

Spain and Islam Once More

Fundamentalism in *Sainte Thérèse d'Avila*

Carol Mastrangelo Bové

Journal of French and Francophone Philosophy - Revue de la philosophie française et de langue française, Vol XXVI, No 2 (2018) pp. 69-80

Vol XXVI, No 2 (2018)
ISSN 1936-6280 (print)
ISSN 2155-1162 (online)
DOI 10.5195/jffp.2018.859
www.jffp.org



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 United States License.



This journal is operated by the University Library System of the University of Pittsburgh as part of its D-Scribe Digital Publishing Program, and is co-sponsored by the University of Pittsburgh Press

Spain and Islam Once More

Fundamentalism in *Sainte Thérèse d'Avila*

Carol Mastrangelo Bové

University of Pittsburgh

Julia Kristeva's *Teresa, My Love: An Imagined Life of the Saint of Avila* confronts us with the contemporary problem of violent forms of fundamentalism, especially Islamic, as it recreates the life of Saint Teresa. The novel's psychoanalytic perspective engages our emotions and sensations, and is also therapeutic for author and reader. But most of all, it engages our thinking and deals in depth with this compelling, timely issue.

Sainte Thérèse is a modernist text to the degree that it foregrounds both Teresa of Avila and Sylvia Leclercq as women who attempt to break with Western orthodox thought in a rationalist cast, including the images it deems acceptable, and to subvert practices harmful to the individual psyche and to social relations. Other examples of such texts foregrounding courageous, unconventional women, which I have examined elsewhere from a psychoanalytic point of view, include Simone DeBeauvoir's novel, *She Came to Stay*; Jean Renoir's film *Rules of the Game*; and François Truffaut's movie, *Jules and Jim*. Virginia Woolf's novels, along with Gloria Anzaldúa's *Borderlands: la Frontera*, also hybrid like *Teresa, My Love*, provide further instances of such texts. Like these female protagonists, Sylvia resists language and behavior harmful to individuals and to groups especially in the two parts of her life that are most important to her: 1) the therapy she provides Paul and Elise, and 2) her research on Teresa. While she offers no explicit reason for stating that it is primarily since 9/11 that these projects have commanded her attention, it becomes clear in the novel's context that the attacks on the World Trade Towers have something in common with rationalism's legacy, despite the very different cultural traditions with which they are associated. The element that the attacks may share with many forms of rationalism deriving especially from René Descartes's work is the drive to assert its dogma in a literal and systematic way in an attempt to unite with an authoritative father figure. For Kristeva, this drive of fundamentalism is not unlike Descartes's view of the mind as it develops during the Enlightenment and attempts to impose its monotheistic, patriarchal hegemony on the world, believing itself

undistorted by the body and its sensations and emotions. In this way, Kristeva rereads Sylvia's engagement with both Teresa's Catholic mysticism and her work at the clinic psychoanalytically: as therapeutic and ethical practices opposed to the legacy of rationalism, and in particular to the religious fundamentalisms, which may be linked to it. *Teresa, My Love* distinguishes Saint Teresa's brand of mysticism from those inscribed within rationalism, taking her revelation of Christ's injunction to her, "Seek Yourself in Me" as a point of departure.¹

Kristeva writes a biographical novel, which gives coherence to the book's variety of genres as well as insights into her critique of rationalism by means of a theory of the semiotic/symbolic. Valuable in itself as fiction, the book is a new and more radical form of hybrid text, both different from but yet not unlike Gloria Anzaldúa's *Borderlands: La Frontera*. These modernist texts foreground an unconventional woman and blatantly cross genre boundaries, "jump-cutting," in Kristeva's case, among biography, fiction, philosophical tale, psychoanalytic cultural theory, and theatre, an unusual mix. One of her principal goals, as I read *Teresa, My Love*, is ultimately to address the contemporary problem of violent forms of "Islamic Fundamentalism," especially its connections to psychological formations arising from patriarchal, rationalist roots and leading to the hoarding of resources, hate, and aggression. There are in fact about 70 references, both direct and indirect, to "Islamic Fundamentalism" in the novel, notably referring often to the work of fundamentalist groups in the discussion of 9/11, of the explosions on the Madrid trains in 2004, and of those on the London metro in 2005. It is fair to say that Kristeva uses the term "Islamic Fundamentalism" to raise questions about violent versions of this religion. Here I use quotation marks to indicate that the vocabulary is problematic; I will sometimes use the less problematic "jihadism."

Marty Martin points out that while all fundamentalisms are patriarchal, undifferentiated condemnation of these -isms encourages the recruitment of violent "Islamic Fundamentalists."² It is possible that the term "Islamic Fundamentalism" itself inappropriately and dangerously condemns various Fundamentalists. In other words, the term has racist connotations, which make Kristeva's novel vulnerable to the charge of racism. Some critics of American imperialism and its marginalization of "Islamic Fundamentalism" may argue that this vocabulary is part of the failure to differentiate among forms of fundamentalism, a failure that could also be applied to *Teresa, My Love*, and that 9/11 is a response to such marginalization.

My title, "Spain and Islam Once More" points to Kristeva's exploration of religion and the confrontation with terrorism by moving back to a place and a "once upon a time" when Christians, Jews, and Muslims did a better job of living together. She harkens back to that world in the Seville episodes in which Teresa meets her greatest challenges threatened by the Inquisition. Yet, the novel depicts this most famous of Andalusian cities as a place of great

energy and passion, the image of the life of the body resisting the constraints of the social contract including its threats. She writes:

One thing has never been plainer than it is here, in Seville: the world threatens to gag you, Teresa, my love, it may end up by burning you alive. What do you expect when you move from pure ecstasy to the work of founding, when you aspire to found pure ecstasy in the world, against the world, but with the world?"³

Kristeva makes clear, as this unwieldy, 700-page novel unfolds, that the key to Teresa's dangerous project is her ability to "write a literary work," that is to say, to open a space within her psyche, an ability lacking in "Islamic Fundamentalism." Such a space enables her to transcend her isolation and the pain inflicted by a patriarchal society, which marginalizes her. She distances herself from herself as Other in a process of interior doubling. At the same time, she engages in the world by communicating with readers and also by reforming the Carmelite order.

Opening this space would mean giving rein to fantasy in Teresa's experience of union with a human Christ, that is, the feminine, semiotic function of language. Kristeva implies that such a union is distinct from that of "Islamic Fundamentalists" who pursue a purely masculine God while Teresa's human Christ is androgynous. Teresa's creation of a literary text would also mean going beyond her yielding to fantasy by asserting the masculine, symbolic pole in writing up her experience. Recognizing the existence of bodily responses — physical and emotional components of herself — leads to a moving beyond bodily responses to imagining them in writing for an audience. She also recognizes and moves beyond them in her founding of seventeen new convents of Barefoot Carmelites, recreating her union with Christ, the man, in the nuns' reformed way of life.

Teresa's mysticism demands that one listen to the voice of love with its hidden layer of hate both in and outside of the psyche. Here, Kristeva/Sylvia builds upon Freud's elaboration of a similar voice, which brings the death drive into his theory of Eros and Thanatos, helping to understand psychic formations underlying behavior. From the beginning, before her stating that it is since 9/11 that she has understood the need to commit herself to her patients and colleagues and to her book on Teresa, Sylvia sees the connections between Teresa's story of Catholic mysticism and the ways in which it may overlap with Islam, a link made evident in the headscarf meeting in Paris.⁴ Along with Judaism and Catholicism, Islam is a religion built on a discourse of love/hate, for instance in the holy wars, which have been part of all three faiths. Early on, Sylvia—and Kristeva speaks often through her autobiographical narrator in this book as we will notice—includes the episode in which a young Muslim woman at a meeting on the new law against the wearing of the headscarf speaks about it as a civil right.

The headscarf episode is more than a passing reference to religious and political conflicts in the setting Kristeva creates for Sylvia and her research on Teresa. Brought into the meeting in her capacity as psychologist, Sylvia objects when a man blurts out that the young Muslim woman is like St. Teresa and her desire to wear a habit. Sylvia then begins to ruminate silently on the possible similarities between the two women, that is, on a comparison that will be at the heart of Kristeva's book as an exploration of mysticism and "Islamic Fundamentalism." She acknowledges a little later⁵ that Islamic terrorists and 9/11, along with her patients, are the only worlds that arouse her passion. By this point in the novel, the reader knows that it is primarily Teresa.

Sylvia/Kristeva's complex definition of mysticism includes, or at least, overlaps with versions of fundamentalism. First of all, she indicates, as we have said, that both Teresa's mysticism and "Islamic Fundamentalism" are based on a discourse of love and hate. Sylvia also defines this mysticism as an erotic secret of canonical faith. Mysticism expresses itself in a language, which it may often refuse. She stresses the desire for and attempt to unite with a father who incorporates the infinite, the divine, enabling the human being to create a sense of being both body and soul. In Teresa's writing, this father will be "Christ's humanity," a figure very different from the one, which the "Islamic Fundamentalist" will seek in asserting literal and systematic dogma. The mystic's attempt to unite with the father is, however, like that of the jihadist in the sense that it violates the social contract and its incest taboo. Thus, one regards mysticism as being at odds with official knowledge. One also considers jihadism antithetical to official knowledge, but this is primarily because of its violent agenda rather than its sexual pursuit of God, given that the latter is less openly expressed than in Teresa's mysticism.

Later in her book, she makes clear that another component of both mysticism and fundamentalism is knowing God through his contradictions--arguably an element to be expected given the fact that each is based upon a dialogue of love and hate. That is to say, Teresa's religion and jihadism are both forms of apophatic thought.⁶

The psychoanalytic reading of mysticism as a union with the father would include versions of "Islamic Fundamentalism," to the degree that the latter see such union in the emphasis on the literal interpretation of a text. Marty Martin explains that in "Islamic Fundamentalism," there is the desire to move back in time to that perfect moment when dogma got it right, in other words, a text from the past that flawlessly incorporated the truth, a version of God the Father. Such fundamentalism reacts to contemporary untruth by attempting to preserve the original knowledge, using violence if needed.⁷ (Scott 2001).

As she explores the mystical component in fundamentalism, both Christian and Muslim, Sylvia/Kristeva goes on in the early chapters of the

novel to lay out some common ground in the history of Judeo-Christian and Islamic belief. Jewish thought, especially that of the Kabbalah, is an important element in each. The Sufis, for instance, develop a form of mystical Islamic faith not unconnected to the Kabbalah in Iraq. Sylvia/Kristeva speaks of their belief that "the Absolute cannot become conscious of itself other than through Man in the image of God."⁸

Sylvia/Kristeva sees her current research on Saint Teresa as part of thinking through how wrongheaded "Islamic Fundamentalism" is, closed and damaging to the emotional and physical well-being of individuals and groups despite the elements it has in common with mysticism, which does not display such weaknesses. She will listen to Teresa's voice in an attempt to open her own writing to the saint's theological psychology. According to Teresa, the body and affect are vital and nourish an ethics promoting the collaborative, imaginative, dialectical, and peaceful ways of thinking, which, according to Sylvia and Kristeva, are frequently lacking in the violent Twenty-First Century. Sylvia will write her work on the saint as well as continue to practice her therapy with Paul and Elise.

Kristeva has Sylvia examine the history of religion, connecting her thoughts on mysticism and fundamentalism to material, historical events and conditions. This is an impressive instance of Kristeva's strength in combining a theoretical understanding of human psychology with more empirical evidence, despite the charge that her work, and psychoanalytic thought in general, lacks specificity and historical validity. Sylvia focuses, for example, on the ways in which Holy Communion became transformed from a personal experience into one that encompassed a broad political and social meaning. She writes: "From the middle of the twelfth century on, the phrase *corpus mysticum* no longer denoted the Eucharist but simply the Church, and *corpus verum* was used for the osmosis with Jesus through Communion."⁹ This historical analysis of Latin gives a fuller meaning to the word "mystical" as both union with Christ and with the institution of the Church. Kristeva goes on to have Sylvia link this transformation of Christian mysticism especially to the Rhenish mystic, Meister Eckhart. Such mysticism prefigures much later developments in the Counter-Reformation and Baroque Art. Offering a creative interpretation of the linking of freedom and ethics in the ending of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, Sylvia outlines later developments in Western thought, which will culminate in Freud's identification of mysticism with an indirect knowledge of the id. In one of the best analyses of Teresa's writing, Sylvia demonstrates that the ideas of the unconscious and sublimation are implicit in these Sixteenth Century texts. Teresa has the insight to express the desire embedded in the Crucifixion and in her own scandalous love for the Son of God in terms that expose the principle of the Incarnation and also prefigure Freud's thought: Christ appears in a powerful image as "divine breasts" from which "flow streams of milk,"¹⁰ to take one brief but cogent example.

To imagine Christ as a lactating mother is to make God androgynous, a quality at the heart of Teresa's form of mysticism. It is this strategy above all in her writing that distinguishes her religious views and behavior from those of "Islamic Fundamentalists."

Sylvia's description of Teresa's desire for a Christ with milk-spouting breasts and more generally her outline of how such desire subverts the rationalist heritage and its denial of the body's sensations and emotions, implies that fundamentalisms are hypocritically prudish.¹¹ It is probable that in this framework, the mention of the lack of desire in a society of the spectacle is not unrelated to such prudishness.¹² Thus, contemporary forms of fundamentalism, both Islamic and Christian, might benefit from Teresa's mysticism, as Sylvia indicates in her invitation to lift Teresa's habit and to look at her metaphors¹³

Kristeva links "Islamic Fundamentalism," her comparison of it to Teresa's mysticism, and the question of why jihadism encompasses hatred for and terrorism against the West to her influential distinction between semiotic and symbolic. This psychoanalytic theory is relevant to a range of disciplines including literature, psychology, philosophy, linguistics, fine arts, and religious studies. The author incorporates her theory in Sylvia's thinking—we have frequently noted Kristeva's presence in her narrator's words—on the semiotic and symbolic poles of language. Briefly stated, for Kristeva, language possesses a symbolic function to the degree that it is part of a social contract. It refers to a commonly agreed upon set of references embedded in Western rationalist traditions valuing clarity, reason, causality, and chronological time. These are values often associated with the masculine. Yet, language also functions semiotically, recreating the life of the body, its senses and affect, in the images and sounds of words, for example, thereby drawing on traditions typically connected to the feminine. The novel arguably raises the question, linked to the comparison of mysticism and "Islamic Fundamentalism," of how one lives these poles. Does one experience them as an alternating structure prone to creating an opposition between Self and Other, with the Other often a projection of the death drive and/or associated with the feminine, masochism and/or abjection? Or does one live the symbolic and the semiotic simultaneously in an antagonistic form tending to more egalitarian social relations? Which structure is more likely to remain stable, which to spin out of control?

Maria Margaroni's analysis of Kristeva's theory of the semiotic in *The Revolution of Poetic Language* concludes that she reads Hegel through Freud and understands this fundamental concept of her theory as a variation of the fourth or excessive movement of the Hegelian dialectic. Margaroni further states that Kristeva's conception of the dialectic of the semiotic and symbolic is antagonistic rather than oppositional or contradictory, that is to say, the two poles of language are more closely linked than critics have previously thought. These linguistic functions are very different but not mutually

exclusive. Taking the lead from Ernesto Laclou and Chantal Mouffe,¹⁴ Margaroni describes the playing out of this antagonism as a give and take. In this context, on the one hand, the language of reason may gain control of that of the senses/emotions, and, on the other hand, the latter, in the powerful development of the death drive with which it is associated, may well break through and overcome the former, connected to sociability and the life force. The highest forms of language keep the semiotic and symbolic in play in a balancing act enabling both communication and the satisfaction of desire, though always under threat of losing one of the two vital components¹⁵.

Nine years before Margaroni, Robert Young implicitly focuses on the idea of antagonism rather than opposition or contradiction at the center of Kristeva's theory of the semiotic, including its interaction with the symbolic.¹⁶ Without explicitly using the term "antagonism," he connects her category of the antagonistic relationship between these two poles of her theory to Mikhail Bakhtin's understanding of the dialogic, dating Kristeva's discussion of the antagonistic to 1966 and her essay "Word, Dialogue, and Novel," eight years before *Revolution*. Inspired by Bakhtin's sense of the dialogic in his work on Rabelais's fiction, she crystalizes her thinking on the dialogic as a kind of antagonistic structure different from a dialectic and writes the history of significant novels based on "dialogue," according to Young.

For Kristeva, as I read her up to and including *Teresa, My Love*, the semiotic and symbolic may be understood as existing alternately or antagonistically in the psyche, that is, playing out in chronological or in synchronic time. In any case, the problem of how to understand the two fundamental poles of language and the thinking which they enable is central to the novel as it is to her psychoanalytic theory in general. She develops this theory in her examination of the need to reject "women" in order to function socially, a need connected to the death drive and to masochism as explained earlier. The insistence on rejecting "women" in adhering to the social contract is significant given that one of the traditions with which some, including Jacqueline Rose, identify Kristeva, degrades pregnancy and heteronormativity. Rose praises Kristeva's writing for confronting dangerous stereotypes, such as that of a masochistic woman, but ultimately does not recognize that her ideas concerning women in her theoretical texts are normally metaphorical not essentialist.¹⁷ Furthermore, Kristeva incorporates the feminine in a positive androgynous figure, as we have seen in her analysis of the image of a maternal Christ in Teresa's mystical experience.

The consequences of these different ways of describing the dialectic of symbolic/semiotic as antagonistic, oppositional, or somehow both, emerge in this context. If Margaroni and Young are right, Kristeva's theory may be more able to accommodate the idea of the Other, particularly the female Other, and therefore be less vulnerable to Rose's feminist argument, not to speak of more hostile, less perceptive ones. The symbolic never fully masters and/or represses the semiotic and its necessary link to "the

feminine/women/maternal,” at least in Margaroni’s, Laclou and Mouffe’s, and also Young’s formulations. Thus, Rose’s version of a feminist critique of Kristeva—that her theory degrades pregnancy and heteronormativity—no longer stands. That is to say, according to her theory, it is not strictly speaking necessary to repudiate “women” in order to obey the social contract that is language. Practicing symbolic language in the fullest sense means at the same time maintaining the link to the drives, dangerous though they may be.

The sense of an opposition (a contradiction or alternation rather than an antagonistic relation within one unit or simultaneous clustering of units) may be more in keeping with human perception and the experience of language as primarily sequential. Understanding language’s structure in terms of an opposition, however, may ultimately mean that the psyche and the society with which it is linked are to some extent schizophrenic, chaotic, and not amenable to orderly thinking, health, and stability. Acknowledging that language may operate not only diachronically but also synchronically may better accommodate an interpretation of the interplay of symbolic and semiotic as an antagonistic structure. Such an acknowledgment, able to include fundamentally different elements, is more conducive to psychic and social well-being.

Kristeva links the negative view of women, the death drive, and masochism to the question of the nature of "Islamic Fundamentalism" and why it may include violence against the West. She uses the saint’s life in part to explore the gendered symbolic/semiotic poles of language as they shape religion, especially "Islamic Fundamentalism." In so doing, Kristeva indicates both the similarities and differences between Teresa’s gendered mysticism and the equally gendered violent version of Islam, which commits terrorist acts against the West.

Sexuality and gender present themselves in complex ways in this book, incorporating notions of a masculine symbolic and feminine semiotic, which underlie mysticism and Fundamentalism, in fact, all language according to Kristeva. From her perspective, Teresa often needs to reject what is usually associated with the feminine in order to survive physically, emotionally, and intellectually. She refuses marriage and the possibility of the multiple childbirths, which eventually killed her mother. In this context, Sylvia/Kristeva will see Teresa’s writings as a precursor of Simone De Beauvoir’s revolutionary *The Second Sex*.¹⁸ The saint advises the nuns in her care to be less like women, more active and strong like men. Monteverdi’s musical composition, both military and sexual, "*Tutti a cavallo!*" ("Gallop forward on horseback!"), though repeated so often that it sometimes loses its significance, as does the much repeated "my love" in addressing Teresa, appropriately accompanies Sylvia’s exploration of the saint’s biography. In the end, moreover, the musical score signals Teresa’s recognition of her physical and emotional life and her commitment to build upon it, not to

repress it, which reveals a form of celebration of the feminine in her mysticism and in her story in general.

What Sylvia finds so precious in Teresa's writing is its singularity, more than its adherence to a political agenda, which would be feminist *avant la lettre*. Sometimes such politics, leading to conflict and violence, are required but Kristeva normally opts for peaceful, literary strategies. Thus, the narrator emphasizes that Teresa's works make identity politics obsolete about five hundred years ago. The Carmelite was bent on telling her own story, a unique tale with links to Catholicism, Judaism, and the Baroque, in literary form—her autobiography, and in institutional form—the founding of discalced convents. Teresa's writings are not a form of feminist identity politics, neither in the Sixteenth Century nor today.

Later in her book, but still in the first sections where she is theorizing mysticism, she discusses it as not unlike Freud's notion of an "oceanic feeling," an identification with a maternal figure.¹⁹ Kristeva makes clear via Sylvia's analysis that Freud rejects this maternal figure, opting for the authority of a primarily phallic identification. This is a rejection implied in the purely masculine authority figure, which "Islamic Fundamentalism" also pursues.

Kristeva interprets Teresa's mystical and literary view of women as a form of thinking that celebrates the body and the emotions, attributes which Catholic, Cartesian, and orthodox Freudian points of view as well as the perspective of "Islamic Fundamentalism" must keep at bay in their marginalization of the second sex and heteronormativity within patriarchy. This volume reveals important connections between Sylvia's turn to mysticism and the ways in which she interacts with her patients and colleagues. Kristeva's novel is thus able to transform a version of Catholic mysticism and its masochistic component into a powerful force for shaping ethical behavior, as in the case of Sylvia's projects and in her own in writing this book, for instance. Such is my interpretation of the following passage, which appears in the opening section:

I have one reservation, however: your uncontrollable love for Christ-like wounds and the humiliation you inflict on yourself serves only to block the tendency that interests me, allow me to insist. Moreover, if you had lived two centuries later, a reading of the Marquis de Sade would have been able to purge your imaginary of your most wild and morbid phantasies, which you do not dare to name, but which you actually embody to the point of risking death by epilepsy.²⁰

Here Kristeva has Sylvia express her care to acknowledge a dangerous, fundamental, and arguably fundamentalist drive in Teresa's relation to Christ, which may resemble parallel drives in Sylvia, in "Islamic Fundamentalism," and also in Kristeva herself. Admiring for the most part

Teresa's literary flair for creating that space within herself so much lacking in the worst forms of fundamentalism, Kristeva indicates the weak spot in the saint's oeuvre, a masochistic tendency, which may be linked to her physical bout with epilepsy and which is clearly connected—though Kristeva does not make this link explicit—to her attitude towards women. Masochism is not limited to Teresa's version of mysticism, nor to the kamikaze jihadists, but characterizes various forms of fundamentalism.²¹ Kristeva implies here that practicing a greater freedom in revealing her most aberrant, death-courting fantasies in writing might have enabled Teresa to live a healthier life.

The dramatic section, the play in the novel's conclusion, entitled "Dialogues from Beyond the Grave," implies that masochism is a continuing threat for Teresa. Before she dies, she confesses that she suffers from her desires for both Father Jerome Gratian and a child but has never revealed these emotions before. The confession arises out of a conversation with another Carmelite who visits Teresa's deathbed and declares her dismay at not having a child. Frances Restuccia states that Teresa is expressing a preference for love over writing here, whereas Kristeva's own analysis of the novel has Teresa preferring the opposite.²² My reading of this episode is that Kristeva suggests that it is part of the human condition to feel pain and to arrive at the end of one's life striving still to transcend it. It may be possible to interpret the episode as 1) Teresa's failure to be successful in her attempts to write and to found new convents for women seeking a meaningful life outside of marriage and childbearing or even 2) as Sylvia's misunderstanding of Teresa's final analysis of her life. The context, however, in which visceral experience and continuing desire as well as struggle dominate, would lend credence to the first reading—that Teresa dies as she was born, prone to disruptive longings and combat, which necessarily accompany both her successes and failures.

Teresa was able, at least in part, to transcend her masochistic tendency through her writing and institutional work in founding reformed convents. Kristeva via Sylvia connects Teresa's internal punishment with a process potentially liberating herself from such isolating pain through public works representing Christ's passion in the world.²³ Sylvia explains that when Teresa speaks of cutting her pleasurable/pain short, of stopping before she has completely satisfied her thirst, she is *thinking*, transforming her body into a flower to be unceasingly watered, and heading out to found a new convent.²⁴

Faith, and especially Teresa's mysticism, represents food for thought, even a model for us now in our society of the spectacle. In her framework of mysticism as "the erotic secret of canonical faith," Sylvia/Kristeva speaks of religious belief as "the last stronghold of secrecy," suggesting it may be an antidote to "see-through, mediatized globalization."²⁵ To the extent that such a globalized world has led to the development of dangerous fundamentalisms, religion may ironically provide an access to buried desires,

which may set free some individuals, or at least free them to some degree from repression and bombings.

But Kristeva is not a believer in God, as she states in her *In the Beginning Was Love*, and she therefore refers to religion as a model for those who do. She does, however, value writing a great deal (and other social practices like Teresa's reform of the Carmelites) and its power to influence individuals via a complex language of love and intellect, that is, a discourse engaging readers as complex individuals. Thus, Sylvia's remarks on the impact of Teresa's thought are primarily relevant to a text's ability to recreate desire for an androgynous figure in a contemporary cultural and historical context. In other words, Sylvia's description of and positive evaluation of Teresa's mysticism and reform of the Carmelite order compel unbelievers as well as the faithful to value writing's function: to write is potentially to maximize pleasure, to minimize pain, and to contribute to the social good.

Teresa, My Love, a substantial contribution to literary studies, provides evidence of the influence of Catholic mysticism in modernist texts both as aesthetic objects and as models for ethical behavior beyond the literary. Given the growing visibility of her thought across national borders and disciplines, Kristeva's impact in this volume is likely to make itself felt in the dialogue on fundamentalisms and violence, as well as in other important debates concerning Islam at a time when it has become the most widely practiced religion in France.

¹ Julia Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love: An Imagined Life of the Saint of Avila*, trans. Lorna Scott Fox (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014), 22.

² Paul Scott, "The Way We Live Now : 9/30/01 : Questions for Martin E. Marty ; Sacred Battles" (New York, NY, 2001), Sep. 30, 2001. Retrieved from <https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/2001/09/30/341690.html?pageNumber=273>

³ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 358.

⁴ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 19.

⁵ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 24.

⁶ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 56.

⁷ Scott, “The Way We Live Now: 9/30/01: Questions for Martin E. Marty; Sacred Battles.”

⁸ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 39.

⁹ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 43.

¹⁰ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 113.

¹¹ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 66.

¹² Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 70.

¹³ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 73-74.

¹⁴ Ernesto LaClau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Toward a Radical Democratic Politics* (London: Verso, 1985), 16-17.

¹⁵ Maria Margaroni, “The Semiotic Revolution, Lost Causes, Uncomfortable Reminders, Binding Futures,” in *Julia Kristeva: Live Theory*, ed. John Lechte and Maria Margaroni (London & New York: Continuum, 2004), 6-33.

¹⁶ Robert Young, *Torn Halves: Political Conflict in Literary and Cultural Theory* (Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1996), 54-55.

¹⁷ Jacqueline Rose, “Julia Kristeva—Take Two,” in *Sexuality in the Field of Vision* (London: Verso, 1986), 141-164.

¹⁸ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 129.

¹⁹ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 58.

²⁰ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 82-83.

²¹ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 66.,

²² Frances Restuccia, “Saint Teresa’s Psychoanalytic and Mysical Journey or Saint Kristeva of Avila” (presentation, Psychology and the Other Conference, Boston, MA, October 10, 2015); see also Julia Kristeva, “La passion selon Thérèse d’Avila,” *kristeva.fr*, retrieved Nov. 19, 2018, <http://www.kristeva.fr/passion.html>.

²³ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 80.

²⁴ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 102.

²⁵ Kristeva, *Teresa, My Love*, 124.