

TEMPLE'S RAPE IN WILLIAM FAULKNER'S "SANCTUARY":
WILFUL VICTIM OR POWERFUL VICTIMIZER?

Mourad Romdhani

Faculty of Arts and Humanities,
University of Sousse,
Tunisia

mourad.romdhani@yahoo.com

Abstract. In this paper, I intend to show that Temple Drake, a well-bred girl who is abducted and raped, does not participate in her own debasement - as many critics argue, since her metamorphosis from innocence to promiscuity is the outcome of patriarchal manipulation. Temple's physical and psychological abuse and her transformation from "a blank-faced baby" to a "doll-faced slut" reverberate in feminist arguments about masculine "subjectivism" constructed upon female "objectification." Either with her father and brothers or with Popeye, Temple Drake is depicted as a puppet controlled in a way that reflects her objectification by a masculine-biased culture. Nevertheless, the doll-faced Temple still shows signs of power in her weakest moments, turning into a stereotypical picture of the new woman who wordlessly claims agency and emasculates the patriarch despite repression and sexual exploitation.

Keywords: female identity, object, subject, repression, victimized, victimizer, agency

The character of Temple Drake in William Faulkner's *Sanctuary* (1931) has been a main issue of debate among critics. Oscillating between innocence and culpability, the female character adds to the complexity of the novel and leaves the reader with contradictory impressions of sympathy and incomprehension. Creating Temple's character upon a controversy, Faulkner ironically mimics a sociocultural system that valorizes yet violates such notions as female virginity and innocence. Throughout the text, Temple undergoes a metamorphosis process in which she is physically and psychologically manipulated by the residues of a patriarchal culture

that celebrates the "doll" in her. Yet she tries to obscure her "slut" face. Thus, Temple turns to a culturally brain-washed object upon which the masculine subject is erected.

Temple is a well-bred college girl who is abducted and violently raped by Popeye - a criminal with an ignominious reputation and past. The (wilful) victim question surrounding Temple has preoccupied Faulkner critics for decades, ever since the novel's publication. Many critics have misplaced Temple as an evil woman who is responsible for her own subjugation while others see her as a victim and object of masculine oppression. In an article entitled "Desire and Despair: Temple Drake's Self-Victimization," Robert Moore argues that Temple is a willing participant in her own debasement (124). Joanne V. Creighton, in "Self-Destructive Evil in *Sanctuary*," goes in the same tandem, stating that Temple's seductive behaviour undoubtedly leads Popeye to violate her (263). James R. Cypher, in "The Tangled Sexuality of Temple Drake," approaches Temple's case from a psychoanalytical point of view, believing that "subconsciously, she desires to be raped at Goodwin's place" (249). Cypher goes a step further to reverse roles in Temple's and Popeye's relationship, pointing out that Popeye is the victim while Temple is the actual aggressor. According to Cypher, Popeye is a surrogate father who tried to escape from Temple's seductive behaviour, yet he failed in front of her seductive skills.

Besides, in *The Novels of William Faulkner*, Olga Vickery sees that Temple does not leave Goodwin's house in the Old Frenchmen Place since she is "fascinated by the idea of her own rape" (107) while Albert J. Guerard, in "*Sanctuary* and Faulkner's Misogyny," describes Temple as hot and animalistic fearing yet waiting to be abused (67). Guerard adds that Gowan Stevens and the Old Frenchmen place simply prompt the girl's already developed sexual drives. Likewise, in "Isaac McCaslin and Temple Drake: The Fall of New World Man," Lewis P. Simpson argues that Temple is "proud" to be raped, for she shows a fervent interest in living in Miss Rebba's whorehouse (100). Similarly, Dianne Luce Cox, in "A Measure of Innocence: *Sanctuary's* Temple Drake," blames the girl for deceiving

the courtroom with a kind of fake innocence and therefore should be accused (301).

In the same way, Edmond L. Volpe, in *A Reader's Guide to William Faulkner*, accuses Temple of her own subjugation, explaining that she

does not deteriorate morally, she responds to the evil of her nature [...]. Her horrible corncob rape by Popeye does not initiate her moral collapse; it merely releases her from the restrictive conventions which society has imposed upon her [...]. Her continual, obsessive absorption with the possibility of rape indicates her desire for violation. (144)

Volpe considers rape as a kind of violence which does not victimize Temple but rather frees her desires. The same view is reiterated by Karen Aubrey Ellstrom who states that the girl not only initiates her own rape but “consistently heightens the intensity and increases the variety of her sexual encounters” (63). Other critics, like John B. Sherrill, argue for Temple’s nymphomania as she lures male characters and drives them to her web of desire. Sherrill describes the impotent Popeye as “a tragic hero [...] who possesses an unbending set of values that lends him [...] dignity” (119-20) and who is victimized by Temple’s voracious sexuality.

These views clearly emphasize Temple’s guilt and responsibility for her own fall in promiscuity, referring to the young woman’s seductive means like her mode of dress and coquettish manners when dealing with the male characters she encounters. This old scholarship, dating from the 1930s to the 1980s, starts from a dominant patriarchal belief in the danger of female sexuality and its threat to masculinity which is typical of earlier generations of Faulkner’s critics who depict Temple Drake as a monstrous feminine that should be reduced into a sexual commodity and should necessarily be contained.

These views exemplify, in fact, the time’s most widespread myth about rape voiced by Julie Allison and Lawrence Wrightsman: “Only bad girls get raped” (98). These myths create a climate hostile to rape victims, portraying them as often-willing participants in or even

instigators of furtive sexual encounters, (99) explain Allison and Wrightsman. Portraying Temple as a willing victim of rape and an accomplice in her own debasement, these views objectify Temple and exploit her as "other" within masculine authority and subjectivism.

Interestingly, however, in Temple Drake's case, Faulkner weaves an unresolved plot and raises many questions which readers are compelled to answer. In *Intimate Violence*, Laura E. Tanner talks about textual blank in *Sanctuary*, seeing it as an "invitation to the reader to participate not only in the viewing but the marking of the novelistic universe" (561). She describes the textual blank created through the abundant use of punctuation as signifying silence and characterizing Temple's rape scene as an instrument that jolts the reader and compels him/her to become the author of the crime. In view of these textual gaps, other critics see the character of Temple Drake from a different perspective.

In "Reading and Rape in *Sanctuary*," Homer B. Pettey comments on the overwhelming silence during the rape scene, arguing that it lures the reader to imagine and write Temple's rape: "The critic, aroused by a desire to know, performs an onslaught upon the text, an apparent rape, in order to discover the hidden meaning within this cryptic temple" (71). Pettey concludes that, like Popeye who dominates the woman and physically abuses her, views that accuse Temple of seduction and promiscuity suppress the female character and abuse her textually. Thus, Temple should not be regarded from misogynistic lenses, for her rape and victimization story still contains an unvoiced plot of virtuousness, power and agency.

Robert Dale Parker, in *Faulkner and Novelistic Imagination*, and Judith Wood Angelius, in "Temple Provocative Quest," equally see that there is no evidence in *Sanctuary* of Temple's evil character. They defend the girl's innocence, arguing that her mind is shaped by the male characters around her. Parker argues that Temple does not want to be what she gets (63) while Angelius believes that the young woman does not consciously intend to be seductive (78). Indeed, Temple is a victim of a patriarchal system that controls her

and obscures her own identity until she becomes a brainwashed and disempowered female character. In so doing, patriarchal culture robs Temple her willpower and turns her into an object through which the male fulfils his masculine subject. Through Temple, Faulkner seems to reject the myth of the willing victim by persistently depicting Temple as a lifeless marionette. During the night before her rape, Temple is already portrayed like a puppet:

Temple's head began to move. It turned slowly, as if she were following the passage of someone beyond the wall. It turned on to an excruciating degree, though no other muscle moved, like one of those Papier-mâché, Easter toys filled with candy, and became motionless in that reverted position. (69)

Faulkner's depiction of Temple as a marionette can be a good argument that resists the classification of Temple as a willing victim and invites the reexamination of a patriarchal culture that exerts violence on female body and identity. By understanding Temple's subdued reactions as her complicity in her own debasement, one fails to account for the patriarchal structures that underline the myth of the willing victim.

In "Temple Drake: Faulkner's Mirror for Social Order," Donald A. Petesch sees in Temple's defenselessness during the rape scene an emblem of an absence of the self rather than a sign of willful victimization. Petesch's argument is relevant insofar as the young woman's powerlessness constructs her as a vulnerable object of masculine violence and a victim of mental and physical desecration.

In *Sanctuary*, Temple Drake is portrayed as an object of masculine subjectivism conditioned to submit to male authority and control. She is seen as an object of desire to the town boys outside the college, as a consumable body to Popeye and as a presumably victimized daughter to the courtroom jury, yet "she is never allowed to represent herself" (Urigo 79). In her family, Temple is depicted as a puppet controlled by a father and four brothers. Likewise, in the trial scene, she is described in a way that reflects her objectification by a masculine culture:

From beneath her black hat, her hair escaped in tight red curls like clots of resin. The hat bore a rhinestone ornament. Upon her black satin lap lay a platinum bag. Her pale tan coat was open upon a shoulder knot of purple. Her hands lay motionless, palm-up on her lap. Her long blonde legs slanted, lax-ankled, her two motionless slippers with their glittering buckles lay on their sides as though empty. (284)

Describing the young woman's appearance through different physical items of ornamentation, Temple's identity is lost as the main focus is placed on external garments without reference to the girl's feelings or personality. Being referred to by her garments, the young woman is turned into an object whose physical appearance obscures an inner identity.

In the same trial scene, Temple appears utterly controlled and manipulated by her father and brothers:

The old man touched her arm. She turned her head toward him, her eyes blank and all pupil above the three savage spots of rouge. She put her hand in his and rose [...]. Halfway down the aisle, the girl stopped again, slender in her smart open coat, her blank face rigid, then she moved on, her hand in the old man's. They returned down the aisle, the old man erects beside her, looking to neither side [...]. Four young men were standing stiffly erect near the exit. They stood like soldiers, staring straight ahead until the old man and the girl reached them. Then they moved and surrounded the other two, and in a close body, the girl hidden among them, they moved toward the door [...]. The girl could be seen shrunk against the wall just inside the door, her body arched again [...] the five bodies hid her again and again in a close body. (289-90)

The masculine domination is well-established in the girl's exit from the courtroom entirely overwhelmed by the shadows of her brothers. Manipulated by an "erect" father and four "stiffly erect" brothers, Temple "is immediately submerged within the strong male bodies that surround her and carry her away, visually erasing her presence and occluding her opportunity for agency" (Hinrichsen168). Seeing that Temple's father is a judge and her two brothers are lawyers, the father's and brothers' authoritarian social statures testify to sociocultural violence against femininity.

As she proceeds down the walkway with her father, Temple drops her “platinum bag” and her father kicks it to the corner of the courtroom with “the toe of his small gleaming shoe” (*Sanctuary* 289), positioning it like wasted refuse. Like her garment, Temple herself “becomes a wasted fantasy object, an objectified “something” upon which the trial’s interpretative machinery churns, judges, and fixates” (Hinrichsen 168).

Interestingly, Temple’s presence in the trial scene is characterized by a failure to use words:

The District Attorney stood before her. “What is your name?” She did not answer. She moved her hair slightly, as though he had obstructed her view, gazing at something in the back of the room. “What is your name?” he repeated, moving also, into the line of her vision again. Her mouth moved. “Louder,” he said. “Speak out. No one will hurt you. Let these good men, these fathers and husbands, hear what you have to say and right your wrong for you.” (285)

Temple’s silence during the trial scene highlights women’s experience under the authority of a masculine-biased discourse that influences the female ability to find expression and subsequently turns women into a muted group¹. Women are muted insofar as their voices are not heard or “may not be heard at the authoritative ‘speech-making’ level of society” (Brenner 135). Accordingly, the American feminist Mab Segrest writes about the *psyche* of the oppressor unveiling the subject’s longing for the domination and separation of the other through voice. She concludes that patriarchal culture is obsessed with speaking since the will to voice is what establishes masculine visibility. “To tell the story of hegemony, to tell stories of belonging, requires voice” (15). Yet, the subject’s visibility and voice are constructed upon the other’s invisibility and voicelessness as is the case of silent Temple and the fluent male voices around her.

However, women’s culture forms an invisible silent background to the dominant culture and since “they are also part of the dominant culture that marginalizes them, the language that they

speak or write is often double-voiced, containing a dominant and muted story" (266), as Showalter puts it in "Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness." In this context, Temple Drake's voiced story is one of guilt and accountability while her muted story is one of subjugation and objectification. More importantly, Temple's muted narrative still conveys signs of power and agency that cannot be heard by the male representatives of the Law of the Father during the trial scene. A muted story of power, agency and resilience is wordlessly voiced by Temple in the courtroom. In this light, the text can be read, as constructed upon a "surface" and a "symbol" plot (Freedman 17).

Many critics, relying on the "surface", describe Temple Drake as one of the most marginalized and powerless characters in *Sanctuary*. However, the "symbol" in Temple's story will turn any reductive reading of her character meaningless. In "Faulkner's Dirty Little Secret," Julianna Leachman studies Temple's name as indicative of a sense of duality governing her characterization and her experiences in the novel². The sense of binarism in the female character's name is equally extended to her experiences in the novel as her female identity, dictated by a patriarchal system, is revised and reformulated though wordlessly.

Many scenes in the novel convey this sense of binarism characterizing Temple's character development and shift from a state of subjugation to a state of power and agency. In "Open Spaces, Open Secrets," Linda Hinrichsen draws an analogy between the rape and the courtroom scene, arguing that in both scenes, Temple is a victim. Nonetheless, in her wordless gaze, Temple is still triumphant over a culture that violated her. Hinrichsen explains that the trial scene "fails to provide justice for the violations Temple suffered, leaving her sexual trauma as unspoken "something" that everyone knows but refuses to directly—and legally—acknowledge" (163).

During the rape scene, Temple was unable to speak and articulate herself. "Something is happening to me!" (102). The use of "something" here implies the speaker's under-lexicalization strategy

in avoiding the most common and most efficient term, namely rape. Resorting to the term “something” signals the speaker’s lack of familiarity with the concept in question or difficulty of access to it (Fowler 152). In Temple’s case, the use of the vague “something” signals her incomprehension and total detachment from the experience she is undergoing. Temple’s repetitive exclamations emphasize her silent pain. Furthermore, her elliptical emphasis, “I told you it was...I told you! I told you all the time!” (102) involves the reader into the text through references to the second-person pronoun “you”. However, Temple’s repetitive and elliptical statements do not help the readers understand the events, forcing them to experience the same state of apprehension and lack of certainty experienced by the girl. In this vein, John Matthews states that ellipsis is a kind of silence that evokes a world before the prohibitions established by language (251). More than this, the use of ellipsis and repetition constitutes a silent structure of the narrative through which Temple resists the reader and prohibits him from having access to her body and privacy.

Likewise, in the courtroom, Temple willingly loses articulation. Hinrichsen describes the courtroom scene as a replay of the rape itself, for “Temple cannot speak as her mouth is stuck to this “something” (164). Faulkner describes Temple bow-shaped mouth “like something both symbolical and cryptic cut carefully from purple paper and pasted there” (*Sanctuary* 284), emphasizing the cultural burden placed on the female character, making her mouth papered over and pasted closed. Hinrichsen adds that Temple’s reluctance to articulate herself is meant to show that liability rests with anyone and everyone, for the community itself, is complicit in the swirl of drunkenness, violence, and fraught desire that chase Temple throughout the novel (164). Hinrichsen argues that accountability has to be thrown on the patriarchal socio-cultural system or the collective consciousness of the modern society that paves the ground to violence exerted on females. This is illustrated through the collective breath of relief (*Sanctuary* 286) that filled the courtroom after Temple failed to speak, revealing “how the culture

of a dominant white male masculinity depends upon the unspoken dynamics of shame, blame, and violence" (Hinrichsen 166).

Despite her traumatic silence, Temple manages to evoke "something" meaningful, namely the social sphere's deeming rape as an unspeakable and invisible crime.

What stands at the centre of the trial is therefore not only the unspoken sexual trauma but the blindness it induces. In nodding toward and exposing judicial blindness, Faulkner underlines how the court's verdict actually ratifies the inherent cultural invisibility of culture's complicity with this violence, marking the relation between patriarchy and violence. (169)

Temple's wordlessness during the trial scene can be understood as her way of telling "something" the community refuses to know. Temple's wordless gaze at the blank space at the back of the courtroom tells about a conspiracy of silence within the patriarchal system.

In the courtroom scene, the audience and the jurors alike react as one unified voice: "The room sighed, a long hissing breath" (*Sanctuary* 288). In this collective sighing breath one can hear a deliberate refusal to know. The trial scene is thus a moment when the law of the father "fails to provide justice for the violations Temple suffered, leaving her sexual trauma as an unspoken 'something' that everyone knows but refuses to directly—and legally—acknowledge" (Hinrichsen 168). The silence in the courtroom can further be described as the patriarchal culture's suppression of female sexuality as the embodiment of "the disruptive eros" and as a result of this suppression complete bodily knowledge cannot be available to males (Urgo 80). Thus, the "something" unspoken here is the female body becoming uncontainable by male discourse despite being physically violated.

In patriarchal presence, Temple becomes an obedient shadow easily controlled and manipulated. She turns into a speechless and defenceless girl as well as a fetishized object to be ornamented and showed around by the patriarch. Judge Drake tries to obscure his daughter's emotional life, being worried mainly about Southern

patriarchal principles of chastity and virginity that allow him to secure his masculine subject as a dominant patriarch. The patriarchal principles of Temple's father are further reinforced by her four brothers. In her talk to Ruby Lamar, Temple uncovers the violence she was subjected to with her father and four brothers. She informs Ruby that her youngest brother, Hubert, constantly warned that "if he ever caught [her] with a drunk man, he'd beat the hell out of [her]" (55). In this sense, Temple is subjected to the patriarchal concern to achieve the subject status which requires for its achievement supremacy over the other, or the object upon which one's sense power and selfhood can be exerted.

Temple is not only exposed but also tamed to masculine power in her patriarchal family. In this vein, Kevin A. Boon remarks that Temple is "preconditioned to acquiesce to dominance before Gowan's lust for alcohol puts her in Popeye's path" (39). Accordingly, Temple Drake is psychologically raped in her patriarchal home and thus prepared to be physically raped by Popeye.

Through Temple's talk, the reader can deduce similarities between her father and Popeye. In addition to raping her psychologically and physically, both men see Temple in terms of her sexuality. Ruby informs Temple that when her father caught her with a townsman called Frank, he "shot him and said 'get down there and sup your dirt, your whore'" (58). Temple whispers "I have been called that," (58) meaning that she heard the same denigrating words that classify her in terms of her sexual identity. Popeye uses the same term to refer to Temple when he talks about her to Gowan: "Make your whore lay off me, Jack" (49). By using the same demeaning term stressing the girl's sexuality, both men turn Temple into a dehumanized sexual object. Kevin A. Boon says in this respect: "What Faulkner implies about Temple's father, he explicitly states for Popeye. Though their motives are different, both the judge's privileged class and Popeye's criminal underworld are shaped by the same doctrine of patriarchal ideology" (40). This ideology openly allows the physical and psychological manipulation

of women by objectifying them to ensure the dominance of the male subject. In the same context, Laura Brown states that "all women live in a culture where sexual abuse not only takes the form of violent physical assault, but also more insidious verbal and psychological forms" (105). A victim of the culture that endorses masculine violence, Temple suffers intense verbal and psychological abuse.

With Popeye, Temple is the object of masculine domination. Besides raping her, Popeye humiliates the woman and even controls her physical needs:

It started as a wail, rising, cut suddenly off Popeye's hand. With her hands lying on her lap, sitting erect she screamed, tasting the gritty acidity of his fingers [...] and feeling her secret blood. Then, he gripped her by the back of the neck and she sat motionless, her mouth round and open, like a small empty cave. He shook her head. 'Shut it,' he said. 'Shut it,' gripping her silent. (138)

Popeye's attempts to silence Temple confirms what Susan Griffin terms as the "silencing of eros" by culture (vii) and holding the female captive to male powers.

In addition to physically abusing her, Popeye becomes a father figure who haunts Temple Drake's mind and rapes her psychologically. Popeye's control of the girl after her rape is a kind of another psychological rape that precedes another physical rape by Red. In her essay, Kevin A. Boon believes that Temple Drake's victimization is a masculine responsibility and guilt. According to her, "responsibility lies not only with Popeye but with all the men in the novel" (48). Boon adds that not only Popeye but also Temple's father is liable for Temple's victimization since both treat women as either promiscuous or "dress-up" puppets. However, through the portrayal of violent males subjugating and humiliating females, Faulkner may have intended to place more liability on a cultural system that allows female objectification and tolerates a dominant male discourse constructing femininity as an instrument of masculine subjectivism; a practice that has been referred to in American legal and sociological scholarship as "rape culture".

In *Sanctuary*, male subject construction at the expense of female objectification is well summarized in Miss Myrtle's statement:

Men just can't seem to take us and leave us for what we are. They make us what we are, then they expect us to be different. Expect us not to never look at another man, while they come and go as they please. (254)

Ironically, at the end of the novel, Temple appears in the Luxembourg Gardens listening to music with her father. Although she finds sanctuary in Paris and escapes from her physical violator, Temple cannot escape a patriarchal tradition which favours masculinity and allows it physical and psychological manipulation of the female.

Temple's physical and psychological abuse and her transformation from "a blank-faced baby" to a "doll-faced slut" reverberate in Simone De Beauvoir's and Luce Irigaray's ideas of masculine "subjectivism" constructed upon female "objectification." In *Speculum of the Other Woman*, Irigaray reveals the ways through which a mainstream Western discourse is constructed upon female absence. She exposes the dominant culture's objectification of woman as a vital condition in the establishment of the male subject:

Woman, for her part, remains an unrealized potentially unrealizable, at least by/for herself. Is she, by nature, a being that exists for/by another? [...] Is she unnecessary in and of herself, but essential as the non-subjective subjectum? As that which can never achieve the status of subject, at least for/by herself? [...]. This 'lack of qualities' that makes the female truly female ensures that the male can achieve his qualifications [...]. Theoretically, there would be no such thing as woman. She would not exist. The best that can be said is that she does not exist yet. (165-66)

Irigaray asserts that the negation of women or their elimination from the cultural and historical discourse is fundamental to the construction and preservation of Western dominant culture. In such a culture, Simone de Beauvoir states in *The Second Sex*, the relationship between sexes is one of exclusion and subjugation,

constituting a strongly gendered system that seeks to banish maternal origins and create the illusion of the masculine subject.

Popeye's and Horace Benbow's exertion of violence on Temple's body is indeed an attempt to assert their masculine subject. Though impotent, Popeye violently rapes Temple using a corncob to fulfil masculine subjecthood and to veil his physical failure and pervert behaviour. Horace Benbow similarly uses Temple's body to affirm his superior position as a successful lawyer. Donald Kartiganer points out in this respect that if Benbow fails Temple's defence, "he loses a certain male authoritative position as both defender of justice and hero of public good" (153). With both male characters, Temple remains the container of male violence and the object upon which masculinity is constructed. However, masculinity can bring its own vulnerabilities, which Temple might learn to take advantage throughout the novel.

In the rape scene, Temple seems to accept the idea of male subjectivism at the expense of female objectification, for she makes use of a cross-gender image of bisexuality when she tries to defend herself against her male aggressor:

That was when I got to thinking a funny thing. You know how do you do when you're scared. I was looking at my leg and I'd try to make like I was a boy. I was thinking about if I just was a boy and then I tried to make myself into one by thinking [...] and as soon as I thought it, it happened [...]. I could feel the jerking going on inside my knickers ahead of his hand and me lying there trying not to laugh about how surprised and mad he was going to be in about a minute. (216-17)

During this scene, Temple fantasizes about becoming a male and thereby being protected from masculine violence. Such a fantasy of becoming a biological male is an ironic reproduction of Irigaray's postulation of masculine subjectivism by means of female objectification. Being vulnerable in front of masculine violence, Temple paradoxically uses the guise of masculinity to protect herself against such a sense of hostility and abuse. Temple's cross-gender disguise is meant to implicitly uncover masculine concerns of

mastery over the female body or the object that ensures the male subject.

Nonetheless, the scene implies a sense of power and agency of the female character as she imagines inflicting such violence on Popeye when she fantasizes about a chastity belt with a spike on it (217). Temple's fantasy about acquiring a phallus is "imitation, subversion and recirculation of phantasmic privilege" (Stringer 30). It is a reaction to the constraints imposed on female identity in a social order constructed upon violence and rape, both material and metaphoric. Fantasizing about having a phallus is metaphorically opposed to Popeye's impotency and castration. In this sense, although the phallus fantasy is the outcome of the pain experienced by the female body, it still contains marks of defiance to the conventional patriarchal discourse that expose declining masculinity and emasculate the abuser.

Popeye continues to project his desires on Temple's body even after raping her. Inviting Red, a Memphis criminal, to Temple's room and compelling her to lie with him while he watches, Popeye attempts to recuperate a lost sense of masculinity. In an article entitled "A Measure of Innocence," Dianne Luce Cox comments on the scene, claiming that "Popeye's desire to bring Red to Temple is motivated by his hope that he can visually learn the potency to act out his hostility" (315). According to Cox, Popeye's violence against Temple is his instrument of becoming potent and thereby asserting his masculine subject. In the same context, in "Faulkner's *Sanctuary* as a Psychosexual Text," James Polchin argues that "Temple Drake provides both Popeye and Horace with a means to be both masculine through each man's outward roles and internal silent imaginings" (156). In both cases, Temple's body acts as the silent and marginalized container of masculine violence, physical and psychological. Nevertheless, through her wordless gaze and her refusal to give testimony in the trial scene, Temple ultimately takes back what she offers, and entraps the men within the canons of her gender identity, which is a form of revenge, agency and power.

In *Women and Sacrifice: Male Narcissism and the Psychology of Religion*,

William Beers psychoanalytically approaches the issue of male violence towards females, explaining that, during their maturation process, males reject the feminine aspect in them, classify it as "not-me" (143), and project it on the sacrificed other. "The sacrificial victim is a marginal being on which is focused the [feminine] 'not-me' parts, which are then destroyed or violently cut off from the group's culture" (145). Thus, in Beers view, female objectification not only enables the regeneration of the masculine subject but also ensures the transformation of the male subject into a dominator and predator as it is the case of Popeye who projects his feelings of frustration and impotence onto Temple's body and turns them into acts of violence and cruelty.

The association of femininity with the sacrificed victim is clearly established in Temple's case. William Beers points out that "the complex ritual violence performed by men is an ancient way for men to identify with each other, as men, and to separate from women" (144-45). Beers' argument is constructed upon Carl Jung's theory of "matricidal sacrifice" where the male rejects his maternal connections during the maturation process and projects his latent feminine feelings onto a sacrificed victim to conform to stereotypes of masculinity. As a kind of internal metamorphosis, the process essentially involves "narcissistic injury" (144) and "mourning" (185-86). However, since mourning is not conventionally accepted to be a male attribute, it is repressed and turned into "narcissistic rage" and aggression projected and acted out onto a female sacrificial victim (144). Beers' postulation is relevant to Popeye's case in *Sanctuary*. Emotionally hurt by his impotency, Popeye transforms his "mourning" and "narcissistic injury" into a kind of "narcissistic rage," projects it onto Temple's body, and rapes her using a corncob. Such an act of violence is meant to hide Popeye's shameful feelings of loss and regenerate the masculine traits in him while using Temple's body as a scapegoat.

In "*Sanctuary, Marriage, and the Status of Women in 1920s America*," Terrell Tebbetts argues that Faulkner's *Sanctuary* is his most "feminine" novel, for it is filled with active female characters

as there is no “runaway Caddy,” as in *The Sound and the Fury* (1929), and no “coffined Addie,” as in *As I Lay Dying*” (1930). In *Sanctuary*, Faulkner creates women who try to be “self-owning individuals, assuming responsibility for their own lives and making decisions accordingly” (47). Tebbetts adds that, in contrast to female characters, the novel’s main male characters, Popeye and Horace, are different yet significantly impotent. According to Tebbetts, “the prominence and strength of *Sanctuary*’s female characters and the weakness of its males present a world in which patriarchy seems to be collapsing as gender equality arises, with its promise of female self-ownership” (48). Accordingly, Temple’s rebellion is connected to her rejection of her objectification by masculine agency.

Lawrence S. Kubie argues that Temple’s rebellious acts are the outcomes of the oppression of fatherly and brotherly forces. Kubie states that

this paradoxical and perverted impulse to revenge herself on those who have not harmed her, but who are essentially normal in their masculinity, fits the whole history of her defiant, rebellious and provocative attitude toward boys and men. Her career seemed to shape itself out of her hate of her father and her four stalwart brothers. (142)

Temple’s acts of sedition are openly voiced in *Sanctuary* when the narrator describes her actions as deliberately opposing her father’s and brothers’ will, for “all she had to do was, do the one thing which she knew they would forbid her to do if she had a chance” (123).

Tebbett’s optimistic vision about female subversive identity in *Sanctuary* may be refuted at the end of the novel when Temple Drake fails in asserting her identity throughout a journey full of masculine obstacles and hardships. She eventually appears overwhelmed by her father’s silhouette. Sitting in the Luxembourg Gardens under the vigilant authority of her patriarch, she turns into a lifeless object:

Beside her, her father sat, his hands crossed on the head of his stick, the rigid bar of his moustache beaded with moisture like frosted silver. [...] She seemed to follow with her eyes the waves of music [...] across the pool and the opposite semicircle of trees where at sombre intervals the dead tranquil

queens in stained marble mused, and on into the sky lying prone and vanquished in the embrace of the season of rain and death. (317)

Temple's struggle to claim a free identity and voice turns into a failure or what Philip Weinstein terms in, *What Else but Love?* "radically failed self-ownership" (92). Temple's failure in her attempt to claim "self-ownership" is due to a patriarchal culture that dooms femininity to objectification as a way of constructing the masculine subject.

Interestingly, however, through female characters like Temple Drake, Faulkner silently conveys the message that masculine attempts to objectify the female subject indeed strengthen the resistive impulses of the repressed female. Although Temple shows a sense of rebellion against the masculine subject, she cannot fully free herself from her father's overwhelming shadow and repeatedly refers to the sexually lifeless Popeye as "Daddy." Explicitly, seeing her dad in Popeye demonstrates the girl's failure to get away from the dominance of the patriarch. Implicitly, however, referring to the sexually lifeless Popeye as "Daddy," Temple symbolically kills the patriarch and denies him the power and control he constantly claimed against her. Thus, desiring to kill the patriarch, Temple tries to turn from a fetishized object of sexual desire into full "self-ownership" and full subjecthood. Likewise, projecting the patriarchal image on Popeye is a strategy for re-appropriating the symbolism of the patriarch and turning it against Popeye, whom she well knows cannot live up to the sexual and reproductive demands of the father's role. To call Popeye "Daddy" actually dishonours both him and her father.

At the end of the novel, the voiced story tells that although she escapes the reach of Popeye, Temple cannot overcome the violence of patriarchal tradition incarnated in Judge Drake's straddled silhouette. The patriarch's "hands crossed on the head of his stick" and "the rigid bar of his moustache beaded with moisture like frosted silver" (*Sanctuary* 317) ironically stand for a sociocultural system that establishes masculine-biased stereotypes and declines

any attempt to question them. The patriarch's stick has for its target a daughter compelled to succumb to the dominance of a father who imprisons her and deprives her of voicing out her femininity. Temple's state of confinement in the Luxembourg Gardens ironically echoes her confinement as a female in a patriarchal society and culture. Indeed, her socioculturally established identity as a woman is a burden which she cannot overcome.

Describing Judge Drake as a dominant figure while portraying Temple as a nearly lifeless body "yawn[ing] behind her hand" and having "a face in miniature sullen and discontented and sad" (317) is indicative of male dominance over her life. The image of the patriarch in the final scene signifies a patriarchal sprawling shadow which spreads out, invading the female character's life and establishing the masculine subject at the expense of the female identity. Temple's portrayal as "a miniature" passively positioned behind male authority uncovers a patriarchal culture that sees in women's dependence on men a vital condition for constructing the masculine subject.

From another perspective, an unworded symbolic narrative can actually be read in the final scene. Indeed, Temple's presence in the Luxembourg Gardens can be empowering since it "marks, a new beginning, a rebirth of sorts. Temple mounts her escape from the patriarchal Southern order through playing by the very rules of that order" (Leachman 20). In the Luxembourg Gardens Temple no longer stands passively in front of the mirror. She holds it in her hands, controlling what she and others see in it. Temple's true identity remains hidden somewhere behind the "face in miniature sullen and discontented and sad" (*Sanctuary* 317), which is reflected to readers through this compact mirror. She certainly comes to destabilize the masculine authority, identity, and power of many of the male characters around her, whether deliberately or not: Horace, Lee, Gowan, Red, even arguably Popeye, whose manhood she ridicules at the Grotto. By the novel's end, Temple is in effect the last (wo)man standing; while all the men in her life are either dead or defeated or otherwise emasculated. Even her father seems old

and decrepit sitting motionless with his cane in the Luxembourg Gardens.

In *Sanctuary*, Faulkner uncovers the psychological and physical manipulation of the female character and exposes the strategies that patriarchal culture implements in shaping female identity. Though many critics condemn Temple of being involved in her own abuse, a reader cannot help identifying with a female character who is not only conditioned to acquiesce to male power and assume the role of a scapegoat but also able to rise against a patriarchal system, claim power, resilience and agency and symbolically rape the law of the father.

NOTES

1. In their anthropological studies, Shirley and Edwin Ardener suggest the term "muted groups" to uncover a dominant culture's predilection toward the white male and the "drowning" of minorities under the dominant group. Ardeners explain that dominant groups occupy a privileged position as far as language is concerned as it is their voice which is raised in the spoken and written word while dominated and minor groups are compelled to either "translate" their experiences and beliefs in the dominant groups' language or remain silent as their experiences find no expression within the dominant language. Therefore, being a denied voice in dominant cultures, dominated groups become "inarticulate," for the language of the dominant does not take into account the voices of the non-dominant groups. As a result, minor groups become silenced and mute as their experiences are seen as insignificant and unworthy of linguistic representation.
2. Temple as a first name suggests a place of divine worship and protection, while her last name evokes that age-old enemy of the divine—a dragon or serpent (Leachman7). Rather than grant Temple Drake any form of divine agency, the second name "Drake" destabilizes her affiliation with divinity while the multiple meanings of "Temple" subvert her associations with evil.

REFERENCES

- Allison, Julie and Lawrence S. Wrightsman. 1993. *Rape: The Misunderstood Crime*. California: Sage Publications.
- Angelius, J. Wood. "Temple's Provocative Quest: or What Really Happened at the Old Frenchmen Place." *Notes on Mississippi Writers*. Vol. 10. (1977): 74-79. Print.

- Beers, William. 1992. *Women and Sacrifice: Male Narcissism and the Psychology of Religion*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Boon, Kevin A. "Temple Defiled: The Brainwashing of Temple Drake in Faulkner's *Sanctuary*." *Faulkner's Journal*. Vol. 6. N°2. (Spring 1991). 33-50.
- Brenner, Athalya, ed. 2001. *A Feminist Companion to Ruth*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. Ltd.
- Brown, Laura. 1995. "Not Outside the Range: One Feminist Perspective on Psychic Trauma." *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Ed. Cathy Caruth. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. [100-112]
- Brylowski, Walter M. 1968. *Faulkner's Olympian Laugh: Myth in the Novels*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Cox, Dianne Luce. "A Measure of Innocence: *Sanctuary*'s Temple Drake." *Mississippi Quarterly*. Vol.39. N°3. (Summer 1986): 301-24. Web. August 8 2013.
- Creighton, Joanne. "Self-Destructive Evil in *Sanctuary*." *Twentieth-Century Literature*. 18 (1972): 259-70.
- Cypher, James R. "The Tangled Sexuality of Temple Drake." *American Imago*. Vol.19. N°3. (1982): 243-52.
- De Beauvoir, Simone. 1949. *The Second Sex*. London: Picador, 1988.
- Dillman, Caroline Matheny.1989. "Southern Women: In Continuity or Change?" *Women in the South*. Ed., Mathews Holly F. Georgia: University of Georgia Press. [8-17].
- Ehrenreich, Barbara. 1997. *Blood Rites: Origins and History of the Passions of War*. New York: Metropolitan.
- Faulkner, William. *Sanctuary*. 1931. New York: Vintage, 1993.
- Freedman. Eden Wales. 2013. "Something is happening to me": Witnessing Trauma in Faulkner's *Sanctuary*. *Faulkner and Morrison*. Ed. Robert W. Hamblin and Christopher Rieger. Cape Girardou: Southeast Missouri State University Press. [230-247]
- Fowler. Roger. 1986. *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Griffin, Susan. 1983. *Pornography and Silence: Culture's Revenge against Nature*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Guerard, Albert J. 1988. "*Sanctuary* and Faulkner's Misogyny." *Modern Critical Interpretations: William Faulkner's Sanctuary*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House. [63-80].
- Irigaray, Luce. 1985. *Speculum of the Other Woman*, trans. Gillian G. Gill. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Kubie. Lawrence S. 1966. "William Faulkner's *Sanctuary*." *Faulkner: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Robert Penn Warren. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice. [137-46]. Web. www.Questia.Com. 29 September 2015.
- Leachman, Julianna. "Faulkner's Dirty Little Secret," *Faulkner Journal*. Fall 2013, Vol. 27 Issue 2: [3-22]

- Matthews, John T. "The Elliptical Nature of Sanctuary." *A Forum on Fiction* 17.3 (Spring 1984): 246-65.
- Moore, Robert R. 1988. "Desire and Despair: Temple Drake's Self-Victimization". *Modern Critical Interpretations: William Faulkner's Sanctuary*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House. [121-33].
- Parker, R. Dale. 1985. *Faulkner and the Novelistic Imagination*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Petesch, Donald A. "Temple Drake: Faulkner's Mirror for Social Order." *Studies in American Fiction*. Vol. 7. N°1. (1979): 37-48. Print.
- Petty, Homer B. "Reading and Rape in *Sanctuary*." *Faulkner's Journal*. Vol. 3. N°2. (1987):71-84.
- Polchin, James. 1996. "Selling a Novel: Faulkner's *Sanctuary* as a Psychosexual Text." *Faulkner and Gender*. Eds., Donald M. Kartiganer and Ann J. Abadie. Mississippi: Mississippi University Press. [145-60].
- Segrest, Mab. "On Being White and Other Lies: A History of Racism in The U.S." *Sing, Whisper, Shout, Pray! Feminist Visions for a Just World*. Eds. M.J. Alexander et al. Fort Brag, CA: Edgework Press, 2002: [243-285].
- Sherrill, John B. "Sanctuary as a Tragedy". *Arizona Quarterly*. Vol. 43. N°2. (1987):119-32.
- Showalter, Elaine. 1997. "Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness." *Autonomy and Assimilation in Afro-American and Feminist Literary Theory*. Ed., Robyn R. Ward and Diane Price Herndl. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press. [213-33].
- Simpson, Lewis P. 1965. "Isaac McCaslin and Temple Drake: The Fall of New World Man." *Nine Essays in Modern Literature*. Ed., Donald E. Stanford. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. [88-106].
- Stringer, Dorothy. 2010. *Not Even Past: Race, Historical Trauma and Subjectivity in Faulkner, Larsen, and Van Vechten*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Tanner, Laura E. 1994. *Intimate Violence: Reading Rape and Torture in Twentieth-Century Fiction*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Tebbetts, Terrell. "Sanctuary, Marriage, and the Status of Women in 1920s America." *The Faulkner Journal*. Vol. 19. No. 1. (Fall 2003): 47-60.
- Urgo, Joseph R. 1991. "Sanctuary and the Pornographic Nexus". *Novel Frames: Literature as Guide to Race, Sex and History in American Culture*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi. [77-112].
- Vickery, Olga W. 1964. *The Novels of William Faulkner*. Louisiana: State University Press.
- Volpe, Edmond Loris. 2004. *A Reader's Guide to William Faulkner: Short Stories*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Weinstein, Philip M. 1996. *What Else but Love? The Ordeal of Race in Faulkner and Morrison*. New York: Columbia University Press.