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William Faulkner's _Requiem for a Nun_, a text which consists of a prose section and a drama section, was published in September, 1951. Faulkner actually started writing a story under the title "Requiem for a Nun" in December 1933, but did not continue this project. He turned to work on what would become _Absalom, Absalom!_, and then moved to some stories of _The Unvanquished_. About 17 years later, Faulkner set out writing a text again with the title "Requiem for a Nun" (SL 305), and the dramatic section of the text deals with the murder of an infant by Nancy Mannigoe. It might be possible that Nancy is related to the African American woman in one of the abortive manuscripts of the past,1 but the focus of the drama
in 1951 is more on Temple Drake Stevens. Why did Faulkner go back to Temple almost twenty years after he had introduced her in *Sanctuary* (1931)?

When Faulkner first started *Requiem for a Nun* as a drama, he expressed some uneasiness about writing a play, but he seems to have been fairly satisfied when he completed the text with the introductory prose before each act of the dramatic section. The writing of the prose narrative had served as a kind of frame structure for the dramatic section. He says: "to me that seemed the most effective way to tell that story" (*FIU* 122). Both the dramatic section and the epic-like narrative section of *Requiem* presuppose the collective audience. Since the social situation and media attention surrounding Faulkner changed drastically around the time of his writing *Requiem for a Nun*, the text provided him with a good opportunity to explore what kind of new voice he would adopt towards readers.

Faulkner had gradually gained popularity since the publication of *The Portable Faulkner* in 1946, and received the Nobel Prize for literature in November 1950. After a long period of suffering from financial problems and the unsympathetic response of the reading public, belated fame finally came to this author. But the sudden spotlight of national attention made him uneasy, since he was not prepared for the exposure of his private life to the public. Besides, the publication of Malcom Cowley's *The Portable Faulkner* ironically made clear that Faulkner was not the "sole & proprietary owner" of Yoknapatawpha County. Admittedly, when Faulkner wrote to Cowley that it was Cowley's book, not Faulkner's, he was congratulating Cowley for his editorship.³ Faulkner's texts were in the public sphere once they were published, and he did not even shy away from selling his stories for film to alleviate his financial problems. Nevertheless, Faulkner seems to reassert the "cosmos of [his] own" in *Requiem for a Nun*, and presents a constant, subtle restructuring of that literary cosmos to the reader. I would like to explore the meaning of Faulkner's revisiting of Temple Drake in relationship to Caddy Compson, especially of the "Appendix: Compsons, 1699-1945," and connect them to Cecilia Farmer, a young woman at the jail window in "The Jail" section of *Requiem for a Nun*. The problems of containment and the struggles against oblivion shared by these women indicate Faulkner's desire to reclaim his Yoknapatawpha and his anxiety about how he would be remembered in society in this period.

Faulkner was sensitive to the artist's position in society from the beginning of his career, but in the beginning, he did not think so much about the national institutions as about the market. In *Mosquitoes*, his second novel, the artists aboard the *Nausikaa* discuss their relationship to the reading public and how they present their artwork to the market.
Fairchild, a novelist in *Mosquitoes*, sometimes regards himself as a laborer who works for wages or a whore who has to oblige herself to please the customer. On the other hand, he also asserts that a writer writes solely to attract the attention of the woman he adores. In this case, the woman serves as a muse, or, represents the whimsical reading public who coldly ignores the author’s artistic efforts.

In a sense, *The Sound and the Fury* and *Sanctuary* each respectively carry into practice the contrastive processes of writing discussed in *Mosquitoes*: writers may write driven by their own sexual and perverse obsessions, or they may write to entertain readers and make money. Faulkner’s attachment to Caddy Compson as his artistic muse is well known, but his harsh treatment of Temple Drake is also noteworthy when we consider his desperate need for money from the book market at the time of writing *Sanctuary*. Joseph Blotner points out that Faulkner may have expected to make easy money on the play *Requiem*, and suggests Faulkner’s pressing financial situation as the common motivation of writing *Sanctuary* and *Requiem*. It is not coincidental that Faulkner returned to Temple Drake in *Requiem for a Nun*, four years after he related Caddy’s fate in the Compson Appendix. My hypothesis is that the struggle of women caught in the frame in *Requiem* is the detour Faulkner took to brood on Caddy’s end in the photo in the slick magazine. As an artist who feels the increasing pressure of public attention, Faulkner pursues the destiny of the women who are either publicly or privately exhibited to the others’ gaze, and explores what their struggles with society illuminates for his new position and for his artistic responsibility to his texts.

In the famous introduction of *The Sound and the Fury* in 1933, Faulkner describes how he experienced the “ecstasy” (Essays 295) of writing after he shut the reading public and the market out of his mind. Still, it was necessary to publish *The Sound and the Fury* and to look at the adorable “vase” from outside: the author knew he “could not live forever inside of it [the vase]” (Essays 296, Miscellany 161). *The Sound and the Fury* proves to be a masterpiece, though the reading public’s attention to it was scant at the time of the publication. Not only the book, but also its heroine Caddy, Faulkner’s “heart’s darling,” stands independent from the control of the other’s gaze within the novel, and her freedom allures and challenges the author as well as her brothers.

In the case of *Sanctuary*, however, Faulkner claims that he wrote this book to sell. He guesses what the readers want is a scandalous sensational plot, and supplies his novel with such elements. Time and again, Temple Drake is under the male gaze. The readers are
seduced to watch Temple from the same position as the other male characters in the novel, and they are gradually forced to acknowledge themselves as voyeurs. In the beginning, Faulkner starts as a subservient story-teller at the customer's service. He says in the introduction for Sanctuary that he "began to think of [himself] again as a printed object" (Essays 177). But the situation is reversed somewhere, and the writer makes the readers see what he forces them to see. It is not the reader but the author who controls the novel.

His position is not unlike that of Temple in Sanctuary. Temple behaves as if she were willing to accommodate the men's voyeuristic desire. But when Horace Benbow asks her to tell what happened at Tommy' murder, she does not tell what Horace wants to know, and instead makes him listen to the illusory fantasy she entertained on the night before the rape and the murder. Admittedly, her story of transformation into a boy or an old man with a beard may have been the result of her despair and psychological self-defense. But Horace suspects that Temple enjoys telling her story. She exchanges her position as a voyeur's victim with the subjective position which manipulates the observer's gaze and desire. She wants to control the narrative whenever there is a chance, just like the author. Faulkner's relentless attitude towards Temple may come from the reluctant awareness of his own complicity with her.

In Sanctuary, Temple loves to see herself in the mirror, and plays the part of the given mirror image, whether in a Memphis brothel or in a courtroom. Temple with her sensitivity to power and to the other's gaze is easily contained in patriarchy. Caddy Compson, on the other hand, is always running out of the mirror, and does not want to be fixed as an image by anybody in The Sound and the Fury.

Caddy, however, is presented with ambiguous fatalism in the "Appendix." Faulkner does not describe Caddy in detail here, but it is possible to roughly follow the process of her change, based on her relationship to her brothers and the patriarchal society in The Sound and the Fury. In The Sound and the Fury, she refuses to be contained in Quentin's imaginary hell of incest, and while she resists Jason's labeling of her as "a bitch," she does not remain as a dryad-like virgin protector for Benjy. Still, she allows herself to be bartered as a commodity when she agrees to marry Herbert to keep the honor of the Compson family. The report of her marriage to a "minor movingpicture magnate" (PF 711) in the "Appendix" develops further the image of Caddy as a commodity, though in this case the selling commodity is not so much her body itself but her status as an object of desire. Her position is not unlike that of a Hollywood actress, who is a constant object of sexual desire on the
screen. And the photo of a woman resembling Caddy with a Nazi officer accomplishes her image as the fetishistic object of desire through media. Here, the power of media goes beyond control of any individual self-representation. The photo rouses Melissa Meek's terror and pity at the same time as she might also feel a secret desire for the woman whom she can never aspire to become. To a single woman maintaining a middle-class position as a librarian in a small Southern town, a woman riding in a luxurious car with a Nazi officer on the Riviera is a scandalous, terrible object of desire. Jealousy and an impotent sense of anger are clear in Jason's answer when Melissa shows the picture to him. And to Caddy's eldest brother Quentin, the woman in the photo surely embodies the beautiful and damned, the extension of his vision of Caddy and himself in the clean fire of hell. Quentin wishes that Caddy remain a virgin, but if that is impossible, he would rather commit incest with her and be damned forever together, keeping their pure, homogeneous blood. This Quentin in the South could become the Nazi officer beside her in the nightmarish, propagandist development of the racial idea of pure blood in world history.

When Faulkner was asked about the possibility of rescuing Caddy from the Nazis at the University of Virginia in 1957, he answered that "it is best to leave here[sic] where she is" (FIU 1), unless he "could start over and write the book again and that can't be" (FIU 2). Apparently, he did not have the energy left to pursue Caddy in a new book. But the impact of the photo in question may well have compelled the author to reconsider the fate of another heroine, Temple Drake, a changeling who took a contrastive position with Caddy in the beginning of Faulkner's most productive years.

The critics' opinions on Temple in Requiem are widely divided, but she tends to be judged favorably in recent criticism. I, for one, would like to recognize her challenge to patriarchy, qualified as it is.⁷ Since Noel Polk, however, already made a strong case for Temple Drake Stevens in his whole-book study of Requiem for a Nun, I would focus my argument mainly on Temple's love letters to examine her significance in this novel. At the Governor's office, Temple declares her love for Red and openly admits her sexual desire. She challenges Gavin Stevens well by voicing a feminine, abject power of sexuality. It is the only weapon being recognized formidable by the patriarchal power. On the other hand, Gavin may be right when he points out that Temple believes that she was in love with Red just because she had no choice but to accept whoever was forced on her with violence. It was Popye who forced her to make love with Red in front of him. It would be too humiliating and unbearable for
Temple unless she convinces herself that she was in love with Red on her own. So, Temple regards her love letters simply as the proof of her love to Red, though she admits that her letters are full of common expressions and stereotypical nonsense. But she remains in the discourse of a phallogocentric society, if she were to rely not on her body but on the written, threadbare words so heavily. Her letter-writing is a performative act to convince herself of her love for Red. Her subjectivity as the author of the love letters can be an illusion just as her subjectivity in narrating her fantasy to Horace in Sanctuary is.

Temple's love letters, however, follow a strange destiny. In Requiem, her letters are used for blackmail. But when Pete tries to return the letters, Temple refuses to take them and Pete disappears with the letters. She does not burn them when Pete gives them back, nor does she cherish them as the evidence of her true love. If she were determined to save her family from any scandal, she should have accepted the letters and should have destroyed them at once. She leaves it to Pete to decide whether he uses them for blackmail again or not. We may judge her conduct as irresponsible and silly, but Temple's seemingly careless conduct recovers the letters from the monetary sphere into the equivocal realm of interdependent human relationship.

When her act is compared with those of the other Faulkner heroines concerning letters, we might make a little more benign judgment on Temple. Narcissa Benbow Sartoris in "There Was a Queen" (first published in 1933) is also blackmailed for the obscene love letters which she had received, not for the ones she wrote. She goes to bed with the ex-FBI blackmailer to take back the letters Byron Snopes wrote to her, and then she burns them. Nancy Mannigoe actually suggests that Temple can get back the letters by sleeping with Pete, but Temple does not adopt that strategy. Her last decision about the love letters might be closer to that of Judith Sutpen in Absalom, Absalom!, though their situations are quite different. Judith gives Charles Bon's letter to Mrs. Compson so that a third person would remember their love. Temple leaves it to Pete to decide what to do with the letters. She is not even sure whether she loves Pete or not, just as she is not sure of her love to Red in the past. But yielding the decision to Pete, Temple bets on love, which may have been just an incidental by-product of violence and threat in the beginning.

At the end of Requiem, Temple answers "Coming" (RFN 664) to Gowan's call of her name, and leaves the stage. It is not clear if Temple's reaction to her husband's call represents her surrender to patriarchy or is a hopeful sign of the beginning of their new life. The life Temple chooses is, at best, a precarious way of living connected fatally to the others around
her. Temple’s effort to purge her past has collapsed. Her future life depends not only on her will and effort to live a better life, but also on Gowan’s and Pete’s consciences to respond to Temple and to compensate for the baby’s sacrifice. But if the stage in Requiem suggests an authoritative, legal power frame which forces Temple to play only the role of a sinner or a penitent, she had better walk off the stage and react in response to her husband’s call anyway, rather than to stay trapped in the jail on the stage.

The jailbreak narrated in “The Courthouse” section indicates that the old jail with one wall completely missing looks like a stage: “not just the lock gone from the door nor even just the door gone from the jail, but the entire wall gone, […] leaving the jail open to the world like a stage” (RFN 484). The episode prepares the reader to see the stage in the text as a jail. Whether it is an upper-middle-class living room or a Governor’s office or the actual jail, the framed stage serves as containment for Temple. The jailbreak in the introduction to Act I, however, also shows the possibility of running away out of the framed stage. The outlaws’ escape the morning after Independence Day demonstrates that the authority of the state can be challenged and be broken. Nancy Mannigoe accepts her sentence according to her own belief in God, and goes back to jail towards the inner stage. Temple does not quite understand Nancy’s advice to “[b]elieve” (RFN 662), but she walks out of the stage without any man’s help. The audience is left to gaze at the empty stage only to realize that they, the law-abiding citizens looking for a Roman Holiday, might make the fourth wall of the containment.

Before the final act of the drama discussed above, Cecilia Farmer in “The Jail” section of Requiem literally gets out of the jailhouse in the end. The young girl at the jailhouse window is an object to be seen by people on the street, but Cecilia on her side is also looking out on the street, though she does not seem to take any positive action of her own. When the young soldier who saw her at the window during the battle in the Civil War comes back to marry her, she just follows him, sitting behind his back on the horse. So far, she is a typically submissive woman. But her inertia and total inefficiency make her unfit for a proper country wife. She could be a passive femme fatale who haunts the man of vitality. Or, as Moreland suggests, her irrational and irresistible charm belongs to the same prehistoric dimension from which Nancy Mannigoe’s esoteric belief comes. On the other hand, while Nancy is indifferent even to how to spell her own name, Cecilia’s signature on the window glass strongly asserts her identity. As an ambiguous mixture of the three contradictory
categories, Cecilia is like Temple: she is not just a fetishistic object of desire under the male
gaze, or a case of primordial, abject femininity, but also an author of the written signature
on the glass.

Since the narrator emphasizes her legendary signature on the jail window glass, the
reader is ready to welcome the strong assertion of her identity. But her signature also sug-
gests a contradiction. Her father is a failed farmer turned jailor, and that suggests an ironi-
cal inconsistency in her last name "Farmer." Since the soldier who marries Cecilia is
determined to start his farm again in Alabama, her name seems to foretell their fatal en-
counter, but she is not likely to become a good farmer. When Faulkner first introduced a
young girl’s signature at a jailhouse window in the "Ambuscade" of The Unvanquished, her
name was Celia Cook. Her name is not mentioned when the author refers to the similar epi-
sode in Intruder in the Dust (1948). Faulkner must have deliberately changed her name to
"Farmer" in Requiem. Here, the power of representation and that of parody function simulta-
neously in her name.

Requiem generally takes an ironical attitude towards the act of authorizing or perpetu-
ating a name. In "The Courthouse (The Name for the City)" section, people succeed in bribing
Pettigrew, a Federal Government mail rider, by giving the town his first name, Jefferson,
and the episode is treated as an amusing tall tale of the town. Pettigrew's episode is in good
contrast with the attitude of Ratcliff's descendants: Ratcliffe played an important role at the
birth of the city with his resilience and cleverness, but his descendants do not mind simplifying
their ancestor's name from Ratcliffe to Ratlif (RFN 483) for convenience's sake. In "The
Golden Dome," the narrator refers to the construction of a new State Capitol, the golden
dome, which is supposed to institutionalize and reaffirm the authority of the State. In this
section, as is well known, Faulkner overtly quotes from Mississippi: A Guide to the Magnolia
State, a product born out of the WPA project to employ writers to engage in the national
project. Though the WPA Guide series held the noble goal of recording the past and present
of local areas and the stories of the American people, the federal influence makes Faulkner
adopt the material ironically. The dry, bureaucratic writing goes with the ugly dome of the
new State Capitol, and indicates Faulkner's criticism against the federal government's mobil-
ization of artists and its intervention into art.

The narrator's critical comments against the WPA are scattered in "The Jail" section of
the Requiem. We might suspect that the episode of the birth of the city in "The Courthouse
(The Name for the City)" also includes the parody of another New Deal project, namely, the
Post office Mural Movement promoted by the Treasury Section of Fine Arts mainly between 1934 and 1942. The movement was planned to encourage the local post offices all over the nation to put a proper art mural which represented the town. According to Sue Bridwell Beckham, the national project was to secure fine artwork for public buildings and "encourage the development of art in the United States" (Beckham 9). Beckham demonstrates the popularity of this movement in the South. The post office in Oxford does not possess any mural of the period, but those in Pontotoc and New Albany still keep the murals created during the movement. There is no external evidence that Faulkner was aware of the mural movement, but ten years before the movement started, Faulkner had served as a postmaster for almost three years at the University of Mississippi post office before he was virtually fired for negligence (1921-24). "A Rose for Emily" mentions Miss Emily Grierson's negative view of the postal system (CS 128) and depicts the postal system as a part of the federal infrastructure. Further, the questions of the suitable theme for the town's post office mural, who decides it and appoints the painter, the federal government or the local one, and whom the hired artist must please, etc. --these problems arising out of the post office mural movement point to Faulkner's disapproval of the federal government's intervention into art. The birth of the town, narrated in the episode of Pettigrew and the Lock at the postoffice-store, and the way the townspeople bribed the federal government agent, serve as an ironic post office mural in Jefferson.

In contrast with such public establishment of a name or a state authority, Cecilia Farmer's carving of her name on the glass is evocative of Faulkner's statement about an artist's role: that is, to make a scratch "on the wall of the final and irrevocable oblivion" (LIG 253). In spite of the ironical touch in her name, her signature reminds one not only of an individual's struggle for existence but also of an artist's personal and solitary struggle against time. Her challenge becomes more valuable because she dares writing on a piece of fragile glass, while the national project of artistic commitment depends on more stable materials. Nevertheless, there is something ominous about the growing popularity of her signature. The travelers who visit Jefferson are led by the townspeople to go look at her signature, and they leave with an impressive memory of the name on the window. Jefferson is not a tourist town, and the jail window barely escapes commercialism, but the narrator suggests that the old window glass with her signature might someday go into a museum for display: "by which time --who knows?-- not merely the pane, but the whole window, perhaps the entire wall, may have been removed and embalmed intact into a museum by an historical, or
anyway a cultural, club of ladies” (RFN 643). A cultural club of ladies is more permissible than a governmental organization to act as an agent to move the signature on the window into a museum. But when we remember the narrator’s critical attitude towards any institutionalization, the chance of the girl’s personal signature becoming institutionalized is something to be deplored rather than to be rejoiced over. When the robbers broke out of the Jefferson jail, leaving “the entire wall gone,” the removed wall signified their dare-devil freedom; if “the entire wall” of Cecilia’s jailhouse were to be removed to a museum, it would be the end of an individual’s assertion of independence.

The emphasis on Cecilia’s signature needs comparison with the narrator’s obsessive mention of the disappearance of people from the land. In “The Jail” section, the narrator refers to an old mirror as well as to Cecilia’s window glass. This mirror, like the old jailhouse, has seen the people come and go: “perhaps even the face itself three hundred years after it was dust [...] saying no to death across twelve generations, asking still the old same unanswerable question three centuries after that which reflected them had learned that the answer didn’t matter, or--better still--had forgotten the asking of it--in the shadowy fathomless dreamlike depths of an old mirror which has looked at too much too long;” (RFN 617). The mirror only reflects the continuous change of generations and transcends all human sufferings. As a matter of fact, the narrator of Requiem is attracted to loss as much as to the trace of loss. He repeatedly mentions all the wild animals and people of the past who stepped on the earth and left their prints, which, however, were again wiped out after they were gone. Likewise, Temple’s suffering in Requiem will also be soon forgotten on this mirror. There is even some consolation in oblivion, because the asking of the desperate, unanswerable question itself is forgotten.

The narrator’s persistently-repetitive narration of loss serves two ways. It may resist oblivion like an old epic, which asks people to remember loss and suffering and to share communal memory. But when “past is never past” and if, like Temple, you do not know for sure how to overcome loss or purge your past sin, the emphasis on oblivion rather than remembering might be a consolation. The narrator asks the readers of the contradictory request both to keep the memory and to accept oblivion.

In fact, the repetitive reference to loss in the narrative prose section sometimes becomes mechanical and synchronizes with Temple’s despair of “Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and still tomorrow” (RFN 657). While the author attacks the monolithic, authoritative remembrance
and institutionalization, the narrator’s persistent enumeration of loss might resemble the monotonous tone of a gramophone or a reproductive photocopy. Therefore, a better way to deal with loss, presumably, is not to repeat it but to accept it as is, and then to pursue and revive or recreate the lost object in a different form. In Requiem, Temple tries to save Nancy’s life after the trial, and comes to understand Nancy’s pain at losing her own baby in the past: "But the other one: yours: that you told me about, that you were carrying six months gone, [...] and the man kicked you in the stomach and you lost it? That one too?" (RFN 660). Little Caddy Compson in "That Evening Sun" (1931) could not understand Nancy’s fear of death caused by her lover Jesus, and left Nancy behind rather innocently and cruelly. Temple Drake Stevens in Requiem comes around and finally sympathizes with Nancy’s loss of her baby, even though she is the murderer of Temple’s own baby. Through Temple’s suffering and growing sympathy with Nancy, Faulkner presumably redeems little Caddy’s cruel innocence in "That Evening Sun" and also imagines that Caddy in her middle age as well understands Nancy Mannigoe’s suffering. The three women all lost their child in one way or another, and they are all betrayed or disappointed by love.

Temple’s recognition of Nancy’s sense of loss, however, does not bring complete understanding with Nancy because Nancy tries to find delivery from her own suffering through God. Nancy in her own way gives Temple her message, "Believe," but Temple is mystified at her advice and is left behind to struggle alone against her despair about the meaning of life and the future. She does not know what to believe, and the ambiguity of Temple’s future approximates that of Caddy.

The final glimpse of Caddy in the "Appendix" is the photo in a slick magazine. Her identity is not confirmed, and the photo is not a signature, nor even a scratch. It is a sign of a beautiful woman’s surrender to power in exchange for luxury. Caddy, who succeeded in running out of each of her brothers’ mirrors in The Sound and the Fury, is finally trapped in the photo in a commercial magazine. The fatality in the photo comes from the fact that she is isolated and her individual suffering is totally lost in the power of media. It needs the response of the two local women to the picture in the "Appendix" to mitigate Caddy’s loss and despair: Dilsey refuses to see the photo, and Melissa Meek hides the magazine in her desk in the library. Melissa’s act is certainly silly, since she cannot protect Caddy from the mass media, and as a public servant of the media institution, her duty is to keep everything ready and available under exhibit. But her anachronistic act of hiding the magazine is more humane than putting Cecilia Farmer’s signature on the window in a museum. While the image
of Caddy as a sign of luxury and damnation circulates through mass media, her spiritual death is privately mourned. And Dilsey's total refusal to be involved in the media world suggests a resigned way of coping with that media. Personal, sympathetic response to any individual's struggle for existence might lessen the despair of loss and suggests the possibility of survival in the age of mechanical reproduction.

In Requiem, Faulkner indicates that between oblivion and the media-oriented world of photographic or reproductive publicity and institutional commemoration, he continues to write and rearrange his artistic cosmos so that nothing can be totally lost or fatally repetitive. His suggestive method is to go back, figuratively, to the technique of daguerreotype rather than modern photography. Stuart Burrows, while discussing Faulkner's way of using the daguerreotype imagery in Absalom, Absalom!, explains that "because of expense, daguerreotype plates were often used more than once in the early days of photography" and points out that "Mr. Compson's trope imagines photography, paradoxically, as a technology for both preserving and erasing the past" (Burrows 120). By following the trace of loss, Faulkner reads the earth which has both registered and deleted the footprints of animals and people in the past. Such palimpsestic earth can be associated with the daguerreotype image of Cecilia Farmer's signature: "that tender ownerless obsolete girl's name and the old dead date in April almost a century ago--speaking, murmuring, back from, out of, across from, a time as old as lavender, older than album or stereopticon, as old as daguerreotype itself;" (RFN 644). The lost existence comes out of loss through revisionary evocation, neither like a modern photo nor like a reflection on a looking glass, but like a daguerreotype image out of the once-erased plate, which looks like a mirror surface.

Faulkner says in the University of Virginia that the "nun" (F/U196) in the title of the novel points to Nancy Mannigoe. But the nun, with a connotation of a whore as in the age of Shakespeare, may be applied to Temple and Caddy as well. The Requiem for a Nun serves as a requiem for these women. And the author, who once let Fairchild, a novelist in the Mosquitoes, sarcastically define a writer as a whore at the reader's service, may regard himself as another whore. Faulkner finally acquired his literary fame and financial security, but there arises another fear that he and his texts may be honored and preserved in libraries like museum-pieces. Requiem for a Nun in 1951 serves as a requiem for the author as well as for the three women contained in the framed society, whether of institutional patriarchy or of mechanical reproduction. But Faulkner aims this text also as a persistent reaffirmation of their struggle for escape from such society. By continuing writing and adding new stories
and different interpretations of the past, he tries to revive and renew his Yoknapatawpha.

**Notes**

1. See Polk, 240-41.
2. The quoted phrase appears on Faulkner's drawing of the Yoknapatawpha map (AA 2-3), but it disappears from the map Faulkner drew for Cowley's *The Portable Faulkner*.
3. SL 211 (8 December, 1945).
4. See *Mosquitoes* 460, 517-18.
6. Admittedly, Faulkner says about the motivation of writing *Requiem* that he "began to think what would be the future of that girl?" (FIU 96), and that he was interested in Temple's marriage. But we can logically pursue the contrast and the hidden common ground between the two heroines' later lives.
7. Barbara Ladd briefly summarizes the critical history of Temple Drake's evaluation in *Requiem* in "Philosophers and Other Gynecologists: Women and the Polity in *Requiem for a Nun*.
8. Kelly Lynch Reames on the other hand emphasizes the importance of Temple's authorship. Reames admits Temple's weakness in succumbing to the "hegemonic patriarchal constructs and definitions" (140), but suggests the possibility of women's liberation from containment through "a sympathetic, woman-centered perspective" (146). Her emphasis on potential cooperation among Temple, Nancy and Cecilia Farmer is valuable, but in my essay the importance of Cecilia's signature is qualified considerably due to the intervention of media and the public, authoritative constructs.
9. As for Temple's act of not throwing the letters into fire, Karl F. Zender insightfully observes that her gesture evades "assimilation into the cathartic labor of regeneration and renewal," which is required of her as a penitent wife. He further suggests that "Temple's letters --and, we may add, 'letters,' writing, art-- return to the possession of the outlaw" (286).
10. See Moreland, 214, 232.
11. "Ambuscade" was published in 1934 on *Saturday Evening Post*. *The Unvanquished* was published in 1938.
13. In *Wall-to-Wall America*, Kara Ann Marling investigates the post office mural movement in general and points out the basic problem of the tense triangle among "the federal patron, the mural painter, and the American public" (8). See also Michael Szalay for the conflict between socialization and individualization of the art in 1930's (242).

14. Susan V. Donaldson associates Dilsey's refusal to look at the photograph with Caddy's resistance to "serve as the object of anyone else's narrative" (37) more positively than I do, but basically I agree that Dilsey and Melissa support Caddy's fight against confinement.
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