

Criticism

HELENE AS PRE-OEDIPAL SELF-OBJECT

Daniel Rancour-Laferrriere, University of California, Davis

All Tolstoy fans remember the famous passage early in War and Peace where Pierre Bezukhov suddenly gets captivated by the bust of Hélène Kuragin. The scene is one of Anna Scherer's evening parties. Pierre is attempting to make small talk about a snuff-box:

...the aunt handed him the snuffbox, passing it across Hélène's back. Hélène stooped forward to make room, and looked round with a smile. She was, as always at evening parties, wearing a dress such as was then fashionable, cut very low at front and back. Her bust, which had always seemed like marble to Pierre [Ee biust, kazavshiisia vseгда mramorom P'eru], was so close to him that his shortsighted eyes could not but perceive the living charm of her neck and shoulders, so near to his lips that he need only have bent his head a little to have touched them. He was conscious of the warmth of her body, the scent of her perfume, and the creaking of her corset as she moved. He did not see her marble beauty [ne ee mramornuiu krasotu] forming a complete whole with her dress, but all the charm of her body only covered by her garments [vsiu prelest' ee tela, kotoroe bylo zakryto tol'ko odezhdoi]. And having once seen this he could not help being aware of it, just as we cannot renew an illusion we have once seen through.

She turned her head, looked straight at him, her dark eyes shining, and smiled.

"So you have never noticed before how beautiful I am?" Helene seemed to say. "You had not noticed that I am a woman? Yes, I am a woman who may belong to anyone [vsiakomu] - to you too," said her glance. And at that moment Pierre felt that Hélène not only could, but must, be his wife, and that it could not be otherwise.

He knew this at that moment as surely as if he had been standing at the altar with her. How and when this would be he did not know, he did not even know if it would be a good thing (he even felt, he knew not why, that it would be a bad thing [nekhoroшо pochemu-to]), but he knew that it would happen.

(222-23/4:278-79)¹

Pierre now feels that Hélène is "terribly close" to him: "she already had power over him, and between them there was no longer any barrier except the barrier of his own will" (223).

Some of Tolstoy's contemporaries thought this passage slightly risqué.² Pierre is obviously aroused, and it is his arousal - not love - which determines that a marriage will take place. At the same time he feels that there is something wrong with being aroused by such a woman. He thinks: "...this is not love. On the contrary, there is something nasty, something forbidden [что-то гадкое... что-то запредельное] in the feeling she excites in me" (223/4: 280).

Pierre's sexual arousal and accompanying guilt feelings are easy enough to see, and I am not going to dwell on them here. As I show in a larger study, tentatively titled Pierre Bezukhov: An Experiment in Literary Psychobiography, such feelings are essentially Oedipal in their origin and dynamics. That is, they depend on the triangular relationships which Pierre either imagines having or actually experiences with his promiscuous future wife and some other man (e.g., Hélène's brother Anatole).

But at a deeper level the problem Pierre has is with Hélène herself. At this level we are dealing with a dyad, not a triangle. The relationship with Hélène is not only Oedipal, it is pre-Oedipal as well.

How can this be so? A pre-Oedipal relationship is between mother and child. It can probably be agreed that Pierre is one of the most infantile characters in the history of Russian literature. The narrator repeatedly describes him as childlike. But in what sense is Hélène a maternal figure?

There are some superficial signs, such as the fact that Pierre accepts Hélène as his wife, or his preoccupation with her promiscuous tendencies. It is an old chestnut of psychoanalysis that a wife represents the mother in a man's psychical life (in semiotic terms, a wife is a mother-icon³). In particular, a wife who is unfaithful is a reminder of the mother, who by definition had to have sex with the father in order for the jealous male child even to come into existence.⁴

But Tolstoy is much more evocative than this. I would like to suggest that Hélène's maternal qualities reside precisely in features which, on the surface, are merely sexual or aesthetic. The narrator so frequently focuses our attention (along with Pierre's) on the physical attractiveness and perfection of Hélène's upper body that we have to suspect that there is more there than meets the eye.

At Anna Pavlovna's first soiree Hélène's "shapely shoulders,

back, and bosom [grudi]" are "in the fashion of those days...very much exposed" (11/4:19). As she listens to the vicomte she sits quietly, "glancing now at her beautiful round arm, altered in shape by its pressure on the table, now at her still more beautiful bosom [na eshche bolee krasivuiu grud'], on which she re-adjusted a diamond necklace" (12/4:19). She seems to be illuminated by "the unusual beauty of a body from antiquity [neobychainoi, antichnoi krasotoi tela]" (4:20). She is so statuesque that the narrator describes her as "turning her beautiful head and looking over her classically molded shoulder [povorachivaia svoiu krasivuiu golovu na antichnykh plechakh]" (16/4:25). The idea of an ancient statue reappears at the second soiree where Helene is again wearing a very low cut dress and her bust seems like marble to Pierre ("Ee biust, kazavshiisia vseгда mramornym P'eru..." -4:278). Pierre is very taken by the "marble beauty" of her bust.

These passages suggest not only sensuality, but an idealized past: it was in the old days that a woman's bosom was exposed like this ("po togdashnei mode"); it was in antiquity that bare shoulders were so perfect ("antichnye plechi," "antichnaia krasota tela"). Her name as well suggests the past, for Helen of Troy was the type of female beauty in classical antiquity: Pierre considered himself lucky "...to be looked on as a sort of Paris possessed of a Helen" (228).

The suggestion of pastness is particularly subtle in the Russian wording of the imagery introduced right after Pierre has seen through the "illusion" ("obman") which clothes Hélène's beautiful body:

Pierre dropped his eyes, lifted them again, and wished once more to see her as a distant beauty far removed from him, as he had seen her every day until then, but he could no longer do it. He could not, any more than a man who has been looking at a stalk of steppe grass through the mist and taking it for a tree can again take it for a tree after he has once recognized it to be a stalk of grass [Ne mog, kak ne mozhet chelovek, prezhe smotrevshii v tumane na bylinku bur'iana i videvshii v nei derevo, uvidav bylinku, snova uvidet' v nei derevo]. She was terribly close to him.

(223/4:279)

Where before Pierre saw a tree, now he sees a stalk of grass, a "bylinka," which etymologically suggests the meaning "a little something from the past" (cf. the related words "bylina" ['a tale about the past'], and the expression "byl'em poroslo" ['long forgotten,' i.e., 'long grown over with grass']⁵). The attractive feminine body, particularly the bust, is suffused with pastness itself. Its pastness and its closeness are indeed inseparable, as the phonological repetitiveness (alliteration, assonance)

of the passage suggests: "...na bylinku bur'iana...uvidav bylinku.. ..Ona byla strashno blizka emu. [...]...Ne bylo uzhe nikakikh pregrad...." The insistent image of a nearby stalk of grass does not seem so odd when the etymology and the phonology of the word in question are taken into consideration.

The narrator says that Pierre's shortsighted eyes cannot but take delight in Hélène's magnificent bust ("...on...nevol'no razlichal zhivuiu prelest' ee plechi i shei..."). Pierre's lips are so close that he can almost touch her with them ("tak blizko ot ego gub, chto emu stoilo nemnogo nagnut'sia, chtoby prikosnut'sia do nee" - 4:278). Pierre is clearly idealizing Hélène's bust at the same time that he considers the possibility of gaining oral gratification from it.

At this moment Hélène is not only sexy. She is maternal as well. It is precisely a woman's breasts that are of interest to a child who is close to them, that is, who is nursing. Pierre's realization that he must marry Hélène is conditioned specifically by the depiction of her bust as an idealized object from the past and as a source of oral gratification. Hélène is at this point what psychoanalyst Melanie Klein would call a "good breast-mother," that is, a mother-figure metonymized by her ideal, orally gratifying breasts.⁶

Right after Prince Vasilii congratulates Pierre and Hélène on their forthcoming marriage, Pierre seems overcome with emotion and several times applies his lips to Hélène's hand. Then, left alone with Hélène, he continues to hold her hand and looks at her beautiful bosom as it rises and falls ("smotrel na ee podnimaiushchiusia i opuskaiushchiusia prekrasnuiu grud'" [4:289] - the awkwardly paired participles rather suggestive of her paired breasts). He starts to bend over in order to again kiss her hand, but Hélène intercepts his movement and grasps his lips with her own ("perekhvatila ego guby i svela ikh s svoimi" - 4:289). Pierre's moment of oral gratification has come - whether he likes it or not. Just a few lines later he is married.

One of the psychological characteristics of the nursling at the breast, according to psychoanalyst Heinz Kohut, is the tendency to treat the mother as a selfobject. A selfobject is an object that is in some way not adequately differentiated from the self. That is, it possesses the properties of the self as well as of an object. According to Kohut, the infant initially (pre-Oedipally) has difficulty separating itself from persons (objects) in the environment. At some stage, for example, the infant may need to idealize one of the parents and experience a sense of merger with that idealized parent. Parents are idealized selfobjects before they are objects. Children initially live in a world of selfobjects, and only gradually, through repeated experiences of empathic response from parental figures (interspersed with occasional failures of empathic response), does the child's self develop into a relatively autonomous entity. If for some reason, however, there has been a chronic

absence of empathic response from those responsible for dealing with the child, then a tendency in adulthood to continue to confuse the self with objects, that is, to continue to deal with others as selfobjects, may result.⁷

Pierre has considerable difficulty differentiating himself from Helene, the object of his idealizing tendencies and his powerful sexual desire. For example, at Hélène's name day party he momentarily imagines that he is the one who possesses her great beauty: "...here he was sitting by her side as her betrothed, seeing, hearing, feeling her nearness, her breathing, her movements, her beauty. Then all at once it seemed to him that it was not she but he who was so unusually beautiful [chto eto ne ona, a on sam tak neo-byknovenno krasiv], and that that was why they were all looking so at him, and happy at this general admiration he expanded his chest, raised his head, and rejoiced at his good fortune" (228/4:286).

There is more to this astonishing passage than just the oddity of a man taking on a woman's features. Pierre's attitude is downright infantile (the narrator speaks of the "childish smile" on Pierre's face). Pierre is like the little boy in Tolstoy's story Childhood who, having kissed his sweetheart on her naked shoulder, is reminded of the erotic feeling he has previously experienced in stroking his own naked forearm.⁸

There is a powerful idealizing impulse and obvious narcissistic gratification as Pierre contemplates Hélène's beauty. In Kohutian terms, the self is momentarily acquiring a property of the idealized object, is treating the object as a selfobject.⁹ This is very reminiscent of the way the pre-Oedipal child, in the absence of the father and in the close physical presence of the mother, sometimes idealizes her and glories in her beauty.

After marrying Hélène, Pierre continues to take great pride in her majestic beauty and in her social tact ("...gordilsia ee velichavoi krasoty, ee svetskim taktom..." - 5:35). It is clear that a large portion of his self-worth during this brief period of the marriage derives from what he thinks she is.

Consider also Pierre's obsessive ruminations about Helene's incestuous behavior. These occur before the marriage takes place. He thinks about what Hélène has done specifically in terms of himself. The thought of her past illegitimate liason with her brother Anatole provokes him to think that what he is feeling is illegitimate ("chto-to gadkoe est' v tom chuvstve, kotoroe ona vzbudila vo mne, chto-to zapreshchennoe" - 4:280). It is as if Pierre were the one guilty of incest.¹⁰ There is no idealization here of course, but the tendency to confuse himself with her, to treat her as a selfobject, is evident.

Both Pierre and Hélène are sexually experienced. This is an objective similarity between the two characters, a similarity which

reinforces the reader's awareness of Pierre's tendency to see something of himself in Hélène (or vice-versa, something of Helene in himself). True, Pierre's sexual experience is quite different from Hélène's in that it is not incestuous. Nonetheless Pierre, not liking what he sees in Hélène, still feels that he has crossed over into a forbidden zone, the zone which Hélène and Anatole had already occupied by being in love with one another and not merely having had sex with one another ("...ee brat Anatol' byl vliublen v nee, i ona vliublana v nego..." - 4:280). A few lines later Pierre imagines that he too can be loved by Hélène ("ona mozhet poliubit' ego"). His culminating declaration to Hélène, "Je vous aime," may seem insincere to him, but it too points to that incestuous experience, defined as love, that she has already had.

The similarities between Pierre and Hélène are remarkable, and they strengthen the reader's impression that Pierre is not adequately differentiating himself from Hélène, i.e., is treating her as a selfobject. For example, Pierre, whose name means "stone" in French, marries a woman whose upper body is repeatedly characterized as sculpted stone, i.e., a marble bust. Both characters, moreover, have French rather than Russian names. The narrator prefers the name "Pierre," and avoids the use of "Petr," or "Petia," or "Petr Kirillovich" in scenes where Hélène is present. As for Helene, she is almost never "Elena," which would be the proper Russian name (the narrator does often speak of "Elen," but this is just a Russian approximation of the French "Hélène," which the English "Ellen" used by some translators and critics completely misses). The Russian diminutive "Lelia" rarely appears, and even then only affectedly, when spoken by Prince Vasilii. Thus, for purposes of describing the premarital and marital relationship between the two characters, the narrator uses primarily the names "Pierre" and "Hélène," as if the two were French citizens, aliens in the Russian land. This situation is particularly paradoxical for Pierre, who is traditionally regarded as Russian to the core (given the bear imagery that is applied to him early in the novel, his name really should have been Mikhail/Misha). On the other hand, if Tolstoy wanted to suggest that there is something bad or un-Russian about the marriage, the foreign names are appropriate (when Pierre courts Natasha later in the novel, the properly Russian "Petr Kirillovich" and "Petia" appear quite often).

The duel with Dolokhov provides an occasion for the narrator to disclose Pierre's deepest feelings about Hélène. The night after he has shot and wounded Dolokhov he meditates on the meaning of what he has done. The image of his faithless Hélène comes into his mind: "...emu vdrug predstaviliias' ona..." (5:36, italics Tolstoy's). He gets up, moves about the room, he starts breaking and tearing at anything that comes to hand (lomat', i rvat' popadaiushchie emu pod ruki veshchi" - 5:36). This is the same rage he had experienced when he originally challenged Dolokhov. Yet obviously it is Hélène he would now like to be breaking and tearing (cf. his earlier feeling of being "razorvan s neiu"). But he cannot admit this to himself.

He thinks instead of those moments when he had most strongly expressed his "insincere love" for her.

Pierre wants to blame the whole situation on the falseness of his love for Hélène: "...in what was I to blame?" he asked [himself]. 'In marrying her without loving her; in deceiving both yourself and her [sic!].' He remembers the evening of the dinner at Prince Vasilii's, "...when he spoke those words he found so difficult to utter: 'Je vous aime.' 'It all comes from that! [Vse ot etogo!]' (342/5:34).

But to blame his predicament on his false love is itself false. It is Hélène who has failed to love Pierre, not the other way around (or perhaps the other way around too). He may not be narcissistically damaged by what society thinks, but he is hurt by what Hélène feels - or fails to feel.

Pierre asks himself why he had not loved her (343), when, logically speaking, he should be asking himself why she had not loved him. He had said "Je vous aime," but she had not replied in kind nor showed that she cared for him in any way. He had desired her beautiful body, but now he is ashamed to have gotten it and nothing else. It is embarrassing for him to remember having needed her sexually (the memory of the honeymoon). Earlier the thought of sex with Hélène had provoked guilt feelings because it represented an Oedipal transgression. Now it provokes shame instead, because of her voracious sexuality Hélène is in effect abandoning Pierre. The woman he had temporarily idealized does not love him, and that is shameful.¹¹

In focusing on the supposed falseness of his "Je vous aime" Pierre is redirecting aggression away from Hélène and back on to himself. He is still confusing himself with the selfobject. Why?

Consider the additional pain he would have to experience if he did not. Were he not to focus on his own "insincere" love for her, then he would have to deal much more directly than he does with her utter disdain for him. After all, she had not been merely unfaithful to him (he had half expected as much). She did not care in the slightest if he chose to be unfaithful (Natasha will be a very different kind of wife in this respect). She had always been condescending toward his attempts to communicate his inner reflections to her. She had married him for his money. She had even refused to mother his children: "One day I asked her if she felt any symptoms of pregnancy. She laughed contemptuously and said she was not a fool to want to have children, and that she was not going to have any children by me" (343). It is difficult to imagine a more unwifely and unloving thing to say to a husband. Yet Pierre does not seem to comprehend this. Instead he keeps imagining that his "insincere love" is what created the bad marriage. He is such a narcissistic dummy.

It is evident to the reader that Hélène would not have been very sorry if Pierre had been killed by Dolokhov in the duel. But there is a woman who would have been very pained indeed to learn of Dolokhov's death. We are suddenly introduced to her in a conversation between the wounded Dolokhov and his second, Nikolai Rostov:

"...I have killed her, killed...She won't get over it! She won't survive...."

"Who?" asked Rostov.

"My mother! My mother, my angel, my adored angel mother," and Dolokhov pressed Rostov's hand and burst into tears.

When he had become a little quieter he explained to Rostov that he was living with his mother, who, if she saw him dying, would not survive it. He implored Rostov to go on and prepare her. (341)

Dolokhov may be a dreadful bully, but he at least has a mother who cares.¹² Nice guy Pierre at this point has neither mother nor father not loving wife. In particular, the poignant mention of Dolokhov's mother only heightens the sense of Pierre's motherlessness, that is, the sense of Hélène's failure to be the devoted mother-icon a wife is supposed to be.

The only aspect of Hélène that Pierre is able to actively and consciously condemn as he meditates on his bad marriage is her sexuality. This topic had already been on Pierre's hidden agenda, for Hélène's promiscuous behavior is what Pierre had needed in order to advance to an Oedipal level of functioning. That is, he had been unconsciously working all along at losing Hélène by Oedipal means, by covertly creating a triangle that was sure to cause disaster (this view is developed at some length in my book-in-progress). But now that Pierre has accomplished this goal he can be frank with himself about Hélène's sexual behavior, even though this frankness is now quite beside the point. In fact it is defensive, for he is using it to block awareness of Hélène's profound indifference toward him. He admits that she is a "depraved woman" ("razvratnaia zhenshchina"), he vividly recalls her allowing herself to be kissed on the shoulders by her brother, he remembers the coarseness and vulgarity of her speech, etc. She is a bad girl indeed. For a moment he even seems to think that Hélène's sexual looseness is the cause of the bad marriage: "It is all, all her fault."

But no sooner has he said this than he starts in again on his "Je vous aime": "Why did I tell her that 'Je vous aime'?" he keeps repeating to himself. And having repeated the question ten times, and having failed to cross the barrier of repression that separates him from the answer, a famous saying of Molière suddenly pops into his head: "Mais que diable allait il faire dans cette galère?" - and he laughs at himself (343/5:36).

If Pierre is going to get out of the mess he is in, he has to act. This is no time for questions. He has to separate completely from the person he had said "Je vous aime" to, not ask why he said it. But because he has in fact repeated the question so many times he has deautomatized its meaning, he has hinted at other meanings hovering around its periphery. He has, in short, come as close as he can to the unspeakable question of why Hélène has not loved him.

Although Pierre may be incapable of expressing to anyone in any language his deep resentment of Hélène's failure to love him (as opposed to her sexual depravity), he nonetheless finally does reach a point where he can at least act on (or psychoanalytically speaking, "act out") this resentment. The day after the meditations on "cette galère" Hélène marches haughtily into Pierre's study, "a wrathful wrinkle on her rather prominent marble brow." She proceeds to berate her husband for his outburst of jealousy. Although she denies having taken a lover, she declares that Dolokhov is a "better man" than he, that she prefers Dolokhov's company to his, and that there are few wives in her situation who would not have taken a lover.

Pierre begins to feel a terrible weight on his chest. He cannot breathe. He suggests a separation:

"Separate? Very well, but only if you give me a fortune," said Hélène. "Separate! That's a thing to frighten me with [Rasstat'sia, vot chem ispugali]!"

Pierre leaped up from the sofa and rushed staggering toward her.

"I'll kill you!" he shouted, and seizing the marble top of a table with a strength he had never before felt, he made a step toward her brandishing the slab.

Hélène's face became terrible, she shrieked and sprang aside. His father's nature showed itself in Pierre. He felt the fascination and delight of frenzy. He flung down the slab, broke it, and swooping down on her with outstretched hands shouted, "Get out!" in such a terrible voice that the whole house heard it with horror. God knows what he would have done at that moment had Hélène not fled from the room. (345/5:38)

The final straw, i.e., what leads Pierre to commit an act of physical violence, is Hélène's mockery of the idea that they might be separated. As if she cared! In other words, Pierre does care (which is his narcissistic problem, not love). And he hates Hélène for having made him care, or for having made him finally realize that he does care. His tentative idea that they might separate leads to an unmistakable sign of her utter indifference to being with him. This is the most painful thing for Pierre, the greatest possible blow to his narcissistic self. It is no wonder that he

gets violent specifically at this point. What happens here is a good illustration of Kohut's thesis that destructive rage is motivated by an injury to the self.¹³

Pierre directs his fury at Hélène. But Hélène is not only Hélène. She is also a (defective) icon of Pierre's pointedly absent mother (note the parallel of what Dolokhov says about his mother - "I have killed her!" - with what Pierre says to his mother-icon - "I'll kill you!"). Pierre's emotions are so powerful because they derive from very archaic and primal feelings about having been insufficiently mothered. There is more in this explosion than anger at having been cuckolded. Pierre is accomplishing even more than was on his hidden Oedipal agenda. He is regressing far back to a pre-Oedipal rage.

It is just before he has his fight with Hélène that Pierre recalls her as she appeared in the early days of their marriage, "with bare shoulders [s otkrytymi plechami] and a languid, passionate look on her face." He also recalls her brother Anatole kissing her "bare shoulders" ("golye plechi"). When Hélène then marches majestically into the room where Pierre has been trying to come to grips with himself, the narrator reintroduces the marble-imagery that had been applied to Hélène's upper body from the very beginning of the novel. Hélène's angry brow is like marble ("na mramornom...lbe") as she approaches Pierre, and a short while later Pierre smashes a marble tabletop ("skhvativ so stola mramornuiu dosku," "razbil ee") as he chases her out. In effect, Pierre finally confronts his mother's invidious rejection/abandonment of him by smashing her cold, stony representation. The "marble beauty" ("mramornaia krasota") of the mother-icon's bust has been dealt a blow. In Kleinian terms, where earlier there had been a "good breast" idealized by the infantile Pierre, now there is a "bad breast"¹⁴ which provokes an act of aggression from him.

A week later Pierre turns over control of his Russian estates to Hélène and travels alone to Petersburg. There is no sign of mourning. But he has achieved some degree of separation from his defective mother-icon, so it is high time he returned to the unresolved issues concerning the men in his life.

NOTES

1. For translation purposes I have used an old standard, the Maude's version (as reprinted in the Norton Critical Edition of *War and Peace* edited by George Gibian). Occasionally I have had to correct errors in this translation or make changes to reflect the Russian text of the novel as edited by E.E. Zaidenshaur and published in the 20-volume edition of Tolstoy's works in 1961-3. References are given in parentheses, with the page number of the Maude's translation first, then the volume and page of the Russian edition.

2. For example, Shchebal'skii 1888 (1868), 84.
3. Rancour-Laferriere 1985, 136 ff.
4. See, for example: Freud, Standard Edition, vol. XI, 165-75.
5. See: Dal' 1984 (1862), I, 235; Dal' 1955 (1880-82), I, 149; Fasmer 1964, vol. I, 258-9.
6. See: Klein 1977, 377, 379, 380, 394, etc. Later, when the marriage to Hélène is falling apart, she will become what Klein calls a "bad-breast mother" (see below).
7. See, for example: Kohut 1977; Greenberg and Mitchell 1983 352 ff.
8. Cf. Ossipow 1923, 30.
9. In more traditional Freudian terms, Pierre has made a "narcissistic object-choice" (cf. Freud, Standard Edition, vol. XIV, 90).
10. The idea that Pierre is willing to marry Hélène because she reminds him of his own unclear conscience has already been expressed by Gary Saul Morson:

In the end, Pierre marries Hélène not out of lust but out of guilt over lust. Without a totally clear conscience, he is unable to see any difference between marrying or not marrying a woman he suspects to be guilty of incest.

(Morson 1987, 237)

In other words, Pierre's lack of a "totally clear conscience" might itself have something to do with Helene's incest. But Morson does not come right out and say this, nor does he consider the narcissistic, Oedipal, and pre-Oedipal substrata of Pierre's feelings about Hélène.

Quite often in his interesting book on Tolstoy Morson seems to be teetering in this fashion on the brink of psychoanalysis. His implicit rejection of psychoanalysis (made explicit in his article in the first issue of Tolstoy Studies Journal, 1988) is apparently based on an acceptance of Tolstoy's own anti-intellectual rejection of the possibility of finding causal laws to explain human behavior. However, it is one thing for Tolstoy to design his narration in such a way as to suppress connections between narrated entities, it is quite another to accept the philosophy behind such suppression (as Morson has apparently done).

11. On the psychoanalytic distinction between guilt and shame, see Piers and Singer 1953.
12. Dolokhov is apparently fatherless, however. He is never once referred to by his patronymic. Anna Mikhailovna dubs him "Dolokhov, Mar'i Ivanovny syn" ("Dolokhov, son of Mar'i Ivanovna" - 5:19).
13. Kohut 1977, 116. See also Piers and Singer 1953, 24.
14. See: Klein 1977, 262 ff.; 191 ff.; 306-307; Rancour-Laferriere 1985, 211.

REFERENCES

- Dal', Vladimir. 1955 (1880-82). Tolkovyi slovar' zhivogo velikorusskogo iazyka. Moscow: 4 vols.
- Dal', Vladimir. 1984 (1862). Poslovitsy russkogo naroda. Moscow: Khud. lit-a, 2 vols.
- Fasmer, M. 1964-1973. Etimologicheskii slovar' russkogo iazyka. Moscow: 4 vols.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1953-1965. Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, trans. under direction of J. Strachey. London: Hogarth Press, 24 vols.
- Greenberg, Jay. R. and Stephen A. Mitchell. 1983. Object Relations in Psychoanalytic Theory. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Klein, Melanie. 1977. Love, Guilt and Reparation and Other Works, 1921-1945. New York : Dell.
- Kohut, Heinz. 1977. The Restoration of the Self. New York: International UP.
- Morson, Gary Saul. 1987. Hidden in Plain View: Narrative and Creative Potentials in 'War and Peace'. Stanford: Stanford UP.
- Morson, Gary Saul. 1988. "Prosaics and Anna Karenina." Tolstoy Studies Journal 1, 1-12.
- OSSIPOW, N. 1923. Tolstois Kinderheitserinnerungen: Ein Beitrag zu Freuds Libidotheorie. Leipzig: Internationaler psychoanalytischer Ver.
- Piers, Gerhart, and Milton B. Singer. 1953. Shame and Guilt: A Psychoanalytic and a Cultural Study. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Rancour-Laferrriere, Daniel. 1985. Signs of the Flesh: An Essay on the Evolution of Hominid Sexuality. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Shchhebalskii, P. 1888 (1868) "Voina i Mir." Russkaia kriticheskaiia literatura o proizvedeniakh L.N. Tolstogo, ed. V. Zelinskii. Moscow: Lissner and Roman, Part III, 79-91.
- Tolstoi, L. N. 1960-1965. Sobranie sochinenii, 20 vols., ed. N.N. Akopovaia, N.K. Gudzii, N.N. Gusev, M.B. Khrapchenko. Moscow: Khud. lit-a.
- Tolstoy, L. N. 1966 (1933) War and Peace, tr. Louise and Aylmer Maude, ed. George Gibian. New York: W.W. Norton.
-