

The Reflection of Dostoevsky's Underground Man in Faulkner's *Sartoris**

Yuri Romanov

National Technical University
Kharkov Polytechnic Institute,
Kharkov, Ukraine

This article is devoted to the comparative typological research related to the 'Underground Man', as featured in the works of F. Dostoevsky and W. Faulkner. Based on the study of the phenomenon of moral alienation – the “underground” embodied in the character of the storyteller in Dostoevsky's novella, *Notes from Underground* – we identify its reflection in Faulkner's novel, *Sartoris*. The relevance of this study is due to the importance of the “underground”, which has not lost its significance in either Russia or the West. The character of the Underground Man, admittedly archetypal, has become part of the vocabulary of modern culture, and the novella *Notes from Underground* is rightly called the prologue to twentieth-century literature. The novelty of the present study is that, despite the existence of a number of works focused on the study of the “underground” in the literary world of Dostoevsky, and the wide scope for a comparative analysis of the works of Dostoevsky and Faulkner, the problem of the “underground” has not previously been considered from this perspective. This study draws on a number of methodologies alongside the comparative typological, including the doctrine of archetypes originated in late antique philosophy, the theory of archetypes first developed by C. G. Jung, and the archetypal approach found in literary criticism. As the results of the study show, in the archetypal character of the Underground Man, the model of “underground” consciousness is clearly expressed (Man-god consciousness, one's own inconsistencies with the ideal, cruel self-punishment and aesthetization of it, estrangement, and spiritual decay) and may be defined – in a broad sense – at the stage of the formation of an “underground” worldview; and in a narrower sense – when complete moral alienation results in a state of “underground”. Idealization of the past, depicted in *Sartoris* (the “heroism” of young Bayard, the symbolic “deafness” of old Bayard, the “serenity” of Narcissa, the infantilism and desire to hide from life in a house surrounded

* Citation: Romanov, Yu. (2021). The Reflection of Dostoevsky's Underground Man in Faulkner's *Sartoris*. In *Quaestio Rossica*. Vol. 9, № 4. P. 1458–1472. DOI 10.15826/qr.2021.4.649.

Цитування: Romanov Yu. The Reflection of Dostoevsky's Underground Man in Faulkner's *Sartoris* // *Quaestio Rossica*. Vol. 9. 2021. № 4. P. 1458–1472. DOI 10.15826/qr.2021.4.649.

by cedars demonstrated by her brother Horace), is functionally similar to the feeling of “sublime and beautiful” by the Underground Man of Dostoevsky and reflects the Man-god consciousness leading the characters of the novel to moral estrangement (“underground” in the broad sense). In the character of young Bayard, the “underground” matrix is fully realized, which allows us to define him as the actual Underground Man (“underground” in the narrow sense).

Keywords: F. Dostoevsky, W. Faulkner, K. G. Jung, archetype, Underground Man

Статья посвящена сравнительно-типологической характеристике «человека из подполья» в творчестве Ф. М. Достоевского и У. Фолкнера. На основе исследования феномена нравственного отчуждения – «подполья», нашедшего свое воплощение в характере героя-рассказчика повести «Записки из подполья» Достоевского, раскрыта специфика его отражения в романе Фолкнера «Сарторис». Актуальность исследования обусловлена важностью темы «подполья», не утратившей своей значимости ни в России, ни на Западе; образ «человека из подполья», являющегося, по общему признанию, архетипическим, стал частью словаря современной культуры, а повесть «Записки из подполья» справедливо называют прологом к литературе XX в. Научная новизна исследования состоит в том, что, несмотря на наличие массива работ по изучению феномена «подполья» в художественном мире Достоевского и широкого спектра направлений сопоставительного анализа произведений Достоевского и Фолкнера, проблема «подполья» в их творчестве в данном аспекте практически не рассматривалась. Методологическими обоснованиями настоящего исследования являются, кроме сравнительно-типологического метода, учение об архетипах, берущее начало в позднеантичной философии, теория архетипов, впервые разработанная К. Г. Юнгом, и архетипный подход в литературоведении. Как показывают результаты исследования, в архетипическом образе «человека из подполья» ярко выражена модель «подпольного» сознания (человекобожество, собственное несоответствие идеалу, жестокая самоказнь и эстетизация ее, нравственное отчуждение и духовный распад), о котором можно говорить в широком смысле (на стадии становления «подпольного» мирозерцания) и в узком смысле – при полном нравственном отчуждении героя в состоянии «подполья». Воплощенная в «Сарторисе» идеализация прошлого («героика» молодого Баярда, символическая «глухота» старого Баярда, «безмятежность» Нарциссы, инфантилизм и стремление укрыться от жизни в доме, окруженном виргинскими можжевельниками, ее брата Хореса) функционально сходна с ощущением «прекрасного и высокого» «человека из подполья» Достоевского и отражает человекобожество, приводящее героев романа к нравственному отчуждению («подполье» в широком смысле). В образе молодого Баярда «подпольная» матрица реализована в полной мере, что позволяет говорить о нем как о собственно «подпольном» герое («подполье» в узком смысле).

Ключевые слова: Ф. Достоевский, У. Фолкнер, К. Г. Юнг, архетип, «человек из подполья»

Since the 1930s, the world of literary criticism has recognized the existence of a system of connections in the works of Fyodor Dostoevsky and William Faulkner: a number of researchers noted the undoubted influence exerted by the literary heritage of Dostoevsky on the artistic world of the American writer.

In particular, following the publication of Faulkner's *Sartoris*, in one of the responses to this work, it was noted: "As in the novels of Dostoevsky, to whose work Mr. Faulkner's is most akin, the accidents, indignities and heroisms of his characters become more than themselves, become symbols of 'the blind tragedy of human events,' the garments and the adventures of the soul" [Critical Essays on William Faulkner, p. 126].

With the release of *Sanctuary* in 1931, references to Dostoevsky's presence in Faulkner's prose were further developed. Thus, R. Chapple points to "the Dostoevskian atmosphere of Faulkner's world" and mentions an early review of *Sanctuary* entitled *Dostoyefsky's Shadow in the Deep South*, whose author, John Chamberlain, "wrote that the novel's nearest analogue was 'The Brothers Karamazov' rather than any work of American fiction" [Chapple, p. 5].

For researchers, the influence of Dostoevsky on Faulkner was apparent, although, at that time, probably due to the American author's "love of the mystification", "[Faulkner] denied having read Dostoevsky at all" [Bloshteyn, p. 72]. As has been noted, there were various editions of Dostoevsky's works in Faulkner's library, and "he read *Crime and Punishment* before writing *Sanctuary*... *Sartoris*, *The Sound and the Fury*, *As I Lay Dying*... should also bear the stamp of Raskolnikov" [Weisgerber, p. 182]. Later, in response to a question about what he thought of Dostoevsky, Faulkner stated bluntly: "He is one who has not only influenced me a lot, but that I have got a great deal of pleasure out of reading, and I still read him again every year or so. As a craftsman, as well as his insight into people, his capacity for compassion, he was one of the ones that any writer wants to match if he can. That's - he was a one who wrote a good *Kilroy Was Here*..." [Gwynn, Blotner, p. 6].

Dostoevsky – Faulkner: Comparative Studies

Understanding the impact of Dostoevsky's literary heritage on the development of world literature, and, in particular, his undoubted influence on Faulkner's artistic world, we consider the comparative analysis of the works of Dostoevsky and Faulkner to be a promising avenue of inquiry.

Existing comparative studies devoted to Dostoevsky and Faulkner can be exemplified by a number of works on a wide range of problems, such as: literary genre development (Dickens, Dostoevsky, and Faulkner) [Guerard]; types and functions of storytellers [Степанян, 1986]; detective story as parallel structure [Rabinowitz]; existential problems (Dostoevsky, Sartre, Camus, Faulkner) [Kellog]; religious feeling and religious commitment (Faulkner, Dostoyevsky, Werfel, and Bernanos) [Smith], literary meaning of kenosis [Rommel]; humor (Dostoevsky, Faulkner, and Beckett) [Pisani]; poetics of suicide [Abernathy]; duality [Bricker]; "accidental family"

(Dostoevsky) and ruined Southern family (Faulkner) [Банах-Маникина]; Dostoevsky's impact on southern writers (O'Connor, McCullers, and Faulkner) [Saxton], etc. As for Dostoevskian traditions in Faulkner's artistic world (the desire to explore the breadth of human moral nature, staging the man in extreme and exceptional circumstances, describing him in a state of moral search, intense internal struggle with himself, a pervasive psychology by using a "stream of consciousness" in the transmission of the spiritual life of the characters), one must acknowledge the works of a number of researchers [Анастасьев; Костяков; Николюкин; Романов, 2015; Сохряков; Степанян, 2010].

Underground Man and Perspectives of an Archetypal Approach

This article is devoted to another important area of comparative study devoted to the works of Dostoevsky and Faulkner, namely the reflection of Dostoevsky's Underground Man in Faulkner's work.

It must be noted that the "underground" is considered the key problem of Dostoevsky's works from his first novel, *Poor Folk* (1846), or the short story, *Mr. Prokharichin* (1846) [Романов, 2016], though it is in *Notes from Underground* (1864) where it was first properly expressed. *Notes from Underground* was a pivoting point in Dostoevsky's literary career; it became the prologue to his subsequent five novels. Furthermore, it is generally acknowledged that without this prologue, *Crime and Punishment*, *The Devils*, and *The Brothers Karamazov* cannot be properly understood [Розанов]. Moreover, the character of the Underground Man had a strong impact on the appearance of a number of "underground paradoxists" in the literature of the 20th century [Гарин, с. 370]; "the term 'underground man' has become part of the vocabulary of contemporary culture, and this character has now achieved – like Hamlet, Don Quixote, Don Juan, and Faust – the stature of one of the great archetypal literary creations" [Frank, p. 310].

In the "analytical psychology" of C. G. Jung, who developed the theory of archetypes from its foundations in ancient philosophy (the concept of "archetype" was borrowed from St Augustine), they are defined as the original, innate mental structures, images (motives) that make up the content of the so-called "collective unconscious" and underlie the universal human symbolism of dreams, myths and other creatures of fantasy, including art. Archetypes are not the images themselves; they are only models of images, their psychological premises, their opportunity. A prototype is only capable of receiving content characteristics when it is updated in consciousness and filled with the material of conscious experience. So, highlighting the Mother archetype, Jung noted that this archetype, like any other, "appears under an almost infinite variety of aspects" and mentioned only some typical forms: "the personal mother and grandmother, stepmother and mother-in-law", "a nurse or governess or perhaps a remote ancestress", "the goddess, and especially the Mother of God, the Virgin, and Sophia", "the Church, university, city or country, heaven, earth, the woods, the sea or any still waters, matter even, the underworld and the moon" [Jung, p. 15].

As S. Averintsev noted, although Jung tried to outline the systematics of archetypes, he still did not consistently reveal the interdependence of mythological images as products of primitive consciousness and archetypes, as elements of mental structures, sometimes understanding this interdependence as an analogy, or as an identity, rather than as the birth of one by another. Therefore, in later literature, this term was used simply to denote the most general, fundamental, and universal mythological motifs, the initial patterns of representations, which underlie any artistic (including mythological) structures, without requiring a mandatory connection with Jungism [Аверинцев].

In Russian literary criticism, the importance of an archetypal approach to understanding Russian literature (as part of world culture and for literary research in general) was noted. So, a hypothesis about the presence of a special Easter archetype and its special significance for Russian culture was put forward, and its manifestation in the novel *Crime and Punishment* was considered [Есаулов]; it was recognized that the categories of conciliarity, law, and grace, although not new in the thesaurus of Russian spiritual thought, had for the first time become categories of philological analysis [Захаров].

According to American scholars, Faulkner's attitude toward the "collective unconscious", due to his special creative temperament, personal experience and the experience of his family, incorporating a time period from the first conquerors to decadent civilization, gave rise to the complex symbolism in his works, "much of which is archetypal" [Kerr, p. 8]; Faulkner's major characters (Thomas Sutpen, Quentin Compson, and Joe Christmas) were studied in terms of the Jungian hero-archetype [Miller]; Flem Snopes's atmospheric rise to spectacular wealth and his ultimate demise at his own hands fits Faulkner's own heroic archetype [Bodmer].

To describe the embodiment of Dostoevsky's *Underground Man* in Faulkner's artistic world, we analyse *Notes from Underground* (where the core traits of the archetypal character of the *Underground Man* are presented and the archetypal model of the *Underground Man*'s behaviour is given) and consider Faulkner's *Sartoris* (the first really mature work of Faulkner) in terms of "underground" manifestation.

Underground Man as an Archetypal Character

The archetypal traits are manifested in the *Underground Man* at two levels of the embodiment of the "underground" phenomenon: in the broadest sense – at the level of general expression of an "underground" psychology; and in a narrow sense – at the level of the "underground" itself.

The *Underground Man* is distinguished by a tragic perception of life and a keen attention to its negative, ugly sides. Such a vision of the world puts him out of the ordinary; resentment towards life makes him a vulnerable outsider, a tragic loner. Opposed to the tragedy of being, in the mind of the *Underground Man*, is the Man-god consciousness with

the ideals of «всего прекрасного и высокого» [Достоевский, с. 102]¹, where the hero of the novella seeks to escape. From the height of «всего прекрасного и высокого», «непосредственные люди и деятели» [Там же, с. 101]² seem despicably low to him; inside the Underground Man, there is a desire to change their life in accordance with his own aesthetic ideals by subordinating everyone to his will (a kind of “Napoleon”, «деспот в душе» [Там же, с. 140]³). In real life, the Underground Man realizes his own discrepancy with the ideal (this contradiction causes his duality – the tragic split of his consciousness) and therefore betrays self-punishment, self-abasement. His position in society is even lower than the position of a “normal” person despised by him. It should be noted that this is one of the metaphorical meanings of the “underground”, which is revealed through cyclically mediated antinomies: “direct persons and men of action” – “sublime and beautiful” – “underground” – “direct persons and men of action”. The act of voluntary self-abasement is crucial for the “underground” phenomenon in this cycle. So, it becomes obvious that “underground” is a synonym for self-abasement. Another metaphorical meaning of “underground” can be described as something which is hidden and does not immediately open. The Underground Man was panicky, afraid that others (society people) could get to know about the meanness of his non-compliance with the “hero”, so the desire to hide his true “I” becomes one of the most important tasks for him. In order to hide his essence, the Underground Man constantly wore masks of the “spiteful official”, the “independent” or the “proud” one, and the “gentleman”; without a mask, his appearance in the world was unthinkable. The constant wearing of masks, the struggle of his living personality with the Man-god consciousness caused bitterness, non-acceptance of the world around him and its curse, and gave rise to his desire to leave, to find peace. This peace, removing him from the outside world, was his transition “underground”.

This transition was made gradually, but its inevitable result was that the inner world of the Underground Man turned out to be directed exclusively inwards. This circumstance entailed a change in his consciousness, making it “underground”, i. e. perverted. Having abandoned the «живую жизнь» [Там же, с. 176]⁴, the Underground Man began to look for its substitutes and find them. All his “underground” adventures, «темный, подземный, гадкий – не разврат, а развратишко» [Там же, с. 127]⁵, reading and daydreaming, “hugs” with the society represented by his headmaster Setochkin, etc. crowned with refined sadomasochism, give a clear description of the “underground” being. Plunging into the “underground” would not

¹ “of all that is ‘sublime and beautiful’” [Dostoevsky].

² “direct persons and men of action” [Dostoevsky].

³ “a tyrant at heart” [Dostoevsky].

⁴ “living life” [Dostoevsky].

⁵ “loathsome vice of the pettiest kind” [Dostoevsky].

have been possible without the philosophical justification of this anti-faith – the totally corrupting militant rationalism which constitutes the core of cynical amorality – fundamentals of the “underground”. The aesthetic justification of the “underground” was to give personal humiliation a poetic form; in this aesthetization there lies «сок того странного наслаждения» [Достоевский, с. 105]⁶; «наслаждение... от слишком яркого сознания своего унижения» [Там же, с. 102]⁷. Being “underground”, Dostoevsky’s character gradually loses many of his human traits, his personality traits, and becomes consistent with his own definition of “underground” («нравственное растление в углу» [Там же, с. 178]⁸). Voluntarily depriving himself of a “living life”, the Underground Man is not able to restrain his appeal to “gentlemen”, to an imaginary audience: «Разве можно человека без дела на сорок лет одного оставлять?» [Там же, с. 121]⁹. Possessing the gift of a thinker, he sees the problem of the “underground” for many people isolated in society. He realizes that it is not the “underground” that is better, but something else that will open, perhaps, to people, but only after his death.

Thus, the “underground” should be understood as the alienation of the inner life of the individual from the spiritual being of other people; as the impossibility of the contact of souls, which occurs only in communication with society; as the rejection and cursing of the world. The “underground” is the orientation of the inner world of the individual towards himself; it is egocentrism, amorality, the decomposition of all human qualities and, ultimately, the spiritual death of a person.

Being the bearer (“in his soul”) of the anti-Christian state – the “underground” and, following in his mind an invariable, “mathematical” model of “underground” behavior, the Underground Man undoubtedly goes beyond the novella *Notes from Underground* and acts as an archetypal character that significantly influenced all subsequent works of Dostoevsky and world literature as a whole.

Faulkner’s *Sartoris* as a Reflection of “Underground”

The significance of *Sartoris* for Faulkner’s work is as difficult to overestimate as the significance of *Notes from Underground* for Dostoevsky’s: the novella of the Russian writer was a precursor of his five great novels, and *Sartoris* (published in a shortened form after being rejected by eleven publishers) was the beginning of the immortal Yoknapatawpha saga.

It should be noted that unlike in *Notes from Underground*, in *Sartoris*, there is no character that embodies the “underground” phenomenon in the same way as the Underground Man. Nevertheless, it is obvious that in the

⁶ “the savor of that strange enjoyment” [Dostoevsky].

⁷ “enjoyment... from the too intense consciousness of one’s own degradation” [Dostoevsky].

⁸ “morally rotting in the corner” [Dostoevsky].

⁹ “How can a man be left with nothing to do for forty years?” [Dostoevsky].

characters of Faulkner's *Sartoris*, there is an expression of traits inherent in the archetypal character of Dostoevsky's Underground Man.

The book opens with a meeting of two old men – Bayard and Falls – over who hangs “the spirit of the dead man” – the father of old Bayard Sartoris, a legendary person, who left an indelible mark on the minds of those remembering him. This spirit of the late Colonel John Sartoris, Faulkner persistently repeats (three times in one paragraph) is “far more palpable” [Faulkner, p. 1–2] than old Bayard and Falls.

Thus, the past in the novel looks more alive than those living. Colonel John Sartoris is described as a giant, while those living in the present, old Bayard and Falls, seem to be “punier things” [Ibid., p. 2]. Faulkner's idealization of the past (“Southern Myth” [Howe]) is obvious, and this idealization is extremely important when considering his work in terms of the embodiment of the “underground”: there is a parallelism between the “Southern Myth” and the “sublime and beautiful” of the Underground Man; both phenomena are used to become a kind of “Napoleon” and rise above others.

It should be noted that the realization of the “underground” in Faulkner's novel can be found in a number of characters, but it is young Bayard Sartoris in whom it can be most clearly traced.

Young Bayard Sartoris

Like many characters of the novel, young Bayard is undoubtedly charged with idealizing the glorious past of the South. Bayard is the most tragic figure in the novel, and his tragedy is stipulated by psychological splitting. This character is the closest to Dostoevsky's Underground Man. Bayard's very first appearance in the novel is of an “underground” nature – his meeting with old Bayard on the threshold of his native home takes place in the late evening, as if “sneakin’”. According to old Bayard's coachman and butler, Simon, young Bayard was “sneakin’ into town on de ve’y railroad his own gran-pappy built, jes’ like he wuz trash” [Faulkner, p. 5]. It is symbolic that, on arriving by the two o'clock train and jumping not onto the platform, but on the “wrong side” of the car, Bayard immediately “lit out though de woods” [Ibid.] (as Simon said) to the cemetery, where his twin brother John had been buried. Making his way to the cemetery, he thought, first of all, about his brother fallen in battle right before his eyes. After his twin brother's death, Bayard returns from the war spiritually dead – which is why, barely stepping on his native land, he goes to the cemetery.

Brother John reflects Bayard's desire and even the (somewhat mythological in his memories) embodiment of an ideal, while Bayard himself is largely inferior to John. There is a parallelism of oppositions of names in the novel: the opposition of twins' names John (“sublime”) and Bayard (“down to earth”) is a reflection of the other opposition – John Sartoris (“ineradicable”) and old Bayard (referring to “punier things”). And while the legendary Colonel John Sartoris and old Bayard are at least formally somewhat separated in time, the twin brothers placed in the same

temporary stream are adjacent and even more vividly show the tragedy of the Southern Myth.

Everything that happened to Bayard upon his return home is evidence of the extinction of the ideal his dead brother embodied and to which Bayard, even in his disbelief, sought. Probably, while his brother was alive, Bayard was still in a certain spiritual balance. The fortitude of his brother John was the same as that of his great ancestor, John Sartoris (“ineradicable”); for the young Bayard, it was only an aesthetic ideal, to which, by family tradition, although he aspired (not to concede to his more valiant brother), but could not fully believe. In his hesitations from ideal to unbelief, he, deep down, considered the ideal to be simply stupid.

Amoralism makes Bayard’s perception of the world tragically gloomy, and in this way he is very close to Dostoevsky’s *Underground Man*. Upon arriving home after his visit to the cemetery, young Bayard comes out to his grandfather “from the lilac bushes beside the garden fence” as “a tall shape”; “His eyesockets were cavernous shadows” [Faulkner, p. 43]. And through this spiritual emptiness he will have to come into contact with the life of his native town, to which he has already become alien; it seems to him an absurd, gloomy pile.

The *Underground Man* escaped from reality by diving into the “sublime and beautiful”. Bayard does not have such an opportunity because, with the death of his brother, the ideal is destroyed. An alternative to life for him is a chain of crazy actions in which he is involved because of his inconsistency with the ideal. Bayard cannot help realizing that the madness carrying him away will entail victims. He also knows that the first and most probable victim is going to be himself. He anticipates the coming physical and spiritual pain, which will arrive with a feeling of emptiness after the meaninglessness of perfect and unnecessary victories. With that greater force young Bayard is drawn into madness, and in this madness, a kind of “strange enjoyment” of his own degradation, similar to the one felt by the *Underground Man*.

For Bayard, an alternative to alienation could be unity with nature in the circle of ordinary, repetitive concerns of the white master: “For a time the earth held him in a hiatus that might have been called contentment” [Ibid., p. 203]. But even then, Bayard could not completely get rid of the fear that haunted him since the war, turning him into a “trapped beast” (the feeling of fear is compared with bouts of nausea), and after having “found himself with nothing to do” his “contentment” gave way to a sense of “savage despair” with “the lost valleys, among black and savage stars” [Ibid., p. 205].

And the accident, when Bayard’s racing car crashed, was not slow to occur. It was an eventual reflection of Bayard’s spiritual state. And soon, in a new accident, his grandfather (old Bayard) dies in a racing car and thus, eventually brings Bayard to the finish line of his own death.

It overtakes him far from home: Bayard agrees to test a dubious aircraft dooming himself to death in advance under the entreaties of a mad inventor.

Old Bayard Sartoris

Old Bayard belongs to the “punier things” and, therefore, does not have enough of the qualities of Colonel John Sartoris (“ineradicable”). It is symbolic that he dies “inside out” – of a heart attack in his grandson’s car, and not, like many of the Sartoris family, in the saddle, of a bullet, or because of military wounds.

At the same time, old Bayard constantly hears the breath of his father. He is all in the grip of the past and would probably like to live up to his glorious ideals. But he, like young Bayard, is not given the opportunity to approach his father, John Sartoris (“ineradicable”). In his symbolically long, colorless life, old Bayard suffers only defeats, although he seems to still belong to the “fathers” of the town and, according to tradition, is “saluted” by “one or two passers... and a merchant or so in the adjacent doorways... with a sort of florid servility” [Faulkner, p. 3]. There are many defeats in his real life. So, his own grandson, like “gasoline-propelled paupers” (whom Colonel Sartoris wouldn’t give a cent from his bank), puts a long rumbling monster into the seemingly unshakable way of life of old Bayard – the car in which he eventually dies. Representatives of the white “trash”, the Snopes family, penetrate the Sartoris bank, and old Bayard is not able to do anything. The only thing he can do is to seem even more deaf, to go into symbolic deafness, as if into a tower of ivory (“his deafness seemed more pronounced than usual” [Ibid., p. 93]. The walls of this tower can be manifested either by loud conversations of completely deaf old men – Bayard and Falls, or by a monumental walking triad (Bayard, a horse, and an old setter), or by frequent immersions in the peace and silence of “ancient disused things” [Ibid., p. 89] in the attic of his own house.

The life of old Bayard looks hopeless, meaningless. The window, where they sit with Falls, opens onto the wasteland of “rubbish and dusty weeds” [Ibid., p. 219] which is their life horizon. Old Bayard’s tower of deafness is, thus, a symbol of the “underground” associated with death.

Narcissa and Horace Benbow

A characteristic feature of Narcissa, repeatedly mentioned by Faulkner throughout the novel, is her “aura of grave and serene repose in which she dwelt” [Faulkner, p. 93]. Even assuming that Narcissa does not live in the past, it seems obvious that, in her “serenity”, she clearly does not exist in the present either.

The main characteristic of Horace Benbow is infantilism, “fine and delicate futility” [Ibid., p. 161]. After arriving in his native town with “an astonishing impedimenta of knapsacks and kit bags and paper-wrapped parcels” [Ibid.] making up a glass-blowing apparatus (a “military” trophy from Europe), Horace instantly hides in the shell of his house among cedars reliably protecting him from reality. His profession, as a lawyer (capable of providing money), serves as a material wall separating him from the world. And soon he is building a speculative love castle with a married, but bored woman called Belle. Due to this, a temporary gap occurs between

brother and sister. Narcissa who has been accustomed to pushing Horace away since she was a child (in his childhood, if Horace was naughty, he was threatened with complaints being passed on to Narcissa) cannot accept the fact that he “had definitely gone his way” [Faulkner, p. 258], that is, turned to Bell. And Bell enveloped “him like a rich and fatal drug, like a motionless and cloying sea in which he watched himself drown” [Ibid., p. 257].

Thus, both Narcissa and Horace are alienated in the house among cedars under which grass never grows and insects are never found. Its symbols are dusk and ever-growing daffodils scattered around. This house is a literal case, which, according to the ethics of Horace, contains the meaning of the world.

In the relationship between Horace and Bell, and Narcissa and young Bayard, the carnival of alienation is realized when Horace and Narcissa begin to play new roles: Horace acts as a kind of philosopher near “tragic and young and familiar with a haunting sense of loss” [Ibid., p. 195] Bell, and Narcissa, appearing as a nurse, try to envelop the insensible young Bayard with waves of affection.

* * *

The reflection of the “underground” phenomenon in Faulkner’s *Sartoris* is as follows. Firstly, it should be recognized that the idealization of the past embodied in *Sartoris* is functionally similar to the “sublime and beautiful” of Dostoevsky’s Underground Man. Both the idealized past and “sublime and beautiful” contributed to the spiritual alienation of the “underground” characters from a “living life” and led them into the world of illusions. Therefore, there is no doubt that the daydreaming and “heroics” of the Underground Man, like the “heroics” of young Bayard, the symbolic deafness of old Bayard, the serenity of Narcissa, and the infantilism and desire to hide from life in a house surrounded by cedars of her brother Horace all have the same function. All these serve the alienation generated by idealizations diverging from a “living life”. These characters (with the exception of young Bayard) can be considered “underground” in a broad sense.

Secondly, young Bayard, like Dostoevsky’s Underground Man, tragically realizes his inconsistency with the ideal and mercilessly executes himself. The things that young Bayard does in order to conform to the ideal are doomed to failure in advance, similar to those attempted by the Underground Man, and, ultimately, bring him only physical and moral suffering. Thus, as is typical for the “underground,” enjoyment from too intense consciousness of self-degradation is realized.

Thirdly, the tragic split of consciousness inherent in “underground” characters found its embodiment in the novel. So, young Bayard wears a mask of a brave man to conceal from others his discrepancy with the ideals of patrimonial honor and, moreover, his own spiritual failure; in his split consciousness, there is an incessant tense dialogue bringing him to “underground” fatigue.

Finally, complete spiritual alienation (when young Bayard “doesn't seem to be glad, or sorry, or anything” [Faulkner, p. 298]) is inevitably associated by Faulkner not only with spiritual, but also physical death. We consider young Bayard to be a proper “underground” character, or a voice of the “underground” itself.

Thus, we note the broad realization of the “underground” phenomenon in Faulkner's *Sartoris*: idealization, inconsistency with the ideal, self-punishment and self-humiliation, alienation, moral decay, spiritual and physical death.

Список литературы

Аверинцев С. С. Архетипы // Мифы народов мира : энциклопедия : в 2 т. М. : Сов. энцикл., 1980. Т. 1. С. 110–111.

Анастасьев Н. А. Владелец Йокнапатофы (Уильям Фолкнер). М. : Книга, 1991. 416 с.

Банах-Маникина А. В. Образ «случайного семейства» в восприятии У. Фолкнера (роман «Авессалом, Авессалом!») // Вестн. Томск. гос. ун-та : бюллетень оперативной научной информации (теоретические и прикладные аспекты литературоведения). 2006. № 80. С. 6–16.

Гарин И. И. Многоликий Достоевский. М. : Терра, 1997. 396 с.

Достоевский Ф. М. Полное собрание сочинений : в 30 т. Л. : Наука, 1972–1990. Т. 5. 407 с.

Есаулов И. А. Пасхальный архетип в поэтике Достоевского // Евангельский текст в русской литературе XVIII–XX веков : цитата, реминисценция, мотив, сюжет, жанр : сб. науч. тр. / отв. ред. В. Н. Захаров. Петрозаводск : Изд-во ПетрГУ, 1998. Вып. 2. С. 349–362.

Захаров В. Н. Православные аспекты этнопоэтики русской литературы // Евангельский текст в русской литературе XVIII–XX веков : цитата, реминисценция, мотив, сюжет, жанр : сб. науч. тр. / отв. ред. В. Н. Захаров. Петрозаводск : Изд-во ПетрГУ, 1998. Вып. 2. С. 5–30.

Костяков В. А. Фолкнер и Достоевский // Американская литература : Проблемы романтизма и реализма. Краснодар : [Б. и.], 1973. Вып. 2. С. 86–99.

Николюкин А. Н. Уроки мастерства (Достоевский и Фолкнер) // Лит. учеба. 1987. № 1. С. 159–165.

Розанов В. В. Одна из замечательных идей Достоевского // Розанов В. В. О писательстве и писателях : собр. соч. М. : Республика, 1995. С. 487–494.

Романов Ю. А. О традициях Ф. М. Достоевского в творчестве У. Фолкнера // Уч. зап. Петрозаводск. гос. ун-та. 2015. № 5. С. 52–56.

Романов Ю. А. «Подполье» господина Прохарчина // Russian Literature. 2016. Vol. 86. P. 67–78. DOI 10.1016/j.ruslit.2016.11.004.

Сохряков Ю. И. Традиции Достоевского в восприятии Т. Вулфа, У. Фолкнера и Д. Стейнбека // Достоевский : Материалы и исслед. Л. : Наука, 1980. Вып. 4. С. 144–158.

Степанян К. А. К истории повествовательных форм (на материале произведений Ф. М. Достоевского и У. Фолкнера) // Контекст 1985 : лит.-теорет. исслед. М. : Наука, 1986. С. 74–101.

Степанян К. А. Явление и диалог в романах Ф. М. Достоевского. СПб. : Крига, 2010. 400 с.

Abernathy K. L. The Poetics of Suicide: A Search for Meaning : Dis. ... Doctor of Philosophy in Literature. Ann Arbor : [S. n.], 2000. 284 p.

Bloshteyn M. R. “Anguish for the Sake of Anguish” – Faulkner and His Dostoevskian Allusion // The Faulkner J. Vol. 19. 2004. № 2. P. 69–90.

- Bodmer M. J.* Monumentalizing Flem's Footprints: Flem Snopes as Archetypal Hero in William Faulkner's Snopes Trilogy : Thesis ... MA in English. Ann Arbor : [S. n.], 2013. 104 p.
- Bricker E. S.* Duality in the Novels of William Faulkner and Fyodor Dostoevsky : Dis. ... Doctor of Philosophy in English Language and Literature. Ann Arbor : [S. n.], 1971. 327 p.
- Chapple R. L.* Character Parallels in Crime and Punishment and Sanctuary // *Germano-Slavica* : A Canadian J. of Germanic and Slavic Comparative Studies. Vol. 2. 1976/78. № 1. P. 5–14.
- Critical Essays on William Faulkner : The Sartoris Family / ed. by A. F. Kinney. Boston : G. K. Hall, 1985. 374 p.
- Dostoevsky F.* Notes from the Underground // The Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation : [website]. URL: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/600/600-h/600-h.htm#chap0103> (accessed: 08.10.2021).
- Faulkner W.* Sartoris. L. : Chatto & Windus, 1954. 380 p.
- Frank J.* Dostoevsky: The Stir of Liberation, 1860–1865. Princeton, N. J. : Princeton Univ. Press, 1986. XVI, 395 p.
- Guerard A. J.* The Triumph of the Novel: Dickens, Dostoevsky, Faulkner. N. Y. : Oxford Univ. Press, 1976. 365 p.
- Gwynn F. L., Blotner J. L.* Faulkner in the University : A Classroom Conference // *College English*. Vol. 19. 1957. № 1. P. 1–6.
- Howe I.* The Southern Myth and William Faulkner // *American Quarterly*. Vol. 3. 1951. № 4. P. 357–362.
- Jung C. G.* Four Archetypes : (from Vol. 9, Part 1 of the Collected Works of C. G. Jung). Princeton, N. J. : Princeton Univ. Press, 2010. IX, 175 p.
- Kellog J. D.* Dark Prophets of Hope: Dostoevsky, Sartre, Camus, Faulkner. Chicago : Loyola Univ. Press, 1975. VIII, 200 p.
- Kerr E. M.* William Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha. A Kind of Keystone in the Universe. N. Y. : Fordham Univ. Press, 1985. 438 p.
- Miller B. B.* William Faulkner's Thomas Sutpen, Quentin Compson, Joe Christmas: a Study of the Hero-archetype : Dis. ... Doctor of Philosophy in Literature. Ann Arbor : [S. n.], 1977. VI, 157 p.
- Pisani A. S.* The Raging Impotence: Humour in the Novels of Dostoevsky, Faulkner and Beckett : Dis. ... Doctor of Philosophy. Ann Arbor : [S. n.], 1976. 277 p.
- Rabinowitz P. J.* The Click of the Spring: The Detective Story as Parallel Structure in Dostoevsky and Faulkner // *Modern Philology*. 1978/1979. № 76. P. 355–369.
- Rommel L. D.* A Poetics of Shame, and the Literary Meaning of Kenosis : Dis. ... Doctor of Philosophy in Literature. Ann Arbor : [S. n.], 2004. 298 p.
- Saxton B.* Grotesque Subjects: Dostoevsky and Modern Southern Fiction, 1930–1960 : Dis. ... Doctor of Philosophy. Ann Arbor : [S. n.], 2012. 205 p.
- Smith J.* Religious Feeling and Religious Commitment in Faulkner, Dostoyevsky, Werfel and Bernanos. L. : Routledge, 2016. 306 p.
- Weisgerber J.* Faulkner's Monomaniacs: Their Indebtedness to Raskolnikov // *Comparative Literature Studies*. Vol. 5. 1968. № 2. P. 181–193.

References

- Abernathy, K. L. (2000). *The Poetics of Suicide: A Search for Meaning*. Dis. ... Doctor of Philosophy in Literature. Ann Arbor, S. n. 284 p.
- Anastas'ev, N. A. (1991). *Vladelets Ioknapatofy (Uil'yam Folkner)* [The Owner of Yoknapatawpha (William Faulkner)]. Moscow, Kniga. 416 p.
- Avertintsev, S. S. (1980). Arkhetipy [Archetypes]. In *Mify narodov mira. Entsiklopediya v 2 t.* Moscow, Sovetskaya entsiklopediya. Vol. 1, pp. 110–111.
- Banakh-Manikina, A. V. (2006). Obraz “sluchainogo semeistva” v vospriyatii U. Folknera (roman “Avešsalom, Avešsalom!”) [The Type of an “Accidental Family” as Perceived by W. Faulkner (the *Absalom, Absalom!* Novel)]. In *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Byulleten' operativnoi nauchnoi informatsii (teoreticheskie i prikladnye aspekty literaturovedeniya)*. No. 80, pp. 6–16.

Bloshteyn, M. R. (2004). "Anguish for the Sake of Anguish" – Faulkner and his Dostoevskian Allusion. In *The Faulkner Journal*. Vol. 19. No. 2, pp. 69–90.

Bodmer, M. J. (2013). *Monumentalizing Flem's Footprints: Flem Snopes as Archetypal Hero in William Faulkner's Snopes Trilogy*. Thesis ... MA in English. Ann Arbor, S. n. 104 p.

Bricker, E. S. (1971). *Duality in the Novels of William Faulkner and Fyodor Dostoevsky*. Dis. ... Doctor of Philosophy in English Language and Literature. Ann Arbor, S. n. 327 p.

Chapple, R. L. (1976/78). Character Parallels in Crime and Punishment and Sanctuary. In *Germano-Slavica. A Canadian J. of Germanic and Slavic Comparative Studies*. Vol. 2. No. 1, pp. 5–14.

Dostoevsky, F. Notes from the Underground. In *The Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation* [website]. URL: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/600/600-h/600-h.htm#chap0103> (accessed: 08.10.2021).

Dostoevsky, F. M. (1972–1990). *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v 30 t.* [Complete Works. 30 Vols.]. Leningrad, Nauka. Vol. 5. 407 p.

Esaulov, I. A. (1998). Paskhal'nyi arkhetyip v poetike Dostoevskogo [Easter Archetype in Poetics of Dostoevsky]. In Zakharov, V. N. (Ed.). *Evangel'skii tekst v russkoi literature XVIII–XX vekov: itisata, reministsentsiya, motiv, syuzhet, zhanr. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov*. Petrozavodsk, Izdatel'sto Petrozavodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Iss. 2, pp. 349–362.

Faulkner, W. (1954). *Sartoris*. L., Chatto & Windus. 380 p.

Frank, J. (1986). *Dostoevsky: The Stir of Liberation, 1860–1865*. Princeton, N. J., Princeton Univ. Press. XV, 395 p.

Garin, I. I. (1997). *Mnogolikii Dostoevskii* [The Many Faces of Dostoevsky]. Moscow, Terra. 396 p.

Guerard, A. J. (1976). *The Triumph of the Novel: Dickens, Dostoevsky, Faulkner*. N. Y., Oxford Univ. Press. 365 p.

Gwynn, F. L., Blotner, J. L. (1957). Faulkner in the University: A Classroom Conference. In *College English*. Vol. 19. No. 1, pp. 1–6.

Howe, I. (1951). The Southern Myth and William Faulkner. In *American Quarterly*. Vol. 3. No. 4, pp. 357–362.

Jung, C. G. (2010). *Four Archetypes: (from Vol. 9, Part 1 of the Collected Works of C. G. Jung)*. Princeton, N. J., Princeton Univ. Press. IX, 175 p.

Kellog, J. D. (1975). *Dark Prophets of Hope: Dostoevsky, Sartre, Camus, Faulkner*. Chicago, Loyola Univ. Press. VIII, 200 p.

Kerr, E. M. (1985). *William Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha. A Kind of Keystone in the Universe*. N. Y., Fordham Univ. Press. 438 p.

Kinney, A. F. (Ed.). (1985). *Critical Essays on William Faulkner: The Sartoris Family*. Boston, G. K. Hall. 374 p.

Kostyakov, V. A. (1973). Folkner i Dostoevskii [Faulkner and Dostoevsky]. In *Amerikanskaya literatura. Problemy romantizma i realizma*. Krasnodar, S. n. Iss. 2, pp. 86–99.

Miller, B. B. (1977). *William Faulkner's Thomas Sutpen, Quentin Compson, Joe Christmas: A Study of the Hero-archetype*. Dis. ... Doctor of Philosophy in Literature. Ann Arbor, S. n. VI, 157 p.

Nikolyukin, A. N. (1987). Uroki masterstva (Dostoevskii i Folkner) [Lessons of Pencraft (Dostoevsky and Faulkner)]. In *Literaturnaya ucheba*. No. 1, pp. 159–165.

Pisani, A. S. (1976). *The Raging Impotence: Humour in the Novels of Dostoevsky, Faulkner and Beckett*. Dis. ... Doctor of Philosophy. Ann Arbor, S. n. 277 p.

Rabinowitz, P. J. (1978/1979). The Click of the Spring: The Detective Story as Parallel Structure in Dostoevsky and Faulkner. In *Modern Philology*. No. 76, pp. 355–369.

Romanov, Yu. A. (2016). "Podpol'e" gospodina Prokharchina [Mr. Procharč'in's "Underground"]. In *Russian Literature*. Vol. 86, pp. 67–78. DOI 10.1016/j.ruslit.2016.11.004.

Romanov, Yu. A. (2015). O traditsiyakh F. M. Dostoevskogo v tvorchestve U. Folknera [On F. M. Dostoevsky's Traditions in W. Faulkner's Works]. In *Uchenye zapiski Petrozavodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. No. 5, pp. 52–56.

Rommel, L. D. (2004). *A Poetics of Shame, and the Literary Meaning of Kenosis*. Dis. ... Doctor of Philosophy in Literature. Ann Arbor, S. n. 298 p.

Rozanov, V. V. (1995). Odná iz zamechatel'nykh idei Dostoevskogo [One of Dostoevsky's Great Ideas]. In Rozanov, V. V. *O pisatel'stve i pisatelyakh. Sobranie sochinenii*. Moscow: Respublika, pp. 487–494.

Saxton, B. (2012). *Grotesque Subjects: Dostoevsky and Modern Southern Fiction, 1930–1960*. Dis. ... Doctor of Philosophy. Ann Arbor, S. n. 205 p.

Smith, J. (2016). *Religious Feeling and Religious Commitment in Faulkner, Dostoyevsky, Werfel and Bernanos*. L., Routledge. 306 p.

Sokhryakov, Yu. I. (1980). Traditsii Dostoevskogo v vospriyatii T. Vulfa, U. Folknera i D. Steinbeka [Dostoevsky's Traditions in the Perception of T. Wolfe, W. Faulkner, and D. Steinbeck]. In *Dostoevskii. Materialy i issledovaniya*. Leningrad, Nauka. Iss. 4, pp. 144–158.

Stepanyan, K. A. (1986). K istorii povestvovatel'nykh form (na materiale proizvedenii F. M. Dostoevskogo i U. Folknera) [On the History of Narrative Forms (Based on the Works of F.M. Dostoevsky and W. Faulkner)]. In *Kontekst 1985. Literaturno-teoreticheskie issledovaniya*. Moscow, Nauka, pp. 74–101.

Stepanyan, K. A. (2010). *Yavlenie i dialog v romanakh F. M. Dostoevskogo* [The Manifestation of Christ and the Dialogue in F. M. Dostoevsky's Novels]. St Petersburg, Kruga. 400 p.

Weisgerber, J. (1968). Faulkner's Monomaniacs: Their Indebtedness to Raskolnikov. In *Comparative Literature Studies*. Vol. 5. No. 2, pp. 181–193.

Zakharov, V. N. (1998). Pravoslavnye aspekty etnopoetiki russkoi literatury [Orthodox Aspects of Ethno-Poetics of Russian Literature]. In Zakharov, V. N. (Ed.). *Evangel'skii tekst v russkoi literature XVIII–XX vekov: tsitata, reministsentsiya, motiv, syuzhet, zhanr. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov*. Petrozavodsk, Izdatel'sto Petrozavodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Iss. 2, pp. 5–30.

The article was submitted on 17.05.2020