "intolerant inflexible and composed" (IITD, p. 13) face that prompted his own action. Once the boy holds the half dollar in his hand, however, he feels only embarrassment: " . . . in the same second in which he knew she [Molly] would have taken them [the coins] he knew that only by that one irrevocable second was he forever now too late, forever

beyond recall" (IITD, p. 15). Realizing that his act insults Lucas' dignity, Chick now views the coins as symbols of that shame, "forever with his dumb hand open and on it the four shameful fragments of milled and minted dross" (IITD, p. 15). Only when Lucas' "'What's that for?'" (IITD, p. 15) turns Chick's shame to rage is he able to escape to the next moment "and [watch] his palm turn over not flinging the coins but spurning them downward ringing onto the bare floor" (IITD, pp. 15-16). This gesture, implying a rejection, a negation of the very existence of the coins, backfires, and what follows demoralizes Chick: "'Pick up his money:' and he heard and saw Aleck Sander and Edmonds' boy reach and scurry among the shadows near the floor. 'Give it to him,' the voice said: and saw Edmonds' boy drop his two coins into Aleck Sander's palm and felt Aleck Sander's hand fumble the four of them at his own dropped hand and then into it" (IITD, p. 16). In this scene Chick is a child--literally, in his demand to pay his way as a Southern gentleman; symbolically, as he stands naked, stripped of his maturity, before the fire. Lucas' final warning epitomizes the feelings of childishness that have just overwhelmed Chick: "'Now go on and shoot your rabbit,' . . . 'And stay out of that creek'" (IITD, p. 16).

This humiliating incident, as Gerstenberger suggests, is central to "all that the [twelve-year-old] boy is henceforth to do."[9] Overwhelmed by Lucas' retort, Chick is unable

to enjoy his rabbit chase, and by flinging the coins into the water, he attempts an irrevocable renunciation of his shame. That night the sleepless, troubled Chick perceives the magnitude of his insult to Lucas: " . . . he knew that the food had been not just the best Lucas had to offer but all he had to offer" (IITD, p. 17). In the throes of such a reality the boy's admission that Lucas has beaten him affords little comfort. Indeed Faulkner's double point of view heightens the intensity of Chick's anxiety. While the twelve-year-old Chick experiences "impotent fury," the central consciousness recalls that within a year the boy will learn that all white men in the county wrestle with the same anger: "We got to make him be a nigger first. He got to admit he's a nigger. Then maybe we will accept him as he seems to intend to be accepted" (IITD, p. 18). Moreover, Lucas' actions will dramatize the townsmen's anger. A year later, when a white man attempts to shake Lucas' arrogance with insults ("'You goddamn biggity stiffnecked stinking burr-headed Edmonds sonofabitch'" [IITD, p. 19]), Lucas displays his "calm speculative detachment" with "'I aint a Edmonds. I dont belong to these new folks. I belongs to the old lot. I'm a McCaslin!'" (IITD, p. 19). Thus, these stories, which Chick has heard the townspeople tell, give him ample evidence that the town is correct in labeling Lucas arrogant.

Yet, as Chick reflects in the present time of the story, this affirmation of his own opinion of Lucas fails to ease the

embarrassment. Rather the shame compounds until the coins become a single disc encompassing "the man, the Negro, the room, the moment, the day itself" (IITD, pp. 20-21) and "annealed vanished into the round hard symbol of the coin" (IITD, p. 21). While time should have dulled these emotions, the sixteen-year-old recalls the obsession with the coin's image with a vividness that intensifies the original suffering (Waggoner labels this doubled or tripled consciousness brilliant, for the "intensity and fullness [of] an event is experienced over and over"[10]). Further, that the boy remembers this torture as keenly as he does ("the coin swelled to its gigantic maximum, to hang fixed at last forever in the black vault of his anguish like the last dead and waneless moon and himself, his own puny shadow gesticulant and tiny against it in frantic and vain eclipse" [ITTD, p. 21]) lends greater plausibility to the younger Chick's compulsive efforts to erase that wrong.

First Chick attempts to buy his vindication: " . . . the two packages--the four two-for-a-quarter cigars for Lucas and the tumbler of snuff for his wife--in their bright Christmas paper in his pocket . . . " (IITD, p. 22). However, he realizes that this action "merely discharged (with doubled interest) the seventy cents" (IITD, p. 22). With the town's pronouncement of Lucas in mind,[11] "If he would just be a nigger first, just for one second, one little infinitesimal second" (IITD, p. 22), Chick evolves a more equable repayment of his debt: with his

four months' savings he buys Molly an imitation silk dress. And this purchase gives a semblance of relief: " . . . and at last he had something like ease because the rage was gone and all he could not forget was the grief and the shame" (IITD, p. 22). Indeed Chick begins to believe that time is also his ally: " . . . the disc still hung in the black vault but it was almost a year old now and so the vault itself was not so black with the disc paling and he could even sleep under it" (IITD, p. 22). Yet, several months later, when Lucas repays the gift with a bucket of fresh homemade molasses delivered by a white boy, Chick knows he "couldn't even start over again because to take the can of molasses back and fling it into Lucas' front door would only be the coins again for Lucas again to command somebody to pick up and return" (IITD, p. 23). Chick's humorous image of himself riding on "a shetland pony which he had outgrown and was ashamed of except that his mother wouldn't agree yet to let him have a fullsized horse or at least the kind of fullsized horse he wanted" (IITD, p. 23) confirms that he is still a child and cannot possibly out maneuver Lucas: "This would have to be all; whatever would or could set him free was beyond not merely his reach but even his ken; he could only wait for it if it came and do without it if it didn't" (IITD, p. 23). Although the twelve-year-old Chick has not reached maturity, his pliant resolution to allow fate to shape the future suggests a

recognition that determination and dedication to a cause will not necessarily mean success in the venture. Perhaps his ruminations on the comic awkwardness of his situation provide further evidence of his potential maturation--to react with humor to his emotionally overwhelming incident with Lucas hints at the adaptability and flexibility needed for one to reach adulthood in Faulkner's world.

Chick's next three meetings with Lucas do not impart a permanent maturity, for the boy remains obsessed with the disgrace Lucas has caused him. In the first meeting Chick consciously credits himself with demonstrating gentlemanly courtesy by speaking first and by thanking Lucas for the molasses. That Chick records Lucas' stinging retort, "'Dont fall in no more creeks this winter'" (IITD, p. 24), without comment suggests that the experience remains painful. For Lucas the incident has lost its significance. When Lucas fails to recognize the boy in their next meeting, Chick's bewildered, self-centered "He has forgotten me. He doesn't even remember me anymore" (IITD, p. 24) betrays the continuing significance of the event in the boy's mind. Since the creek incident looms so large in Chick's immature mind, he finds it inconceivable that Lucas could have forgotten it. The final meeting does find Chick faced with the reality that Lucas "looked straight into [my] eyes for perhaps a quarter of a minute and then away and . . . He didn't even fail to remember

me this time. He didn't even know me. He hasn't even bothered to forget me" (IITD, pp. 25-26). But this time Chick feels a sense of peace.

Between the second and third meetings the boy apparently learns that time can obliterate the past. Since this meeting is closest to the time of the central-consciousness narrative, the reactions to that encounter may be the most reliable guage of the level of reality that Chick has reacted to prior to Lucas' incarceration. Moreover, the twelve-year-old Chick evaluates this third meeting's final import as the conclusion to an incident of childhood to be flung aside, "carrying into manhood only the fading tagend of that old once-frantic shame and anguish and need not for revenge, vengeance but simply for re-equalization, reaffirmation of his masculinity and his white blood" (IITD, p. 26). Whether this position is founded on mere hope or conviction that someday the affair will be remembered as "merely a breath a whisper like the bitter-sweet-sour taste of the sheep sorrel eaten by the boy in his dead childhood" (IITD, p. 26), Chick does demonstrate maturity in his comic fantasy of the creek incident that the two will remember in old age.

When Chick concludes his assessment of these encounters ("Because it was over now. He had turned the other cheek and it had been accepted. He was free" [IITD, p. 27]), he is hurled back to childhood in a way comparable to the experience

suffered by Bayard Sartoris, and he is as doomed as another initiation figure, Ike McCaslin. Chick, like Bayard, when challenged, fails to achieve maturity: the one contemplates flight, the other returns to the Colonel and Granny. Furthermore, Chick's absolute declaration that he is free of Lucas relates him to Ike and his problem. Ike's demand for absolutes denies him the ability to act; Chick admits, late in the novel, that he also might not have acted had Miss Habersham not given him the courage to forget his bywords, "he was free." Essentially then, the creek incident and Chick's shame and rage constitute the first stage of the initiation journey, a baptism like Ike's ritualistic hunt replete with a substitute father and emotional trauma.[12] Again, just as Sam Fathers captures Ike's spirit for the transcending experience, Lucas translates Chick's guilt to compassion and then to action in the initiation's second phase.

Initially, when he learns that Lucas has killed a white man, Chick rationalizes the crisis away: the adults would handle the matter; by now "the constable [would have] taken Lucas and the story said had handcuffed him to a bedpost and was now sitting over him with a shotgun (and Edmonds too of course by now . . . of course Edmonds would be there)" (IITD, p. 28). Anway, Chick "was free" (IITD, p. 28). His actions bespeak otherwise as he steals up to his uncle's office to think: "he had never really appreciated rubber soles before,

how nothing could match them for giving you time to make up your mind what you really wanted to do" (IITD, p. 29); performs a perfunctory cleaning of the law office, perhaps a symbolic renunciation of "legal" responsibility for Lucas ("he rose taking up the cup and saucer and crossed the room picking up the coffeepot and the kettle too in passing and in the lavatory emptied the grounds and rinsed the pot and cup and filled the kettle and set it and the pot the cup and saucer back on the shelf and returned to the chair and sat again after really no absence at all" [IITD, pp. 29-30]); and rejects personal involvement when he remembers that Edmonds is lying in a hospital and cannot possibly help Lucas, "because he [Chick] was free" (IITD, p. 30). Even while he continues to wrestle with the problem of his handling of Lucas' fate, Chick introduces still another alternative: " . . . all he would need to do tonight was to give Highboy about two extra cups of oats against tomorrow" (IITD, p. 31). Physical flight would obviate the need to act on Lucas' behalf. Yet the boy never seriously considers escape, as indicated by his use of conditional verbs each time he contemplates riding away on Highboy; the idea of flight becomes a crutch to support a troubled mind.

Nevertheless, the news that Lucas has gotten himself in trouble shatters Chick's composure: "'Yes.'. . . 'They're going to make a nigger out of him once in his life anyway'"

(IITD, p. 32). This comment is the verbalization of the remaining rage and shame felt by Chick because of the creek incident, but the words themselves reflect the town's attitude to Lucas. Indeed the emotion-tinged actions following the remark ameliorate Chick's bigoted words: " . . . eating rapidly, eating quite a lot and talking rapidly and quite a lot too about the ballgame and waiting to get hungry any minute any second now until suddenly he knew that even the last bite had been too much, still chewing at it to get it down to where it would swallow" (IITD, p. 32). Fleeing to town to confirm either his words or emotions, Chick demonstrates that he has no doubt, however, of Lucas' guilt: " . . . so apparently Lucas was still chained and peaceful to the bedpost . . . and Lucas with a good appetite, sharp set for his since he not only wouldn't have to pay for it but you dont shoot somebody every day in the week" (IITD, p. 33). Meant to reassure Chick, his uncle's words that Lucas is safe for the night merely augment the turmoil; first, Chick denies concern ("'It's all right with me. Lucas didn't have to work this hard not to be a nigger just on my account.' Because he was free" [IITD, p. 34]), and second, the leavings of the old rage against Lucas erupt in a three-page tirade that labels the Black a fool to murder a Gowrie in Beat Four with Edmonds out of town: " . . . yet that was what Lucas had had to pick, that time that victim and that place" (IITD, pp. 36-37).

This stream-of-consciousness diatribe is another example of the "fullness" that Waggoner believes is produced through point of view. Chick moves from the solitude of the night to the distractions of the town and its voices: he sees no Blacks on the street, learns that at least one car full of men had set out to lynch Lucas and hears the bigoted conversations. Ignoring the town's voice, Chick determines his course of action: " . . . he knew exactly what he was going to do" (IITD, p. 41). To ride twelve hours out of town and then to ride back will place Chick far away at the moment of Lucas' death. This immature belief that he can run from his own memory matches the childish reason he offers for being in town: " . . . not to see Lucas, he had seen Lucas but so that Lucas could see him again if he so wished, to look back at him not just from the edge of mere uniqueless death but from the gasoline-roar of apotheosis. Because he was free. Lucas was no longer his responsibility, he was no longer Lucas' keeper; Lucas himself had discharged him" (IITD, p. 42). Once more, however, when the crowd, which his uncle says was in all Southern towns, arrives out of nowhere, Chick instinctively moves toward the Black man. Perhaps the motives behind the boy's action are altruistic, but they reflect Chick's self-centered immaturity: " . . . Lucas looked at them for the first time and he thought Now. He will see me now and then he thought He saw me. And that's all and then he thought

He hasn't seen anybody because the face was not even looking at them but just toward them, arrogant and calm" (IITD, p. 44). Again Chick reacts with indecision: he will run away; he will remain and find Gavin for Lucas.

This fluctuation between rage and compassion ends the initiation's second phase with Chick's commitment to action, the compliance with Lucas' request. In addition, the voice of Gavin and the attitude of the town through the generalized focus of the central consciousness influence Chick's thinking. As he approaches a confrontation with Lucas, Chick remembers his intuitive sense of oneness with the townspeople on other occasions: " . . . so in keeping with the Sabbath's still suspension that he and his uncle would have been passing them steadily, recognizing them yards ahead without knowing or even pausing to speculate on when or how or why they had done so--not by silhouette nor even the voice needed: the presence, the aura perhaps; perhaps merely the juxtaposition: this living entity at this point at this moment on this day, as is all you need to recognise the people with, among whom you have lived all your life" (IITD, p. 46). Tonight, however, the town is empty, and the bigoted words of the one man they do pass parallel those Chick rejected earlier. The struggle generated by this juxtaposition of Chick and the town will determine the direction of the boy's final beliefs about man. As Volpe suggests, "As Southern Boy [Chick], his character is

naturally shaped by a sense of continuity with the past and a strong feeling of belonging to his community. . . . For him, the community becomes an extension of his own family."[13]

Again, fullness of point of view delineates this struggle, for the voice of Gavin Stevens through the central consciousness counterpoints Chick's own beliefs. Prior to chapter three, the reader discerns the intimate relationship uncle and nephew share, "that blind and absolute attachment to his mother's only brother which he had never tried to reason about" (IITD, p. 21). Now, ideas interpreted by Gavin echo Chick's viewpoint and dramatize the pair's affinity; yet, since he has lived a longer life and has had a variety of experiences unknown to the boy, Gavin adds complex moral questions to each situation. Gavin's voice provides background for interpretation, not moral absolutism:

> "All he Mr. Lilley requires is that they act like niggers. Which is exactly what Lucas is doing: blew his top and murdered a white man--which Mr Lilley is probably convinced all Negroes want to do--and now the white people will take him out and burn him, all regular and in order and themselves acting exactly as he is convinced Lucas would wish them to act: like white folks; both of them observing implicitly the rules: the nigger acting like a nigger and the white folks acting like white folks and no real hard feelings on either side. . . . Which proves again how no man can cause more grief than that one clinging blindly to the vices of his ancestors." (IITD, pp. 48-49)

Certainly Chick's youth precludes his ability to formulate such a last sentence, much less to agree with it; however,

today in town the boy has heard enough people speak against Lucas to believe that Gavin's generalization is valid. Gavin verbalizes Chick's subconscious impressions that may never rival, for lack of experience or personality, the eloquent abstractions of the loquacious lawyer.

Yet it is the ignominy Lucas faces in jail that triggers Chick's commitment to action: " . . . as the oak door swung back there seemed to rush out and down at him the stale breath of all human degradation and shame . . . " (IITD, p. 56). Chick still insists on Lucas' guilt; however, he finds compassion for the Black man, who, in sleep, is just old: " . . . and he stood in an almost unbearable surge not merely of outrage but of rage, looking down at the face which for the first time, defenceless at last for a moment, revealed its age" (IITD, p. 58). Then, Chick realizes that Gavin's interrogation represents a searching for a logical explanation of the murder. Indeed, when Lucas fails to satisfy him, Gavin himself fashions a version of what happened in Beat Four. The central consciousness never intrudes in this section; nevertheless, when Chick leaves the cell, his emotions reveal that he disagrees with his uncle's demand for logical answers: " . . . he and Lucas still looked at one another through the steel bars . . . and looking at him with whatever it was in his face so that he thought for a second that Lucas had spoken aloud. But he hadn't, he was making no sound: just

looking at him with that mute patient urgency" (IITD, pp. 65-66). This intuitive concern sends Chick back to the jail to hear Lucas ask him to "'Go out there and look at him'" (IITD, p. 68). Having anticipated a reminder of the creek incident or a plea that "I'm all he's got, all that's left" (IITD, p. 68), Chick, in amazed, incredulous outrage, realizes that Lucas knew that he could persuade the boy to honor the request. Faulkner captures Chick's dilemma best as the boy and Lucas face each other at the cell door: "'Come here.' Lucas did so, approaching, taking hold of two of the bars as a child stands inside a fence. Nor did he remember doing so but looking down he saw his own hands holding to two of the bars, the two pairs of hands, the black ones and the white ones, grasping the bars while they faced one another above them" (IITD, p. 69). Separated by race and social barriers (symbolically the jail), Chick discovers that his bond to Lucas transcends the childhood insult and has become a compact based on understanding and truth: " . . . [this was] the death by shameful violence of a man who would die not because he was a murderer but because his skin was black" (IITD, p. 72). Chick has completed the initiation's second phase; as Millgate proposes: "The progress of Charles's initiation is charted very largely in terms of his rejection of his original motive, which derived in large measure from the racial difference between Lucas and himself, in favour of a positive and even

passionate awareness of the need to preserve human dignity and avert the shame of mob-violence."[14]

Now, Chick is committed to the central action of the book,[15] and since Lucas "was not even asking a favor, making no last desperate plea to his humanity and pity" (IITD, p. 72), the boy, like Bayard and Ike, independently determines his own fate. Overwhelmed, however, by the terrifying ramifications of Lucas' request to exhume the murdered man's body, Chick returns to the place of childhood security, home, and tries to enlist help from his most compassionate relative, Gavin. But Gavin, as an adult, negates the simplistic acceptance of such a bizarre demand; he must have more substantial reasons for this act. Chick has known intuitively that Gavin could not help ("And that was all. He could go now, in fact should. For that matter he should never have stopped on his way through the hall or even come into the house at all" [IITD, p. 78]); the boy implies he returned out of habit, not in hope of assistance. Instead of the relief he sought from Gavin, Chick finds only a confirmation of the terror he senses: "'And how risk it [digging up Vinson Gowrie]? I'd just as soon go out there and shoot another one of his sons as to tell Nub Gowrie I wanted to dig his boy's body up out of the ground it had been consecrated and prayed into'" (IITD, pp. 79-80). Although these words fail to deter Chick (certainly a mark of the strength of Chick's pledge to Lucas),

he feels outrage "because he simply could not conceive of himself and Aleck Sander being left with" the task (IITD, p. 81).

Thus, Chick is to continue with the project simply because he is ignorant of the physical travail that will be required of him: "He could see himself reaching the church, the graveyard without effort nor even any great elapse of time; he could see himself singlehanded even having the body up and out still with no effort, no pant and strain of muscles and lungs nor laceration of the shrinking sensibilities" (IITD, p. 82). An additional source of strength is his realization that "the reason he was going out there was that somebody had to and nobody else would" (IITD, p. 83). Indeed his continual indecision about his course of action ("here was the irrevocable moment after which there would be no return" [IITD, p. 84]) is his bulwark against the nightmarish fear of the future. If he continues to tell himself he can back out at any time ("he could stop here and never pass it, let the wreckage of midnight crash harmless and impotent against these walls because they were strong, they would endure; they were home" [IITD, p. 84]), he need worry only about the present.

Additional solace derives from Aleck Sander and Miss Habersham, his companions on the ride to Beat Four. Like Bayard's Ringo, Aleck is gifted with intuitive understanding of how to handle stress (he senses the approach of the

murderer as the trio travel to the graveyard, and, once there, he directs in a professional manner the operation of grave-digging). In addition, as Chick's boyhood companion and friend, he dramatizes the value of sacrifice in the face of danger, for his journey to Beat Four as a Black in a lynch-crazy town is almost heroic. Likewise, Miss Habersham possesses intuitive wisdom. Although Chick continues to doubt Lucas' innocence, Miss Habersham accepts it on faith:

> "He said it wasn't his pistol," he said.
> "So he didn't do it," she said, rapid still and with something even more than urgency in her voice now.
> "I dont know," he said. (IITD, p. 87)

Miss Habersham's character includes, of course, more than one emotional quality; indeed, some critics, comparing her to Granny Millard,[16] call her the heroine of the novel; but, although Miss Habersham does face physical danger, she does not make the personal sacrifices or endure the physical hardships that Rosa Millard faces. Her role of interpreter is paramount, nevertheless, for she helps Chick understand both why Lucas must ask his help ("'Of course. Naturally he wouldn't tell your uncle. He's a Negro and your uncle's a man'" [IITD, p. 89]) and why Chick can help ("'Lucas knew it would take a child--or an old woman like me: someone not concerned with probability, with evidence'" [IITD, p. 89]). Finally, Miss Habersham, penetrating the confused reactions Chick experiences, guides him to an understanding that any

person (young or old) can reach the essential nature of life: "... what Miss Habersham paraphrased was simple truth, not even fact and so there was not needed a great deal of diversification and originality to express it because truth was universal, it had to be universal to be truth and so there didn't need to be a great deal of it just to keep running something no bigger than one earth and so anybody could know truth; all they had to do was just to pause, just to stop, just to wait" (IITD, p. 89). With Aleck's and Miss Habersham's support "the simple inert unwieldy impossible physical vastness of what he faced" (IITD, p. 90) disappears. He but needs Miss Habersham to say, "'Then we'll have three'" (IITD, p. 90) to make a positive response: "'Drive on down the lane to the pasture gate'" (IITD, p. 90).

That journey to Caledonia Chapel and the grisly opening of Vinson Gowrie's grave are Chick's killing of the deer or rescuing of the fyce (Ike McCaslin's moments of initiation) and Chick's confrontation, weaponless, of Redmond (Bayard Sartoris' moment). Ironically, once they accomplish the repugnant task of proving Lucas' innocence, the trio must relinquish the facile completion of the task to those who originally refused to act. For Chick, specifically, the consequence is a return to the restrictions of home (symbolized by the vignette of nagging Mrs. Mallison: " . . . at once his mother her hair loose and in her nightdress wailed from right beside

the front door: 'Where have you been?'" [IITD, p. 105]) and to the influence of Gavin's ideas (exemplified in the rationalizations of the night's events: "'Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings and old ladies--' he paraphrased. 'Quite true, as a lot of truth often is, only a man just dont like to have it flung in his teeth at three oclock in the morning'" [IITD, p. 106]). Chick does return a man. Technique delineates this change: now the boy interrupts and interprets Gavin's speeches; now the boy judges and verbalizes abstractions that permeate Gavin's more eloquent ramblings: " . . . how you could never really beat them [women] because of their fluidity which was not just a capacity for mobility but a willingness to abandon with the substanceless promptitude of wind or air itself not only position but principle too" (IITD, pp. 105-106). By the time of the ride back to Caledonia Chapel in chapter seven, Chick's reactions to the land and its people are identical with Gavin's sense of priorities--a respect for the individual, a sense of history, and pride in the South. And by chapter nine Gavin's and Chick's thoughts are almost synonymous: " . . . yesterday today and tomorrow are Is: Indivisible: One (his uncle for this too, anticipating this too two or three or four years ago as his uncle had everything else which as he himself became more and more a man he had found to be true)" (IITD, p. 194). Hence, the central consciousness of the reflective focus scarcely

exists. Although Chick could not possibly be telling his adventures immediately following the last incident in the book, the reader does not sense that many years have passed before Chick attempts to verbalize the story (for one, Chick does not make judgments about his actions at Caledonia Chapel or about his reactions to the town's flight). The reader has reached the point Millgate sees as the progressive initiation into manhood through the central-consciousness technique.[17] This progressive narrowing of focus technically supplements the assertions and dramatization of Chick's maturation.

No degree of maturity, however, can enable Chick, or Chick with Miss Habersham and Aleck, to free Lucas from jail. Chick discovers that a man must depend upon his community to help him accomplish his goals. And, although the community's method of operating may be faulty ("Since he [Hampton] couldn't succeed himself, although now in his third term the elapsed time covering Sheriff Hampton's tenure was actually almost twice as long as the twelve years of his service" [IITD, p. 107]), individuals transcend those faults: Hampton indicates, after learning that Jake Montgomery now lies in Vinson Gowrie's grave, that their first concern is to Lucas.

As Chick relinquishes his active role in the movement of events, his physical weariness descends upon him: " . . . and he began to eat, chewing and even swallowing, rising and falling as though to the motion of the chewing along the deep

soft bottomless mire of sleep, into then out of the voices buzzing of old finished things no longer concern of his: the sheriff's" (IITD, pp. 114-115). Time, like the initiation experience, eclipses reality: " . . . it was last night, of course; it seemed like years now" (IITD, p. 118). This sleep motif intensifies, in chapter six, to combine unrelated aspects of Chick's maturation process; his mother's acceptance of his maturity, the remembered flight from Caledonia Chapel, and his father's fear of Chick's adulthood carry the boy beyond the nightmare experience at Vinson's grave. Refreshed only after he has drunk the coffee, a symbol of the adult world, which is too bitter to drink without sugar and milk, emblems of childhood, Chick is ready to face the town that knows nothing of the boy's bravery or of Lucas' innocence.

At first glance the townspeople seem busy with daily routine; then in one illuminating instant, Chick realizes they do not know of his adventures in Beat Four. They are still awaiting the Gowries and the lynching. Now the boy reevaluates his visual interpretation of the town: " . . . the same weathered still almost inattentive faces and the same faded clean cotton shirts and pants and dresses but no crowd now waiting for the curtain to rise on a stage's illusion. . . . come not to see what they called justice done nor even retribution exacted but to see that Beat Four should not fail its white man's huge estate" (IITD, pp. 136-137);

he perceives the unity in "the faces myriad yet curiously identical in their lack of individual identity, their complete relinquishment of individual identity into one We" (IITD, p. 137). Astounded by "sheer hopelessness" and the "physical imponderability" of the crowd, Chick suffers an impulse of immaturity: " . . . to run home and fling saddle and bridle on the horse and ride as the crow flies into the last stagger of exhaustion and then sleep and then return after it was all over" (IITD, pp. 137-138). But the ultimate recognition is that he has helped reveal the sins of his own people: " . . . it seemed to him now that he was responsible for having brought into the light and glare of day something shocking and shameful out of the whole white foundation of the county which he himself must partake of too since he too was bred of it" (IITD, p. 138). As the creek incident is the central action of the book, so is this recognition the center of Chick's spiritual struggle through the rest of the book, for he knows he is doomed: "But it was too late now, he couldn't even repudiate, relinquish, run (IITD, p. 138). Chick's handling of his dilemma, moreover, resembles Ike's and Bayard's: Ike decides to relinquish the land, Bayard to end the bloodshed, and Chick to protect home and mother from the possible threat of mob violence. Yet Gavin calls upon the boy to complete the job he began last night at the graveyard.

Thus, the return trip to Caledonia Chapel refines Chick's new adult sensitivity. The landscape complements his internal transformation: the strong, immobile pines are replaced by the delicate, sweet-smelling dogwood and fruit trees, and the moonlight is succeeded by sunlight. Moreover, Chick's thoughts turn from the frustrations of human relations to a reflection on the landscape he views from the car window. He notes the enduring quality of the land but senses that man is insignificant in comparison with the vast earth he inhabits: " . . . the beast the plow and the man integrated in one foundationed into the frozen wave of their furrow tremendous with effort yet at the same time vacant of progress, ponderable immovable and immobile like groups of wrestling statuary set against the land's immensity" (IITD, p. 147). This vignette of plow, beast, and man, indeed the Black man caught in this trap, reassures Chick that his fight for Lucas was right. The panorama of the land further stirs Chick's thoughts to the history detailed therein. And he perceives, although he was right in his actions on Lucas' behalf, that he was wrong in believing he could divorce himself from the people of this land: " . . . the dirt, the earth which had bred his bones and those of his fathers for six generations and was still shaping him into not just a man but a specific man, not with just a man's passions and aspirations and beliefs but the specific passions and hopes and convictions and ways of

thinking and acting of a specific kind and even race" (IITD, p. 151). Try as he might, he cannot sever himself from the South, which he calls a condition bred into him from birth.

Therefore, Gavin's harangue, although criticized scathingly by scholars as mere propaganda,[18] is germane to Chick's struggle. The thesis on Black freedom creates guidelines for the boy that will allow him to help the individual Black maintain dignity and himself to live at peace with his community. Gavin's key point--that the South itself deserves the privilege of setting the Black free--does not resolve Chick's spiritual torment. Indeed, having arrived at the graveyard, Chick finds visual evidence to suggest that resolution is impossible: the single word "Burn" inscribed on the belfry of Caledonia Chapel suggests to Chick that most life experiences are enigmatic. Later, when Mr. Gowrie's actions publish his grief, the boy can empathize with the old man. Thus, Mr. Gowrie's grotesque yet affectionate efforts to free Vinson's body from the quicksand cause Chick grief:

> . . . watching the old man coated to the waist with the same thin patina of sand like the pole, looking down at the body, his face wrenched and his upper lip wrenched upward from the lifeless porcelain glare and the pink bloodless gums of his false teeth:
> "Oh gee, Uncle Gavin, oh gee, Uncle Gavin, let's get him away from the road, at least let's get him back into the woods--."
> (IITD, p. 178)

Although the boy desperately wants to save Lucas, he learns that even such a humanitarian act may bring grief to others.

Now Chick has reached the final phase of the decisive initiation: his new sensitivity should enable him to reconcile himself with his community. However, an air of hallucination hangs over his interpretation of the cowardly flight of the town in the face of Lucas' innocence. Exhausted by the physical initiation at the grave, Chick is uncertain of what he sees: " . . . it seemed to him that he saw crowding the opposite side of the street facing the jail not just the county . . . but the Town" (IITD, pp. 180-181); indeed, he even fantasizes his reaction: " . . . it seemed to him that he was already leaning out of the window . . . yelling back at them in a kind of unbearable unbelieving outrage" (IITD, p. 181). Although his essential reactions are uncertain, as Warren suggests, his continual reference to "Faces" and "Heads" reveals his concern for his town: "He does not think of himself as a member of a mere collection of people who happen to live in a place called Jefferson. Instead, he belongs to an organic society that shares basic assumptions."[19] Chick cares about his community and is dumbfounded by the feebleness of their actions: " . . . the faces in invincible profile not amazed not aghast but in a sort of irrevocable repudiation" (IITD, p. 185). Chick's "'They ran'" (IITD, p. 190), spoken in disbelief, suggests that the boy could more easily accept a dramatic, forceful action by the mob than this insipid negation of Lucas: "'They saved their consciences a good ten

cents by not having to buy him a package of tobacco to show they had forgiven him'" (IITD, p. 192).

Now so keenly aware of the injustices man will heap upon his fellowman, Chick reaches the depth of despair. He discovers that these frustrations catapult him beyond the world of sleep and peace of mind: " . . . he didn't dare relinquish into nothing what little he had left: which was nothing: no grief to be remembered nor pity nor even awareness of shame, no vindication of the deathless aspiration of man by man to man through the catharsis of pity and shame" (IITD, pp. 192-193). Truth and right are empty words, for Chick can find reality only in Gowrie's grief and "a Face" that symbolizes the town as it appears to Chick before the mob fled: " . . . a Face, the composite Face of his native kind his native land, his people his blood his own with whom it had been his joy and pride and hope to be found worthy to present one united unbreakable front to the dark abyss the night" (IITD, p. 194). Thus, overwhelmed, Chick considers, in the stream-of-consciousness style, the possible reasons why the mob ran. Gavin's proposal that at least they were moving, that mobility is better for man than immobility, offers Chick little solace. His next suggestion, that they fled because they had forgotten Lucas, hardly appeases the boy: "'That's exactly what I'm saying.' . . . 'They didn't even wait to send him a can of tobacco and say It's all right, old

man'" (IITD, p. 198). But Gavin's "'Was that what you wanted?' . . . 'The can of tobacco?'" (IITD, p. 199) captures the fallacy of Chick's logic. Having thus convinced Chick that the symbol of apology will do Lucas no service, Gavin explains that the mob fled because "'they were not running from him, they were running from Crawford Gowrie . . . thou shall not kill thy mother's child. It [this sin] came right down into the street that time to walk in broad daylight at your elbow, didn't it?'" (IITD, pp. 199-200). Again Chick reacts with disbelief, and again Gavin counters: "' . . . if we are not to hold to the belief that that point not just shall not but must not and cannot come at which Gowrie or Ingrum or Stevens or Mallison may shed Gowrie or Ingrum or Stevens or Mallison blood, how hope ever to reach that one where Thou shalt not kill at all, where Lucas Beauchamp's life will be secure not despite the fact that he is Lucas Beauchamp but because he is?'" (IITD, pp. 200-201). Here Gavin proposes that man stripped of his social façade still possesses an innate ethical code. Although this moral attitude lacks the humanitarian depth Chick demands, his uncle points out that the town's refusal to countenance fratricide is a positive stand. Perhaps time and teaching will expand this ethical belief.

Because Gavin's resolution for the reason behind the flight lacks an absolute answer, Chick can accept this idea only if he thrusts his remaining ire elsewhere; the people

have left Hampton and Gavin to tidy up the situation: "'Did they think to tell you how to do it? What to use for bait to get Crawford Gowrie to come in and say All right, boys, I pass. Deal them again. Or were they too busy being--being . . . '" (IITD, p. 204). Gavin's "'Righteous?'" (IITD, p. 204) stuns Chick. Indeed, in an epiphany comparable to Bayard's sleep-and-tears epiphany and Ike's epiphany in the tent with Roth's mistress, Chick perceives his failing: "Now he completely stopped. But only for a second. He said, 'They ran,' calm and completely final, not even contemptuous, flicking the shirt floating away behind him and at the same moment dropping the trousers and stepping barefoot out of them in nothing now but shorts. 'Besides, it's all right'" (IITD, pp. 204-205). Although the first stripping-of-clothes experience was a shameful revelation of Chick's unconcern for an individual's dignity, this second experience symbolizes a clearing of the mind, a rejection of the many irresoluble concepts with which the boy has struggled. Now he can fling aside contempt and say with finality, "They ran," for he understands he misunderstood the objective of his search: "'I dreamed through all that; I dreamed through them [the townspeople] too, dreamed them away too. . . . Because they were not the dream; I just passed them to get to the dream'" (IITD, p. 205). Gavin's defense of the town has caused Chick to realize that his self-righteous indignation has corrupted

his boyhood dream of fighting for truth and right ("' . . . only there was something else too--I was trying. . . .'" [IITD, p. 205]). The reader understands Chick's epiphany as the boy intuits the magnitude of his wrong, "feeling the hot hard blood burn all the way up his neck into his face and nowhere even to look not because he was standing there almost naked to begin with but because no clothes nor expression nor talking either smoke-screened anything from his uncle's bright grave eyes" (IITD, pp. 205-206). Yet, Gavin, entreating the boy to see this mistake as part of maturing, encourages Chick to persist in his refusal to bear injustice, to repeat the same battle in the future if necessary, but "'dont be ashamed'" (IITD, p. 206).

Thus, in chapter nine, Gavin's eloquent abstractions enable Chick to analyze his complex emotions to reach a clearer awareness of his place in society. Although Gavin's tirades often do not offer absolute truth--indeed the Black thesis speech does not make sense always--these harangues act as a sounding board for Chick's half-formed thoughts. Certainly, as Carter complains, "Faulkner does not play fair with this device central consciousness , putting words into Chick's mouth and thoughts into his head that never could be part of the probable world of the sixteen-year-old."[20] Nevertheless, two factors justify this technique. First, Chick as central consciousness, may be recounting this story some years after

the events; hence his thoughts and vocabulary are matured. Second, the boy has listened to his uncle's ramblings for so long that his style of thinking mimes Gavin's. Most importantly, in the early sections of the book Chick has neither interrupted nor interpreted Gavin's ideas; this style is in keeping with James' theory of the child as character: " . . . their vision is at any moment much richer, their apprehension even constantly stronger, than their prompt, their all producible vocabulary."[21] As he matures through the demanding attempt to prove Lucas' innocence, however, Chick begins to contemplate his actions more carefully, and his thought patterns become more complex. Thus, it is wholly conceivable that in the repartee of chapter nine Chick's grammar and thought content rival Gavin's. Perhaps of all the scholarly words written to interpret the growth in Chick's verbal skills and Gavin's role as preacher, Vickery's provide the most comprehensive justification: "Words cease to be mere verbal counters when the individual restores meaning to them out of and by his own experience. The problem of the child emerging into manhood is, in a sense, a verbal one, for he is compelled to reconcile language with experience and in the light of their significant interaction to accept, reject, or redefine his tradition. In such a situation there is room not only for the revivifying action of Chick but for the verbal readjustments of Gavin Stevens."[22]

Finally, for the initiation journey to be complete, Chick must assimilate these complex principles of life. In chapter ten this understanding is symbolized when, as Chick begins to eat after those dramatic hours without sleep or food, his thoughts turn to Gavin's belief that man by the act of eating translates himself into a new person and, in a way, shapes the course of history as well. Figuratively, as he mentally "chews and swallows" the irresoluble aspects of man and society, Chick is changing his nightmare experience into his own viable code for life. Having eaten, Chick once more feels ready to be received into the society that he had rejected, "and so it must have been the eating" (IITD, p. 209). As Volpe suggests, Chick has earned his "Eagle Scout Dont Stop" award, and "[t]his promotion signifies his acceptance of his heritage and his people, his faith in the fundamental pity and conscience of the human being, and his determination to feed the small flame of pity and justice in the South until it is warm and bright enough to reach the outcast Negro."[23]

Although the reader sees Chick's initiation limited to a brief period of time, several days, Chick's struggle, resolution, and positive attitude to future times are comparable to Bayard's healthy restoration to home and community. Chick has come to love his people: " . . . they were his own and he wanted no more save to stand with them

. . . one unalterable durable impregnable one: one people one heart one land" (IITD, pp. 209-210). Therefore, he has had a decisive initiation. Indeed, the light-hearted vignette that concludes the book echoes this promised maturity. As Lucas and Gavin banter over the legal costs of Lucas' case, Chick sees that Lucas still remains "intractable and calm and not looking at either of them" (IITD, p. 247). But this time the boy feels no outrage, no frustration; indeed, he attaches this observation to a happy description of his town "on [this] bright afternoon" (IITD, p. 247). To use a later version of Chick in support of decisive rather than an uncompleted initiation may be objectionable to scholars; yet Kerr provides one convincing example of Chick's healthy maturation from The Mansion. After Ratliff saves Yoknapatawpha County from Clarence Snopes, the twenty-four-year old Chick perceives the contrast between Gavin's defeatist attitude and Ratliff's affirmative actions and so concludes "that trust in God is not enough: ' . . . we need to fix things so He can depend on us for a while.'"[24] In this more mature picture of Chick, the same youthful sense of responsibility and concern for community appear undaunted.

Chapter VI

The Reivers: The Uncompleted Initiation

Identified as the "Golden Book" of Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha County, The Reivers (1962) receives critical praise for its reveiw of and relation to the entire Faulkner saga,[1] its autobiographical closeness to the author's life,[2] and its acceptance of life and the human condition.[3] Nevertheless, the uncomplimentary phrases "sentimentality,"[4] "childish" subject matter,[5] "immersion in the trite,"[6] and "literary remnants or sweepings"[7] brand the novel a minor work in the Faulkner canon. This coupling of accolades and denigrations is the most famous of many controversies that surround the book and thus must be considered in any effort to determine the value of this initiation journey in relation to those of Vardaman's, Bayard's, Ike's, and Chick's. The question, "What was Faulkner's literary purpose in The Reivers?", although ultimately unanswerable, must be analyzed.

When Lucius Priest, as narrator, parenthetically notes that "a gentleman always sticks to his lie whether he told it or not,"[8] the possibility that The Reivers is one marvelous "big whopper," one grand deception to confound the critics, whom Faulkner disliked and most often chose to ignore, is

worthy of critical consideration (the title which means thieves[9] may provide a clue). Indeed, the reader must be skeptical of the scholarly discussion of "a never-never land where parents are all they should be, prostitutes are reformed by the innocence of a boy . . . [and all] are really warm, good-hearted people."[10] After Faulkner's eighteen books of man's struggle with the forces of life, is it possible to write off The Reivers as "a genial nostalgic"[11] and "tranquil glance back at the familiar county"[12] to describe "man not tragically, satirically, or comically but simply lovingly,"[13] "as if the old novelist were casually, almost unconsciously going back to touch characters and events, ideas and places of that fiction--the aged author surveying the past, his work"[14]?

Initially, a reinterpretation of The Reivers' significance centers on the book's format and structure. First, the format for the author's name and book-title on each page, both in parentheses, may be more than a stylistic whim: if parentheses means an episode or incident, often an irrelevant one, perhaps Faulkner jokingly hints that the real author's relation to the book is insignificant (the author stands at a great distance from his material) and that the title may not be an initial clue to the book's direction. Second, an implied author controls the narrative frame of a story that begins with "Grandfather said" (Reivers, p. 3). Yet, the story Lucius Priest, the grandfather, recounts is about a youthful adventure that had occurred half a century before the

telling. Central to the story are the storyteller's grandfather and father, Boss and Maury Priest, and, apparently, the frame-narrator, one of Lucius' grandchildren, who records the storyteller's adventure. Five generations of a family and almost one hundred years of history thus affect the storyline.

As a result, an analysis of the complex point of view offers the best approach to a reading of the novel. If one of the grandchildren is recording this story that Grandfather Lucius experienced as an eleven-year-old, the reliability of statements made by the story's characters, of the sequence of events, and of the protagonist's own original reactions to the experience is questionable. Moreover, unlike the central-consciousness technique in Intruder in the Dust, which establishes a distinction between the character Chick and the frame-narrator, The Reivers' point of view is always colored by the words of the storyteller.

Moreover, Faulkner often blends the child's verbal spontaneity with the subtle philosophy of the adult. The simple language captures the child's confusion: "'He didn't! [Boss didn't die]' I said, cried. 'He was on the front gallery this morning when we passed.' He was. Father and I both saw him, either reading the paper or just standing or sitting there like he was every morning, waiting for time to go to the bank" (Reivers, p. 43). Yet, the storyteller's maturer

observations on death conclude the incident: "when an old person becomes sick he or she has already quitted living; the actual death merely clears the atmosphere so to speak, incapable of removing anything which was already gone" (Reivers, p. 43).

There is no question that the verbal freshness of Henry James' Maisie characterizes Lucius' youthfulness. James specifically labelled this freshness as an attempt "to invest [his character] with perceptions easily and almost infinitely quickened."[15] Lucius' sensuous response to Miss Reba's house is one such example: "It was like any other hall, with a stairway going up, only at once I smelled something; the whole house smelled that way. I had never smelled it before. I didn't dislike it; I was just surprised. I mean, as soon as I smelled it, it was like a smell I had been waiting all my life to smell" (Reivers, p. 99). Furthermore, by rarely allowing the boy Lucius to speak, Faulkner shows that he never overestimates the child's capacity to verbalize but through the narrator's reminiscences never underestimates the child's capacity for rapid comprehension.[16] Similarly James translates small children's many perceptions through their limited vocabulary.[17] In the scene where Ned, Boon, Otis, Corrie, Sam, and Lucius lead the horse to the railroad, "the boy's precocious initiation into the facts of life . . . through the nearness to experience of total recall, as well as the ability to comment

on experience which comes only with maturity"[18] maintain the balance James sought: "It was after ten now; there were few lights, these only in the other boarding houses (I was experienced now; I was a sophisticate--not a connoisseur of course but at least cognizant; I recognised a place similar to Miss Reba's when I saw one)" (Reivers, p. 139).

Herein lies the book's second enigma: if the child's perception becomes the dominant focus for the reader, then The Reivers is indeed a "Golden Book," a fairy-tale of good fun; if the storyteller manipulates the reader's understanding of the story, then Faulkner's last book is infinitely darker and more complex than most critics admit. To pursue the latter reading requires a return to "Grandfather said" (Reivers, p. 3), for as Millgate suggests, Lucius as narrator is an old man who nostalgically remembers a youthful adventure.[19] How reliable then are those wistful impressions, and does the storyteller's devotion to his art ("a gentleman always sticks to his lie" [Reivers, p. 304]) become a justification in itself for the story he tells? Vorpahl's statement that "[t]ime, Lucius's long experience, and probably a good deal of reading appear to have gone into it [the art of storyteller]"[20] lends support to the narrator's use of poetic license, as do the many literary borrowings liberally sprinkled among the narrator's observations. Samplings might include references to a literary generalization: "children, like poets, lie

rather for pleasure than profit" (Reivers, p. 53); Coleridge's "Kubla Khan": "But Ballenbaugh and his entourage--stable, pleasure-dome, whatever you want to call it" (Reivers, p. 75); Plutarch's Lives: "Because the die was indeed cast now" (Reivers, p. 93); and Wordsworth's "My Heart Leaps Up": "You see how indeed the child is father to the man" (Reivers, p. 133). Since storytelling often accounts for changes in the emotional states of characters in the Faulkner canon (the stories concerning Thomas Sutpen obsess Quentin Compson's waking thoughts in Absalom, Absalom!; the Civil War legends about Gail Hightower's grandfather shape the preacher's character in Light in August; the romantic tales of Colonel Sartoris' heroics in The Unvanquished give Bayard and Ringo preconceived notions of war; and Sam Fathers' tales create Ike's mystical oneness with the wilderness in Go Down, Moses), artistic sense and background can be said to shape the story that Grandfather creates. As Volpe notes, "Faulkner's young protagonists are molded and their attitudes and values are established by the stories they hear during their childhood. We also know that the family storytellers create legends about the past, and that these legends bear only tangential relation to reality."[21]

Seemingly, Grandfather is oblivious to the level of maturity of his audience. If, as most critics suggest, this is a story told to a group of children,[22] the subject matter and method of telling the tale are startlingly unchildlike. The adventure

concerns the theft of Lucius' grandfather's car by the simple-minded Boon, a stay in a Memphis brothel where Lucius is cut in a knife-fight with a teen-age pimp, and a race successfully concluded by Ned's chicanery. If these situations of social deviation were merely glossed over by the narrator, it is conceivable that they could be included in a child's story; however, the trip to the brothel is the boy's initiation, and his fight with Otis is his "coming of age." Indeed, if children comprise the audience and are affected by the story they hear (perhaps true in the case of the grandchild who writes down the incident), the story becomes the initiation process for them.

Likewise, why does the action-packed but adult story of Ludus and Boon begin grandfather's narrative? Presumably the more appeal to the child the initial incident in a story has, the stronger the possibility that the young listener will follow it to its conclusion. The Ludus story does have action:

> That's what we were doing when Boon came jumping through the door. That's right. Jumping. . . . In its normal state his face never looked especially gentle or composed; at this moment it looked like it was about to explode right out from between his shoulders with excitement. . . .
>
> "I'm going to shoot Ludus!" Boon hollered. (Reivers, pp. 4-5)

But the subsequent explanations for those actions will not fascinate the child; neither the complicated story of John Powell's pistol, nor Ludus' "tomcatting" in the stolen livery

wagon, nor Boon's reason for shooting Ludus ("'He told Son Thomas I was a narrow-asted son of a bitch'" [Reivers, p. 15]) is a typical opening for a child's story. That the Ludus adventure is a miniature version of the Boon-Ned-Lucius adventure in Memphis further undercuts any moral reasons that might be found for Grandfather's "Ludus-narration" to a group of children. Although Ludus and Boon are placed under legal bonds, neither is severely punished, Ludus' theft of the wagon is forgotten, Boon's five bullets merely crease a Black girl's buttock, and Boon, begging for another chance to harm Ludus, follows Maury Priest home. The narrator never observes that any of these actions are wrong, and the method of reporting his observations of the incident tends to becloud the experience further: "and two or three bystanders were wrestling with Boon, and . . . another deputy was holding Ludus about twenty feet away and still in the frozen attitude of running or frozen in the attitude of running or in the attitude of frozen running, whichever is right" (Reivers, p. 14). In fact one critic, Moses, sees the previous quotation as an example of the ironic attitude ("Faulkner is laughing, not only at passionate people, but at his own previous passionate description of them") Faulkner assumes in The Reivers.[23]

Finally, what Faulkner says about history affects the way a reader must approach a study of the book's value. Since Sartoris, Faulkner has been describing history (Oxford/Jefferson)

and coloring that history (Lafayette/Yoknapatawpha County) to suit his purpose; hence, many critics view The Reivers as a "nice big bow-knot on the Yoknapatawpha saga"[24] or a completion of "the picture of the world of Yoknapatawpha."[25] Yet, the whole story of The Reivers demonstrates a third handling of history by Faulkner: here he is creating social history and, perhaps, saying something about the method by which that history is created. Linked by the automobile are two key sections of social history in the novel--the story of the wilderness' demise in chapter two and the events at Ballenbaugh's in chapter four. As Grandfather develops the story of the receding wilderness, he recalls that the "almost virgin" land of pre-1905 contained "bear and deer, and wolves and panthers . . . less than twenty miles from Jefferson--the four or five sections of river-bottom jungle" (Reivers, p. 20); yet civilization (specifically the lumber company) changes social history, for by 1905 the wilderness' boundaries are forty miles from Jefferson: "the wagons bearing the guns and food and bedding had merely to start at sundown; and now a northern lumber company had built a narrow-gauge railroad for hauling logs . . . with a courtesy stop to let Major de Spain and his guests off" (Reivers, p. 20). Then by 1925 the wilderness' demise is apparent: "Major de Spain and the rest of that old group, save your Cousin Ike and Boon, were gone now and . . . their inheritors switched off their automobile engines to the sound of axes and saws where a year ago there

had been only the voices of the running hounds" (Reivers, pp. 20-21). Thus, by 1940 Major de Sapin as banker, not hunter, has sold lease, land, and timber (it is now McCaslin's camp), and the hunters "would load everything into pickup trucks and drive two hundred miles over paved highways to find enough wilderness to pitch tents in" (Reivers, p. 21). Thus, Grandfather Lucius finds it easy to guess from past evolution the wilderness' portentous future: by 1980 no wilderness will exist. In a moment of levity he suggests that perhaps the moon or Mars will offer a new wilderness, "with maybe even bear and deer to run it" (Reivers, p. 21). Since Grandfather consciously reviews the change in hunting traditions and landscape of Yoknapatawpha, his story creates a record of social history.

Much the same historical sequence occurs at Ballenbaugh's. Having guided the listeners through Boon's and Lucius' departure from Jefferson, Grandfather halts the story midway on the road to Memphis to move this time from the modern atmosphere at Ballenbaugh's to its historic past and back again to the present by the end of his chronicle. The present Ballenbaugh's compares with the sterility of Grandfather's 1940 wilderness: the place is run by an outsider, an Italian bootlegger; de Spain's hunting camp is a drainage district; and cotton and corn have replaced the bear and deer. At least in 1905 "there was still vestigial wilderness, though most of the deer

and all the bears and panthers (also Major de Spain and his hunters) were gone" (Reivers, pp. 72-73), and the further back in time that Grandfather searches, the more vital, the more atuned to the landscape Ballenbaugh's becomes: "and the first Wyott came along and the Indians showed him the crossing and he built his store and ferryboat and named it after himself, this was not only the only crossing within miles but the head of navigation too; boats . . . came as it were right to Wyott's front door, bringing the whiskey and plows and coal oil and peppermint candy up from Vicksburg and carrying the cotton and furs back" (Reivers, p. 73). Grandfather then repeats his survey with a review of the figures who have tamed this area: the creator of "a roaring place" peopled with tough men, the "ancestryless giant calling himself Ballenbaugh" (Reivers, p. 73), is replaced by his son, a harborer of cattle thieves and murderers, who made the place "a byword miles around for horror and indignation" (Reivers, p. 75). In 1886, a Baptist minister, Hiram Hightower, who "converted the entire settlement with his fists" (Reivers, p. 75), transforms Ballenbaugh's again. Finally the land is willed to Ballenbaugh's only child, a fifty-year-old spinster, "A prim fleshless severe iron-gray woman who farmed a quarter section of good bottom cotton- and corn-land and conducted a small store . . . [which accommodated] fox- and coon-hunters and fishermen, who (it was said) returned the second time not for the hunting and fishing but for the table Miss Ballenbaugh

set" (Reivers, p. 76). Each figure that Grandfather chronicles further saps the natural vitality of the land; by her time Miss Ballenbaugh reflects the lifelessness of the land. Now even Miss Ballenbaugh's chickens are not safe from the automobile, which has helped in the destruction of the Yoknapatawpha landscape. As Grandfather shifts backwards and forwards in time, he reveals social history's fragile basis, which depends to a great degree on letters, diaries, journals, personal documents, and traditional stories handed down by word-of-mouth. Grandfather's story, which he passes on to the grandchildren, is the stuff of social history; "[i]t [the story] deals directly with that difficult relationship between history, individual experience and imagination which comprises The Reivers' central problem."[26] That his story is tinged sometimes with irony, exaggeration, or nostalgia establishes yet another warning-signal to the reader of this novel, as Vorpahl notes: "Thus, 'apocryphal' and actual are confused in Lucius' mind to the extent that his confusion itself may be seen as his narrative's most important fact."[27]

The image of moonlight emphasizes Grandfather's confusion: the moon promises the only future wilderness, shines down as Lucius and Boon arrive at Ballenbaugh's, guides the group's effort to load the horse on the boxcar, floats over the attic room where Lucius and Otis fight, outlines Uncle Parsham's white moustache as Lucius lies next to him in bed, and pierces the daylight on the Parsham race track. Moonlight colors what

is retold, stretching "all the way from the attic of a Memphis brothel to the sunlit finish line of The Reivers' final horse-race, and from a spring night in 1905 to another night more than fifty years later when the story is told."[28] This complex frame for a reading of The Reivers adds depth to Lucius' uncompleted initiation, which "is not to be separated from the distinctive culture of Yoknapatawpha, the conditioning impact of familiar environment, or the example of that 'norrerheaded' giant, Boon Hogganbeck."[29]

Marcus defines such initiations as the taking of "their protagonists across a threshold of maturity and understanding but [leaving] them enmeshed in a struggle for certainty. These initiations sometimes involve self-discovery."[30] Lucius' initiation begins in chapter one with Boon's ridiculous assault on Ludus, for the incident dramatizes Boon's childlike actions and thoughts. Indeed, eleven-year-old Lucius recalls that "over a year ago Father had already begun to say that at any moment now I would outgrow him [Boon]" (Reivers, p. 19). Therefore, when Grandfather Lessep dies and Boon gains sole control of the use of Boss' automobile, Lucius, in retrospect, believes he should have realized that he was doomed to be a captive of Boon's whims: "There is no crime which a boy of eleven had not envisaged long ago. His only innocence is, he may not yet be old enough to desire the fruits of it, which is not innocence but appetite; his ignorance is, he does not

know how to commit it, which is not ignorance but size" (Reivers, p. 46). Boon gives direction to Lucius' willingness, and by the time he has taught Lucius how to drive the auto, the boy realizes that "Boon licked [him] in the fair battle after all; evidently he hadn't quite forgot all he remembered from his own youth about boys. [Lucius knows] better now of course, and [he] knew better then: that Boon's fall and [his own] were not only instantaneous but simultaneous too" (Reivers, p. 50). Hence, Boon and Lucius become the reivers off on a stolen holiday with Lucius minute by minute becoming the director of the adventure: "I was the leader, I was the boss, the master" (Reivers, p. 53).

The boy's spontaneous descent to "Non-Virtue" soon arouses feelings of guilt ("I will never lie again. It's too much trouble. It's too much like trying to prop a feather upright in a saucer of sand. There's never any end to it. You never get any rest" [Reivers, p. 58]), suggesting that the eleven-year-old senses a certain amount of social responsibility. Indeed, by the time they have finished telling lies to Aunt Callie, Cousin Ike, and Cousin Zackary Edmonds, Lucius' irritation increases: "No. Let's go now. If I've got to tell more lies, at least let it be to strangers" (Reivers, p. 64). Unlike Bayard and Ike, Lucius is hurled into his new adventure with little time for regret; thus, when he stands still for the first time since hearing of Grandfather Lessep's death,

his first emotion is regret; his little-boy fears surface: "and suddenly I wanted my mother; I wanted no more of this, no more of free will; I wanted to return, relinquish, be secure, safe from the sort of decisions and deciding whose foster twin was this having to steal an automobile" (Reivers, p. 66). But Lucius continues in the charade because, like Chick, he believes the irrevocable decision has not yet been made; it was "still a mile ahead, where the road to McCaslin forked away from the Memphis road" (Reivers, p. 67). Suddenly he is beyond that moment, stalled in the second mudhole and forced to play a mature role in the extrication of the auto. Having learned how to drive the car only hours before, Lucius must assume responsibility for its safety as Boon pushes it free.

Events that test the boy's courage have followed so rapidly that the discovery of the stowaway, Ned, and their arrival at Ballenbaugh's provide Lucius his first moments of peace since leaving Jefferson: "He [Boon] blew out the lamp and got on his mattress. Then there was all the spring darkness: the big bass-talking frogs from the sloughs, the sound that the woods makes, the big woods, the wilderness with the wild things" (Reivers, p. 78). Moreover, Boon's offer of rides to Miss Ballenbaugh, Alice, and Ephum creates an interlude from Lucius' anxiety.

Only when the trio reaches Hell Creek does Lucius' initiation resume. Here he learns that looks are sometimes

deceiving: "It [Hell Creek] didn't look very bad to me, nowhere near as wide as the river bottom we had already crossed, and we could even see the dusty gash of the road mounting to the opposite plateau beyond it. But Boon had already started to curse . . . as if he were eager, anxious to reach and join battle with it, as if it were something sentient, not merely inimical but unredeemable, like a human enemy, another man" (Reivers, p. 80). Although he senses Boon's preparation for struggle, Lucius does not have the background to anticipate Hell Creek's snares:

> "Aint you going to use the block and tackle yet?" I said.
> "Hell no," Boon said. "When the time comes for that, you wont need to ask nobody's permission about it. You'll already know it." So it's the bridge I thought. Maybe there's not even a bridge at all and that's what's wrong. And Boon read my mind there too. "Don't worry about the bridge. We aint even come to the bridge yet." (Reivers, p. 83)

Once the trio gains sight of the bridge, Lucius' education progresses rapidly: he learns that a man deliberately creates a mudhole to trap automobiles and then charges money to help free them, that he himself will have to help push the automobile from the mud, and that Boon's fury at the injustice of the situation makes him strive "like a demon, titanic, ramming his pole beneath the automobile and lifting and heaving it forward" (Reivers, p. 87). Most importantly, however, Lucius discovers that colossal fury also has its breaking point, for Boon's desire to get to Memphis overpowers

his hatred of the "mudhole farmer." No longer the titan Lucius had observed, "Boon had already quit, given up, surrendered" (Reivers, p. 91); he finally pays his money in exchange for the car's extrication from the mudhole. With Hell Creek behind, Lucius feels that he has reached another turning point in the adventure: "Because the die was indeed cast now; we looked not back to remorse or regret or might-have-been; if we crossed Rubicon when we crossed the Iron Bridge into another county, when we conquered Hell Creek we locked the portcullis and set the bridge on fire" (Reivers, p. 93). Little does Lucius know that the surprises and trials that lie ahead in Memphis and Parsham will make Hell Creek seem a mere skirmish by comparison.

Miss Reba's brothel becomes Lucius' "initiation hut"; unlike Bayard's and Ringo's lonely pursuit of Grumby, Chick's essentially isolated trial at Caledonia Chapel, and Ike's solitary stand in the wilderness, Lucius' "coming-of-age" experience is achieved in society. The boy soon learns, however, that this society is culturally opposite from that of the Priest family. Initially, the youth's reaction of amazement is reflected by the repetition of "I was only eleven": as Ned reveals his knowledge of Memphis ("Ned had been in Memphis before. Though probably even Grandfather, though he might have known when, didn't know how often. And you see, I was only eleven" [Reivers, p. 97]); as Boon asks

Lucius to safeguard his car-key and money ("Because I had never been inside a boarding house either; and remember, I was just eleven" [Reivers, p. 98]); when Lucius first views Minnie's gold tooth ("it would have been worth being her husband just to watch that tooth in action across the table every day; a child of eleven, it seemed to me that the very food it masticated must taste different, better [Reivers, p. 100]). His naiveté soon dissipates, however, for he is able to perceive Boon's ulterior purpose in labeling virtuous that which Lucius will learn in the stay at Miss Reba's: "'What you mean is, whatever I see on this trip up here, not to tell Boss or Father or Mother or Grandmother when we get back home. Is that it?'" (Reivers, p. 105). And other appearances begin to prove deceiving: Miss Reba's house has a confusing, but revealing, smell ("I smelled something; the whole house smelled that way. I had never smelled it before. I didn't dislike it; I was just surprised. I mean, as soon as I smelled it, it was like a smell I had been waiting all my life to smell" [Reivers, p. 99]); although Otis looks like a young boy, there is something different about him; and Corrie, a whore, has the power to mesmerize a male ("at first I thought her face was plain. But she came into the room already looking at me, and I knew it didn't matter what her face was" [Reivers, p. 102]). Perhaps most surprising of all to Lucius are the manners enforced in Miss Reba's house:

Miss Reba demands cleanliness, no dancing and "frolicking" on Sunday, politeness, and no gambling (in brothel society Miss Reba's Mr. Binford is considered a paragon of virtue, but his gambling vice forces him to leave the house).

Indeed this strange agglomeration of etiquette, freedom, traffic in sex, and greed are Lucius' first exposure to the dichotomies of life. Like Bayard's, Ike's, and Chick's, Lucius' journey to understanding hinges on the recognition that adherence to absolute value is impossible. As Lucius lies beside Otis at night, he senses that the corruption in Otis has spread to himself, and his hatred of the awareness grows. Overwhelmed by Otis' deviling about "pugnuckling" and verbal exposé of Corrie's former life, Lucius, feeling too many new sensory impressions have been forced upon him too rapidly, asks, "'What is pugnuckling?'" (Reivers, p. 156). The spontaneous fight that follows this remark provides Lucius his moment of maturity, symbolically in the cut he sustains from the pocketknife he fearlessly seizes from Otis and literally in Lucius' mature reaction to Otis' presence after the fight: "'Just keep him out of here,' I said. 'I'm tired. I want to go to sleep'" (Reivers, p. 158). The rewards of such heroics befit his new-found maturity: Boon offers earthy admiration ("'Eleven years old,' he said, 'and already knife-cut in a whore house brawl.' He looked at me. 'I wish I had knowed you thirty years ago. With you to learn me when

I was eleven years old, maybe by this time I'd a had some sense too. Good night'" [Reivers, p. 159]), and Corrie promises to make herself worthy of Lucius' courage ("'You fought because of me. . . . I ain't used to it, you see. That's why I dont know what to do about it. Except one thing. I can do that. I want to make you a promise. Back there in Arkansas it was my fault. But it wont be my fault any more'" [Reivers, pp. 159-160]).

In the horse-race episode that follows, the durability of Lucius' new-found maturity is tested. Appropriately, qualified administrators do the testing: Ned, who has an intuitive control of horses, replaces the simple-minded, childish Boon as guide. Indeed, as the boy becomes more dependent on Ned for direction, Faulkner extends Ned's good sense from animal to human concerns: although Lucius finds it difficult to determine Otis' age, Ned does so immediately ("'About fifteen, aint he?'" [Reivers, p. 163]); the Black demonstrates sincerity to people who respect him ("He was not Uncle Remus now. But then, he never was when it was just me and members of his own race around" [Reivers, p. 182]); and he sees through the human facade ("'A man [Butch in particular] that never had nothing in it nohow, one of them little badges goes to his head so fast it makes yourn swim too'" [Reivers, p. 185]). In similar fashion the setting for testing is modified. Uncle Parsham's home, offering

love, understanding, and comfort, replaces Miss Reba's house: the Black's house is poor but clean and neat; Uncle Parsham's daughter feeds Lucius, helps him with his hurt hand, and provides a comfortable place to rest; and Uncle Parsham and Lycurgus help Ned and Lucius test the horse's skills.

The first real test of Lucius' commitment to maturity, Butch's advancements to Corrie, triggers ambivalent emotions in the boy. He is afraid, "afraid for Everbe [another name for Corrie used interchangeably in The Reivers] and Uncle Parsham and Uncle Parsham's home and family" (Reivers, p. 174); he feels hatred, "hating Everbe for being the vulnerable and helpless victimised; and Uncle Parsham and Lycurgus for being where they had to, couldn't help but watch white people behaving exactly as white people bragged that only Negroes behaved" (Reivers, p. 174); finally he is homesick: "I was anguished with homesickness, wrenched and wrung and agonised with it: to be home, not just to retrace but to retract, obliterate" (Reivers, pp. 174-175). Lucius shows his adult control, however, as he rejects this last emotion: "It was too late. Maybe yesterday, while I was still a child, but not now. I knew too much, had seen too much. I was a child no longer now; innocence and childhood were forever lost, forever gone from me" (Reivers, p. 175). Thus, when Otis refuses to ride Lightning, Lucius, weary and injured, earns Ned's praise by working the horse as Ned wishes.

Yet, for all Lucius' new-found independence, he discovers that the spoils of battle with Otis include Everbe as surrogate mother. Besides clinging to him to avoid Butch's advances, Everbe insists on medical care for Lucius' cut. Upon meeting the careless, ether-addicted doctor, Everbe, reminding Lucius of his own mother's dominance, becomes more possessive: "and if Mother had been there his [the doctor's] fingernails would have touched no scratch belonging to her, let alone four cut fingers, and evidently Everbe agreed with her; she--Everbe--said, 'I'll unwrap it,' and did so" (Reivers, p. 190). Finally, she forces the boy to allow her to wash his clothes; this act provides her with a chance to symbolically clean her hero's battle-stained uniform and to wash away her own guilt of prostitution.

Appropriately, on the day of the horse race, Everbe's presence is only slightly felt by Lucius, for the importance of winning dominates the boy's thoughts. Initially, he feels the power that winning will bring: "set Boon and Ned . . . free to go home again, not with honor perhaps, not even unscathed, but at least they could go back" (Reivers, p. 213); then he feels the fear such a task creates: "for the first time I really realised that I was going to ride in a horse race before many more hours, and I could taste my spit sudden and sharp around my tongue" (Reivers, p. 220). Ultimately, reason transcends emotion as Lucius realizes that a communal

bond is necessary to achieve a goal: "I actually realised not only how Lightning's and my fate were now one, but that the two of us together carried that of the rest of us too, certainly Boon's and Ned's, since on us depended under what conditions they could go back home, or indeed if they could go back home" (Reivers, p. 224). Although he romanticizes his role in a task that in itself is likewise depicted extravagantly by Boon and Ned, the boy, like Bayard and Chick, perceives that man achieves little in isolation. With the appearance of Bobo, the eleven-year-old Lucius further demonstrates that he knows the counterfeit role he plays: "if we could get the automobile back for no more than just telling Bobo to go get it and be quick about it, what were we doing here?" (Reivers, p. 229). Yet, he desires that the sham continue, that his task remain momentous: "if the successful outcome of the race this afternoon wasn't really the pivot; if Lightning and I were not the last desperate barrier between Boon and Ned and Grandfather's anger . . . then all of us were engaged in a make-believe not too different from a boys' game of cops and robbers" (Reivers, pp. 229-230). This observation, that the adventure is merely a little boy's game, is unsophisticated enough to be made by Lucius the boy. Therefore, if this is not exclusively the older narrator's remark, then it becomes an epitaph for Lucius' youth, the understanding of which guides the boy in his re-entry into the Jefferson-Priest world.

Thus, in the next chapter, his sojourn with Uncle Parsham helps orient Lucius to the healthy atmosphere he left behind in Jefferson. Repeatedly the boy compares Uncle Parsham to Boss (he uses his napkin as Boss does, has a gold toothpick like Grandfather's, and understands the boy's emotional reactions as Boss would understand them); hence, the story Uncle Parsham tells about the mule's wisdom gains stature in the boy's eyes: "I could feel what Uncle Parsham meant; there came back to me through the lines not just power, but intelligence, sagacity; not just the capacity but the willingness to choose when necessary between two alternatives and to make the right decision without hesitation" (Reivers, p. 246). The mule's simplistic reaction to alternatives is the crux of the initiation struggles that Bayard, Chick, Ike, and Lucius must resolve in order to be reunited with their community. Realizing that Uncle Parsham's use of folklore to allay his fears is deliberate, Lucius abandons all reserve: "And so suddenly I was talking, telling him: about the beagles: how I wanted to be a fox hunter like Cousin Zack . . . ; and how Father paid me ten cents each Saturday at the livery stable and Father would match whatever I saved of it until I could buy the first couple to start my pack, which would cost twelve dollars and I already had eight dollars and ten cents; and then, all of a sudden too, I was crying, bawling" (Reivers, p. 246). This catharsis, handled with manly kindness

by Uncle Parsham, breaks the tension Lucius has faced in lonely, trying circumstances. Instead of additional soothing words or emotional gestures, Uncle Parsham leaves Lucius to fish Mary's hole in the twilight; perhaps the Black senses that the boy must have a peaceful setting in which to collect his thoughts. Thus, that night in bed Lucius determines that "the simple truth was, I wanted to go home and just wasn't brave enough to say so, let alone do it" (Reivers, p. 252). That he is able to form such a concept suggests his mental growth; that he intends to complete the task, for whatever reason, reflects his essential dignity.

Uncle Parsham often verifies Lucius'"coming of age"; therefore, when Ned tells the boy only part of the adventures since the mass-arrest, Uncle Parsham demands that Ned accord the boy the respect of an adult: "'He's stood everything else you folks got him into since you brought him here; what makes you think he cant stand the rest of it too . . . ?'" (Reivers, p. 255). Yet Lucius responds with ambivalence to the news that Boon has hit Everbe and that Everbe has broken her promise; he childishly refuses to believe and then more maturely recognizes that disbelief serves no function: "You see, just to keep on saying I dont believe it served only for the moment . . . anguish, rage, outrage, grief, whatever it was--unchanged" (Reivers, p. 258). Finally, believing physical retribution will somehow relieve his frustration,

Lucius discovers that this time his physical immaturity mocks his adult desires: " . . . I walking at him, up to him, not tall enough by more than half and nothing to stand on either (that ludicrous anti-climax of shame), having to reach, to jump even, stretch the best I could to strike at his face" (Reivers, pp. 259-260). Ned's homespun philosophy best characterizes the crisis the boy-man endures: "'Been crying again.' . . . 'A race-horse jockey and still aint growed out of crying'" (Reivers, p. 262).

Now Lucius' trying experiences culminate in a whirlwind of confusing, rapid-fire events (the race in which Acheron jumps the rails, the argument to place the second race in escrow, the immediate demand for the third race, and Lightning's spectacular win) and fling him to an abrupt stop before Boss' knowing eyes: " . . . only the stopped horse with Ned at the bit like a tableau, and me looking past Lightning's ears at Grandfather leaning a little on his cane" (Reivers, p. 274). Prophetically, Boss' only response to his grandson ("'You're busy now.' . . . 'So am I.' . . . 'We'll wait until we get home'" [Reivers, p. 274]) reveals how he will lead the boy to an understanding of the bizarre adventure. First, however, Boss aids in a righting of the wrongs created by this romp to Parsham: Minnie gets her tooth back, Everbe is forgiven, Boon is freed, also the bets on Lightning are profitable, and Boss and Lightning's owner receive a partial explanation of

Ned's horsesense. And two nostalgic touches tie a neat ribbon on the fairy-tale aspects of the adventure: Lucius asks Ned to give his horse-race winnings to Uncle Parsham, and Boon announces he will marry Everbe.

Only the reunion with community and family remains to complete the initiation experience. Here Lucius' situation compares most closely to Chick's, for the assimilation occurs through words: a dialogue between Boss and Lucius about a gentleman's responsibility. It is Boss who again rescues the situation from human debasement. Although Lucius accepts his father's method of punishment, he has matured enough to see the shame of the razor strop: "So here we were at last, where it had taken me four days of dodging and scrabbling and scurrying to get to: and it was wrong, and Father and I both knew it. I mean, if after all the lying and deceiving and disobeying and conniving I had done, all he could do about it was to whip me, then Father was not good enough for me. And if all that I had done was balanced by no more than that shaving strop, then both of us were debased. You see? it was impasse, until Grandfather knocked" (Reivers, p. 301). Unlike Maury, Boss does not have parental dignity to maintain; immediately he can break the impasse that threatens to disgrace father and son:

> "I lied," I said.
> "Come here," he said.
> "I cant," I said. "I lied, I tell you."

"I know it," he said.
"Then do something about it. Do anything, just so it's something."
"I cant," he said. . . .
"Then what can I do?"
"Live with it," Grandfather said.
(Reivers, pp. 301-302)

Lucius has matured sufficiently to sense how his experience should end, but he needs a mature interpreter to guide him to this peaceful resolution: "'A gentleman can live through anything. He faces anything. A gentleman accepts the responsibility of his actions and bears the burden of their consequences, even when he did not himself instigate them but only acquiesced to them, didn't say no though he knew he should. Come here'" (Reivers, p. 302). Boss suggests that life encompasses the dualities, the traps that create chains of events beyond the individual's control. Yet, the fact that he has set off the chain reaction makes him responsible for its total effect. Boss' "'Come here'" dramatizes this encompassment: in the moment of the revelation of the cruelest truth for the adult (that man cannot erase his mistakes), Boss offers the compassion due a child. Even Lucius' final tears are awarded the label of maturity by Boss: "'Now go wash your face. A gentleman cries too, but he always washes his face'" (Reivers, p. 303).

If Lucius is to live successfully in the world, like Bayard, Ike, and Chick, he will need to accept the dualities of life. Faulkner's tall-tale ending of The Reivers, "'His

name is Lucius Priest Hogganbeck'" (Reivers, p. 305), is the final ironic comment on the struggle with absolutes. Such an appellation dooms the child of Everbe and Boon to follow the difficult road to adulthood that all youthful characters have taken in Faulkner's writing.

Although The Reivers' story ends on this light-hearted touch, the final enigma for the reader, the best approach to this complexly structured work, must be resolved. Several hints late in the initiation sequence tie what Lucius learns to the darker reading that can be extracted from the point of view. Lucius' reaction to his community upon his return clearly proposes that this experience represents an uncompleted initiation: "I thought It hasn't even changed. Because it should have. It should have. It should have been altered, even if only a little. I dont mean it should have changed of itself, but that I, bringing back to it what the last four days must have changed in me, should have altered it" (Reivers, p. 299). And such an experience emphasizes the negative characteristics of life: " . . . if all that [the adventure] had changed nothing, was the same as if it had never been--nothing smaller or larger or older or wiser or more pitying--then something had been wasted, thrown away, spent for nothing; either it was wrong and false to begin with and should never have existed, or I was wrong or false or weak or anyway not worthy of it" (Reivers, p. 300). Priest-Jefferson society does remain

unaffected--Boon's emotions will continue to get him into trouble; Ned will still play the "con artist"; and Lucius' mother will persist in her inflexible moral standards. Moreover, Grandfather Lucius could have chosen to tell any kind of a story to his grandchildren. That he chose to relate such an unresolved story of childhood echoes Faulkner's lack of faith in mankind in general. Yet Lucius' understanding of Boss' explanation of adjustment to the dichotomies of life ("A gentleman can live through anything") confirms Faulkner's specific belief in the essential dignity of the individual, a belief developed in the other four initiation figures. Therefore, the various levels of interpretation offered in this chapter suggest a possibly richer reading than some critics have been willing to discern in The Reivers.

Chapter VII

Conclusion

The motto "A gentleman can live through anything," which Boss Priest in The Reivers offers to Lucius to ease his troubled conscience epitomizes Faulkner's attitude towards a healthy adjustment to life. As the previous chapters suggest, each young man's journey to manhood necessitates attempting such an adjustment, usually through an initiation experience. Whether an individual succeeds or fails in this attempt does not seem important to Faulkner (e.g., in "Delta Autumn" Faulkner sketches Ike McCaslin's character with compassion; he leaves the uncompleted initiation of Lucius Priest open to a healthy adjustment, for the boy has learned much about human nature); however, the posture a person assumes throughout the trial is all important. Faulkner himself once proposed that there are three possible approaches to life: "The first says, This is rotten, I'll have no part of it, I will take death first. The second says, This is rotten, I don't like it, I can't do anything about it, but at least I will not participate in it myself, I will go off into a cave or climb a pillar to sit on. The third says, This stinks and I'm going to do something about it. . . . What we need are

people who will say, This is bad and I'm going to do something about it, I'm going to change it."[1] Faulkner asks that the individual attempt to help other individuals or the community or the world; yet the success of the effort is not so important as the participation. As Adams suggests, "Moral maturity in Faulkner's moving world does not consist in any particular achievement, but rather an acceptance of this necessity to keep moving."[2]

How then do Vardaman, Bayard, Ike, Chick, and Lucius illustrate Faulkner's philosophy? Perhaps Vardaman reveals most clearly the value gained from motion: he runs from his mother's deathbed, runs at Peabody's horses, runs in fear to the barn to hide, runs along the riverbank in an attempt to save the coffin, runs at the buzzards, and, once in town, wants to run to the window of the store that houses the toy train. However erratic these motions dramatize the boy's attempt to understand Addie's death; they complement his irrational thinking. Although the reader never learns if Vardaman achieves moral maturity, the scenes involving motion depict a vitality, a desperate need to know, which may make the adult-Vardaman a member of the third approach to life. Likewise, the control and dignity Lucius maintains in his often demoralizing, always exhausting struggle with "non-virtue" win the admiration of almost every character in the novel--from Miss Reba to Boss Priest. In spite of the sheer

absurdity that the journey to Memphis often becomes, Lucius' determination not to run home to mother and safety, to see the events to their conclusion, indicates that this boy is another potential "doer." In the decisive initiation of Chick Mallison, Faulkner introduces a "particular achievement," the saving of Lucas Beauchamp, to delineate the youth's strong moral character. Ironically, this accomplishment leads to self-delusion, which in turn threatens to destroy the maturity Chick has achieved. After much soul-searching, Chick learns that only when man attempts to function within society has he really done "something about it [life] . . . to change it."

Faulkner offers the most complete exposition of the path to and achievement of moral maturity in the decisive initiation of Bayard Sartoris. The boy's development from childhood innocence to adult reality depends on motion: the attempted journey in "Retreat," the trip to Hawkhurst, the tracking of Grumby, and the return to the Sartoris plantation in "An Odor of Verbena." In turn these motion-based experiences expose Bayard to a variety of environments and individuals eventually leading him to reject the heroics of a public confrontation with Redmond. Indeed, because of the numerous conflicting beliefs of people whom he respects (e.g., Drusilla's approach to the handling of Redmond compared to Aunt Jenny's approach, Colonel Sartoris' military attitude versus the Yankee Colonel's humane attitude, or Uncle Buck's brand of

justice as contrasted to Professor Wilkin's concept of justice), Bayard ultimately learns that the pursuit of absolutes is valueless; he learns that flexibility is realistic (inflexibility led to Colonel Sartoris' spiritual degeneration and to Drusilla's insanity).

Significantly, key situations in Ike McCaslin's decisive initiation, which ends in moral failure, are devoid of motion: Sam commands Ike to stand still for the running of the mystical buck in "The Old People"; his first confrontation with Old Ben occurs when Ike finally does stand still; he watches the killing of Old Ben; he learns of his heritage as he sits in the commissary and reads the McCaslin ledgers; and in "Delta Autumn" he does not participate in the hunt and in the last scene lies in his tent contemplating mankind's achievements. Further, Ike's geographical world seldom changes, and his relationships with others are restricted to Yoknapatawpha society. Hence, Ike has climbed "a pillar to sit on."

Since Faulkner believes that past, present, and future work as one to mold the individual, he sees the story of mankind as the movement from innocence to experience: "Experience for Faulkner, more conspicuously perhaps than for most of us, is never limited and self-contained; it is an experience of being always on the threshold of something beyond. Past and future and the illimitable are all 'beyond,' but for an analysis of Faulkner's best work the past is especially important

as stimulus and vehicle of the threshold experience."[3] If the young protagonist cannot accept the constant possibility of "something beyond," he is Ike McCaslin, whose inability to accept the presence of evil in life requires that he repudiate land, home, and family. If he can accept the possibility of "something beyond," he remains flexible. He is Chick Mallison, who, at the conclusion of Intruder in the Dust, transforms his self-righteous anger into pride in his community and into humility in the face of mankind's frailty, and he is Bayard Sartoris, whose faithfulness to honor and courage makes him the son of Colonel John Sartoris but whose rejection of tradition and heroics makes him the only hope of the post-Civil War South. Youth is the threshold of life; hence, the initiation story provides the richest setting for an investigation of moral maturation. That Faulkner chose to analyze this experience in at least four novels and several short stories is the best testimony to substantiate the thesis statement of these studies. To posit a single version of the initiation story would be to mock Faulkner's stated belief that absolutes are impossible. Although the reader sees a variety of young men questioning the process of becoming, each study demonstrates the value of motion. Hence, as Reed proposes, "The children of his fiction have been justly praised; sometimes innocent, but always unashamed, they represent at once his accuracy of transfer in consciousness and voice, and they represent, I suppose, his place in the mainstream of American writing."[4]

Moreover, if a healthy and peaceful adjustment to life is central to these initiation stories (and it seems difficult to read them otherwise), then these stories do much to destroy one of the strong adverse criticisms of the Faulkner canon. Many scholars propose that the works of the earlier period, "the time of genius," are somber and pessimistic, that evil and violence overpower goodness,[5] and that there is no concern for didactic statements. By 1940, then, there is a general movement toward affirmation of life made annoyingly explicit through spokesmen-characters.[6] Finally, after the Nobel Prize, there may be an attempt through Faulkner's "downright affirmative"[7] last works and public statements to reassure himself that this optimistic attitude is what he has been talking about all of the time.[8] Since Bayard represents Faulkner's strongest statement concerning the adult's understanding of society, it is possible to suggest that he has always held an optimistic view toward the individual who adapts to the dualities of life.

Chapter I Notes

[1]John Bassett, William Faulkner: An Annotated Checklist of Criticism (New York, 1972), p. 6.

[2]Edmond Volpe, A Reader's Guide to William Faulkner (New York, 1964), p. 17.

[3]Cleanth Brooks, "William Faulkner, Vision of Good and Evil" in William Faulkner: Four Decades of Criticism, ed. Linda Welshimer Wagner (East Lansing, 1973), p. 119. Reprinted from The Hidden God by Cleanth Brooks (New Haven, 1963), pp. 22-43.
Joseph W. Reed, Jr., Faulkner's Narrative (New Haven, 1973), pp. 21-22.

[4]Volpe, p. 17.

[5]Reed, p. 21.

[6]Reed, p. 35.

[7]Reed, p. 35.

[8]William Faulkner, "Shingles for the Lord" in Collected Stories of William Faulkner (New York, 1950), p. 36. Originally published in Saturday Evening Post (February 13, 1943), 14-15, 68,70,71.

[9]Reed, p. 34.

[10]Faulkner, "A Justice" in Collected Stories, p. 343. Originally published in These 13 (New York, 1931).

[11]Faulkner, "A Justice," p. 360.

[12]William Faulkner, The Hamlet (New York, 1940), p. 136.

[13]Faulkner, The Hamlet, pp. 223-226.

[14]William Rossky, "Faulkner: The Image Of The Child In The Mansion," Mississippi Quarterly, 15 (Winter, 1962), 18.

[15]Henry James, "Preface" in The Novels and Tales of Henry James, Vol. XI (New York, 1908), p. vi.

[16]Leslie Fiedler, "From Redemption to Initiation," New Leader (May 26, 1958), 20.

[17]James William Johnson, "The Adolescent Hero: A Trend in Modern Fiction," Twentieth Century Literature, 5 (April, 1959), 4.

[18]Johnson, 4.

[19]James, p. ix.

[20]James, p. ix.

[21]Reed, p. 38.

[22]Jack Gordon Goellner, "A Closer Look at As I Lay Dying," Perspective, VII (1954), 44.

[23]Johnson, p. 5.

[24]Mordecai Marcus, "What is an Initiation Story?" in Critical Approaches to Fiction, eds. Shiv K. Kumar and Keith McKean (New York, 1968), p. 203. Reprinted from The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, XIV, No. 2 (Winter, 1960), pp. 221-228.

[25]Marcus, pp. 204-205.

[26]Volpe, p. 18.

[27]Reed, p. 43.

[28]Faulkner, "Barn Burning" in Collected Stories, p. 4. Originally published in Harper's (June, 1939), 86-96.

[29]Faulkner, "Barn Burning," p. 9.

[30]Gayle Edward Wilson, "'Being Pulled Two Ways': The Nature of Sarty's Choice in 'Barn Burning,'" Mississippi Quarterly, 24 (Summer, 1971), 280.

[31]Faulkner, "Barn Burning," pp. 24-25.

[32]Faulkner, "Barn Burning," p. 8.

[33]Faulkner, "Barn Burning," p. 25.

[34]Faulkner, "Barn Burning," p. 25.

[35]Reed, p. 44.

Chapter II Notes

[1]Floyd C. Watkins and William B. Dillingham, "The Mind of Vardaman Bundren," Philological Quarterly, 39 (April, 1960), 247.

[2]Watkins, 248.

[3]Marcus, p. 204.

[4]Marcus, p. 204.

[5]James, p. x.

[6]James, p. x.

[7]James, pp. xiii-xiv.

[8]Watkins, 248.

[9]Watkins, 248.

[10]William Faulkner, As I Lay Dying (New York, 1957), p. 22. Originally published in 1930--all subsequent references to this book will be internally cited by the abbreviation AILD and appropriate page number(s).

[11]Olga W. Vickery, The Novels of William Faulkner: A Critical Interpretation (Baton Rouge, 1959), p. 62.

[12]Reed, p. 94.

[13]Watkins, 249.

[14]Vickery, The Novels, p. 62.

[15]Watkins, 249.

[16]Watkins, 250.

[17]Watkins, 249.

[18]Addie, as central character, exerts influence on each member of the Bundren family. She has planned to take revenge on Anse for the children he forced her to bear and the emotional emptiness he created in her. Since Addie believes that ritual destroys people and feels "that the reason for living is getting ready to stay dead" (AILD, p. 167), she couples these two ideas to achieve her aim: the only value of living is to have "marked . . . one person's blood with my own forever and ever" (AILD, p. 162). Ironically, the figure least punished by her death-wish is Anse, who arrives at the end of the journey with new teeth, gramophone, and new wife in tow. Her revenge strikes hardest at Cash, who suffers a physical nightmare; Jewel, who sacrifices his horse, the only thing he has ever loved; Darl, who is committed to Jackson; and Vardaman.

[19]Vernon Tull is extremely sympathetic, and his impressions of Vardaman's power to instill courage (p. 132) reveal the boy's sensitivity. Yet Tull, as neighbor and husband of Cora, can hardly be an influential figure in Vardaman's life.

[20]Reed, p. 85.

[21]Vickery, The Novels, p. 59.

Chapter III Notes

[1]Marcus, p. 202.

[2]Cleanth Brooks, William Faulkner: The Yoknapatawpha Country (New Haven, 1963), p. 92.

[3]Marcus, p. 204.

[4]William Faulkner, The Unvanquished (New York, 1965), p. 3. Originally published in 1938--all subsequent references to this book will be internally cited by the abbreviation Unvanquished and appropriate page number(s).

[5]Volpe, p. 77.

[6]Lewis Leary, William Faulkner of Yoknapatawpha County (New York, 1973), p. 138.

[7]Reed, p. 178.

[8]Hyatt H. Waggoner, William Faulkner: From Jefferson to the World (Lexington, 1966), p. 181.

[9]Waggoner, p. 172.

[10]Volpe, p. 78.

[11]Reed, p. 183.

[12]Waggoner, p. 172.

[13]Reed, p. 185.

[14]Elmo Howell, "William Faulkner and the Concept of Honor," Northwest Review, 5, No. 3, (Summer, 1962), 57.

[15]Waggoner, p. 177.

[16]Marcus, p. 204.

[17]Marcus, p. 210.

[18]Volpe, p. 78.

[19]Volpe, p. 78.

[20]Volpe, p. 78.

[21]Volpe, p. 79.

[22]Volpe, p. 80.

[23]Volpe, p. 79.

[24]Volpe, p. 79.

[25]Volpe, p. 79.

[26]Volpe, p. 80.

[27]Brooks, William Faulkner, p. 95.

[28]Joseph Gold, "William Faulkner's 'One Compact Thing,'" Twentieth Century Literature, 8 (April, 1962), 5.
Howe, p. 34.

[29]Irving Malin, William Faulkner: An Interpretation (New York, 1972), p. 41.
Waggoner, p. 179.

[30]Volpe, p. 81.

[31]Volpe, p. 80.

[32]Brooks, William Faulkner, p. 85.

[33]Brooks, William Faulkner, p. 85.

[34]Volpe, pp. 80-81.

[35]Howell, p. 56.

[36]Brooks, William Faulkner, p. 92.

[37]William E. Walker, "The Unvanquished--The Restoration of Tradition," Reality and Myth, eds. W. E. Walker and R. L. Welker (Nashville, 1964), p. 288.

[38]Walker, pp. 286-288.

[39]Walker, pp. 291-292.

[40]Brooks, William Faulkner, p. 90.

[41]Sally R. Page, Faulkner's Women: Characterization and Meaning (Deland, Florida, 1972), pp. 179-180.

[42]Brooks, William Faulkner, p. 99.

[43]Waggoner, p. 172.

[44]Gold, p. 6.

[45]Brooks, William Faulkner, p. 126.

[46]Walker, p. 296.

[47]Walter Brylowski, Faulkner's Olympian Laugh: Myth in the Novels (Detroit, 1968), p. 124.

Chapter IV Notes

[1]Michael Millgate, William Faulkner (New York, 1966), p. 73.

[2]William Faulkner, Go Down, Moses (New York, 1955), p. 363. Originally published in 1942--all subsequent references to this book will be internally cited by the abbreviation Moses and appropriate page number(s).

[3]John M. Muste, "The Failure of Love in Go Down, Moses," Modern Fiction Studies, 10 (Winter, 1964-1965), 366-367.

[4]Vickery, The Novels, p. 126.

[5]Vickery, The Novels, p. 126.

[6]Reed, p. 188.

[7]Muste, p. 368.

[8]Reed, p. 187.

[9]Brooks, William Faulkner, pp. 253-254.

[10]Brooks, William Faulkner, p. 254.

[11]This writer is indebted to Dr. E. A. James, Lehigh University, for explaining that Sam's statement to Ike is not, in the parlance of hunting, an ambiguous directive; the statement has to do with "buck fever." This writer is considering the command on a symbolic level in relation to Faulkner's concern for intellectual flexibility.

[12]Lawrance Thompson, William Faulkner: An Introduction and Interpretation (New York, 1967), p. 87.

[13]John Lydenberg, "Nature Myth in Faulkner's The Bear," Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom and Arthur F. Kinney (New York, 1971), p. 163. Originally published in American Literature, XXIV (March, 1952), 62-72.

[14]Lydenberg, p. 162.

[15]Francis Lee Utley, "Pride and Humility: The Cultural Roots of Ike McCaslin," Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom, and Arthur F. Kinney (New York, 1971), p. 169.

[16]Olga W. Vickery, "God's Moral Order and the Problem of Ike's Redemption," Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom, and Arthur F. Kinney (New York, 1971), p. 209. Originally published in The Novels of William Faulkner: A Critical Interpretation by Olga W. Vickery (Baton Rouge, 1959).

[17]Arthur F. Kinney, "Faulkner and the Possibilities for Heroism," Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom and Arthur F. Kinney (New York, 1971), pp. 245-246. Originally published in and revised from The Southern Review, VI, N.S. (Autumn, 1970), 1110-1125.

[18]Waggoner, p. 203.

[19]William Van O'Connor, "The Wilderness Theme in Faulkner's 'The Bear,'" William Faulkner: Three Decades of Criticism, eds. Frederick J. Hoffman and Olga W. Vickery (New York, 1960), p. 325. Reprinted from Accent (Winter, 1953), 12-20.

[20]Gloria R. Dussinger, "Faulkner's Isaac McCaslin as Romantic Hero Manqué," South Atlantic Quarterly, 68 (Summer, 1969), 384.

Joseph Gold, William Faulkner: A Study in Humanism From Metaphor to Discourse (Norman, Oklahoma, 1966), p. 58.

Joyce W. Warren, "The Role of Lion in Faulkner's 'The Bear': Key to a Better Understanding," Arizona Quarterly, 24 (Autumn, 1968), 253.

[21]Utley, p. 183.

[22]Lydenberg, p. 162.

[23]Utley, p. 169.

[24]Warren, p. 257.

[25]Michael Millgate, The Achievement of William Faulkner (New York, 1966), p. 204.

[26]Gold, p. 58.

[27]Lydenberg, p. 165.

[28]R. W. B. Lewis, "The Hero in the New World: William Faulkner's The Bear," Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom, and Arthur F. Kinney (New York, 1971), p. 198. Originally published in Kenyon Review, XIII, 4 (Autumn, 1951), 641-660.

[29]Millgate, Achievement, pp. 205-206.

Chapter V Notes

[1]Reed, p. 202.

[2]Box 11, William Faulkner Collection, Alderman Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia. A typed note found between pages 8 and 10 [9] of original draft of Intruder in the Dust.

[3]Millgate, Achievement, p. 215.

[4]Andrew Lytle, "Regeneration for the Man," Sewanee Review, 57 (Winter, 1949), 252.

[5]Millgate, Achievement, p. 218.

[6]James, p. x.

[7]William Faulkner, Intruder in the Dust (New York, 1948), p. 4. Originally published in 1948--all subsequent references to this novel will be internally cited by the abbreviation IITD and appropriate page number(s).

[8]James, p. x.

[9]Donna Gerstenberger, "Meaning and Form in Intruder in the Dust," College English, 23 (December, 1961), 223.

[10]Waggoner, p. 219.

[11]This motif of the town's thoughts repeated through the central consciousness offers another aspect of the fullness Waggoner praises.

[12]Malin, p. 28.

[13]Volpe, p. 255.

[14]Millgate, Achievement, p. 219.

[15]Lytle, p. 258.

[16]Elizabeth M. Kerr, "William Faulkner and the Southern Concept of Women," Mississippi Quarterly, 15 (Winter, 1962), 15.

[17]Millgate, Achievement, p. 218.

[18]Waggoner, p. 218.

[19]Warren, p. 291.

[20]Everett Carter, "The Meaning of, and in, Realism," Antioch Review, 12 (March, 1952), 92.

[21]James, p. x.

[22]Vickery, The Novels, p. 144.

[23]Volpe, p. 263.

[24]Elizabeth M. Kerr, "The Reivers: The Golden Book of Yoknapatawpha County," Modern Fiction Studies, 13 (Spring, 1967), 111.

Chapter VI Notes

[1]Brooks, William Faulkner, p. 366.
Elizabeth M. Kerr, "The Reivers: The Golden Book of Yoknapatawpha County," 95.

[2]Millgate, Achievement, p. 253.
Volpe, p. 349.

[3]Edwin Moses, "Faulkner's The Reivers: The Art of Acceptance," Mississippi Quarterly, 27 (Summer, 1974), 309.
Page, p. 186.
William Rossky, "The Reivers: Faulkner's 'Tempest,'" Mississippi Quarterly, 18 (Spring, 1965), 82.

[4]Rossky, "The Reivers: Faulkner's 'Tempest,'" 90.

[5]Irving Malin, Review of The Reivers, Pale Fire, Letting Go, Wisconsin Studies in Contemporary Literature, 4 (Spring-Summer, 1963), 254.

[6]Volpe, p. 347.

[7]Thompson, p. 14.

[8]William Faulkner, The Reivers (New York, 1962), p. 304 --all subsequent references to this novel will be internally cited by the abbreviation Reivers and appropriate page number(s).

[9]There are many striking similarities between The Reivers and Sherwood Anderson's short story "I Want to Know Why," The Triumph of the Egg, 1921. Both are initiation stories: the disillusionment of the boy in his relation with Jerry, the horse trainer, in "I Want to Know Why," compares with Lucius' healthy relationship with Ned; the oft-repeated phrase, "I don't know why," has interesting counterparts in the apologies Grandfather makes for his ignorance as a boy. The uncompleted nature of each story also prompts a reader to wonder if Faulkner, who was familiar with Anderson's material (Blotner's discussion of the Faulkner-Anderson relationship supports this), may be making a literary joke in his choice of a title, The Reivers.

[10]Volpe, p. 345.

[11]Millgate, Achievement, p. 253.

[12]Brooks, William Faulkner, p. 366.

[13]Vickery, The Novels, p. 239.

[14]Rossky, "The Reivers: Faulkner's 'Tempest,'" 85.

[15]James, p. viii.

[16]Millgate, Achievement, p. 257.

[17]James, p. x.

[18]Millgate, Achievement, p. 256.

[19]Millgate, Achievement, p. 256.

[20]Ben M. Vorpahl, "Moonlight at Ballenbaugh's: Time and Imagination in The Reivers," Southern Literary Journal, 1 (Spring, 1969), 14.

[21]Volpe, p. 348.

[22]J. M. Mellard, "Faulkner's 'Golden Book': The Reivers as Romantic Comedy," Bucknell Review, 13, No. 3 (May, 1965), 19.
Volpe, p. 348.

[23]Moses, 317.

[24]Thompson, p. 15.

[25]Mellard, 19.

[26]Vorpahl, 11.

[27]Vorpahl, 11.

[28]Vorpahl, 16.

[29]Albert J. Devlin, "The Reivers: Readings in Social Psychology," Mississippi Quarterly, 25 (Summer, 1972), 327.

[30]Marcus, p. 204.

Chapter VII Notes

[1]Frederick L. Gwynn and Joseph L. Blotner, eds., Faulkner in the University: Class Conferences at the University of Virginia, 1957-1958 (second ed. New York, 1965), p. 246.

[2]Richard P. Adams, Faulkner: Myth and Motion (Princeton, 1968), p. 156.

[3]Waggoner, p. 196.

[4]Reed, p. 34.

[5]Neal Woodruff, Jr., "'The Bear' and Faulkner's Moral Vision," Studies in Faulkner, ed. Austin Wright, et al. (Pittsburgh, 1961), p. 43.

[6]Waggoner, p. 213.

[7]Woodruff, p. 43.

[8]Frederick Hoffman, "Introduction," William Faulkner: Three Decades of Criticism, eds. Frederick Hoffman and Olga W. Vickery (East Lansing, 1960), p. 29.

Bibliography

Adamowski, T. H. "Joe Christmas: The Tyranny of Childhood," Novel, 4 (Spring 1971), 240-251.

Adams, Richard P. Faulkner: Myth and Motion. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Aiken, Conrad. "William Faulkner: The Novel as Form" in William Faulkner, ed. Dean Morgan Schmitter. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973, pp. 45-52. Reprinted from Atlantic Monthly, 164 (November 1939), 650-654.

Altenbernd, Lynn. "A Suspended Moment: The Irony of History in William Faulkner's 'The Bear,'" Modern Language Notes, 75 (November 1960), 572-582.

Backman, Melvin. "'The Bear' and Go Down, Moses" in William Faulkner, ed. Dean Morgan Schmitter. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973, pp. 136-146. Reprinted from PMLA, LXXVI (December 1961), 595-600. Original title: "The Wilderness and the Negro in Faulkner's 'The Bear.'"

Backman, Melvin. "Faulkner's 'An Odor of Verbena': Dissent from the South," College English, 22 (January 1961), 253-256.

Bassett, John. William Faulkner: An Annotated Checklist of Criticism. New York: David Lewis, Inc., 1972.

Baum, Catherine B. "'The Beautiful One': Caddy Compson as Heroine of The Sound and the Fury," Modern Fiction Studies, 13 (Spring 1967), 33-44.

Beauchamp, Gorman. "The Unvanquished: Faulkner's Oresteia," Mississippi Quarterly, 23 (Summer 1970), 273-277.

Beck, Warren. Man in Motion: Faulkner's Trilogy. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961.

Blotner, Joseph. Faulkner: A Biography. 2 vols. New York: Random House, 1974.

Bowling, Lawrence E. "Faulkner and the Theme of Innocence," Kenyon Review, 20 (Summer 1958), 466-487.

Bradford, Melvin E. "Brotherhood in 'The Bear': An Exemplum for Critics," Modern Age, 10 (Summer 1966), 278-281.

Brooks, Cleanth. William Faulkner: The Yoknapatawpha Country. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Brooks, Cleanth. "William Faulkner, Vision of Good and Evil" in William Faulkner: Four Decades of Criticism, ed. Linda Welshimer Wagner. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1973, pp. 117-133. Reprinted from The Hidden God by Cleanth Brooks. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963, pp. 22-43.

Brumm, Ursula. "Wilderness and Civilization: A Note on William Faulkner," Partisan Review, 22 (Summer 1955), 340-350.

Bryer, Jackson R., ed. Fifteen Modern Authors. Durham: Duke University Press, 1969.

Brylowski, Walter. Faulkner's Olympian Laugh: Myth in the Novels. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1968.

Campbell, Harry Modean. "Experiment and Achievement: As I Lay Dying and The Sound and the Fury," Sewanee Review, LI (1943), 305-320.

Campbell, Harry Modean, and Ruel E. Foster. William Faulkner: A Critical Appraisal. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1970.

Carter, Everett. "The Meaning of, and in, Realism," Antioch Review, 12 (March 1952), 78-94.

Ciancio, Ralph A. "Faulkner's Existentialist Affinities" in Studies in Faulkner, ed. Austin Wright, et al. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1961, pp. 69-91.

Collins, Carvel. "A Note on the Conclusion of 'The Bear,'" Faulkner Studies, 2 (Winter 1954), 58-60.

Collins, Carvel. "The Pairing of The Sound and the Fury and As I Lay Dying," Princeton University Library Chronicle, 18 (Spring 1957), 114-123.

Cowley, Malcolm, ed. The Portable Faulkner. New York: Viking Press, 1967.

Cross, Barbara M. "Apocalypse and Comedy in As I Lay Dying," Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 3 (Summer 1961), 251-258.

Devlin, Albert J. "The Reivers: Readings in Social Psychology," Mississippi Quarterly, 25 (Summer 1972), 327-337.

Dussinger, Gloria R. "Faulkner's Isaac McCaslin as Romantic Hero Manqué," South Atlantic Quarterly, 68 (Summer 1969), 377-385.

Eliade, Mircea. "The Pattern of Initiation" in Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom, and Arthur F. Kinney. New York: Random House, 1971, pp. 135-137. Reprinted from Myths, Dreams and Mysteries by Mircea Eliade, trans. Philip Mairet. New York: Harper & Row, Inc., 1960.

Faulkner, John. My Brother Bill: An Affectionate Reminiscence. New York: Trident Press, 1963.

Faulkner, William. As I Lay Dying. New York: Random House, 1957. Originally published in 1930.

Faulkner, William. Collected Stories. New York: Random House, 1950. Originally published in 1930.

Faulkner, William. Go Down, Moses. New York: Random House, 1955. Originally published in 1942.

Faulkner, William. Intruder in the Dust. New York: Random House, 1948. Originally published in 1948.

Faulkner, William. The Hamlet. New York: Random House, 1959. Originally published in 1940.

Faulkner, William. The Reivers. New York: Random House, 1962. Originally published in 1962.

Faulkner, William. The Unvanquished. New York: Random House, 1965. Originally published in 1938.

Fiedler, Leslie. "From Redemption to Initiation," New Leader (May 26, 1958), 20-23.

Fisher, Marvin. "The World of Faulkner's Children," University of Kansas City Review, 27 (Autumn 1960), 13-18.

Fisher, Richard E. "The Wilderness, the Commissary, and the Bedroom: Faulkner's Ike McCaslin as Hero in a Vacuum," English Studies, 44 (February 1963), 19-28.

Franklin, Phyllis. "Sarty Snopes and 'Barn Burning,'" Mississippi Quarterly, 21 (Summer 1968), 189-193.

Frey, Leonard H. "Irony and Point of View in 'That Evening Sun,'" Faulkner Studies, 2 (Fall 1953), 33-40.

Gelfant, Blanche. "Faulkner and Keats: The Identity of Art in 'The Bear,'" Southern Literary Journal, 2 (Fall 1969), 43-65.

Gerstenberger, Donna. "Meaning and Form in Intruder in the Dust," College English, 23 (December 1961), 223-225.

Goellner, Jack Gordon. "A Closer Look at As I Lay Dying," Perspective, VII (1954), 42-54.

Gold, Joseph. William Faulkner: A Study in Humanism, From Metaphor to Discourse. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966.

Gold, Joseph. "William Faulkner's 'One Compact Thing,'" Twentieth Century Literature, 8 (April 1962), 3-9.

Green, A.Wigfall. "William Faulkner at Home" in William Faulkner: Two Decades of Criticism, eds. Frederick Hoffman and Olga W. Vickery. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1951, pp. 33-47. Reprinted from Sewanee Review, (Summer 1932), 294-306.

Gwynn, Frederick L., and Joseph L. Blotner, eds. Faulkner in the University: Class Conferences at the University of Virginia, 1957-1958. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1959. Second edition, New York: Vintage Books, 1965.

Handy, William J. "As I Lay Dying: Faulkner's Inner Reporter," Kenyon Review, 21 (Summer 1959), 437-451.

Hardwick, Elizabeth. "Faulkner and The South Today" in William Faulkner: Two Decades of Criticism, eds. Frederick Hoffman and Olga W. Vickery. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1973, pp. 244-250. Reprinted from Partisan Review (October 1948), 1130-1135.

Hart, John A. "That Not Impossible He: Faulkner's Third-Person Narrator" in Studies in Faulkner, ed. Austin Wright, et al. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1961, pp. 29-42.

Hemenway, Robert. "Enigmas of Being in As I Lay Dying," Modern Fiction Studies, 16 (Summer 1970), 133-146.

Herman, John. "Faulkner's Heart's Darling in 'That Evening Sun,'" Studies in Short Fiction, 7 (Spring 1970), 320-323.

Hoffman, Frederick, and Olga W. Vickery, eds. William Faulkner: Three Decades of Criticism. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1960.

Hoffman, Frederick, and Olga W. Vickery, eds. William Faulkner: Two Decades of Criticism. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1951.

Hogan, Patrick G., Jr., Dale A. Myers, and John E. Turner. "Muste's 'Failure of Love' in Faulkner's Go Down, Moses," Modern Fiction Studies, 12 (Summer 1966), 267-270.

Howe, Irving. William Faulkner: A Critical Study. New York: Random House, 1952.

Howell, Elmo. "Faulkner's Elegy: An Approach to The Bear," Arlington Quarterly, 2 (Winter 1970), 122-132.

Howell, Elmo. "William Faulkner and the Concept of Honor," Northwest Review, 5, No. 3 (Summer 1962), 51-60.

Hunt, John W. William Faulkner: Art in Theological Tension. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1964.

James, Henry. "Preface" in The Novels and Tales of Henry James, Vol. XI. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908, pp. v-xxii.

Johnson, James William. "The Adolescent Hero: A Trend in Modern Fiction," Twentieth Century Literature, 5 (April 1959), 3-11.

Kerr, Elizabeth M. "The Reivers: The Golden Book of Yoknapatawpha County," Modern Fiction Studies, 13 (Spring 1967), 95-113.

Kerr, Elizabeth M. "William Faulkner and the Southern Concept of Woman," Mississippi Quarterly, 15 (Winter 1962), 1-16.

Kerr, Elizabeth M. Yoknapatawpha: Faulkner's "Little Postage Stamp of Native Soil." New York: Fordham University Press, 1969.

Kibler, James E., Jr. "A Possible Source in Arisoto for Drusilla," Mississippi Quarterly, 23 (Summer 1970), 321-322.

Kinney, Arthur F. "Faulkner and the Possibilities for Heroism" in Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom, and Arthur F. Kinney. New York: Random House, 1971, pp. 235-251. Reprinted and revised from The Southern Review, VI, N.S. (Autumn 1970), 1110-1125.

Kumar, Shir K., and Keith McKean, eds. Critical Approaches to Fiction. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1968.

LaBudde, Kenneth, "Cultural Primitivism in William Faulkner's 'The Bear,'" American Quarterly, 2 (Winter 1950), 322-328.

Leary, Lewis. William Faulkner of Yoknapatawpha County. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1973.

Lewis, R. W. B. "The Hero in the New World: William Faulkner's 'The Bear'" in Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom, and Arthur F. Kinney. New York: Random House, 1971, pp. 188-201. Reprinted from Kenyon Review, XIII, 4 (Autumn 1951), 641-660.

Longley, John L., Jr. The Tragic Mask: A Study of Faulkner's Heroes. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1963.

Lydenberg, John. "Nature Myth in Faulkner's 'The Bear'" in Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom, and Arthur F. Kinney. New York: Random House, 1971, pp. 160-167. Reprinted from American Literature, XXIV (March 1952), 62-72.

Lytle, Andrew Nelson. "Regeneration for the Man" in William Faulkner: Two Decades of Criticism, eds. Frederick Hoffman and Olga W. Vickery. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1951, pp. 251-259. Reprinted from Sewanee Review, 57 (Winter 1949), 120-127.

Lytle, Andrew Nelson. "The Son of Man: He Will Prevail," Sewanee Review, 63 (Winter 1955), 114-137.

Malin, Irving. Review of The Reivers, Pale Fire, Letting Go, Wisconsin Studies in Contemporary Literature, 4 (Spring-Summer 1963), 250-255.

Malin, Irving. William Faulkner: An Interpretation. New York: Gordian Press, 1972.

Marcus, Mordecai. "What is an Initiation Story?" in Critical Approaches to Fiction, eds. Shiv K. Kumar and Keith McKean. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1968, pp. 201-213. Reprinted from The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, XIV, No. 2 (Winter 1960), pp. 221-228.

Massey, Linton R., comp. William Faulkner: "Man Working," 1919-1962: A Catalogue of the William Faulkner Collections at the University of Virginia. Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1968.

Mellard, J. M. "Faulkner's 'Golden Book': The Reivers as Romantic Comedy," Bucknell Review, 13, No. 3 (May 1965), 19-31.

Meriwether, James B. "The Novel Faulkner Never Wrote: His Golden Book or Doomsday Book," American Literature, 42 (March 1970), 93-96.

Meriwether, James B. "The Short Fiction of William Faulkner: A Bibliography," Proof, 1 (1971), 293-329.

Meriwether, James B. "William Faulkner" in Fifteen Modern Authors, ed. Jackson R. Bryer. Durham: Duke University Press, 1969, pp. 175-210.

Merton, Thomas. "Wisdom and Initiation in William Faulkner," Catholic World, 207 (June 1968), 124-130.

Miller, Douglas T. "Faulkner and the Civil War: Myth and Reality," American Quarterly, 15 (Summer 1963), 200-209.

Millgate, Michael. The Achievement of William Faulkner. New York: Random House, 1966.

Millgate, Michael. William Faulkner. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1966.

Moses, Edwin. "Faulkner's The Reivers: The Art of Acceptance," Mississippi Quarterly, 27 (Summer 1974), 307-318.

Mueller, William R. "The Reivers: William Faulkner's Valediction," Christian Century (September 4, 1963), 1079-1081.

Muste, John M. "The Failure of Love in Go Down, Moses," Modern Fiction Studies, 10 (Winter 1964-1965), 366-378.

O'Connor, William Van. The Tangled Fire of William Faulkner. New York: Gordian Press, Inc., 1968.

O'Connor, William Van. "The Wilderness Theme in Faulkner's 'The Bear' in William Faulkner: Three Decades of Criticism, eds. Frederick J. Hoffman and Olga W. Vickery. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1960, pp. 322-329. Reprinted from Accent (Winter 1953) 12-20.

Page, Sally R. Faulkner's Women: Characterization and Meaning. Deland, Florida: Everett-Edwards, 1972.

Parsons, Thornton H. "Doing the Best They Can," Georgia Review, 23 (Fall 1969), 292-306.

Randall, Julia. "Some Notes on As I Lay Dying," Hopkins Review, 4 (Summer 1951), 47-51.

Reed, Joseph W., Jr. Faulkner's Narrative. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973.

Rollins, Ronald G. "Ike McCaslin and Chick Mallison: Faulkner's Emerging Southern Hero," West Virginia University Philological Papers, 14 (1963), 74-79.

Rossky, William. "Faulkner: The Image of the Child in The Mansion," Mississippi Quarterly, 15 (Winter 1962), 17-20.

Rossky, William. "The Reivers and Huckleberry Finn: Faulkner and Twain," Huntington Library Quarterly, 28 (August 1965), 373-387.

Rossky, William. "The Reivers: Faulkner's 'Tempest,'" Mississippi Quarterly, 18 (Spring 1965), 82-93.

Roth, Russell. "William Faulkner: The Pattern of Pilgrimage," Perspective, 2 (Summer 1949), 246-254.

Schmitter, Dean Morgan, ed. William Faulkner. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Simpson, Lewis P. "Ike McCaslin and the Second Fall of Man" in Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom, and Arthur F. Kinney. New York: Random House, 1971, pp. 202-209. Reprinted from Nine Essays in Modern Literature, ed. Donald E. Stanford. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. Original title: "Isaac McCaslin and Temple Drake: The Fall of New World Man."

Slabey, Robert M. "Quentin Compson's Lost Childhood," Studies in Short Fiction, 1 (Spring 1964), 173-183.

Slatoff, Walter J. Quest for Failure: A Study of William Faulkner. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1960.

Smith, Henry Nash. "A Troubled Vision," Southwest Review, 16 (Winter 1931), xvi-xvii.

Souder, William J. "Lucas Beauchamp as Existential Hero," College English, 25 (November 1963), 115-127.

Stewart, David H. "Ike McCaslin, Cop-Out" in Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom, and Arthur F. Kinney. New York: Random House, 1971, pp. 212-220. Reprinted from Criticism, III, 4 (Fall 1961), 333-342. Original title: "The Purpose of Faulkner's Ike."

Stone, Edward. "William Faulkner's 'Two Little Confederates,'" Ohio University Review, 4 (1962), 5-18.

Sultan, Stanley. "Call Me Ishmael: The Hagiography of Isaac McCaslin," Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 3 (Spring 1961), 50-66.

Swiggart, Peter. The Art in Faulkner's Novels. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1962.

Taylor, Walter F., Jr. "Let My People Go: The White Man's Heritage in Go Down, Moses," South Atlantic Quarterly, 58 (Winter 1959), 20-32.

Thompson, Lawrance. William Faulkner: An Introduction and Interpretation. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1963.

Thorpe, Thomas Bangs. "The Big Bear of Arkansas" in Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom, and Arthur F. Kinney. New York: Random House, 1971, pp. 148-159.

Tick, Stanley. "The Unity of Go Down, Moses," Twentieth Century Literature, 8 (July 1962), 67-73.

Tischler, Nancy M. "William Faulkner and the Southern Negro" in Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom, and Arthur F. Kinney. New York: Random House, 1971, pp. 276-280. Reprinted from Susquehanna University Studies, VII, 4 (June 1965), 261-265.

Utley, Francis Lee. "Pride and Humility: The Cultural Roots of Ike McCaslin" in Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom, and Arthur F. Kinney. New York: Random House, 1971, pp. 167-187.

Utley, Francis Lee, Lynn Z. Bloom, and Arthur F. Kinney, eds. Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear." New York: Random House, 1971.

Vickery, Olga W. "God's Moral Order and the Problem of Ike's Redemption" in Bear, Man, and God: Eight Approaches to William Faulkner's "The Bear," eds. Francis Lee Utley, Lynn Z. Bloom, and Arthur F. Kinney. New York: Random House, 1971, pp. 209-212. Reprinted from The Novels of William Faulkner by Olga W. Vickery. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964.

Vickery, Olga W. The Novels of William Faulkner. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964.

Volpe, Edmond L. A Reader's Guide to William Faulkner. New York: Noonday Press, 1964.

Vorpahl, Ben M. "Moonlight at Ballenbaugh's: Time and Imagination in The Reivers," Southern Literary Journal, 1 (Spring 1969), 3-26.

Waggoner, Hyatt H. William Faulkner: From Jefferson to the World. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1959.

Wagner, Linda Welshimer, ed. William Faulkner: Four Decades of Criticism. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1973.

Walker, William E. "The Unvanquished - The Restoration of Tradition" in Reality and Myth, eds. W. E. Walker and R. L. Welker. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1964, pp. 275-297.

Walker, William E., and R. L. Welker, eds. Reality and Myth. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1964.

Walter, James. "Expiration and History: Ike McCaslin and the Mystery of Providence," Louisiana Studies, 10 (Winter 1971), 263-273.

Warren, Joyce W. "The Role of Lion in Faulkner's 'The Bear': Key to a Better Understanding," Arizona Quarterly, 24 (Autumn 1968), 252-260.

Warren, Robert Penn, ed. Faulkner: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Watkins, Floyd C., and William B. Dillingham. "The Mind of Vardaman Bundren," Philological Quarterly, 39 (April 1960), 247-251.

Wertenbaker, Thomas J., Jr. "Faulkner's Point of View and the Chronicle of Ike McCaslin," College English, 24 (December 1962), 169-178.

Wheeler, Otis B. "Faulkner's Wilderness," American Literature, 31 (May 1959), 127-136.

Wilson, Edmund. "William Faulkner's Reply to the Civil-Rights Program" in Faulkner: A Collection of Critical Essays, ed. Robert Penn Warren. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966, pp. 219-225. Reprinted from Classics and Commercials by Edmund Wilson. New York, 1950, pp. 460-469.

Wilson, Gayle Edward. "'Being Pulled Two Ways': The Nature of Sarty's Choice in 'Barn Burning,'" Mississippi Quarterly, 24 (Summer 1971), 279-288.

Woodruff, Neal, Jr. "'The Bear' and Faulkner's Moral Vision" in Studies in Faulkner, ed. Austin Wright, et al. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1961, pp. 43-68.

Wright, Austin, ed. Studies in Faulkner. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1961.

Vita

Connie Ranck Kondravy, born March 1, 1942, is the daughter of Robert H. and Virginia K. Ranck, 2936 Lindberg Avenue, Allentown, Pennsylvania, and the wife of John H. Kondravy, 610 North Lime Street, Lancaster, Pennsylvania. She attended Cedar Crest College as an English-history major and received a B.A. in June, 1964. She received an Ashton Scholarship to study at the University of Pennsylvania and was awarded an M.A. degree in English in August, 1971. Prior to her present position as Honors English teacher in the Hempfield School District, Landisville, Pennsylvania, she taught in the Media School District, Media, Pennsylvania.