

“Familles, je vous hais”: Aesthetics of Hatred and Silence within the Family in François Mauriac’s Fictional

GIBSON NCUBE

Stellenbosch University, South Africa

SHELTON MUVUTI

University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe

This article analyses the recurrent and overarching themes of hatred and silence in François Mauriac’s fiction. It has been argued that the author’s gloomy depiction of the family was directly related to his own upbringing. His literature can be read as an attempt to heal a psychic wound caused by his family background. Mauriac infused his personal anguish into his fictions, but the question is whether his retributive stance towards his family lead to some form of catharsis. This analysis does not mean to suggest that Mauriac was a misanthropist (or a misogynist for that matter, as the majority of his literary characters are females) or that he found pleasure in his characters’ suffering. The article contends that the author got “emotional closure” by creating characters, who, just like him, suffered and almost suffocated at the hands of their own relatives. Mauriac achieved catharsis by creating – and identifying with – fictional people going through painful experiences similar to his own. Thus, he successfully faced his troubled past and he went through the process of healing his bettered and fragmented sense of *self*.

Keywords: family; hatred; silence; emotional closure; catharsis; François Mauriac.

La famille ! Thérèse laissa éteindre sa cigarette ; l’œil fixe, elle regardait cette cage aux barreaux innombrables et vivants, cette cage tapissée d’oreilles et d’yeux, où, immobile, accroupie, le menton aux genoux, les bras entourant ses jambes, elle attendrait de mourir.

(François Mauriac, *Thérèse Desqueyroux*)

Familles, je vous hais ! Foyers clos ; portes refermées ; possession jalouse du bonheur.

(André Gide, *Les faux-monnayeurs*)

The family is undoubtedly François Mauriac’s subject of choice and a considerable amount of his literary energy is devoted to exploring it and the present literary study closely reflects on the family unit, given that, as Maurice Maucuer explains: “La famille constitue le lieu des drames et le terrain privilégié de Mauriac. Ce qui la fait la matière de ses romans, ce sont les relations entre les êtres au sein de la famille, dans le cercle étroit où se côtoient et se heurtent ceux que devraient unir des liens d’affection et de tendresse” (1996: 74).

The family being a microcosm of society, Mauriac analyses the human condition by casting an unflinching and unswerving gaze on various crises afflicting family life: “Je n’étais pas moins attentif à ce qui se déroulait au dehors: les conflits, au plus épais des familles, de ces microcosmes

que j'observais à l'œil nu, ou plutôt que j'absorbais et que je retrouverais un jour" (1965: 63).

Less concerned in what happens in the world in general, his highly interested in all kinds of conflicts taking place within the family. Be that as it may, it is important to note that literature, like any other forms of art, influences and is influenced by the culture where it is produced and to which it consequently resembles. The same is true for Mauriac, even though he claims that the world around him is of little importance. If we look closely at his literary world, we can find striking similarities with the prevailing cultural tendencies.

Much has already been said about the family in Mauriac's literary works. However, this paper differs from previous studies in that we seek to show that the author's pessimistic vision of the family is heavily influenced by his relationship (or lack of it) with his parents. Resentment and anger are characteristic of Mauriac's relationship with his father and mother. Mauriac feels anger and resentment towards his father that he lost to death when he was still an infant, which he seems to view, however irrationally, as wilful abandonment (he never explicitly states this, but his literary works do all the speaking on his behalf). Even greater bitterness and resentment is directed towards his mother, who attempted to fill and compensate for the void left by the departed father, by enforcing the presence and reality of God in the lives of her children. Mauriac's *self* seems to be deformed by this intermingling of emotions during his childhood and formation years. This deformation of his *self* consequently informs everything that he writes and as Michel Suffran reveals: "Les angoisses cachées de sa vie, ses frayeurs, ses remords, bien loin d'amoindrir dans l'artiste sa puissance pour créer, devraient au contraire l'exciter et la nourrir" (1990: 43).

As Suffran notes, it is through writing that Mauriac expresses and channels towards his parents (especially his mother since she is his only remaining parent) the anger and the bitterness he feels. As Mauriac declares in *Un adolescent d'autrefois*: "Derrière l'apparence de la fiction se dissimule toujours ce drame vécu du romancier, cette lutte individuelle avec ses démons et ses sphinx. L'œuvre est un miroir hanté. Lui donner la vie à partir de sa substance profonde, c'est libérer de soi le dangereux ennemi, l'implacable témoin" (1969: 55).

The battle he wages against his parents in his fictional works, as he points out, turns him into a dangerous enemy and a merciless witness. This attack on the parents however has ripple effects on the way he relates to the other members of his family. This is mainly because, by attacking his parents, he makes his brothers and sisters feel attacked too.

That said, it is important to highlight that Mauriac's approach in dealing with various existential problems is expressed in terms of the position he takes with regard to the difficulties arising for the individual from the narrow world of the family. Through writing, Mauriac heals a fragmented and fractured sense of *self* resulting from the claustrophobic nature of his own family. Barbara Almond and Richmond Almond claim that: "we read, we write, we talk to heal" (1996: 169) and Robert Speaight by the same token recognises that: "The intimacies of literary creation raise problems of a moral and psychological order. The dispersal of the novelist through so many characters, and the ever-closer identification with them, imperilled the unity of his personality" (1976: 121).

Speaight also compares the manner in which an author splits his personality and projects it onto his literary creations to Proteus. Bonaparte points out on this same issue: "We should have to determine the extent to which the author's personality, split into psychic elements seeking to embody themselves in different characters, permits the author to re-embody himself in each of the characters observed" (1957: 55).

Mauriac adopts this protean stance and, by constantly projecting various aspects of his fragmented sense of *self* he is able to coalesce them into one whole.

In Mauriac's depiction, the family is not only a dysfunctional unit but hatred seems to be the singular emotion that festers within it. Hatred assumes a subtle character and, in its subtlety, it slowly eats away at the very fabric of the family. Mauriac's characters do not openly declare their hatred to the other members of their family, but muted and silent hatred comes to represent and emblematises intra-family relationships. The narrator of *Le sangouin* makes a comment on this aes-

thetic of hatred in the family: “comme on dit ‘faire l’amour’, il faudrait pouvoir dire ‘faire la haine’. C’est bon de faire la haine, ça repose, ça détend” (1952c: 26). Mauriac’s characters do not make love, but they rather create hate. The incapacity to “make love” not only renders family life a “désert de l’amour”, but equally makes it a “nœud de vipères”. The titles of novels by Mauriac reveal how the bitterness, anger and hatred transform the family into a brood of vipers that are unable to peacefully coexist. What makes the Mauriacian literary family even more fragile, and potentially volatile, is that the family members are forced to stay under the same roof. Moreover, such internally disintegrated families are obliged to present, to the outside world, a picture of unison and togetherness. Hypocrisy thus becomes the only possible bedrock for the survival of the family.

The *esprit de famille* compels family members to stay together, in spite of themselves, and to keep up appearances, although, internally, the family has lost its very soul, being dead, in other words. For instance, when Thérèse asks Bernard to release her from the family, he rejects her request, arguing that it is in the best interest of the family that they stay together: “Il importait pour la famille, que le monde nous croie unis et qu’à ses yeux, je n’aie pas l’air de mettre en doute votre innocence [...] Le dimanche, nous assisterons ensemble à la grand-messe, dans l’église de Saint-Clair. Il faut qu’on vous voie à mes bras” (1927: 248).

The omniscient narrator of *Le désert de l’amour* alludes to the *esprit de famille*, meant to conserve some form of eternal unity, however superficial “L’esprit de famille leur inspirait une répugnance profonde pour ce qui menaçait l’équilibre de leurs caractères. L’instinct de conservation inspirait à cet équipage, embarqué pour la vie sur la même galère, le souci de ne laisser s’allumer à bord aucun incendie” (1951b: 51).

The *esprit de famille* ensures that members of the family strike a balance between an attempt to keep displays of temper at a minimal level within the family milieu, whilst at the same time posing as a knit-together and properly functioning unit. The family environment becomes a universe in which each member is a distant planet that nonetheless gravitates within the orbit of the family: “Déjà apparaissait l’épaisse prison de feuilles où les membres d’une seule famille vivaient aussi confondus et séparés que les mondes dont est faite la Voie Lactée” (80).

Within the double concentric circles defined by the provincial society and the house where the Mauriacian literary family resides, the family unit becomes a group of prisoners, all fighting for their own survival.

What aggravates this already tragic crisis is that family members do not communicate or do not strive to communicate. Lost in their own solitude, they are like “Robinson dans son île” (1954: 185). Dr Courrèges in *Le désert de l’amour* poses questions relating to communication (or lack of it) within the family: “Qui de nous possède la science de faire tenir dans quelques paroles notre monde intérieur? Comment détacher de ce fleuve mouvant telle sensation et non telle autre? On ne peut rien dire dès qu’on ne peut tout dire” (1951b: 45).

The above words indeed alert us to what is common to Mauriac’s characters: they all desire to communicate their personal feelings. However, this willingness comes with a condition: they either want to communicate everything or they do not communicate anything at all. Most who attempt to communicate find that their interlocutor is either not interested or does not understand what is being said. Thérèse, for example, tries to talk to her husband, but he has his own preconceived ideas and brushes aside what Thérèse says. Equally, when he tries to talk to her, she is also indifferent to what he says: “telle était la vanité de ses paroles qu’elles bourdonnaient à mes oreilles, sans que je voulusse en pénétrer le sens” (1951a: 519).

Other characters, like Dr Courrèges, wishing to express themselves in front of family members, are hedged about by the defences they have put up, they are unable to find their words and, inevitably, they end up conquered by mutism: “Comment se frayer une route jusqu’à ce cœur hérissé de défenses? Quand il se flattait d’avoir trouvé le joint et qu’il adressait à Raymond des paroles longtemps méditées, il ne les reconnaissait pas, et sa voix même le trahissait – malgré lui, ricanante et sèche. Toujours ce fut son martyre de ne rien pouvoir exprimer de ses sentiments”

(1951b: 15).

Mauriac's characters are thus each left to suffer in their own silence and solitude. This calls to mind J. M. Coetzee's description of silence that separates people in their relationships: "The recognition that to live in silence is to live like the whales, great castles of flesh floating leagues apart one from another, or like the spiders, sitting each alone at the heart of his web, which to him is the entire world" (1986: 59).

In *La pharisienne*, Louis Pian goes to the extent of personifying his solitude as an enemy that he espouses *vis-à-vis* his relation to members of his family: "Ma vieille ennemie: la solitude, avec qui je fais bon ménage aujourd'hui. Nous nous connaissons: elle m'a asséné tous les coups imaginables et il n'y a plus de place où frapper. Je ne crois avoir évité aucun de ses pièges" (341).

However, in instances where Mauriac's characters do speak to each other, they discharge words that cause more harm and damage than good. André Gozier notes that: "Parce qu'il subit des blocages et des inhibitions, le personnage de Mauriac va essayer malgré tout de réagir; mais il ne pourra le faire qu'en blessant" (2001: 25). Maurice Delcroix equally points to the destructive nature of the spoken word in Mauriac's novels, as either pointless or wounding: "On parle beaucoup dans *Le sangouin*, mais pour rien, ou pour blesser" (1997: 219). All means of communication, verbal or non-verbal, are directed not at expressing oneself but at emotionally injuring others. In *Le nœud de vipères*, Louis elevates to an art form the use of facial expressions and of a monstrous laughter meant to provoke rage, anger, fear and hate among his family members.

When a factor like money is added to this already explosive state of affairs, tempers flare to unfathomable levels. In *Le nœud de vipères*, hatred and lack of communication reach the most tragic and pessimistic level that Mauriac has ever depicted. Hatred between husband and wife, father and children, as well as between father-in-law and son-in-law blinds all the family members as they all attempt to control the family fortune. Louis detests his children because he feels they have taken their mother's side and therefore he tries to leave all his fortune with his illegitimate son. Even though Louis does not eventually disinherit his children, they so blinded by their hatred and love for money, that they do not recognise the transformation that their father goes through towards the end of his life. Louis's death is a relief to his children, especially to his son Hubert.

The deep-cutting and bitter Mauriacian hatred and lack of communication have destructive effects. In *Génitrice*, for instance, Félicité hates her daughter-in-law to such an extent that she does nothing to help her when she goes into premature labour. Mathilde dies in solitude whilst her husband and mother-in-law stand by. In *Le sangouin*, Galéas de Cernes's wife hates him and makes his existence living hell to such an extent, that Galéas commits suicide. As Emmanuelle in *Asmodée* says: "C'est horrible que de haïr, que de torturer une créature dont le seul crime est de ne pouvoir se passer de nous" (1952a : 46). Mauriac's characters are driven to hate people that they should normally love, or at least tolerate. Mauriac paints a rather grim and pessimistic picture of intra-family relationships: individuals within the family are compelled to live and share the same house with people that they hate, which to them is a life-sentence, so to speak.

Hatred within the family is firmly entrenched on the basis of the fact that individual family members hate themselves or have an extremely low self-esteem. When they hate someone else, it is a reflection of their own deep-seated self-loathing and self-hatred. Pierre de Boisdeffre poses pertinent questions in this respect: "Brigitte Pian, Thérèse Desqueyroux, Blaise Couture sont des êtres à qui nul n'a appris à s'aimer. Pourquoi aimeraient-ils leurs semblables puisque eux-mêmes détestent leur propre chair et lorsqu'ils se regardent dans un miroir se prennent en horreur?" (1967: 25).

What drives the Mauriac's characters to be obsessed with hatred and causing pain is that they are unable to love themselves, to begin with. In fact, the "désert de l'amour" that is the family is actually a representation of an interior and hidden desert, which like acid eats away the inside of the characters. Unable to love themselves, these characters find it doubly difficult to love others: how can they express something that they do not have within themselves? How can Thérèse love her husband or daughter when she despises herself? How is Jean Pelouyre expected to love his

wife when he is appalled by his own image in the mirror? Unable to love, Mauriac's characters are caught up in a vicious circle of "hate-making" and causing pain to the people that matter the most, members of one's family. Szczepan Babinski concludes on this tragic and pessimistic vision of Mauriacian intra-family relationships characterised by hate: "On n'aperçoit aucune affinité entre les membres d'une même famille. Aucune complicité dans le sens positif du terme, ne les unit, car s'il y a une complicité, elle n'a pour but que de détruire l'autre" (1987: 19).

What further exacerbates this situation is that Mauriac's characters are incapable of forgiving and they also possess a vivid memory of past events; nothing seems to escape their memory, every minute detail is remembered and used to fuel their anger towards others. Louis in *Le nœud de vipères*, for example, does not forget the night when his wife innocently tells him of the short-lived love affair she had just before meeting him. Louis takes this to mean that Isa did not love him but merely accepted him because she has been trying to get over her failed love affair. Louis does not forgive Isa for this innocent error she makes. In *Thérèse chez le docteur*, Dr Schwartz's wife, Catherine, describes this trait, or obsession rather, of Mauriac's characters of remembering almost everything: "Je me rappelle mot pour mot ce que tu m'as raconté, ce soir-là... J'ai une mémoire terrible, dès qu'il s'agit de toi. Rien n'est perdu, pas une syllabe de ce que tu articules en ma présence" (1938 : 147).

Locked away in the past, Mauriac's characters find sustenance for their anger and hatred from the slightest of errors made by other people.

What is interesting in the manner in which Mauriac's couples fail to "connect" sexually and this fact can be linked in a way to the personal demons that the author had to grapple with concerning his own sexuality. This sexuality has been a question of great debate and speculation and it is only in the year 2009 (thirty-nine years after the death of Mauriac) that Jean-Luc Barré broke the silence that surrounded Mauriac's sexuality. In his biography *François Mauriac: Biographie intime 1885-1940*, Barré officialises Mauriac's "homosexuality". The failure of heterosexual relationships in his books, especially in as far as sexuality is concerned, can be read as some sort of hint of the reservations he has of his own sexuality. It has often been considered that Mauriac had a good marriage but François Dufay moves away from this widely-held supposition and shows how the author could have had some misgivings about his marital life: "Quant à Thérèse Desqueyroux, cette empoisonneuse prisonnière du huis clos conjugal, n'est-elle pas la jumelle de cet écrivain étouffant dans le carcan du mariage?" (2009: n.p.). This perspective of Mauriac's unhappiness within his marriage offers a fascinating ontological position from which to analyse his distressed sexuality. We argue that Mauriac's own unhappiness might trigger his way of depicting marriages as suffocating spaces in which couples are eternally unsatisfied. It is interesting to note that, although neither Mauriac nor his literary characters explicitly say anything about their homosexual longings, the texts themselves, through an intricate interplay of semantic buoyancy and silence, deconstruct the sacred domain that homosexuality is. In this manner, his literary texts become the rallying point of the writer's internal struggle, embodying his "troubled" sexuality, which subsequently reveals his fragmented and displaced identity. The negative light in which Mauriac presents heterosexual relationships leaves a lot more questions than answers. In his ambivalent relation to matrimony as an institution, he implicitly questions his own marriage especially in the light of the homosexual longings, albeit chaste, that he has to fight with right through his life.

By his recurrent approach to family issues, Mauriac elevates it almost to mysticism. Alekander Milecki highlights that Mauriac uses the family as the centrepiece of all his work: "Quoi qu'il en soit de ses convictions, un point reste indiscutable: parmi tous les éléments qui imprimeront leur sceau sur toute l'œuvre de Mauriac, une place de choix revient à la famille" (1999: 29).

We contend that a conscious attack on the family in his literary works is a veiled attack on two main individuals: his own mother and father. Therefore, by depicting the family in the darkest light, Mauriac in fact deliberately sought to create a situation that would bring him into conflict with his family, in particular his mother, his surviving parent. Such a confrontation with his mother was the only way in which he could come to terms with the upbringing that he had received from

her. Neither his father is spared Mauriac's violent recriminations. His father's absence and the over-presence of his mother were responsible for making the son the person he was. Mauriac did indeed feel the weight of this dichotomous effect of his parents on his temperament and character. Let us therefore, as a point of conclusion, attempt to pinpoint and reveal particular stages in Mauriac's literary texts that show a progression in Mauriac's attempt to resolve the primal psychic wound caused by his upbringing.

As Mauriac's literary career progressed, there was a marked reduction in the levels of acrimony of the author towards the subject of the family. His first works like *Le baiser au lépreux*, *Génitrix* and *Thérèse Desqueyroux*, produced the darkest representations of the family and intra-family relations. These novels can be considered to be the works with which Mauriac sought to begin his attack on his parents. *Génitrix* in particular offers the darkest depiction of the mother figure, who literally destroys the life of her beloved son by being over-possessive. Mauriac's mother, who died six years after the publication of *Génitrix*, was never to read *Le Mystère Frontenac*, which glorified the mother figure. His mother's death does not however lessen his anger but he still struggles with the "demons" that had haunted him before. There is, however, a marked decline in bitterness following the publication of the novel *Le Mystère Frontenac*, and his brush with mortality after an operation of his vocal cords in the year 1932.

We can attribute this decline in Mauriac's aggression towards the family and the parental figures to the fact that Mauriac might have obtained some healing of the psychic wound discussed previously in this article. As he continued to write, he also found and consolidated a writing voice, which was of prime importance in bringing together parts of his fragmented *self*.

As he came to terms with the upbringing that he received, Mauriac did not come to terms with the demons of his sexuality, though. The reason why he did not disclose his homosexual longings boils down (as usual) to the family. Nonetheless, in this instance, instead of making his family suffer, he spares them all embarrassment and pain that would have accompanied his "coming out". Barré analyses this reaction by Mauriac, which seems to differ from the manner in which he related to his family in other instances, asking why he should have been so concerned to spare them: "Pourquoi le « monstre des lettres » qui, depuis toujours, « tire sa substance d'une classe et d'une lignée: s'est-il montré si soucieux, en fin de parcours, de les épargner l'un et l'autre ?" (2009: 12).

Mauriac himself confessed to his friend Julien Green why he did not disclose his homosexual longings: because he had a family that might have been harmed by such an admission – "Je ne peux pas, je ne suis pas seul, j'ai une famille" (1996: 67). Again, we can ask: why does Mauriac want to save his family from pain when all he has done through his writing is inflict pain on the family?

By constantly attacking the family in his literary works, Mauriac simply tested the waters to see how his family would react to his attacks. Moreover, by gauging the reaction of the family to issues like loveless intra-family relationships and deformed filial bonds, Mauriac was able to ascertain how his family would act in response to his disclosure of his homosexual longings. Judging by what he said to Green, it is clear that Mauriac knew that the disclosure of his homosexuality would utterly destroy his family, particularly his mother.

For Mauriac, therefore, fictionalising the family became a creative quest, through which he sought to heal the psychic trauma haunting him throughout his whole life. Given that he could not confess his homosexuality to his family, he created literary characters who equally struggle with their sexuality, like Thérèse Desqueyroux or Jean Peloueyre, who provide vicarious examples of his own transgressive desires: "des messagers d'une douleur, d'une colère, d'un désir de transgression qui l'ont habité lui-même [Mauriac], sa vie durant, sans jamais s'exprimer pleinement au grand jour" (Barré, 2009: 21). Writing of this deep internal strife became a cathartic quest to purge himself of the guilt and the regret caused by his denial of his homosexuality and his failure to disclose this most intimate part of his life. Lejeune rightly remarks on this cathartic effect of writing that the written word no longer seems to entirely belong to its author, but it becomes a

reality shared with other people; this way, he can conquer his secret pain: “Comme c’est drôle, la délivrance par papier! Il me semble que dès que j’ai écrit, ce n’est plus entièrement moi, et que même si ce papier reste inconnu, ma peine est partagée par des millions de personnes, ou par moi plus tard. Et puis, il y a la joie de se sentir décrit, compris, ne serait-ce que par soi-même. La joie d’avoir triomphé de sa peine, puisqu’on a réussi à en faire autre chose qu’une page écrite” (2005: 204).

Lejeune reveals that the written word becomes an avenue through which a distressed author shares his sorrow not just with a million other people, but with himself as well. The fact that the writer is able to create something out of his anguish represents a triumph over this anguish. In his conclusion to posthumously published memoirs, *La paix des cimes*, Mauriac comments that poetry, and presumably, creative writing in general, must necessarily express the drama of man divided against himself, enabling him to finally understand what kind of love and sexuality he was made for: “Si la poésie se ramène à l’effusion de notre être secret, si elle est le cri d’un cœur plein de désir qui se répand et qui se livre, si elle prend sa source en nous à l’intersection de l’esprit et de la chair, elle ne peut pas ne pas exprimer le drame de l’homme divisé contre lui-même jusqu’à ce qu’il ait compris pour quel amour il a été fait” (2009: 115).

At this point, Mauriac reminds of Michel Foucault who asks himself: “Who am I? What is the secret of my desire?” (1985: 136). Literature represents for Mauriac a space where he can address his internal strife. However, this internal strife cannot be resolved as long as he does not understand, in his own words, “what love he was made for”. Mauriac completely denies the homosexual longings that he has and that torment him each and every day of his existence.

In conclusion, we find that Mauriac’s relationship with his family reveals a fascinating paradox. Although he apparently had no compunction in attacking the family, especially his parents for his upbringing, he continually sought to spare his family from the ultimate anguish that he could ever inflict on it. In Mauriac’s life and works, we can discern the drama of a man who attempts to integrate his sense of *self*, by attacking and, at the same time, protecting his family.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- MAURIAC, F. (1922). *Le baiser au lépreux*. Paris: Grasset.
 ----- (1923). *Génitrix*. Paris: Grasset.
 ----- (1927). *Thérèse Desqueyroux*. Paris: Grasset.
 ----- (1932). *Le nœud de vipères*. Paris: Grasset.
 ----- (1933). *Le mystère Frontenac*. Paris: Grasset.
 ----- (1935). *La fin de la nuit*. Paris: Grasset.
 ----- (1938). *Thérèse chez le docteur*. Paris: Grasset.
 ----- (1951a). *Conscience, instinct divin*. Paris: Fayard.
 ----- (1951b). *Le désert de l’amour*. Paris: Fayard.
 ----- (1952a). *Asmodée*. Paris: Fayard.
 ----- (1952b). *La pharisienne*. Paris: Fayard.
 ----- (1952c). *Le sangouin*. Paris: Fayard.
 ----- (1954). *L’agneau*. Paris: Fayard.
 ----- (1965). *Nouveaux mémoires intérieurs*. Paris: Flammarion.
 ----- (1969). *Un adolescent d’autrefois*. Paris: Flammarion.
 ----- (2009). *La paix des cimes: Chroniques 1948-1955*. Paris: Bartillat.

ALMOND, B. & ALMOND, R. (1996). *The Therapeutic Narrative: Fictional Relationships and the Process of Psychological Change*. London: Praeger.

BABINKSI, S. (1987). *Le thème de la solitude dans Génitrix, Le désert de l’amour et Thérèse Desqueyroux. Travaux du Centre d’Etudes et de Recherches sur François Mauriac*, 21, 5-32.

BARRÉ, J.-L. (2009). *François Mauriac: Biographie intime 1885-1940*. Paris: Fayard.

- BOISDEFFRE, P. de. (1967). *Les écrivains français d'aujourd'hui*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- BONAPARTE, M. (1957). *Poe and the Function of Literature*. New York: Meridian Books.
- COETZEE, J. M. (1986). *Foe*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- DELCROIX, M. (1997). *Les mal-aimés dans Le sangouin*. Paris: Association Internationale des Amis de François Mauriac.
- DUFAY, F. (2009). Mauriac homo, le brûlant secret. *L'Express*. Available at: www.lexpress.fr/culture/livre/mauriac-homo-le-brulant-secret_823354.html. [Last accessed: September 2016].
- FOUCAULT, M. (1985). *The Will to Know*. New York: Anchor Books.
- GIDE, A. (1958). *Les faux-monnayeurs*. Paris: La Pléiade.
- GOZIER, A. (2001). *Le christ de François Mauriac*. Paris: CLD.
- GREEN, J. (1996). *Pourquoi suis-je moi? Journal 1993-1996*. Paris: Fayard.
- KINGSTON, M. (2009). Subversive Friendships: Foucault on Homosexuality and Social Experimentation. *Foucault Studies*, 7, 7-17.
- LEJEUNE, P. (1996). *Le pacte autobiographique, nouvelle édition augmentée*. Paris: Seuil.
- MAUCUER, M. (1996). *Thérèse Desqueyroux: Profil d'une œuvre*. Paris: Hatier.
- MILECKI, A. (1999). *François Mauriac ou la liberté de l'esprit*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- SPEAIGHT, R. (1976). *Francois Mauriac: A Study of the Writer and the Man*, Chatto & Windus: London.
- SUFFRAN, Michel. (1990). Au nom du père: Essai sur les rapports de « réalité » et de « fiction » entre François et Jean-Paul Mauriac. *Cahiers François Mauriac*, 17, 33-46.