

The Beautiful Death of Thérèse of Lisieux and the Sufferings of the Tubercular Self

Diana Neal

For those familiar with the themes of traditional female spirituality in the Christian West, the dreary saga of Thérèse Martin and her death at the age of twenty-four in 1897 can only come as a grim reminder of the symbolic burden by which women have carried in their persons the dualistic designation of the spirit at war against the flesh. In the past the story of Thérèse has divided the Catholic faithful between traditional adherents of her cult, and those who opposed it in the name of a more virile postVatican II spirituality. More recently interest in her has extended beyond its traditional bounds. Monica Furlong's biography, written from outside the Catholic community, provided a long overdue reappraisal of the young woman's ambiguous character, from a frankly feminist perspective.¹ Furlong concluded that the vitality and strength of determination typical of the young adult Thérèse has often been hidden from view by the sickly cult of weakness and submission that sprang up after her death.

Thérèse's asceticism, which has come to be known as the Little Way, is an asceticism which reaches its apogee in her uncomplaining spirituality of suffering and death. By the time Thérèse died, a few months short of her twenty-fifth birthday, she had developed a spirituality of the body which stood over against a theology of considerable insight. The orthodoxy of her assertion of the gratuity of divine love, and of her conclusion that God cannot be pleased by heroic effort, but accepts the imperfect human being without question of merit, is expressed with all the clarity and conviction of so distant a figure from her in time, if not altogether in temperament, as Martin Luther. But the profundity of her basic theological insight is not the subject of this article.

For modern readers it is Thérèse's dualistic conception of the relationship between body and spirit that settles so uneasily. And regrettably, it is this spirituality of body and spirit, of living and dying, which provides the oxymoronic vehicle for her more refined theological

speculations. My thesis is three-fold. I suggest that Thérèse's spirituality incorporates many of the themes common in women's spirituality in the Christian tradition. I go on to establish the interpretative context within which her death was perceived as that of the "beautiful death" of the nineteenth century. Thirdly and finally I reflect on the unreality of the "religious drama" in which Thérèse and her community of Carmelites acted out her final days. Suffice it to say that mine is a different reading of these events from theirs, in a different time, and from quite a different perspective.

That Thérèse should die of tuberculosis just before the turn of the present century potentially made her a very modern saint. Daniel Weinstein and Rudolph Bell² have convincingly demonstrated the paradigmatic shifts in the style of sainthood that require the interpreter of Thérèse to investigate the particular hagiographic model which she sought to emulate. Thérèse's style in fact recapitulated the body spirituality of the medieval period so ably expounded by Caroline Walker Bynum and others.³ Thérèse, however, set this body spirituality against a sentimentally romanticised modern theology of death and dying.

Some commentators, including Furlong, have noted the limitations of Thérèse's education and in her personal prospects as a woman of the late nineteenth century. Sackville-West has suggested that Thérèse, who was in fact under-educated by the bourgeois standards of her time, was also rather "low-brow"⁴, and that her sister, Pauline, in preparing the autobiography for a wider reading public than that for which it was originally intended, was aware of this problem, and did what she could to alleviate her sister's simplistic and, perhaps, ungrammatical style. But unless it can be said that the *Autobiography* is substantially Pauline's work, rather than that of Thérèse, little sign of the lowbrow nature of her thinking is immediately apparent. Her separately published *Letters* confirm Thérèse as an intelligence of some genius in her own right, and go some way in confirming her as the guiding spirit of the *Autobiography*.

Thérèse's spirituality of the body is, in many ways, a typical one of her age. In a letter to Pauline she refers to her body as the "envelope" which she compares negatively with the "letter" itself, the core of her subjectivity, the soul.⁵ The soul, she notes, is in exile here on earth and longs for freedom in order to enjoy the beatific vision of God in heaven. "How pleasant it is to see my destruction,"⁶ Pauline reports her as saying when examining the progress of emaciation as tuberculosis took its course. Thérèse is reconciled to a spirituality in which bodily suffering becomes the chief vehicle of the soul's reunion with the divine. In this,

her spirituality reaffirms the main emphases of medieval female spirituality. As Bynum notes,

To put it simply, the weight of the Western tradition had long told women that physicality was particularly their problem, nurturing particularly their opportunity. There is nothing specifically female about the late medieval concern with matter and body or about the extravagance of certain fourteenth and fifteenth century efforts at imitatio. Physicality as problem and opportunity was a basic theme throughout late medieval religiosity.⁷

Thérèse embraced physicality, as well, as a vehicle of the spirit, but we might think that she did so rather negatively, at the expense of her bodily well-being.

Despite the fact that Thérèse longed for spiritual greatness, longed to be ordained, to be martyred in the cause of the oriental missions, her Little Way was, in general, an acceptance of the constraints she suffered as a middle class woman of her times. They are constraints which had, by and large, been reinforced by the biases of a Christian spirituality of femininity. The main elements of this spirituality included an extreme sense of isolation, in this case behind the walls of Carmel from the age of fifteen. Such isolation was, on the other hand, only an exaggeration of the isolation experienced normally by women in nineteenth century provincial French society. Thérèse refers time and again to her "littleness", to her lack of talent and greatness, even though "greatness" and "virility" had been attained by the mother foundress of the discalced Carmelites, Teresa. Of Teresa, a contemporary chronicler said:

This woman ceased to be a woman, restoring herself to the virile state to her greater glory than if she had been a man from the beginning, for she rectified nature's error with her virtue, transforming herself through virtue into the bone from which she sprang.⁸

But Teresa herself was apparently convinced that such greatness was rare in her own sex, which she strategically and relentlessly undermined.⁹ Teresa's namesake, Thérèse, it is clear, suffered from the social constraints of femininity, but sought, through a kind of *via negativa* to remake frustrated ambition into positive virtue, albeit of the "very little"¹⁰ variety. Thérèse stresses her weakness and powerlessness as the mother foundress had done, but, unable to become a strong man, exults in enfeeblement. Isolated from secular society, isolated even within ecclesiastical society, she suffers doubly from being voiceless. But voicelessness becomes, for her, only an aspect of weakness and littleness. As her disease takes hold, the remnant of her voice is

physically muffled as well. Unable to breathe, she is unable to speak:

I'll suffocate one night, I feel it!¹¹

she says and,

At each breathe I suffer violently. But not to the point of crying.¹²

She regresses into a spiritual and material infancy until

There's no longer anything but bed for baby... Everything—
everything makes her suffer.¹³

Her sister Pauline, whom she variously addresses as “Mama” and as “Little Mother”, remarks on her singular capacity for suffering.¹⁴ It was this suffering which Thérèse embraced as a vocation, as the “other aspect” of being a woman in her Age. As Chris Shilling says in *The Body and Social Theory*,

The arguments about the physical frailty of women were brought together and crystallised into a model of health and illness in the eighteenth century which held that lifestyle and social position were closely related to a person's bodily capacities. The lesson drawn from this model was that women's bodies made them fit only for the production and care of children and the 'creation of a natural morality' through family life.¹⁵

Without such a rationale, Thérèse's health and, indeed, her life, might be deemed expendable. As she says to her sister shortly before her death,

Oh, no, we are not unfortunate when we're dying from our sickness. How strange it is to fear death!...But when we're married, when we have a husband and children this is understandable; but I who haven't anything!¹⁶

The little child who had deliberately chosen not to grow up so as to refuse the biological reproductive capacities of an adult woman, would maintain her infantile dependency on Jesus, in whose arms she could rest and sleep. Death was her vocation, to which her useless woman's body could only be magnetically attracted. And all this was accomplished with a surrealistic cheerfulness which appears as a refusal realistically to confront her negative feelings of the horrific approach of an early death. Perhaps we can speculate that to accept the negativity of her feelings would be too much like accepting the essential ambiguity of a human rather than an angelic existence, to which she aspired.

Very often I give beautiful smiles that are lost on 'Bonne' and the others.¹⁷

And,

Yes whenever I can I do my best to be cheerful in order to please you.¹⁸

Her sense of insignificance, then, what we might describe nowadays as a poor sense of self, her progressive voicelessness, her renunciation of the health of a dysfunctional female body, the requisite cheerfulness and the need to please, all these made hers a spirituality of femininity. Paradoxically, however, she appears anxious to leave this life so as the sooner to recapture some of the comforts, pleasures and securities of her childhood. By the time she succumbed to TB, her parents and some of her siblings were already dead. Just as a religious vocation appealed to the Martin sisters as a way of peopling Carmel with close blood relations, so Thérèse's understanding of heaven was in keeping with the preconceptions of nineteenth century Catholic religiosity.

As Philippe Ariès explains¹⁹ the two essential elements of the beautiful death were happiness and a family reunion around the bedside of the dying person. Thérèse was convinced, like many in her Age, that paradise was already populated with those who had gone before her. Writing to her aunt, Mme. Guérin, she declares:

What happiness, darling Aunt, if our whole family went to heaven on the same day. I fancy I see you smile, perhaps you think it is an honour not reserved for us... What is certain is that all together, or one by one, we shall one day leave exile for the Homeland and there we shall rejoice at all these things of which 'heaven will be the reward...'²⁰

Thérèse, of course, had two families. It was from the bosom of her Carmelite family (which included three of her own sisters and a cousin) to her heavenly family that the tubercular disease was finally to deliver her. Nevertheless, it is clear that Thérèse, like many of her contemporaries, had lost a fear of the Last Things. The horrors of Purgatory and of Hell itself were all but negated by the vastness of God's love. And if she did not explicitly deny their possibility, they were not to be experienced by the famille Martin. A daughterly and sisterly sense of duty and affection, then, also made hers a spirituality of femininity. The degree to which her hopes for the future were centred in the family itself is a remarkable feature of Thérèse's Carmelite sentiments.

On the other hand, Thérèse's spirituality of bodily suffering incorporates other social codes and practices which extend beyond a spirituality of femininity to reflect elements of Romantic religiosity. Prominent in this sense is her expectation, if not desire, for an early

death, and a reciprocal ambition to transcend the physical envelope of the body in order to gain the pure consciousness of the soul, without which she would not expect to join the company of martyrs as a “victim of love”. In this she identifies with an early Christian notion of martyrdom articulated by Ignatius of Antioch before his own martyrdom. She says:

I'm thinking of the words of St. Ignatius of Antioch: 'I, too, must be ground down through suffering in order to become the wheat of God.'²¹

The slow but relentless progress of tuberculosis required only a total passivity on her own part, coupled with the affirmation of her Little Way, that full acceptance of “what God sends” is all that is necessary to release the exiled from her imprisonment in the body.

Nineteenth century conceptions of tuberculosis interpreted it as an eminently spiritual disease “in which the body was consumed.”²² But it was also a disease to which only certain personality types were assumed to fall victim, those like Thérèse who saw themselves as victims (even if of divine love itself), those who were highly passionate (if indeed only for divine love) and those who were repressed in sexual desire or social ambition. Furlong rightly notes the apparent absence of the erotic from Thérèse's spirituality²³, an absence which throws Pauline's own mystical eroticism into relief, and demonstrates her hand in editing the *Autobiography* and Thérèse's *Last Conversations*. Ultimately, the mythology of tuberculosis conceived of its victims as those immolated by love.

Fever in TB was a sign of an inward becoming, the tubercular is someone ‘consumed by ardor, that ardor leading to the dissolution of the body’.²⁴

But the tubercular was also one who lacked the *élan vital* sufficiently to survive, clearly so in the case of Thérèse, who not only embraces her disease, but who occasionally expresses impatience with the pace of its progress. She is careful, on the other hand, to add her compliance to the Will of God. The tubercular patient is, according to Sontag, “someone too sensitive to bear the horrors of the vulgar, everyday world”.²⁵ The disease is an “emblem of refinement,”²⁶ which isolates the victim from society and community, as it kills. Thérèse seeks out this total separation in confinement, asking even the night before she died that she be left alone in order not to disturb the community. Even in engaging the long process of dying, Thérèse seeks to isolate herself further from the consolation and warmth of human encounter, so that she may be “ground to the pure wheat of Christ,” the

pure spirit of her religious ambition.

Her conviction that human subjectivity, the essential “I”, was the equivalent of pure consciousness, unhindered by the body is, of course, at variance with contemporary criticisms of the Cartesian self. Hence, as Turner says:

To be a person is to be fundamentally bound into the body, but the body cannot be separated from the idea of conscious experiences of the world.²⁷

Turner here expresses the notion essential, in my opinion, even to orthodox Christian belief, that spirituality is reliant on the expressivity or creativity of the sensual body. In this view personality is dependent on the well being or health of the body to communicate through gesture and physical intimacy.²⁸ Thinking, indeed praying, is thought and prayed through the body.

Nevertheless, Thérèse’s contrary conviction provides a counter-rationale for her desire to escape embodiment. As her world is destroyed by the intense pain²⁹ of consumption, another purely spiritual world beckons. Shrinking her own body into itself releases the power of love. As Elaine Scarry has pointed out, the body in pain nullifies the claims of the everyday world in which it has once claimed its space, “clearing the path for entry of an unworldly, contentless force.”³⁰ This “self” of Thérèse, as partially constructed by the spirituality of femininity, is deconstructed by the material forces of the body in revolt against itself. Thérèse controls her pain, to some degree, by spiritualising it in the work of writing her Autobiography (for the spiritual benefit of her sisters) or in painting. In doing so she attempts to negate the spirituality of a shrinking universe. In doing so she remains this worldly. Characteristically, however, she is the sensitive, creative personality, engaged in the immolation of the old self, in order to fling herself into the arms of Love. She is wounded by victimising Love, in order to be reconstituted or healed as pure spirit.³¹ But the divine, in Thérèse’s notion, which victimises, is also itself Victim. And while she is unswerving in her insistence that Love can only be expressed through human suffering, she is full of pity for the divine Victim. She prefers crucifixes in which the Victim is already dead, beyond the possibility of suffering.

The progressive consuming, indeed spiritualising, of her body prepares her and her community for the climaxing event of her beautiful death. She looks forward to the day of her death, although she disapproves of her sister Pauline’s cruel and insistent speculation that she will die on a great feast day. She is, she insists, “too little” for such a

grand exit! She looks forward to the “agony of death”, not only because it will usher in the end of her earthy exile, but because it will prompt the ultimate in physical suffering. “I would not,” she says, “want to suffer less!”³² The Carmelite account of her final agony (of which Thérèse curiously seeks confirmation from the prioress) closely mirrors the great Romantic accounts of the beautiful death, as Ariès relates them. Although there are elements of what he refers to as the realism of the “dirty death”³³ of the late nineteenth century (just as elements of the “dirtiness” of the disease itself are sometimes present in the *Last Conversations*), the death of Thérèse is highly stylised and hagiographically modelled. In fact it is difficult to distinguish this Carmelite death from the lay deaths which Ariès discusses. hers was, as Pauline notes, “the most beautiful death which was ever seen at the Carmel of Lisieux.”³⁴ The body, wracked by breathlessness and fever, manages yet to smile at the assembled community, saving her last smile for her sister Céline. Clutching her crucifix and confirming her love of the divine Victim, she regains the “lily white complexion [she] always had in full health, her eyes were fixed above, brilliant with peace and joy.”³⁵ At the end, the agony stylistically incorporates elements of Pauline’s own favoured Teresian mysticism.

Looking at her Crucifix:

‘Oh! I love Him!...

‘My God...I love you...’

Suddenly, after having pronounced these words, she fell back, her head leaning to the right. Mother prioress had the infirmary bell rung very quickly to call back the community... The sisters had time to kneel down around her bed, and they were witnesses to the ecstasy of the little, dying saint. She made certain beautiful movements with her head as though someone had divinely wounded her with an arrow of love, then had withdrawn the arrow to wound her again...:

This ecstasy lasted almost the space of a Credo, and then she gave her last breath.³⁶

Like the heroines of Ariès’ accounts, Thérèse’s countenance is transfixed with a “heavenly smile” and in death she is “ravishingly beautiful”. Hagiographically, Pauline ends by noting the suppleness of the corpse’s limbs up to the time of her burial,³⁷ just as she notes the “fresh and intact”³⁸ nature of the triumphal palm buried with Thérèse and disinterred thirteen years later. And miraculously, Pauline comments, the body of the saint appeared to have regained its adolescence: “...we noticed she didn’t seem any more than twelve or thirteen years old.”³⁹ Such a device is common in early Christian

martyrologies, where the old, tortured bodies of the martyred regain the blush of youth, but it seems odd here. The intention of the hagiographer is, however, clear. The torture of the divine wound in suffering had been transformed in death by immortalising the body. Augustine of Hippo had speculated in the fifth century that the body would be resurrected at its ideal age—for him the age of thirty. How appropriate, then, for Thérèse of the Child Jesus to be immortalised at her ideal age, as a little child.

A comparison of Thérèse's death agony with Ariès' account is telling. The dying kiss the tortuously held crucifix. They die panting, not in agony, but as "...someone who is winning a race."⁴⁰ In the death agony they begin to regain their beauty, and they, like Thérèse, become angelic. Their deaths are spectacles which friends and family are loathe to miss.

Presence at the bedside in the nineteenth century is more than a customary participation in a social ritual; it is an opportunity to witness a spectacle that is both comforting and exalting.⁴¹

Ariès' conclusion, that in the Age of the beautiful death "Death has started to hide...concealing itself under the mark of beauty"⁴², is a remark which might be usefully explored in Theresian studies. For the overall impression with which one is left in reflecting on the life and death of Thérèse, is a massive refusal to bear up to the grimness and disappointment of human life; an inability to accept disappointment as a starting point in transforming the created, if imperfect, world of the One who was himself divine Victim. Thérèse seems to lack an ordinary adult sense of the seriousness of human life and suffering, which, in the end, may lead us to assume that we are dealing with someone who is merely playing games, not only with us, but with the divine Victim himself. She refers in her writings to the child Jesus as her playmate,⁴³ and I believe we must take her literally.

A close reading of the Thérésian texts reveals a young woman who is indelibly inscribed by the discourses of spiritual femininity and bodily suffering. She is emphatically not revealed to be unintelligent or simple. Her obvious knowledge and use of scripture in theological argument is impressive in one considered to be "undereducated", even by authorities like Furlong. But the power of the discourses which effectively shape her subjectivity, prevent her from facing the seriousness of human suffering, and place the character of the God who sends suffering in considerable moral doubt. Before she died Thérèse wondered what she would do with her new disembodied subjectivity in death. The answers she provides belie a curious playfulness in her encounter with her personal end.

I will come back;
I will spend my heaven doing good on earth.
You will see, it will be like a shower of roses.⁴⁴

Even if the hagiographic tone of these remarks is accounted for, noting the bonds which unite the communion of saints, both living and dead, they reveal a personality unaware that there was to be no second rerun of the religio-secular drama in which she found herself to be the main player. There are one or two intimations that she began to realise the seriousness of her situation shortly before her death. Her cousin Marie Guérin, writing to her own father two and a half months before Thérèse died, reports that, "She herself now realises that she's very ill".⁴⁵ And Thérèse herself exclaims on the day of her death, "Oh! its pure suffering because there is no consolation! No not one!"⁴⁶ And, "O Mother, its very easy to write beautiful things about suffering, but writing is nothing, nothing! One must suffer to know."⁴⁷

But on the whole we are left with a sense of Thérèse, her sisters and community, colluding in a religious game, in which reality was seldom allowed to obtrude, and which makes a mockery of the millions in this world who do not choose to suffer, nor, indeed, to play the game she chose. She says to Céline:

When I say: I'm suffering, you answer: 'All the better'. I don't have the strength, so you complete what I want to say.⁴⁸

The tragedy lies in Céline's assumed complicity in making the responses like some perverse litany, and in writing them down for hagiographic posterity. This raises as well the whole unsavoury question of the community's sponsorship of Thérèse's canonisation, before and after her death, the grisly portrait taken of her in preparation for death, the relics gathered from the living, dying body.

It is tempting to look for pathological explanations for the tragedy of Thérèse's sponsored, rationalised suffering and early death in her own personal development. Such explanations have recently become less popular. The sweeping condemnations of, for example, Simone de Beauvoir that

Most women mystics are not content with abandoning themselves passively to God: they apply themselves actively to self-annihilation⁴⁹

represents a generalisation that has recently been rejected by Bynum's reassessment of medieval women's spirituality.⁵⁰ She has suggested that women's spirituality cannot be simply judged to be a negative recapitulation of women's hatred of the body or be viewed as hysterical

in nature, but that women have traditionally used their representation as bodily in western theology to gain access to God through the body where other, male approved avenues of exploration were closed to them. Given the gender roles imposed upon them, their spirituality can be interpreted as an attempt to reflect theologically in and through the body. It is, of course, possible to interpret Thérèse's experience in this light. To do so allows for an empathy for spiritualities like hers which otherwise might be more simplistically (and perhaps unfairly) evaluated, for example, by Bryan Turner's summary of Nietzsche's theory of resentment. For Nietzsche, he says,

Sickness is ultimately resentment turned against the self via the sufferings of the body.⁵¹

But is Thérèse's spirituality of the body simply the product of resentment? Nietzsche himself describes resentment as the devious and desperate attempt of the powerless to place their own mark on the world of the strong and noble. Christianity has... "forged out of the resentment of the masses its chief weapon against us, against everything noble, joyful, high-spirited on earth, against our happiness on earth..."⁵² If this is so, the case of Thérèse might be judged to be far more complex than the notion of *ressentiment* suggests. On the other hand, a spirituality which destroys the body, or which encourages the speed with which the body succumbs to destruction, is not a spirituality which a truly incarnational theology could ever advocate as one to be emulated by Christians and/or by feminists.

- 1 Monica Furlong, *Thérèse of Lisieux* (London: Virago, 1987).
- 2 Daniel Weinstein and Rudolph Bell, *Saints and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).
- 3 See: Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast, Holy Fast* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987, and *Fragmentation and Redemption. Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (New York: Zone Books, 1991). Also see: Frances Beer, *Women and Mystical Experience in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1992).
- 4 Vita Sackville-West, *The Eagle and the Dove* (London, Sphere Books, 1988), p. 139.
- 5 Abbé Combes (ed.), *The Collected Letters of Thérèse of Lisieux* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1949), p. 46. Elsewhere, Thérèse refers to soul and body as being related as "chick" is to "egg", *Ibid*, p. 61.
- 6 John Clarke (ed.), *St. Thérèse of Lisieux: Her Last Conversations* (Washington, D.C.: ICS Publications, 1977), p. 280.
- 7 Bynum, *Holy Feast, Holy Fast*, p. 258.
- 8 Fray Francisco de Jesus, *Relación sencilla y fiel de los Fiestas que el rey D. Felipe III nuestro Señor hizo* (Vatican Library: Factico volume, 1627)
- 9 See: Alison Weber, *Teresa of Avila. The Rhetoric of Femininity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990)
- 10 *Combes*, p. 251.

- 11 Clarke, p. 160.
- 12 *Ibid*, p. 160.
- 13 *Ibid*, p. 166.
- 14 *Ibid*, p. 198.
- 15 Chris Shilling, *The Body and Social Theory* (London: Sage Publications, 1993), p. 45.
- 16 Clarke, p. 171.
- 17 *Ibid*, p. 196.
- 18 *Ibid*, p. 185.
- 19 Philippe Ariès, *The Hour of Our Death* (London: Penguin, 1983), p. 436.
- 20 Combes, p. 243.
- 21 Clarke, p. 144.
- 22 Susan Sontag, *Illness as Metaphor and Aids and its Metaphors* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991), p. 11.
- 23 Furlong, p. 132.
- 24 Sontag, p. 21.
- 25 *Ibid*, p. 36.
- 26 *Ibid*, p. 63.
- 27 Bryan Turner and Georg Stauth, *Nietzsche's Dance* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988), p. 90.
- 28 Mike Featherstone et al, *The Body. Social Process and Cultural Theory* (London: Sage Publications, 1991), p. 85.
- 29 Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain* (Oxford: OUP, 1985), p. 29.
- 30 *Ibid*, p. 34.
- 31 Combes, p. 253.
- 32 Clarke, p. 206.
- 33 Ariès, p. 569.
- 34 Clarke, p. 269.
- 35 *Ibid*, p. 206.
- 36 *Ibid*, p. 206-7.
- 37 *Ibid*, p. 207.
- 38 Robert Backhouse (ed.), *The Autobiography of Thérèse of Lisieux* (London: Hodder and Staughton, 1994), p. 219.
- 39 Clarke, p. 207.
- 40 Ariès, p. 473.
- 41 *Ibid*, p. 473.
- 42 *Ibid*, p. 473.
- 43 Combes, p. 266.
- 44 *Ibid*, p. 266.
- 45 Clarke, p. 62.
- 46 *Ibid*, p. 271.
- 47 *Ibid*, p. 229.
- 48 *Ibid*, p. 224.
- 49 Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), p. 684.
- 50 See footnote 3, above.
- 51 Turner and Stauth, p. 114.
- 52 Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Twilight of the Idols/The Anti-Christ* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), p. 156.