

Tribhuvan University

Fleeting Subjectivity in Leo Tolstoy's *The Cossacks*

A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English, T.U.

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of

Arts in English

By

Narayan Prasad Lamichana

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

February, 2010

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Mr. Narayan Prasad Lamichana has completed his thesis entitled "Fleeting Subjectivity in Leo Tolsloy's *The Cossacks*" under my supervision. He carried out his research from July, 2009 A.D. to February, 2010 A.D. I hereby recommend his thesis be submitted for viva-voce.

Mr. Shuv Raj Rana Bhat

Supervisor

Date:

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Central Department of English

Approval Letter

This thesis titled "Fleeting Subjectivity in Leo Tolsloy's *The Cossacks*" submitted to the Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Mr. Narayan Prasad Lamichana has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee

.....

Internal Examiner:

.....

External Examiner:

.....

Head

Central Department of English

Date:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Concrete reality stands upon the scaffolding of abstract ideas. Similarly, the concrete existence of my thesis has its root in the relentless inspiration and support of different people. The warm love and encouragement of my parents, my relatives, my brothers and my son Shalin always strengthened my faltering steps in course of thesis writing: the moral support will be encouraging my will power, as well as my wife Shantu Maya who encouraged to write this thesis.

I deeply owe my gratitude to Mr. Shuv Raj Rana Bhat, Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, who always stood beside me for the fulfillment of required material during the preparation of the thesis.

I wish to acknowledge my gratefulness to Professor Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, head of Central Department of English, Kirtipur for the opportunity given to me to write this dissertation.

I also express my hearty gratitude to lecturer, Poam Gurung who paved a new way to generate and arrange my ideas systematically and provided the praiseworthy instruction on thesis writing during the seven days writing classes. Similarly, I am greatly indebted to the Central Library of T.U., where I got sufficient materials to complete my thesis.

I would also like to thank wowids computer system for its cooperation while preparing this thesis. I am deeply obliged to my friend, Mr. Lila Raj Bam and my cousin, Krishna Lamsal for their voluntary help in the course of preparing this thesis.

Narayan Prasad Lamichana

Abstract

The present thesis titled “Fleeting Subjectivity in Leo Tolstoy’s *The Cossacks*” covers the leading psychological problems of nineteenth century of Russia represented through the protagonist Olenin. Leo Tolstoy has shown especially the protagonist's fleeting psychology. His psychology is so split that he is not consistent in his thinking and behaviour. That is to say, he is full of confusion, and can not make any fixed decision whether to love Maryanka or not. His 'Id' 'Ego' and 'Superego' are in constant struggle. His Id frequently longs for the possession of Maryanka, but his superego, the internalization of the codes of society, does not allow him to do so as an army cadet of Russia, thereby resulting in the constant arbitration of Ego between the Id & Superego. Olenin is sublimating his libido by just aestheticizing the beauty of Maryanka as he compares her beauty to the beauty of mountain. His aestheticization of her beauty is nothing but the mere camouflage of his Eros, which is much evident in the end of the story when Olenin confesses his love for Maryanka. Olenin's inner psychology further fleets when Maryanka dismisses his entreaty.

Contents

	Page No.
Chapter - I	1-8
Introduction	1
Review of Literature	7
Chapter - II	9-26
Psychoanalysis: Fleeting Subjectivity	9
Chapter - III	27-40
Textual Analysis	27
Fleeting Subjectivity in Leo Tolstoy's <i>'The cossacks'</i>	27
Chapter - IV	40-42
Conclusion	39
Works Cited	43-44

Chapter – I

Introduction

Leo Nikolayevich Tolstoy's writings have engendered ideological disagreements in the world, disagreements in the ideological perspectives that have not died down to this day. His works are alive with the essential elements of epic literature. Tolstoy's creative career is an instructive admixture of great achievements and great delusions, delusions that at times led him away from the emotional tradition to the preaching of a rationalistic sermon. For an artist this is treading on dangerous ground because sermonizing is based on scholastic speculation rather than a critical appraisal of reality.

Nevertheless, it is the same sermon with which this amazing artist medicated half of his life. He, with a stroke of the pen, persuades the reader to transform the human soul more responsive and more uncompromising towards evil. His world was a world of men and women facing the complex moral, social, personal and fragmented aspects of life as they lived and not only day after day but in a whole world as well. This was his unique ability to portray the simplest emotions and conditions of man, his place in the whole structure that makes Tolstoy the true master of fiction. What enriches anybody who reads Tolstoy is his vast area of human understanding. Especially, Tolstoy has sketched the psychological problem of protagonist in his most of literary works. His novel *The Cossacks* is one of such novel where the protagonist Olenin shows his fleeting subjectivity in the whole novel.

Leo Nikolayevich Tolstoy (1828-1910) is a Russian novelist, a profound social and moral thinker, and one of the greatest writers of realistic fiction of all time.

Tolstoy, the son of a nobleman landowner, was born on September 9, 1828, at Yasnaya Polyana, the family estate south of Moscow, orphaned at the age of seven, raised by relatives and educated by French and German tutors. Coming of an aristocratic landowning stock, he had all he needed for a quiet rural existence, but his restless character tossed him between all sorts of experiences, contrasts and contradictions. At the age of sixteen, Tolstoy enrolled at Kazan University, first studying oriental languages and then law; influenced by the writing of the French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau, he became dissatisfied with formal study and in 1847 he left without a degree. When he was seventeen he rejected all the rites of Christianity. After a brief futile attempt to improve the condition of the serfs on his estate and frustrated in this task he plunged into the dissipations of Moscow's high society, which he candidly recorded in his diary with vows to reform. He left in 1851 and joined his brother in the Caucasus, where his regiment was stationed and after some time Tolstoy joined the army there. In the Caucasus, he came into contact with Cossacks and later focused on them in one of his shorter novels: *The Cossacks* (1863). In it he compared the effects of a Muscovite with the vigorous and natural Cossack life, portrayed with sympathy and profound of the daily life of Cossacks village.

Even in these early writings he combined a profound psychological insight with an almost incredible visual power. Between battles with the hill tribes, he completed an autobiographical trilogy *Childhood* (1852), followed by two others, *Boyhood* (1854) and *Youth* (1856), which without rhetoric or sentimentally draws on the psychologically significant memories common to all growing boys. He took part in Crimean war and after the defense of Sevastopol he wrote *The Sevastopol Stories* (1855-56). These works received instant acclaim, as did his Trilogy. It is a sobering

exposure of the pretentious heroics of the military command as opposed to the uncomplaining bravery of common soldiers and war's grim reality. Regarding Tolstoy John Canning quotes, "This young writer will eclipse us all, and one might as well give up writing" (129). He feared that his poetic 'contemporary' has already used up all the available poetic inspiration.

He became unhappy in the army because of his experiences that had given him a strong dislike of war, the horrors of which seemed to him to destroy the dignity of men. So, pondering over the real meaning of life, he returned to his old life of dissipation. He rejected the welcome given to him by the literary giants of the day because he did not agree with their views. All the time he had moments of disquiet and dissatisfaction on account of his own moral behavior. Tolstoy returned to St. Petersburg in 1856 and became interested in the education of peasants. While on trips abroad (1857 and 1860), he visited French and German elementary schools, and he became rather disappointed with the materialistic trend of western civilization. At Yasnaya Polyana he started a village school, introducing new teaching methods which foreshadowed the tenets of modern progressive education.

Introducing an entirely revolutionary method of teaching, that had no compulsory lessons, no orders, or rewards or punishment, the children would come as they like, sit where they like and listen or not as it pleases them. His unorthodox actions and teaching brought him into constant conflict with the authorities. The middle period of his life 1862 to 1876 saw him at his calmest and happiest. In this period he reached at the zenith of his literary powers. Tolstoy presented a stimulating, exciting and unsurpassable masterpiece of total enrichment where his full genius is seen. Most of Tolstoy's novels are dominated by the idea that a man's life begins when the spiritual forces in him triumph over him.

In 1862, the novelist married Sonya (Sofya) Andreyevna Bers, a member of a Moscow family. In the next 15 years he raised a large family, successfully managed his estate, and wrote, the greatest ever written book *War and Peace*. It is a vast epic centered on Napoleon Bonapartes' invasion of Russia in 1812. The story opens in 1805 at a soiree in Moscow, where all the talk is of the recent proclamation of Napoleon as Emperor. There then follows a long passage in which the three principal characters, the artless and innocent Natasha Rostov, the arrogant and cynical prince; Andrew Bolkonsky and the thoughtful Pierre Bezukov, the illegitimate son of Count Bezukov, are introduced together with a large group of their friends, relatives, and dependents. These people are shown as they progress from youthful uncertainties towards a more mature view of life.

Tolstoy succeeds in expounding his views of life by attributing to his characters the contrasting qualities that he felt were to be adopted or eschewed in order to reach a proper understanding of mankind's place in the world. *Anna Karenina* (1875-77), one of his masterpieces, is distinguished by its realism. The novel contains two plots: the tragedy of Madam Karenina, in love with a man who is not her husband, and the story of Ko'nstantine Levin, a sensitive man whose personal philosophy is Tolstoy's reason for writing about him. The story of Anna is an absorbing one and true, but in the person of Levin, Tolstoy reflects his own ideas about the Russian society in which he lived. The book is a closely-knit plot of a woman bound in the fetters of the Russian social system and a philosophy of life, which attempts to disentangle the maze of incongruities present in this society.

After *Anna Karenina*, Tolstoy had given up writing fiction, feeling that to do so was somewhat dishonest. Instead, he turned to a series of philosophical works, putting forward his personal viewpoint as to what life is and how it should be lived.

Tolstoy's moral philosophy in the uniquely candid, powerful *Confession* (1882), where he described his growing spiritual turmoil, castigated himself and his class for leading a selfish, empty existence, and started his long quest for moral and social certitudes. He found them in two principles of the Christian Gospels: Love for all human beings and non-resistance to the forces of evil. He expanded upon and illustrated his new radical faith in eloquent essays and a tract, including *The Kingdom of God is within you* (1894). It was immediately suppressed from within autocratic Russia, Tolstoy fearlessly attacked social inequality and coercive forms of government and church authority, urging freedom from hatreds and a purer life dictated by one's own moral conscience.

What is Art? (1898) is an indictment of almost all classical and modern art including his own masterpieces, which he claimed were produced for the cultured elite. Tolstoy advocated a morally inspired art, accessible to everyone. His didactic essays, translated into numerous languages, won adherents in many countries and from all walks of life. Many of them visited Yasnaya Polyana seeking instruction and advice. Returning to imaginative fiction, Tolstoy wrote a number of brief edifying tales with peasant settings; they are models of economy in construction.

A long twenty-eight years before his death, Tolstoy, disenchanted with the ways of the world he lived in, came to see the supreme gratification of existence not in privileged indolence nor amusements nor even books, but in a total merging with the millions of drops that comprise the human sea, in his case the peasantry. So in every one of Tolstoy's writing the author's sympathy is with the masses. Art must not be an end in itself but have an overriding ethical purpose. And as he grew old, Tolstoy the artist became subservient to Tolstoy the preacher and prophet. Tolstoy became one of the great moral forces of his time. His other works, intended for the

educated reader, are also morally purposeful in subject matter but give fuller rein to his immense creative powers. The best known of these are the short stories, *The Death of Ivan Ilych* (1886) and *Master and Man* (1895), both depict the spiritual conversion of a man facing death. His another short story, *The Kreutzer Sonata* (1889) is about a loveless marriage; the play *The Power of Darkness* (1888) is a naturalistic peasant tragedy of cupidity and lust leading to violence. These years were also dedicated entirely to polemic writing on religious, social and educational themes (which the authorities vainly tried to suppress). Until, as an old man of seventy- one, after twenty years, returned to the novel form to record the inner change which had taken place within him towards the end of the seventies as a mechanism to preach at the reader and to raise money in order to help the Dukhobors fund, he wrote his last novel *Resurrection* (1899). *Resurrection* is said to have recorded in artistic form the 'resurrection' of a fallen man as well. His short novel *The Cossack* is the psychological and moral novel.

In *The Cossacks*, the story shows the psychological concept of the protagonist, who is in love a young girl named Maryanka; later Maryanka did not chose him and protagonist Olenin is convicted for is psychological fleeting attitude who becomes one sided, could not possess his love affair with Maryanka. He could only make a good relation within himself and his self, subjectivity is always fleeting situation either in the urban city of Moscow or the wild village of Cossacks where Olenin could not maintain a good relationship with Maryanka.

Father Sergius is the highest achievement in the artistic productions of the later years and is also a partial self- portrait which reveals very powerfully and clearly Tolstoy's, long and painful inner struggle with vanity and lust. Another *Hadzhi Murad* is full of fascination about The Cossacks and later about the Chechen. It would not have

been a work of genius had it not been combined all materials drawn from historical archives, with extremely skillful stylization of the documents of the epoch.

His teachings earned him numerous followers but also much opposition and in 1901 he was excommunicated by the Russian holy synod. At the age of 82, increasingly tormented by the disparity between his teachings and his personal wealth, and by endless rift with his wife who resisted his attempts of abandoning his home and material possessions, dividing his land among the peasants and disappearing among the same peasants, ran away from his home one night but was caught by pneumonia and died at the small railway station, Astapovo, on 7, Nov. 1910.

Review of Literature

The Cossacks by Tolstoy is a powerful, depressing but ultimately hopeful novel of a life lived with love, faith and inner strength. The novel has been analyzed from various perspectives as John Hagon sees Ambivalence in Tolstoy's *The Cossacks*. He further writes, "The Protagonist Olenin has grown weary of his frivolous, aimless life in fashionable society"(11). He himself seeks redemption through a cadet in the army of the Caucasus. He was moving in the path of self-satisfied theory. Olenin has been shown a frustrated one, who could not accomplish his aim of self-satisfied life.

Hagon has discussed in article the protagonist's outlook changes in the aimless way. So Olenin achieves nothing of the kind, for at this point he is not more than a shallow egoist of highly uncertain values and harbors misconceived sense of freedom.

Andrew D. Kaufman critically analyzes Tolstoy's *The Cossacks* with the lens of existentialism. According to him, the protagonist undergoes Herculean quest for

his existence. The tension of concealment and disclosure of his being dramatically drives the plot of the novel.

Another critic by C.J.G. Turner comments on his book *The Cossacks*: “*The Question of Genre*, about the different critic’s perspectives, and he on the whole, says that the novel problematizes the concept of genre in which in the novel is based on”.

In the regard, it becomes clear that the psychoanalysis theory has not been applied yet. There exists a strong need to carry out research on this novel from new perspective. Without a proper study on this issue, the meaning of the text will remain incomplete. Having taken this fact into consideration, the present researcher proposes to carry out research from the perspective of psychoanalysis.

Chapter - II

Psychoanalysis: Fleeting Subjectivity

Psycho-analysis is a perspective to explore human mind. It deals with the in depth exploration of human psychic functioning and its impact on the mode of living through analysis and interpretation. However in the course of time, it developed as a usual approach to read and interpret literature. In literature, it is used to analyze everything in a text to know the root of human activities, subjectivism and pattern of linguistic expression. Sigmund Freud in the nineteenth century, the writer of psychoanalysis first developed such methodological perspective. His new ideas and field of knowledge dazzled the Victorian conservative society in Europe that emphasized pretentious mode of living under licentiousness. Freud opines in his book *The Interpretation of Dreams*, “the driving force of human life is not the knowledge and social code of conduct, but is the hidden and almost unknown aspect of psyche, which he calls, the unconscious, the self subjectivity (111). It is the Freudian discovery.

From the point of view of subjectivity, the problem of it might appear to be insoluble. In other words to establish subjectivity in the full sense, it is not to be enough to show that there are inward feelings and thoughts in subjectivity; it will be necessary to show that the behavior as we behave, subjectivity draws back from its experiences and actions and relate within itself. Hence we must reveal subjectivity is a world and which organizes a world around itself.

As we talk about fleeting subjectivity, an important stand in philosophical discussion of intention is the idea that intentions are concerned with planning for future. To understand the fleeting subjectivity the Lacanian perspective is chosen to

picture how the protagonist is maneuvered in the play of illusion/desire. It is hypothesized that perfection of libidinal desire of the protagonist becomes a mirage because the more he tries to possess it, the farther it slips away. Lacanian view of "desire" is similar to Derridian idea of "meaning". Both of them are slippery in nature. Desire, according to Lacan, is like a signifier but, having no signified. Merredith Skura, in *Psychoanalytic Criticism*, writes, "Desire, for Lacan, is never assuage able in reality. Lacan's call is to question what passes for reality, not to accept it, and certainly to question all authoritative versions of it" (354).

If we analyze the history of study on "Subjectivity", Enlightenment is the period when human subject was considered as a unified individual with a centre, an inner core that was there at birth and developed as the individual grew, while remaining essentially the same. This core of the subjectivity was the source of the subject's identity. However, contemporary philosophy has followed the natural sciences in shattering this notion which is linked with a cosmology that puts "man" at the centre of the universe and has de-centered the subject itself. In Enlightenment period, the subject was constructed in the interaction between "subjectivity" and society. The postmodern subject, by contrasting, has no fixed, essential, or permanent identity. Subjectivity is formed and transformed in a continuous process that takes place in reaction to the ways.

Psychoanalysis studies the oftentimes skewed ways in which the mind expresses feeling. Ryan Michael views that it is also "concerned with the dynamics of interpersonal relations and with the way subjectivity is formed through interactions with its familial and socio-cultural environment" (103). The study of the mind's operations in literature is concerned either with the unconscious and the instincts or with the family, personal history and social world that shapes the subjectivity.

The focus of the psychoanalysis is, therefore, unconscious part of mind. It can help us better to explain literary relationships, actions, motives, and the very existence itself of the text. Moreover, it engages in the interpretation and source of information therapeutically. Themes and motives central to psychoanalysis are desire and loss, delay and repletion of doubling, lack and so on. In his book *Ecrits* Lacan opines:

Psychoanalysis is the science of the mirages that appear within this field. A unique experience, rather abject one after all, but one that cannot be recommended too highly to those who wish to be introduced to the principle of man's follies, for, by revealing itself as akin to a whole gamut of disorders, it throws light upon them. (119)

For Freud, consciousness is not primary but only the aspect of the unconscious. This is how the birth of psychoanalysis took place.

Freud believed that unconscious motives and the feelings people experiences as children have an enormous impact on adult personality and behavior. He was the first modern psychologist to suggest that every personality has a large unconscious component. Life includes both pleasurable and painful experiences. For Freud, experiences include feelings and thoughts as well as actual events. He believed that many of our experiences, particularly the painful episodes of childhood, are forgotten or buried in the unconscious. But, although, we may not consciously recall these experiences, they continue influence our behavior. The “unconscious” is the mental realm into which those aspects of mental life that are related to forbidden desires and instincts are co-signed through the process of "repression". Freud theorized that all of life moves toward death and that the desire for final end shows up in human personality as destructive and aggression. But the life

instincts were more important in his theory, and he saw them primarily as erotic or pleasure-seeking urges.

Freud had described what became known as the structural components of mind: "id", "ego" and "superego". Though, he often spoke of them as if they were actual parts of personality, he introduced and regarded them simply the model of how the mind works. In other words, id, ego and superego do not refer to actual portions of the brain. Instead, they explain how the mind functions and how the instinctual energies are regulated. The id is the reservoir of the instinctual urges. It is the lustful or drive-ridden part of the unconscious. The id seeks immediate gratification of desire, regardless of the consequences. The id is, therefore, treasure house of such desires and buried thoughts which are guided by "pleasure principle". The personality process that is mostly conscious is called the ego. The ego is the rational thoughtful, realistic personality process. The part of the personality that would stop us is called the superego. This is guided by "morality principle". Rules, regulations, standards, values, and codes of society are the concerns of superego.

The ego's job is so difficult that unconsciously all people resort to psychological defenses. Rather than face intense frustration, conflict or feelings of unwillingness, people deceive themselves into believing nothing is wrong. If the demands of the id and the ego cannot be resolved, it may be necessary to distort reality. Freud called these techniques defense mechanisms because they defend the ego from experiencing anxiety about failing in its tasks. Freud felt that these defense mechanisms stem mainly from the unconscious part of the ego and only ordinarily become conscious to the individual during a form of psychoanalysis. A few of the defense mechanisms he identified are shortly discussed below.

Other defense mechanisms discussed by Freud are: "repression", "reaction formation", "projection" and "regression". When a person has some thought or urge that causes the ego too much anxiety, he may push that thought or urge out of consciousness down into the unconscious. This process is called repression. The person simply forgets the thing that disturbs him, or pushes it out of awareness without ever realizing it. Reaction formation involves an unacceptable feeling or urge with its opposite. Another way the ego avoids anxiety is to believe that impulses coming from within are really coming from other people. This mechanism is called projection because inner feelings are thrown, or projected outside. It is a common mechanism which we have probably observed in ourselves from time to time. Many people, for instance, feel that others dislike them, when in reality they dislike themselves. Lastly, regression means going back to an earlier and less mature pattern. When a person is under severe pressure and his other defenses are not working, he may start acting in ways that helped him in the past. For example, he may throw a temper tantrum, make faces, cry loudly, or revert to eating and sleeping all the time the way he did as a small child. Transferring of feelings is originally associated with the infantile object, childhood trauma or other object of psychoanalytic investigation, from its sources to investigating psychoanalyst. That is why, transformational activities are regressions.

Studies on the Lacanian subject is therefore, constituted through two movements: the first corresponds to the process of alienation through language, the record to the reparation of desire. Lacan never, however, precisely designates the point at which the subject appears, because it never appears as such. The subject in Lacanian psychoanalysis has no permanence persistence. Lacan always refers to the subject as arriving or having just arrived; as always too early or too late. There is

never a point in time that subject can be said to finally emerge as a stable and complete entity. It emerges only fleetingly through a continuous of subjectification-alienation and reparation-rather than at a specific movement in time. Paul Verhaeghe summarizes the process well: the subject, confronted with the enigma of the desire of the other, tries to verbalise this desire and this constitutes itself by identifying with the signifiers in the field of other, without ever succeeding in filling the gap between subject and other. Hence, the continuous movement from signifier to signifier, in which the subject alternately appears and disappears. (168)

According to Freud, transference is a process of exploration of the unconscious mind, exploration of the self-experience of patients, which is referred to as self-object transferences. It reflects deprivation in the early childhood and early objects, in the self-object transference the past emerges in the present.

In recent literary theory the concept of transference is sometimes broadened to include any process whereby the analyst of a text becomes inextricably involved in the object of his or her process of analysis. This method of transference is becoming very popular in the research of literary text. Moreover, transference is acknowledged as ubiquitous in human interactions. Its meanings have provided a basis for life span development of the psychology of the subjectivity.

It should be noted, however, that whereas in Freud's writing it is the person analyzed who is responsible for the transference. But in the extended concept it is the person doing the analysis who is responsible, so that, perhaps, counter transference might be more appropriately involved. This notion first appeared in Freud's writings in 1910, "We have become aware of the 'counter-transference', which arises in [physician], as a result of the patient's influence on his unconscious feelings [. . .]" (144). Freudian concept of counter-transference is based on an inherently developed

from his theory of "transference". He regards it as a dangerous phenomenon that jeopardizes the analytical process, in *The Future Prospects of Psychoanalytic Therapy*, Freud defines counter-transference in terms of desire that arise in the analysis "as result of patient's influence on [the physician's] unconscious feelings" (144-145). To keep the psychoanalytic discourse scientific and natural, Freud insists that the analyst must resist the patient's unconscious transference toward him and overcome the patient's influence or interference. He believes that all transference reactions are determined by unconscious, irrational wishes and desires based on person's own faculty of past and insignificant relationship. Likewise, counter-transference is manifested through anxiety, inappropriate and defensive behavior and distorted perception based on counselor's unconscious conflict, in this regard, counter-transference is essentially an obstacle to be overcome. The physician unconsciously experiences the patient. Freud argues that this reaction is caused by an unconscious and intolerable wish of the counselor to love the client which must be defended against through distancing punishing behavior. This Freudian view is commonly referred as narrow perspective, and it is still espoused by some modern classical analyses.

In modern psychoanalysis, Freud's concept of transference is questioned. What Freud does not realize is that counter-transference might occur before rather than after transference, the cause instead of the effect of transference, in place of other's desire through counter-transference and the narrative of the unconscious, thus, inserted into the analyzed eventually reverts to his own: tautological and narcissistic. This characterizes, what J.B. Ponnytails called, "death of Oedipus, and triumph of narcissus" (78). Freud's attempts cannot discover at all the unconscious of the other, but the desires of himself. Instead of a reaction to transference the other's

unconscious desires, counter-transference initiates an intra-subjective relationship within oneself in narcissistic space of self reflexivity.

Thus, the concept of subject had been de-centered, fragmented, and split through the attempt of Saussure and Freud. Fragmentation in human self is also fueled by Marxist view that life is not determined by consciousness but vice versa. Similarly, Darwin's theory of species refused the existing view that man is a son of God. He rather proved human as an ape. Similarly, Nietzsche's work about Death of God questioned the immortality of God (center). In addition to this, feminist theories also de-centered the phallic-centric tradition. Likewise, Derridian concept of deconstruction totally ruptured the idea of unified self.

Jacques Lacan, a new Freudian, also naturally opposes the idea of a whole self that serves as an agent of strength, synthesis, mastery, integration and adaptation to realistic norms. Lacan has unflinchingly insisted that human subject is neither unified nor unifying. But, Lacan delimits consciousness and makes consciousness and language themselves defined against unconscious meaning. The Lacanian subject (*je/moi*) is not unified in consciousness. The ego, however, is intrinsically unified - except in dreams, psychosis, and other unraveling manifestations - and projects itself into consciousness as the principle of individuality. Because it emanates from the unconscious and yet must continually verify itself through the very means of its occultation - consciousness and language - the *moi* cannot 'see' itself as it really is. "The ego is a function; the ego is synthesis, a synthesis of functions, a function of synthesis" (131).

Freud sees the subject as de-centered and marked by a lack. Lacan follows Freud in this regard. He moves from the individualist orientation of Freud to a more social view, with the concept of big Other (the symbolic order). He does this by

incorporating Saussurian insights concerning language into his work alongside Freudian concepts of unconscious. Hazard Adams, in his book *Literary Theory and Criticism*, writes, "[Lacan] privileges the Saussurean signifier over the signified, thus de-centering both unconscious and language and calling and old style empirical analysis [. . .] cannot escape from the chain of signifiers to point to any origin beyond signification itself" (897). We can think of Lacan as the symposium of Freud, Saussure and some reasoning of Derrida. However, his main influence is Freud. Lacan reinterprets Freud in the light of structuralist and poststructuralist theories, turning psychoanalysis from an essentially humanist philosophy or theory of mind into a poststructuralist one. His concept of psychoanalysis aims to understand the unconscious of human mind in terms of language which he derives from the growth of infant to adulthood. For Lacan, the unconscious undermines the subject from any position of certainty, and from any relations of and simultaneously reveals the fictional nature of the category to which every human subject is none the less assigned. He divides human growth into three phases: Mirror, Imaginary and Symbolic (Real). These three are the phases in the constitution of the psychic subject.

Lacan states that the mirror stage is far from a mere phenomenon which occurs in the development of the child; it illustrates the conflicting nature of the dual relationship, "It is an experience which leads us to oppose any philosophy directly issuing from the Cogito"(193). The mirror stage describes the formation of the ego via the process of identification, the ego being result of identifying with one's own specula image. In this regard, Lacan opines in his book *Ecrits* in this way: The mirror stage is a drama whose internal thrust is precipitated from insufficiency to anticipation and which manufactures for the subject caught up in the lure of spatial identification, the succession of phantasies that extend from a fragmented body image to a form of its

totality that I shall call orthopedic - and, lastly, to the assumption of the armor of an alienating identity, which will mark with its rigid structure the subject's entire development. (4)

At six months the baby still lacks coordination; however, he/she can recognize himself/herself in the mirror before attaining control over his bodily movements. He/she see his/her image as a whole, and the synthesis of the image produces a sense of control with the insubordination of the body; which is perceived as a fragmented body. This contrast is first felt by the infant a rivalry with his/her own image, because the wholeness of image threatens him/her with fragmentation, and, thus mirror stage gives rise to an aggressive tension between the subject and the image. To resolve this aggressive tension, the subject identifies with the image: this primary identification with the counterpart is what forms the ego. Thus, at first, the infant identifies himself with his mother. Gradually, he begins to see a visual image in his mother. The spatial distance is created between the child and the mother because of this reflection. Now, the child finds himself in the series of gestures. He looks his own experience in the mirror (mother). So, the first phase in the mirror stage is called Gaze phase. The spatial distance between the child and the mother gives birth to illusion. He can not distinguish himself and his [m] other.

The imaginary order is the formation of the ego in the mirror state. In this phase a child becomes jubilant. Jubilant phase is full of illusions and gazing activities. The child sees no gap between him and his image. Later, the ego is constructed by identification with the peculiar image. The subject becomes aware of the spatial gap between him and the image. Then, the alienation phase begins. The relationship between the ego and the peculiar image means that the ego and imaginary order itself are places of radical orientation. Therefore, alienation is constitutive of the imaginary

order. In his regard, Lacan states, "the spatial and temporal categories in which the ego and the object are constituted, experienced as events in perspective of mirages, as affections with something stereotypical about them that suspends the workings of the ego/object dialectic" (17).

As a result, ego is formed. Imaginary state is the field of images and imagination and deception: the main illusions of this order are synthesis, autonomy, duality, similarity. The narcissistic relationship develops in this phase.

Imaginary stage, thus, overlaps with mirror stage and forms a path to symbol stage, which starts from eighteen months (of child), but properly begins after two years. To underpin his concept Lacan provides the concept of "other" and "Other". The little other is the other who is not really other but reflections and projection of the ego. The big Other designates a radical alteration and Lacan equates this with language and the law: the big Other is inscribed in symbolic order. The big Other is, the, another subject and also the symbolic order which mediates the relationship with that other subject. In this respect, Lacan states in his book *Ecrits*, "It is *the name of the father* that we must recognize the support of the symbolic function which, from the dawn of history, has identified his person with the figure of the law" (67).

In short, the "other" is the conceptualized image of a substitute object of desire, whereas, the "Other", which opposes the subject's initial desire, is the law of father or language. But, as the "center" in Derridian term, the other cannot be merged with. Nothing can be in the center with the other; so the position of the other creates and sustains a-never-ending lack, which Lacan called desire. Desire is to be Other. - Therefore, "the satisfaction of human desire is possible only when mediated by the desire and the labor of the other" (26).

The last stage in which an infant comes across in his childhood is the symbolic phase, in this phase the child arrives at a sense of identity. Gaps between the child and the mother and signifier and signified is further disclosed, "The Symbolic conceived as the other of orders, as the separator (as well as the agent of separation)" (*Returns of the French Freud: Freud, Lacan and Beyond* 103).

Desires on language are spatially distanced. Here, Lacan states that "the desired affect may be obtained merely by placing the individual within reach of the field of reflection of mirror" (*Ecrits* 3). The child, indeed, enters into the world of "lack" and "anxiety". Dreams for him become the patches of fragmentation. He, in this stage, recognizes his "Father" and the law of his Father", that is language. To crystallize this concept of Lacan, Martin Jay states:

[A] difference between normal and psychotic behavior which depends on the partial transition from the imaginary to a further stage, which Lacan termed 'the symbolic'. Coincident with the resolution of the Oedipus complex, the symbolic meant the child's entry into language. (349-350)

The more an infant grows the more fragmented his/her self (ego) becomes. In addition to this, the primal oneness with the mother's body becomes possible only at the cost of death. The child enters into and finds bound by all man-made rules and regulations of morality, religion and of social affairs. He maneuvers from "the I to socially elaborated situations" (5). This means there is the existence of two "I" individual or subjective and social. This process is, in other words, "the deflection of the mirror I into the social I" (97). For him the interpretation of dreams by Freud by constituting condensation and displacement is nothing but linguistic in nature and they correspond to metaphor and metonymy. But Lacan goes a step further and goes on proving that

the so called stable structure is, in fact, fragmented, and thus, Lacan gives the deconstructive study on Freud. For Lacan unconscious is structured like a language. "The unconscious is neither primordial nor instinctual; what it knows about the elementary is no more than the elements of the signifier" (170). As Lacan opines condensation and displacement both are essentially linguistic phenomena where meaning is either condensed in metaphor or displaced in metonymy. Lacan states that the contents of the unconscious are actually aware of language and particularly of the structure of language. He points out this fact in *Ecrits* in this way:

This signifying game between metonymy and metaphor, up to an including the active edge that splits my desire between a refusal of the signifier and a lack of being, and links my fate to the question of my destiny, this game, in all its inexorable subtlety, is played until the match is called, there where I am not, because I can not situate myself there. (166).

Saussure paved the way for Lacan regarding the concept of signifier and signified. Lacan modifies his concept further whereas, Saussure talked about the relationship between signifier and signified. Lacan focuses on relations between signifiers only. Because of this lack of signified the chain of signifiers is constantly sliding and shifting and circulating in the play (in Derridian sense); there is no way to stop this sliding down of this chain. Rather, one signifier only leads to another and never to a signified. Lacan further clarifies that "signifiers are taken from the material to which the second give the signification" (141).

The signifier will, therefore, be the signifier for which all the other signifiers represent the subject. That is to say, in the absence of this signifier, all the other signifiers represent nothing since nothing is represented only for something else.

Language is the distinctive form of human communication, both in life and in analysis, but it is coupled with emotional induction at every turn. Lacan revises Freudian notion of transference and argues for a symbolic relationship between the subject and the unconscious in his book, *The Four Fundamental concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Hence, 'transference' is the actualization and dramatization of the unconscious subject. Lacan states in his book *Ecrits* as below:

It is memory, a comparable to what is called by that name in our modern thinking machines (which are in turn based on an electronic realization of the composition of signification), it is in this sort of memory that is found the chain that *insist on* reproducing itself in the transference and which is the chain of dead desire. (167)

Transference is a theory where we transfer our feelings and expectations for help onto another (an analyst). Because we think they know something about who we are and who we should become. Lacan argued that the analyst does not have the correct reality paradigm to help on patient with his or her impasses in knowledge and desire, but he maintained, the phenomenon itself (including the fact that it includes feelings of love and hate) tells us more about an unstable base for knowledge in being, than it does about who actually has the correct theory. The analyst is like a role player who sits silent, the patient knows and that he/she can speak only in the (logical) time it takes to unravel repressed traumata, drop harmful to live by.

In Seminar XL Lacan says that "through transference [. . .] the patient "acts" out of the reality of unconscious" (158). It is essential to relocate Lacanian counter-transference from the imaginary into symbolic realm, into the locus of the other. It involves not only the presence of the analyst and the patient, but also the co-presence of their different subject positions and repetitive unconscious. The subject is not a

person but a position, an "I" defined relatively, by his or her difference from the "you" he or she addresses, in the counter-transference "the analyst returns to the sum of the prejudices, passions, embarrassments, even insufficient information which characterize the analyst at a given moment in the dialectical process (xi-xiii). Lacan offers this definition in the course of his examination of the Dora case, in which he attributes Freud's failure in the case of counter-transference. Freud's failure, according to Lacan "was to recognize Dora's love for Frau K. as a function of his countertransferential belief that Dora ought to have fallen for Herr K., instead of Frau K" (42).

Lacan notes that had Freud utilized this wrong material in a transference. Interpretation (relating Dora's relationship to Freud to that of Herr K.). It would have kept the case moving by virtue of her response to it. Thus, Freud's mistake here is two fold: one, the wrong "understanding" of the case caught up in the imitation of Freud's view of the case; and two, the failure to act decisively, even with that, in his interventions. What psychoanalysis calls transference is a form of resistance and it involves the unconscious displacement through time and place of a past relationship into the present. That is to say, previous infantile or early relationships will be displaced and in some sense restaged in the analytic situation, through the relationship between the patient and analyst. The transference is always ambivalent. It is both relationship of love (positive-transference) and hate (negative-transference) and thus inherently unstable.

Counter-transference is partly determined by the therapist's preexisting internal object world and partly influenced by feelings included by patient. The concept is now regarded as inevitable and minor enactments of counter-transference may provide valuable information about what is being recreated in the therapist - patient dyad.

Self-disclosure of counter-transference may be useful in some situations, but the sharing of some feelings will overwhelm patient and burden them in a way may be destructive to the therapeutic process. P. Heimann suggests that "the analyst's total emotional response to the patient is not simply an obstacle or hindrance based on the analyst's own past, but an important tool in understanding the patient's unconscious (31). This view is often referred as the broad or totalistic perspective on counter-transference.

In fact, Lacan implies that resistance comes primarily from the analyst who tries to reify the past and unconscious and to freeze the flow of analytic dialogue into answer. The notion of projective identification enables the connection between intrapsychic and the inter-subjective field of the analytic process. Grigoris Vasiamatzis opines, "The communicative aim of projective identification and the metaphor of the container-contained relationship between the mother and her infant" (116). When the infant is overwhelmed by unmodulated effects, it tends to project them into the mother. The mother receives the infant's feelings, and her own capacity for reverie modulates, transforms, and finally returns to the infant in a more tolerable and structured experience. In this way, containment is not a passive reception of what is projected.

Thus, counter-transference is to articulate a double relation: the subject's relation to the Other (the other subject) and to the other (the unconscious). In "Intervention and Transference", Lacan insists that "what needs to be understood regarding psychoanalytic experience is that it proceeds entirely in a relation to subject" (93). The Lacanian subject, who is determined by the unconscious desires configured in the symbolic system, emerges as the other to itself. Lacan further says, "[T]he subject appears first in the Other, in so far as the first

signifier, the unary signifier emerges in the field of the other" (218). Unlike Freud, Lacan views counter-transference effects positively. He opines that analyst's emotional response to the patient is not just an obstacle based on analyst's own past but also an important tool in understanding the patient's unconscious. Hence, counter-transference focuses more on intra-personal or intra-subjective relation than inter-personal or inter-subjective relation. The unconscious in terms of the other constitutes the other scenes in counter-transference which articulated a relationship of the other (the subject of the unconscious) to the other (the symbolic structure of desires). In this respect, here, psychoanalysis' focus is on person's fleeting subjectivity.

Tolstoy's *The Cossacks* show here how Olenin's awareness of himself as an individuated being also leads him to an awareness of the individuated of every element in his surroundings. Olenin's transformation from a naive self into an individuated, aware self is thus shown by Tolstoy to be the beginning of a creative, dialogic relationship between the hero and his surrounding world. It is a moment in which all the confusion and contradictions of Olenin's inner world seem to melt away. But Tolstoy shows that there is in this naïve subjectivity also an absence of something that will emerge only when Olenin's self-consciousness appears: moral and intellectual awareness and flees from his subjectivity which he would like most.

Chapter - III

Textual Analysis

Fleeting Subjectivity in Leo Tolstoy's '*The Cossacks*'

Tolstoy's *The Cossacks* can be analyzed through the protagonist Olenin's psychological fleeting subjectivity. In the text Olenin appears frustrated from the Moscow society and wants the search for happiness to settle in the wild village Caucasus. So, his departure can be seen by imagining the nostalgic memories in the journey towards Caucasus, "All is quiet in Moscow. The squeak covered street. There are no lights left in the windows and the street lamps have been extinguished. Only the sound of bells, borne over the city from the church towers, suggests the approach of morning. The streets are deserted". (01)

Protagonist Dmitri Andrich Olenin travelling his journey with his serf Vanyusha and remembering his new life for the satisfaction of his desire to come and maintain his sexual desire because he was repressing his sexual desire being a cadet. He was remembering his nostalgic life of Moscow society that how he was feeling of the town's life and had got frustration in love and relation of so called friends. He wants to be fresh after reaching in the life of Caucasus so he was expressing his new life in this way:

Never Loved! . . . Yes, quite true, I never have! But after all, I have within me a desire to love, and nothing could be stronger than that desire! But then, again does such love exist? There always remains something incomplete. As well! What the use of talking? I've made an awful mess of life! But anyhow it's all over now; you are quite right. And, I feel that I am beginning a new life. (03)

Olenin was talking about himself without noticing to other in the journey. He was expressing his feelings for a new life to settle down happily in the calm and tranquil society in the village of Caucasus. In way, he was expressing about his feeling and desire where he was making the journey within himself. He was comparing his love as a free love, "A man is never much an egoist as at moments of spiritual ecstasy. At such times it seems to him there is nothing on earth more splendid and interesting than himself" (03). Olenin was frustrated in his life of Moscow so he is thinking, "perhaps I shall not return from Caucasus" (07). He is being so conscious of his past memories so sometimes he becomes bore of this consciousness within himself, But Olenin was so happy to leave Moscow:

On leaving Moscow he was in that happy state of mind in which a young man, conscious of past mistakes, suddenly says to himself 'that was not the real thing' . . . with his departure from Moscow a new life was beginning - life in which there would be no mistakes, no remorse , and certainly nothing but happiness. (09)

He would look much hunted in love affair so he was conversing alone in his journey. He expresses his ideas about love, "How much in love I was that night and how happy! And, how hurt and vexed I was next morning when I woke and felt myself still free! Why does not love come and bind me hand foot?" thought he. 'No, there is no such thing as love!' (10)

Being an army cadet of Moscow, Olenin was visioning of his marriage life in the wild village Caucasus with the beautiful and young girl. Even though she was not literate, he was expressing his desire about love to be free from any kinds of bondages and which must be selfish free, the love of eternal and forever. He was picturing such love in those hills and regions which were looking so submissive towards him.

Maryanka was looking beautiful enchanting, suppose she was coming to kiss him. That would make him more conscious. He was imagining all those thoughts in his journey towards Caucasus and feeling to get a literate young lover who would be suitable for his existence. He realized on way his dreams only:

One other vision, the sweetest of them all, mingled with the young man's every thought of the future - the vision of a woman. And there among the mountains, she appeared to his imagination as a Circassian slave, a fine figure with a long plait of hair and deep submissive eyes. He pictured a lonely hut in the mountains and on the threshold she stands awaiting him when, tired and covered with dust, blood and fame, he returns to her, He is conscious of her kisses, her shoulders, her sweet voice and her submissiveness she is enchanting, but uneducated, wild and rough. In this long winter evenings he begins her education. She is clever and gifted and quickly acquires the entire knowledge essential. Why not? She can quite easily learn foreign languages, read, and the French master pieces and understand them. *Notre Dame de Paris*, for instance, is sure to please her. She can also speak French. In a drawing - room she can show some innate dignity than a lady of the highest society. She can sing, simply, powerfully, and passionately . . . Oh' what nonsense! Said he to himself. (13)

Olenin is on his way to Caucasus, dreaming of the desire of pure and innocent love. This all shows he is repressing his sexual desire and unmarried situation. He is travelling one place to another being frightened the beauty of desert appearances. At the same time he was forgetting his desire of love and getting repentance of his thoughts. He was coming out of his nostalgic feeling. He was refluxing his internal

subjectivity. He was coming with his believable self but there he won't be in conversations to each other. He was presenting himself only. At the same time, he observed the beauty of mountains on the way. The mountain was appearing so black which made Olenin frightened. Olenin reached with his serf Vanyusha in Cossacks village near the black mountain and which is narrated in his way:

At first Olenin was astonished at the sight, then gladdened by it, but later on gazing more and more intently at that snow-peaked chain that seemed not to rise from among other black mountains, but straight out of the plain, and to glide away into the distance, he began by slow degrees to be penetrated by their beauty and at length feel to the mountains. From the moment all he saw, all he thought and all he felt acquired for him a new character, steering majestic like the mountains! All his Moscow reminiscence shame and repentance and his trivial dreams about the Caucasus, vanished and did not return. (12)

The writer of the text, Leo Tolstoy, has described about the beautiful Cossack girl Maryanka who is the daughter of Granny Ulitka, the wife of the Cossack cornet who is also a teacher in the regimental school. Maryanka is attracted by the sight of Olenin. Olenin reaches in the station and observed everywhere. He starts to compare his feeling by looking the beauty of Maryanka. He is joining his previous feeling and describing his self as well as he was overwhelming in his thought to persuade her beauty. Maryanka used to work in the village. The cattle's would be her friends as well as she is with her mother in this sense the narrator expresses:

The beautiful and shapely Maryanka enters at the gate to and rushes with all the speed of her nimble feet to separate and drive the cattle into their sheds. 'Take off your slippers, you devil's wench!' shouts her

mother, 'you've worn them into holes!' Maryanka is not at all offended at being called a 'devil's wench', but accepting it as a term of endearment cheerful goes on with her task. (25)

Olenin engages mostly with Daddy Eroshka for hunting and drinking. They exchange their views to each other about love and life. Olenin wants to know much about the beautiful Cossack girl Maryanka and mostly thinks about her beauty and her love towards him. He could not talk directly, only describes her beauty and her movements within himself. Even though, he has understood her love with the young Cossack Lukashka a tall handsome lad about twenty years old and very like with his mother. Lukashka would not be very much in relation with Maryanka just like Olenin. Lukashka did not look faithful to Maryanka. He feels proud after getting romance with Maryanka, "Cornet's daughter", thought Lukasha. 'She will marry me. Marriage is all very well, but you just love me!' He found Nazarka at Yamaka's house and after having a spree with him went to Dunayka's house where, in spite of her not being faithful to him, he spent the night" (23). On the other, Maryanka has not thought herself like Olenin. Olenin represses his desire by describing her beauty and maintaining his diary. Every time, he is hesitating and comparing his status to express his love with Maryanka. But he is changing the concept of love every time. Olenin applies his theory of happiness by providing a precious horse to Lukashka to make him happy. Here, Olenin's all activities are only the pretend to show his self-sacrificed theory of his repressed desire of wanting to Maryanka. Olenin frightened by his own theory self-sacrificed. He shows his repressed desire by praying to God to accomplish his happiness theory time to time to be happy. So he expresses, "He felt more frightened than he had ever done before. he began to pray to God, and feared

above all that he might die without having done anything good or kind; and he so wanted to like, and to live so as to perform a feat of self-sacrifice" (111)

Olenin is applying so called self-sacrificed, the theory of his happiness but in reality he could not rest anymore without looking Maryanka's movement and her body as well as her dress up. He is fleeing from his subjectivity time to time. He is not determined in his settling. This means he is repressing his internal desire rather to prefer his wants. Olenin is struggling to maintain the social taboo and being much conscious. He is in dilemma. He is only appreciating the beauty of Maryanka:

Olenin went on reading but did not understand a word of what he was written in the book that lay open before him. He kept lifting his eyes from it and looking at the powerful young women who were moving about. Whether she stepped into the moist morning shadow thrown by the house or went out into the middle of the yard lit up by the joyous young light so that the whole of her stately figure in its bright colored garment gleamed in the sunshine and cast a black shadow - he always feared to lose any one of her movements. It delighted him to see how freely and gracefully her figure bent: into what folds her only garment, a pink smack, draped itself on her bosom and along her shapely legs; how she drew herself up and her strong arms with the sleeves rolled up, exhibiting the muscles, used the spade almost as if in anger, and how her deep dark eyes sometimes glanced at him (129)

When Beletski Olenin's friend manages to acquaint Maryank with Olenin in the party. Olenin expresses his real repressed desire by projecting in drunken mood. Olenin is entrapped with Maryanka. Such was the counter- transference of his psychology and repressed desire. Changing the attitude psychologically, he was fully

amusing with his hunting friend Eroshka. He is celebrating with Chikhir(drink) in the village of Caucasus. Drinking is the best time pass of his life at least he is not being an army cadet of Russia any more, rather he is preferring his love towards Maryanka. So, he attends in the party of Beletski's home. This is the preplan of Beletski to join the party, Beletski had invited to Olenin. In the party Olenin got the chance to encounter with Maryanka and it is expressed in this way:

‘How is one to know him if he never comes to see us? Answered Maryanka with a look at Olenin.

Olenin felt frightened, he did not know of what. He flushed and, hardly knowing what he was saying, remarked; ‘I’m afraid of your mother. She gave me such a scolding the first time I went in.’

Maryanka burst out laughing. ‘And so you were frightened? She said, and glanced at him and turned away.’ (137)

Coming at the last of the party by the full of drink (Chikhir). Beletski, Maryanka and Olenin are in the party openly celebrating the party. He was in the full of drinking mood and showing his internal, repressed desire to love physically as well as mentally to Maryanka. Maryanka was little understanding about his intention but she was not accepting of his kisses and embraces in such mood. Olenin was even full of conscious during that time. He had gone back of his own taboo which he was practicing in his existence. He was playing with Maryanka a kind of hide and seeks but he became astound at last and pull himself. Here is the conversation of two loves:

Yes, see what a beauty I am,’ Maryanka’s look seemed to endorse.

Without considering what I was doing Olenin embraced Maryanka and was going to kiss her, but she suddenly extricated herself, upsetting Beletski and pushing the top off the table, and sprang away towards the

oven. There was much shouting and suddenly, they all ran out into the passage and locked the door behind them. 'Why did you kiss Beletski and won't kiss me?' Asked Olenin. 'Oh, just so, I don't want to, that's all!' she answered, pouting and frowning. 'He's Grandad', she added with a smile. She went to the door and began to bang at it. 'Why have you locked the door, you devils?' 'Well, let them be there and us here', said Olenin drawing closer to her. She frowned, and sternly pushed him away with her hand. And again, she appeared so majestically handsome to Olenin that he came to his senses and felt ashamed of what he was doing. He went to the door and began pulling at it himself. (139)

They are engaging for the first time in the Beletski's home and somehow expressing their intentions to each other. Knowing that Maryanka's feeling that she is in love with Lukashka, even though he wants to engage with her. These activities shown that he was really in fleeing of his own subjectivity. He could not pay the way of his aim as the strong position and never lament of his activities. As he talks with Maryanka:

Beletski! Open the door! What a stupid joke!

Maryanka again gave a bright happy laugh. 'Ah, you're afraid of me?' she said.

'Yes, you know you're as cross as your mother'.

'Spend more of your time with Eroska', that will make the girls love you! And she smiled, looking straight and close into his eyes.

He did not know what to reply. 'And if I were to come to see you' - he let fall. (140)

Olenin could not understand his self-psychology and his self-sacrificed theory of happiness which he was practicing in his life. Olenin unconsciously burst at the same time. He was repressing his psychological desire to possess Maryanka 's love. The so called his self-sacrifice theory is not working well. This is the expression of his self repressed desire which cannot be forgotten in any stage of life. It is accomplished after death but he was in life and not accepting in any of his psychological situation so he further bursts in such way:

It's all nonsense what I have been thinking about- love and self sacrifice and Lukashka. Happiness is the one thing. He who is happy is right', flushed through Olenin's mind and with strength unexpected to himself he seized and kissed the beautiful Maryanka on her temple and her cheek. Maryanka was not angry, but only burst into a loud laugh and ran out to the other girls. (140)

Cornet's daughter Maryanka and Lukashka's betrothal is taking place in the Cornet's hut. Olenin has been invited even though he does not go there. For the first time, he becomes sad since he has settled in the Cossack village. He had seen Lukashka earlier in the evening and was worried by the question why Lukashka was so cold towards him. Olenin shut himself up in his hut and began writing in his diary" (148). Lukashka's betrothal was taking place and he was feeling very sad. He starts writing on his diary, that Lukashka's coldness makes Olenin very much exciting. When Olenin was writing his diary he was expressing his desire. But he was performing artificially his self-sacrifice theory. He expresses his attitude in such way, "The one way to be happy is to love, to love self-denyingly, to love everybody and everything; to spread a web of love on all sides and to take all who come into it" (148). Daddy Eroshka is only looking his own best friend Olenin who well

understands his feeling and emotion. So he states about the situation of Lukashka, "What, Lukashka? They've lied to him and said I am getting his girl for you," whispered the old man. But what's the girl? She will be ours if you want her. Give enough money-and she's ours. I'll fix it up for you. Really! "(153). Daddy Eroshka is conversing in the crying mood, and Olenin is convincing him in the following statements, "No, daddy, money can do nothing if she does not love me. You'd better not to talk like that" (158). Remembering his own thought, Olenin expresses, "So now my Lukashka is happy" (153). Thus, he feels sad. Here we can understand Olenin's repression of his ultimate desire to get Maryanka. On the other hand, Maryanka and her friend Ustenka shares their views of love, especially Lukashka and the lodger (Olenin):

Ustenka: 'don't want happiness', repeated Ustenka in a whisper, insistently. But you are lucky, that you are! How they love you! You are so crusty and yet love, you. Ah, if I were in your place I'd room turn the lodger's head! I noticed him when you were at our house. He was ready to eat you with his eyes. What things Grandad has given me! And, yours they say is he richest of the Russians. His orderly says they have serfs of their own.' (161)

At the same time Maryanka listens her statement and replies, "Do you know what he once told me: the lodger I mean?" She said, biting a grass. He said, I'd like to be Lukashka the Cossack, or your brother Lazutka- what do you think he meant?" (161). When we analyses the text *The Cossacks*, Leo Tolstoy has sketched the psychological fleeting subjectivity of protagonist Olenin. The first up to the last of the text, Olenin is repressing his unconscious as the social dimension and status of being a cadet of an army in Russia. Olenin could not understand his subjectivity his

ego spirit. Only he practices his over consciousness as the name of happiness theory, self-sacrificed etc. When he proposes to Maryanka for marriage, She directly rejects to him because at the same incident Chechen had killed Lukashka in the front. Being much tired of consciousness Olenin regards, "I tried to throw myself into that kind of life but was still more conscious of my own weakness and artificiality. I cannot forget myself and my complex, distorted past and my future appears to me still more hopeless" (173). Actually he shows his own unconscious desire by fluctuating his self which he can't resist artificially. He praises her beauty and compare to her as a nature. He is not maintaining his selfhood with his tormenting feeling which he is hardly considering about his happening. He could not forget the beauty of Maryanka. He is disturbed and fleets his subjectivity in another direction so he again thinks in such ways:

She is happy, she is like nature: consistent, calm, and self-contained, and I, a weak distorted being want her to understand my deformity and my torments! I have not slept at night, but have aimlessly passed her windows not rendering account to myself of what was happening to me. (173)

Olenin is changing his mentality by his complex mental status. Anyway, he wants to express his love to her, "I love this woman; I feel real love for the first time and only time in my life" (173). He changes his subjectivity time to time. He has not his determination to do things in his life. He is much fleeting from the tussle of counter transference. So the following conversation is with Maryanka and Olenin's attitude to marry her:

Olenin had talked in whispers to Maryanka.

‘Will you marry me?’ he had asked ‘you’d deceive me and not have me,’ she replied cheerfully and Calmly.

‘But do you love me? Tell me for God’s sake!’

‘Why shouldn’t I love you? You don’t squint’, answered Maryanka, laughing and with her hard hands squeezing his - - -

‘What, white, whi-i-ite, soft hands you’ve got- so like clotted cream,’ She said. ‘I am in earnest. Tell me, will you marry me?’ ‘Why not, if father gives me to you?’

‘Well then remember, I shall go mad if you deceive me. To-morrow I will tell your mother and father. I shall come and propose.’

Maryanka suddenly burst out laughing.

‘What’s the matter?’

‘It seems so funny!’

‘It seems so funny!’

‘It’s true! I will buy a vineyard and a horse and will enroll myself as a cossack’

‘Mind you don’t go after other women then. I am sever about that.

(198)

Olenin could not exist in the new coming thought that to marry the Cossack girl Maryanka when Chechen kills Lukashka. Maryanka is psychologically so sad and even could not talk with Olenin. Chechens were so angry with Lukashka that they killed him by shooting unexpectedly. He was killed because he had in front of the fighting field. Previously, he had also killed some Chechens. Chechens kill him in the fort. Maryanka was deeply shocked the death of Lukashka. Olenin hardly puts his decision to Maryanka, but in such situation, it would not be better to put the propose

to her. Such activities show that how much psychic is Olenin. Olenin was in hurry to marry her if Lukashka would be removed from his way. Thus, his theory of so-called self-sacrifice is much feeble. This is the main reason his self is fluctuating and his subjectivity is fleeting when he again rejected by Maryanaka:

Get Away. I'm sick of you!' Shouted the girl, stamping her feet, and moved threateningly towards him. And, her face expressed such abhorrence, such contempt, and such anger that Olenin suddenly understood that there was no hope for him and that his first impression of this woman's inaccessibility had been perfect correct. Olenin said nothing more, but ran out of the hut. (208)

Thus, Olenin comes again in his beginning's position and he is counter-attacked by the Maryanka's position. He prepares to quite Caucasus and by settling his accounts with his landlord. He departs to Russia where was his station. The protagonist Olenin could not accomplish his desire but only suffers in his subjectivity. He gives much more emphasis to his superego. His subjectivity has been fleeting from Moscow to Caucasus. Olenin could not handle a good relationship with his beloved Maryanka, the situation of unmarried and the pre-nostalgic life of Moscow.

Chapter - IV

Conclusion

Leo Tolstoy has recorded in a powerful way the plight of protagonist Olenin's life which has become psychological fleeing of his subjectivity. The protagonist, being frustrated from the urban life of Moscow and a strict army profession, fleets to the wild village, Caucasus. However the constant hunting of Moscow he could hardly make the good relation with local girl Maryanka, but becomes fail and again returns Moscow.

The protagonist Olenin tired in the civilized society an attempt to find happiness among the wild, free-living cossacks in the Caucasus village. The portraits of the old cossacks, Eroshka and the native girl, Maryanka are especially successful. Olenin tries to escape himself from the unmarried situation and starts to search the taste of married life. So he writes his journal, and goes for hunting with the villagers. All his activities show that his fleeting subjectivity, from one situation to another. Olenin's interest shows every time to praise Maryanka's beauty which attracts him to near her. Olenin compares her beauty with the beauty of Mountain. He could not make his right choice rather he shows the satisfaction of Lukashka's desire. Thus, the overall situations are only the fluctuation of his subjectivity.

Tolstoy has sketched the protagonist Olenin's about psychic transference from the lack of unbalancing between id and superego or the conscious and unconscious psychic forces. Olenin fleets from psychologically one place to another. And psychologist has talked if the patient could not maintain the good relationship with conscious and unconscious psychic forces, then the patient either go in frustration or in inrancmood.

By summing up, the understanding of psychoanalysis and the textual interpretation has shown the psychological problem of Olenin. He fleets from his repressed desire, love, thoughts and feelings. Lacanian and Freudian interpretation have become the fruitful and pervasive in Leo Tolstoy's novel *The Cossack*.'

Works Cited

- D. Kaufman, Andrew. *Existential Quest and Artistic Possibility in Tolstoi's The Cossacks*. Virginia: University of Virgin, 2005.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Ed. James Stranchey. London: Harper, 1975.
- . . . "The Dynamics of Transference". *Recommendation to Physician Practicing Psychoanalysis*. Ed. And Trans. James Stranchey. London: Hogarth Press, 1986
- . . . *The Future Prospects of Psychoanalytic Therapy*. Ed.and Trans. James Stranchey. London: Hogarth Press, 1986.
- Gobbard, Gleno. "Countertransference: The Emerging Common Ground". *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*. 475-85, 1995:76.
- Hagan, John. *Ambivalence in Tolstoy's The Cossack*. New York: Norton, 1995.
- Hrimann, P. "On Countertransference". *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*. 31, 42, 1950:20.
- Intervention and Transference. *In Dora's Case. Freud*, New York: Colombia Untwcsty Press. (1990). 92-104.
- . . . *Seminar XI*. New York: Norton, 1988.32.
- Jay, Martin. *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Lacan. Jacques. *Ecrits: A Selection*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. London: Routeledge, 1977.
- . . . F i r lessons on the Psychoanalytic Theory of Jacques Lacan. Juan David

- Nasio. Trans. David Pettigrew and Raffoul. New York State of University of
New York, . . . 1998. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Ed.
Jacques-Alain Miller. Trans. Alan Seridan. New York: W. N. Norton, 1978.
- Pontalis, *J.B. Frontiers in Psychoanalysis: Between the Dreams and*, Trans.
Catherine Sullen and Philip Sullen. New York: International University Press,
1977.
- Quan, Shirley N. *Asian Literature Collections*. New York: Norton, 1999.
- Ryan, Michael. *Literary Theory: A Practical Introduction*. Maiden, Massachusetts:
Blackwell, 1999. Vicki A. Sanders
- Sanders, Vicki A. *Jin and His Works*. London: East and West Publication, 1998.
- Sen, *Sxxnil. Asian Writers*. Delhi: Gupta Publishing House, 1994.
- Skura, Meridith. "Psychoanalytic Criticism". *Redrawing the Boundaries:*
- Vaslamatzis, Grigoris. "On the Therapist's Reverie and Containing Function". *The
Edge of Experience*. London: Karnac Books, 2001. 430-40.
- Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. Eds. Stephen
Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. New York: MLA, 1992. 347-373.

