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by

Janet Vrancken

Unconvinced of Emile Glénisson's theory that all Mauriac's characters are but one person with an emotionally arrested development, we took Mauriac's novel, La Pharisienne, and studied its ten principal characters, not only to see to what extent they were individualized, but also to understand them in greater depth.

As guidelines in our consideration we used the concepts of Transactional Analysis. While this approach is particularly appropriate here, given the novel's subject matter and format, it is also relatively new in literary criticism. We therefore explained briefly its basic ideas, stressing strokes, ego states, existential positions and scripts.

While discussing in depth the three young people in the book, we showed how the psychological make-up of each authority figure in their early lives had influenced the development of their personalities differently, leading in two instances to social disfunction. Under similar analysis the adult characters revealed equally differentiated personality structures.
I should like to take this opportunity to thank most warmly my director of thesis, Dr. Patrick Brady, and my two readers, Dr. Michèle Farrell and Dr. Deborah Nelson, for their unceasing help, encouragement and kindness over the last months.
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Introduction

In his interesting study of love in Mauriac's novels,¹ Emile Gleenisson expounds his theory that each protagonist in each novel, indeed all the characters of any depth in all the novels, are but one and the same character.² Furthermore, in his view, that one character is a child, or rather an adult whose emotional development has stopped before the age of seven.³ A personality so emotionally stunted is perforce incapable of an adult approach to love in any of its forms, among which he mentions mutual heterosexual, fraternal, parental, love between friends and even that of God.

Glénisson criticizes Mauriac for the monotony which results from there being only one personality with a limited number of guises and scenarios in his novels. "Les différentes formes d'amour qu'on y rencontre sont des étiquettes, les différents personnages qui sont censés aimer sont des masques, sous lesquels un seul personnage caractériellement infantile joue et rejoue tel ou tel passage à peine modifié de son acte unique."⁴
However, it must be noted that, having determined the psychological truth of this one recurring character and criticized Mauriac for his lack of variety, Glénisson in his penultimate section criticizes him for lack of psychological truth when some of the characters do not fit what one might call the psychological straight-jacket that he (Glénisson) has constructed for them. Adults with emotionally arrested development, says Glénisson, are usually passive, and in several cases Mauriac's characters are active, which is a sign, again according to Glénisson, of mental adulthood. Glénisson cites the "pleurnicheur Puybaraud" in *La Pharisienne* and wonders how he could ever hold the post of "surveillant d'internat". Later, in discussing some of Mauriac's female protagonists, among whom he places, of course, "la Pharisienne" herself, Glénisson is perplexed. He says:

> On ne voit pas comment elles aient pu, à longueur d'années, régenter leur entourage ou leur domaine, car elles se révèlent, tôt ou tard, aussi irrémédiablement infantiles que leurs congénères masculins".  

He draws the conclusion that Mauriac has formed these characters in a different mold "aux dépens de leur vérité".  


Yet, as readers of the book _La Pharisienne_, we are not surprised by any such inconsistency or lack of truth in the two characters mentioned above. Indeed, with some minor adjustments to allow for the inevitable changes in social mores which have occurred during the eighty or so years since the fictional setting and our own days, we can relate well to both these characters. They and the other characters in the book are credible people; to a greater or lesser extent we have all met with their counterparts in the real world. While Glénisson's arguments are convincing in many instances, could he be guilty to some extent of seeking to oversimplify the personality structure of Mauriac's creations? Could it not be that, albeit alike with the rest of humanity in that they are often unhappy, unbalanced and lonely, with those frequent failures in their emotional relationships that Glénisson stresses, Mauriac's people resist uniform classification? Do they not in fact differ quite clearly one from the other?

To explain further the psychological behavior of some of his creations, and to point out the differences between them, we should like to consider in detail one novel to which we have already referred above, that is _La Pharisienne_. Here, as is so often the case in Mauriac's works, it is family relationships that are investigated.
For this reason we have seen it appropriate to consider the book in the light of the theories of Eric Berne, who studied family behavior and published, in the nineteen-sixties, his findings on parental influence upon the development of the personality and lives of their offspring. We should take into account also the writings of Claude Steiner and Ira Tanner, who continued and developed Berne’s work in this field.

La Pharisienne was selected not only for its subject matter and for its cross-section of characters - age and sex - who are treated in some detail, but also, and indeed principally, because of its form. In Steiner’s view, for a valid assessment of a person’s state of mind, three criteria must be available:

a) the visible behavior and actual speech of the person observed;

b) the observer’s own reactions;

c) the opinion of the person being observed.

Social psychiatrists, like Berne and Steiner, deal of course with living people who come to them in person for help with their problems. We are concerned with a work of fiction, and Steiner’s requisites are not always met with in such works. However, in La Pharisienne we find a format reminiscent of Gide’s Les Faux-monnayeurs in its multiplicity of points of view and variety of ways in
which the first person communication is achieved, but also reminiscent of Proust's *A la Recherche du temps perdu* with its protagonist/spectator/narrator. Let us see how this format enables us to fulfil Steiner's requirements.

Louis Pian is the narrator as an old man looking back on his youth and early manhood, describing his relationships with his sister, Michèle, and his father, Octave Pian, but principally dealing with his step-mother, Brigitte, the "Pharisienne" of the title. He also describes the life and family of his classmate, Jean de Mirbel and Jean's involvement with Louis' own family, together with the effect of contact with these people on the Abbé Calou, Puybaraud and Octavie Tronche.

As an adult, Louis has become a writer and is most concerned — he mentions it on numerous occasions — that we, his readers, should know that all he relates about these now mostly dead people is true, real. He records their speech and actions as he has witnessed them himself. When he was not present at the time personally he justifies, in a credible manner, how he came to know such intimate details. Reconciled with an estranged uncle in later life, he learns from him certain family secrets which would never have been vouchsafed to the child Louis. Michèle recalls for her brother almost verbatim the conversation between Brigitte and Octavie. Jean de Mirbel
recounts the feelings and experiences of his eventful night bicycle ride, when he and Louis are in close contact again in later life in Paris. Therefore, although La Pharisienne is a work of fiction, we are able to fulfil to a large extent the first of Steiner's requisites.

Where Louis has no verbal communication with participants, which would permit them to give him their firsthand reports, letters and journals are quoted as sources. The abbé Calou kept a diary and letters. Puybaraud kept a private journal. These come into the hands of Louis after the deaths of the two men. Letters are preserved by Louis or read and remembered by him. In this way we are given first person emotional reports from Octavie, Jean, Calou, and Jean's mother, the comtesse La Mirandieuze-Mirbel. Obviously all such reports provided by a narrator are bound to be limited and biased. He admits this. Nevertheless we have first person assessments in these several cases to satisfy in part requisite number three.

As for number two, Louis gives us his own assessment of and reaction to the personalities involved - and incidentally of himself as a child as well - both from his point of view as a young person and later as an adult at a distance. We, the readers, also take the position of the observer mentioned in Steiner's criteria, a position which
is usually assumed by the social psychiatrist. We must therefore observe and record our own reactions to what is said and done.

From the foregoing, La Pharisienne would seem to be an appropriate choice among Mauriac's novels to be approached with Berne's theories in mind. A brief review of these theories, a little of their elaboration at the hands of Steiner and Tanner, including an explanation of some of the terminology, is deemed necessary before proceeding to an examination of the book itself. This review will be given in Chapter 1. It will be followed by an in-depth discussion in Chapter 2 of those characters whose development is seen in the book from early youth to adulthood. Chapter 3 deals with those characters who enter the book when already adult and in whose case little is known about the influences on their childhood.
Chapter 1: Theories

1. Strokes

It is a truism that people need people, proven by the fact that infants, deprived of handling over a period of time, literally die, by the dread of solitary confinement and by the loneliness that drives so many people to suicide at the traditionally family times of the year such as Christmas and Easter.

If physical contact is absolutely necessary for our well-being in the early months and years of life, this literal contact can be transmuted later to mental contact of some kind, verbal or visual recognition of our existence, in even so basic a form as "Hi!" from a neighbor. Touch remains however very important throughout life. Each acknowledgment of our existence, each hug, smile, "Well done!", even "Get out!" — for negative reactions to our presence are preferable to no reaction at all — is called in Berne's terms, a "stroke", that is a fundamental unit of social action. An exchange of strokes constitutes a "transaction", which is the unit of social intercourse, hence Transactional Analysis, the term by which Berne's theories are generally known. "Hi, Joe!" (stroke for Joe) and the reply "Hi, Bob! How are you
doing?" (stroke for Bob) = one transaction. Both Joe and Bob feel better as a result of this contact.

Of course strokes vary enormously in quality, but the fact remains that we all need them and that we structure our lives to procure them, be it at work, in rituals (accepted social exchanges as is the example just cited), in pastimes, in "games" (ploys used, often repeatedly, by an individual with a special and concealed end in view which will bring him gratification in some way), and finally, in "intimacy", that is, an open, rewarding and satisfying relationship with another, a state which is to be sought by all as it provides unlimited supplies of strokes of all kinds.

2) Ego States

For a further understanding of transactions and games and for our future discussion of La Pharisienne, something must be known of Berne's theory of ego states. From observed behavior patterns, Berne deduced the existence in each person of three different psychic attitudes or, in other words, states of mind. "All three aspects of the personality have a high survival and living value, and it is only when one or the other of them disturbs the healthy balance that analysis and reorganization are indicated."¹ For simplification's sake, the three ego states are called: the Child, because it contains still-active ego
states which were fixated in early childhood; the Parent, because it resembles those of parental and authority figures; and the Adult, a state which is the dispassionate evaluator, the appraiser of reality.²

These ego states are associated with certain functions. The Child, preserved as it is in entirety from childhood, is the well-spring of our creativity, spontaneity, emotions both pleasant and unpleasant, love and hate, fear and joy, sexuality, curiosity and all pleasure.

The Parent is copied or learned from the behavior of authority figures, usually parents. Here are found the methods and tenets that are accepted without reasoning, the way of doing things which avoids the necessity of "reinventing the wheel" daily. Although taken whole from others, the Parent is fortunately not fixated, as is the Child, but can be modified throughout life under the influence of other authority figures and experience. Most authority figures are nurturing and protective and are also examples of control, which is necessary for well-being in life. However, control can become oppressive, supercritical, power-crazy rather than beneficial. When this is the case, the Parent that develops within the
Child of the offspring — called the Pig Parent by Steiner — can have a very detrimental effect on the balance within his personality.

The Adult state, detached from emotions, is the source of objective reasoning. It modifies the unreasoned fears of early childhood. It is developed throughout life, as a result of interactions with the external world.

It is only possible to be in one ego state at any given moment. The way in which a person behaves and speaks reveals in which ego state he is at that time. Whoever happens to be observing him can be conscious of this ego state, which aids the therapist greatly in his consulting room, and us in our quest for a better understanding of Mauriac's characters. A drunk at a party, laughing uproariously, is in his Child ego state. At the same party, another man who refuses a drink saying "Thank you, no; I am driving to the airport tonight" is in his Adult state, though he could be in his Parent state, masquerading as his Adult if, for instance, his teenage son is beside him, in which case he is really issuing a "Don't drink and Drive!" injunction. The drunk's wife who says "Time to go home, Ted!", depending on the tone, is either in her protective or in her oppressive Parent state.
Each of the three ego states should interact with and counteract the others. The Parent controls the wilder impulses of the Child; the Adult alters tenets previously imprinted in the Parent but now proven to be erroneous or inefficacious; the Child feels and softens the logical but cold judgments of the Adult. This seems straightforward, but there are of course complications. Within every person's Child are fixated the ego states that person had in his early years.

Consider the Adult within the Child. At under, say, seven years of age, just how much experience for forming a rational judgment has an infant? It perforce must be limited, and the earlier in life, the more limited.³

What of the Parent in the Child? Those who serve as authority figures, usually parents, are, as we have said, totally responsible for its composition. It is in fact the balance of their own ego states which will be impressed upon the Parent in the Child of their offspring. A father who believes self-control and repression of emotion are good will create within his son or daughter a Parent in the Child wherein control and repression play a dominant role. How will the Child in the Child — or the Natural Child, as Berne termed it — essentially impulsive and fun-loving, maintain its own existence in the face of a repressive, controlling Parent in the Child and with no
Adult in the Child developed enough to mediate or reason between the wishes of the one and the strictures of the other? Unfortunately, all too often, when the power and oppressive elements in the authority figures encountered in childhood dominate the protective, nurturing elements, repression of the Natural Child in the Child and adaptation to what is called either the Pig Parent (the offspring acquires the same oppressive traits as his parent) or the Adapted Child (when the Parent in the Child is molded to suit the pleasure of the parent) can occur to the detriment of the future balance of the personality. In short, the Parent in the Child either duplicates or complies with the oppressive authority figure, quelling all autonomy, limiting spontaneity, damming up creativity, causing distrust of its own feelings within the Natural Child.

The results can be unhappy, even tragic. Steiner says that "the Child ego state in an unhappy person is often completely adapted to the Pig Parent." Long forgotten, irrational fears and concepts, fixated at an early age, can be triggered, one knows not how necessarily, in later life and bring with them all the conviction of the personality's own tradition. The role
of the Parent in the Child should therefore not be underestimated nor must the role of authority figures in childhood.

An adaptation of Steiner's diagram will help clarify and summarise the ego state theory. Each adult personality is made up of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGO STATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Nurturing Parent</td>
<td>Nurture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Rationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C P in C</td>
<td>Adapted Child/Pig Parent</td>
<td>Oppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A in C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C in C</td>
<td>Natural Child</td>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Prince, Princess)</td>
<td>Intimacy etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be noted that for a series of transactions to continue according to Berne, they have to be made reciprocally between the same ego states, e.g. most generally, A → A, P → P, C → C, P → C. If there is a crossed transaction e.g. A → A, P → C, the series cannot continue and strokes cease. Take, for example:
Janey: Where does snow come from, Mummy? (J's A→M's A)
Mummy: Hush, don't bother me now!" (M's P→J's C)
We, the readers, can also feel that communication must cease.

3) Existential Positions

When the ego states are in balance, a person feels deep-seatedly in harmony with himself and with the world: as Berne puts it, "I'm OK, you're OK." For him, this state of harmony is the natural lot of man, the natural condition of each child at birth. Disharmony comes as a result of external influences (the authority figures, principally). Hence his well-known image of all children being born princes and princesses and being turned into frogs. Disharmony leads to the other three existential positions: "I'm not OK, you're OK"; "I'm OK, you're not OK"; and the tragic "I'm not OK, you're not OK".

A follower of Berne in other instances, Ira Tanner postulates however that all infants very soon have times of feeling rejected and unloved. A baby feels loved by his mother when she is with him but when she leaves him to tend to household chores, he cannot rationalize this apparent abandonment. He cannot explain to himself that she is busy and loves him all the same. This situation is anxiety-provoking for the child. The late development of the Adult leaves a long, highly impressionable period in
which the emotions of fear and rejection and, by extension, unlovedness, indeed of unlovableness, will be indelibly registered in the child's mind without any moderating, rational check. Feeling "not OK" i.e. with a poor self-image, a person will be afraid of loving others and thus risking the hurt of rejection when, on closer acquaintance, they find out his lack of worth. As a result, he will be lonely and his loneliness will be self-perpetuating as it results from the fear both of loving and of being loved. For Tanner, loneliness is an endemic disease, the disease of the fear of love. All humans have to come to terms with it in whatever way they can. The differences lie in the degree of severity and the manner of coping with it.

Let it be noted here, in preparation for our consideration of La Pharisienne, that one of the most striking impressions left after the first reading of the book is of the loneliness of some of the characters. The very frequent occurrence of the words "seul", "solitude" and "solitaire" is noteworthy.

Tanner links this fear of love to the existential positions established by Berne. As we have seen, with ego states in balance the existential position is "I'm OK, you're OK". With this view of life a person is not lonely. He does not fear to love or to be loved. The
other three states have at their base more or less acute forms of this fear of love and its resulting loneliness. With the existential position "I'm not OK, you're OK", the person with the poor self-image feels as Tanner says: "I don't deserve to be loved and I'll prove it". A seemingly more acute fear of love gives rise to the second existential position "I'm OK, you're not OK", a reversal of number two as an extra defense-mechanism against hurt. According to Tanner, the idea here is "I don't trust people who want to give love and I'll prove it". When the fear of love and the utter loneliness have become so acute that all effort seems useless, the final existential position ("I'm not OK, you're not OK") is assumed. In Tanner's view, this implies "I've given up trying to give or receive love".

The first existential position is clearly the one we should all endeavor to achieve, as, once established in this mode, we should be able to lead full, happy lives, developing our real selves, giving and receiving strokes freely and participating in the joy of truly intimate relationships.

Positions two and three are ones which, once unconsciously assumed, modify the expectations and development of the tendencies of the Natural Child of the person involved. In number two, life is bearable as
long as the position "I'm not OK" is maintained. Nothing must be allowed to disturb this position, which is workable and comfortable in its very habitualness, but basically unnatural and precariously balanced. The person with this life view has to keep proving his unworthiness. Any too positive stroke would therefore threaten to change the "I'm not OK" to "I'm OK" and must be counteracted. Feelings of guilt or of rejection must be reinforced, the "Poor me" syndrome reaffirmed. The stroke "You've got lovely eyes!" is countered by "Yes, but my teeth are awful!".

Number three existential position, the reverse method of confronting the same fear, also needs to maintain the status quo. Nothing must be allowed to disturb the "I'm OK" person's feeling of superiority and rightness. People with this existential position tend to be bullies, arrogant and sure of themselves on the surface, intensely lonely within. They have an urgent need to prove how OK they are by constantly putting down other people, proving that others are not worthy of love nor to be trusted when they seem to want to give love. Bursts of anger are frequently used as a defensive mechanism, both to shut down dialogues or arrest actions that threaten to shake their opinion of themselves, and to reinforce their mistrust of others.
The final existential position, "I'm not OK, you're not OK", leads to black despair and loneliness, withdrawal, drug abuse, alcoholism and, not infrequently, suicide.

4. Scripts

Ideally, in his late teens, a young person would consciously decide what to become in his life - artist, miner, doctor. He would make his decision after consulting his own inclinations, qualifications and situation and the views of parents and teachers. It would be for his Adult to make the final decision, taking into consideration his Parent's and his Child's wishes and needs.

Sometimes decisions of a different nature but no less significant for his life's course are taken unconsciously and earlier by a much younger Adult. These decisions determine his "script", for such is Berne's term for an unconscious prematurely decided-upon life-plan. Scripts can vary from the banal, e.g. "I'm going to be lazy" to the tragic, e.g. "I'm going to be an alcoholic." Scripts can be adopted as a result of a traumatic experience, or they can be constructed over a long period of time, as a result, as it were, of a war of attrition between the
autonomous natural tendencies and attributions, such as "You're such a good girl!" and injunctions, such as "Don't cry!", received from the primary family group.

A mother who constantly warns her son "Don’t knock over that vase/glass/mirror. I’m always telling you not to be so clumsy!" is giving him an injunction overtly and verbally not to do something whilst implying that he is already set in a clumsy mold i.e. attributing to him clumsiness as a characteristic. A drawing in of breath or a tension in the body of his mother when he is near the china cabinet will make the same boy feel even more innately clumsy. According to Ronald Laing, implied non-verbal attributes - and the subtler, the more powerful - make a more lasting insidious impression than overt verbal ones.

In Berne's theory, there are three basic groups of life scripts: the mindless, which leads in its most tragic cases to madness; the joyless, where an inability to deal with bodily sensations leads to drug abuse in varying forms; and the loveless, which prevents the formation of successful, loving relationships. The last mentioned is of course by far the most common.
The above is a brief outline of the theories involved in transactional, structural and script analysis. Further details will be given as needed to clarify points in the following chapters. Wherever the words stroke, transaction, intimacy, game and script appear in the ensuing chapters, they are used in the special sense ascribed to them in this past chapter.
Chapter 2
The Young

As has been seen in Chapter 1, much of importance in the development of a personality, and thus of a life, is determined in early childhood. In the book La Pharisienne only three of the characters are shown in their youth: Louis Pian, Jean de Mirbel and Michèle Pian, Louis' sister. We meet the other members of the two families as a therapist would meet them, that is in their middle years with scripts, should they have them, well established. We will discuss the personalities of the three young people in the order given above.

Louis

Louis plays a special role in this book. He is at one and the same time an actor with a major role, in that it is his action that links the two families, and minor thereafter, in that he serves as confidant to several personages, especially to Brigitte; he is an interested spectator; he is a narrator who recalls the past and comments upon it with hindsight. We meet him first when he is thirteen years of age, again at fifteen, and thereafter have glimpses of him in Paris in his late teens and early twenties. The whole story is recounted by Louis, the old man, near the end of his life.
What are we told of Louis' life prior to that momentous thirteenth summer? He is the second child of Octave and Marthe Pian. His sister, Michèle, is one year his senior. When Louis was seven his mother died, in what was ostensibly a driving accident. There is however a suspicion that it was suicide, as she had been very much in love with a young cousin and the Pian couple had severe marital problems. In Louis' presence there had been scarcely any talk of the accident. Whether, as a child, he suspected suicide or not is of no real importance to our understanding of his make-up. The death of a loved parent - and clearly Louis had a loving relationship with his mother (pp. 13, 16) - is traumatic for any child. Louis would sense that this death was even more distressing than a mother's death usually is. He would probably feel abandoned and lonely; possibly rejected and, irrationally, so unlovable that his mother did not consider him worth living for, in the same way that many children in cases of divorce unjustifiably blame themselves for the breakdown of their parents' marriage.

Soon after the death of his adored first wife, Louis' father remarried another cousin of hers, Brigitte. After this marriage he never again mentioned Marthe's name, at least in Louis' presence. Such behavior could not have helped the child work through his grief. Nor would the
choice of stepmother benefit the little boy, a stepmother for whom he felt no warmth, who reminded him each evening to pray for his dead mother as if she had special need for prayers, but who did not tuck him in and kiss him goodnight. Octave was secretly troubled about his first wife’s possible adultery and the consequent illegitimacy of Louis. This gnawing doubt must have affected his relationship with Louis, subconsciously to be sure, for Octave is not an unkind man, even before Brigitte’s oblique reference to it finally causes the couple’s separation. It is certain that Octave has a much stronger bond with his daughter, Michèle, than with Louis. Within the family unit there are clearly two alignments: father and Michèle, Brigitte and Louis. Symbolically this can be seen early in the book, when Michèle and Octave stand at one end of the balcony watching the procession, with Brigitte and Louis at the other end.

With the exception of Brigitte the family liked to live in their country home at Larjuzon. On marrying, Brigitte had promised to live in the country, but she used Louis’ constantly alleged sensitivity to make the family reside in Bordeaux during term time, so that Louis might be a day boy rather than a boarder at school. However, it
is during a two-week period that, for family business reasons, Louis has to spend as a boarder at the school, just prior to the summer vacation, that the book begins.

The summer of his thirteenth year is a painful one for Louis. "Je ne puis me taire sur cette blessure que j'ai reçue, enfant", says the older Louis (p.57). Across the years, the intensity of the emotions he felt then suffuses his mature writing. We, the readers, cannot but relate to them and be affected by them. It is during these critical weeks that Louis' existential position is assumed, his decision taken and the script formulated by which he seems to live the rest of his life.

What is revealed to us of the young Louis' ego states? At the beginning of the book they are still those of the child he frequently refers to himself as being, but they are in transition. His Adult seems well-developed. An intelligent boy, he is a good student and can seemingly reason well. On the other hand the intuitive part of the Adult, which, in Berne's view, operates to help a child whilst experience and knowledge are being gathered, seems to have served him well in knowing how to treat "les grandes personnes".

His Natural Child is loving. Despite his father's "torpeur" (p. 94) and seemingly distant behavior, Louis is fond of him, for the boy is comforted in his own misery as
a boarder by the fact that his father will be happy in the country. However it is clear that in the absence of his mother and the quasi-absence of his father, his love is centered upon his sister, from whom he seeks total commitment in return. Michèle has probably been the stable loving figure that has kept his ego states in relative balance in the previous troubled years. He craves affection. In Berne's terms, his need for strokes is very great, strokes not only verbal but physical. He appreciates Puybaraud's goodnight kiss in the dormitory; he puts his head on his sister's shoulder when crying; he holds her hand.

He seems a lonely child with no special friends at school. He is therefore overjoyed when he realizes his new friend, Jean, will stay near Larjuzon: "Un brusque bonheur m'envahit" (p. 16). So in need of strokes was Louis at that time that even the dreaded Rausch's exceptional use of his first name remains noteworthy within the memory of the older Louis many years later. The use of a first name is a basic stroke.

The authority figures in his life fill Louis with fear rather than love. He is terrified of Rausch and wishes he would die. His feelings for his stepmother, who has by far the most dominant influence upon him, are ambivalent. He does not love her, sometimes he hates her.
He fears her control over him - a fear which lasts at least until he is fifteen - and is wary of her at all times, yet he has more respect for her and her views than for his father, whom he refers to as "mon pauvre père" (p.23). Indeed, for his father Louis now feels principally a tolerant but dismissive scorn, a scorn no doubt imprinted in his Parent from Brigitte's attitude to her husband and subsisting even into the older Louis' view of him, a scorn which renders minimal Octave's influence as an authority figure on the young Louis.

Over the six years during which, as Brigitte constantly reminds Louis, she has assumed the responsibility of being his mother, her personality has been impressing itself upon his Parent. He has listened with his Adult to her religiosity and moralizing, but has taken into his Parent her example of hypocrisy, a hypocrisy which is physically represented by her cold eyes in an ever-smiling face. From her he has learnt how to act a part and thus avoid her displeasure - the role of "l'enfant sage" (p. 10) in both senses of the word, well-behaved and wise. This role is a consciously adopted one - "Je feignais de ne perdre aucune de ses paroles", (p. 83) and, most revealingly, as he walks with Puybaraud in the park at Larjuzon:
...je lui donnais la réplique, en lui témoignant cette gentillesse un peu fourbe qui m'ouvrirait si aisément les coeurs, dès que je m'en donnais la peine. Rien ne décelait au pauvre homme que mon coeur souffrait à mille lieues de lui, que je lui dévidais des propos sans aucun lien avec mes pensées ni avec mes sentiments réels, que je lui échappais sans gêne, sans effort, ne lui laissant que cette apparence d'un enfant sage et attentif..." (pp. 75-6).

Here he is but the younger version of Brigitte as she asks Louis about his examinations (p. 25).

Louis is indeed the emotional, highly-strung child Brigitte so repeatedly says he is. Timid, afraid of the dark, he cries easily and frequently. Whether he was by nature ever thus, or whether Brigitte by constant attribution has made him so, we cannot tell. From her directly, but more often by implication, he comes to believe that feeling and showing emotion is bad. She openly warns him against passion, citing Puybaraud's downfall. More insidiously, she shows disapproval of him by criticizing in Puybaraud the very same traits she attributes to Louis himself. Puybaraud is "beaucoup trop doux et d'une sensibilité dangereuse" (p. 18), all of which is guaranteed to make Louis feel "not OK" about himself. Self-control, in her image, is to be emulated.

However, he also learns from Brigitte how to use his "sensibilité" to his own advantage, as she did in order to live in Bordeaux. To escape punishment when he is caught
trying to slip out of the house to see Jean one last time, Louis deliberately induces a crying fit that leads to nervous exhaustion.

With Brigitte as the principal authority figure, Louis' Parent has become in part Adapted Child, that is, it has molded itself to suit her wishes and thus to make life tenable, in part, Pig Parent, that is, it has taken into itself certain of the characteristics from her oppressive Parent. Within his personality there is conflict between the demands of the Natural Child and those of Adapted Child/Pig Parent. Inconsistent behavior in two incidents at the beginning reveal this confused state. Let us consider in detail "l'histoire des gâteaux" (pp. 8-10) and the betrayal of Puybaraud (pp. 25-7).

The cake incident provides the link between the two boys, Jean and Louis. Prior to this day, they had not really been friendly, separated by character as by age. Jean was at least two years older than Louis and for his age was two years behind in his studies. When Jean is to be punished by his uncle for his poor behavior and work, the Adapted Child in Louis is selected by Rausch as a model pupil, to be a tool in this punishment. Contrary to expectations, Louis in his Natural Child refuses to cooperate. In what is a spontaneous gesture of solidarity with a fellow being, he does not accept the cream cakes.
Although the older Louis relates this incident, he proffers no reason for his younger self's behavior, as he does elsewhere for other actions. Perhaps he senses that this action stems from the very core of his being and needs no explanation. It is he being himself.

A bond is formed between the boys. The act makes a lasting impression on them both. It is referred to in teasing Michèle later in the summer as a special secret they share. The older Louis recalls the conversation between Jean and himself just after the cake incident (pp. 10-15). It is interesting as an example of strokes and transactions, and reveals the ego states of both boys.

It is Jean de Mirbel who approaches Louis, a most gratifying stroke for the younger boy, who thought himself 'méprisé' by Jean (p. 10). Jean says "Regarde!" and shows Louis two stag-beetles, further strokes. Jean is speaking and acting in his Natural Child to the Child of Louis. Louis replies, ostensibly in his Adult to the Adult of Jean. He gives a short lecture on the habits of stag-beetles. This is really a reasoned, controlled cover - Brigitte would have approved! - for what is an unusual and exciting moment for Louis. It is a social transaction (A → A) hiding a psychological one (C → C); that is, an ulterior transaction. Jean senses this and is not put off by the apparent Adult. He returns with the offer of the gift of
one of the stag-beetles — and the bigger one at that! — a further stroke for Louis. There is no refusal on the part of Louis to the offer, although we know from the older Louis that the gift posed practical problems. Though Louis says nothing, the two sit down together, which counts as reciprocal strokes and the temporary end to each boy's loneliness.

Here we have action and speech observed (number one of Steiner's requisites). The older Louis says of his younger self's feelings at the time "J'étais content qu'il me parlât avec gentillesse" (p. 10). He has a warm pleasant feeling, his need for kindness satisfied (number three of the requisites). Finally, we, the readers, have our own reactions. In our Child we feel that they have communicated - Jean has thanked Louis and a friendship has been formed; we feel the warmth and pleasure of their interchanged strokes. The conversation can continue unstressed. Jean, still in his Natural Child, impulsive, uncontrolled, threatens to hit the child who ate the cakes. Louis, ostensibly in his Adult - as a good student, this is a mode he habitually uses - asks what a "zouave pontifical" is, and Jean replies it his Adult. However, on the psychological level, the question was a pretext in his Child to continue a series of mutually satisfying transactions. After an outburst of the Child
in Jean against Rausch and his uncle - the Child is Jean’s most frequently used ego state - there follows an interchange between their two Adults, with interest shown and confidences given, and therefore strokes for both boys.

Then, Louis’ Pig Parent appears. The desire to be superior, taken directly from Brigitte, compels him to say proudly "Ma mère à moi est venue habiter Bordeaux pour mon éducation". (p. 12). Jean retaliates. He has his share of Pig Parent also.⁴ We have four more exchanges in which each boy tries to establish superiority over the other. This interchange, whilst still affording strokes, is of less positive worth than the preceding golden moment. We, the readers, feel less comfortable and sense that the episode has been soured for both boys. Stalemate and silence ensue for a short while.

Louis reopens the exchanges in his Child, extending relief to Jean’s suffering under cover of his own genuine delight at the thought of the up-coming holidays. He speaks in short exclamations, as is often the case with the Natural Child⁵: "Bientôt, les prix! m’écriai-je". (p. 14). Jean replies ostensibly in his Adult to Louis’ Adult, but is really a frightened Child (note the broken sentences) seeking comfort from a Nurturing Parent in the
sympathetic Louis, who tries to help. Their conversation continues unstressed until Rausch calls all the boys to the refectory.

If Louis' Natural Child is strong enough to provoke this rebellious sympathetic gesture, it is too undermined to resist the temptation of his Adapted Child to tell Brigitte of Puybaraud's letter and its sentimental message. After the event his Natural Child feels dreadful remorse which is appeased by seeking Brigitte's help for Jean. The older Louis, ashamed of his younger self's act, suggests that "gonflé par l'importance de ce secret" he was impelled by the need "d'étonner, de scandaliser" but adds "je n'osais rien découvrir devant la famille réunie". (p. 21). Why not? Why was it only to Brigitte that he longed to tell his tale?

In his Pig Parent, which had taken on so many of Brigitte's ethical views, he knew that only Brigitte would react to his tale-telling by praising him for his action. He would thus procure strokes for himself. At the same time he would satisfy his need, again copied from Brigitte's personality, to control people. The other two members of the family, more resistant to Brigitte's influence, would indeed be appalled by his betrayal. So the older Louis somewhat misreads his younger self;
perhaps he does not see, or does not wish to see, just how adapted to his stepmother his personality has become.6

The conversation of the betrayal is interesting also as a revelation of ego states. It is a series of transactions, the Adapted Child of Louis playing up to the oppressive Parent of Brigitte, both disguised at the beginning as Adult to Adult discussing a question of ethics, that is, whether a confidence should be revealed or not. Not only has Louis learnt hypocrisy from Brigitte, he has also taken on her moralising phraseology:

Mère, je voudrais vous confier quelque chose... Mais, ajoutai-je hypocritement, j'ignore si j'en aie le droit.... Une flamme d'attention s'alluma dans les yeux noirs, jusqu'alors distraits.
- Mon enfant, j'ignore ce que tu veux me confier. Mais il y a une règle à laquelle tu dois t'attacher aveuglément; c'est de n'avoir rien de caché pour ta seconde mère, pour celle qui a reçu mission de t'élever." (p. 25).

We do not know whether the young Louis' hypocrisy is conscious or unconscious. "Hypocritement" could be a comment of the older Louis with hindsight. However, it is more than likely that young Louis has already begun to manipulate others, his stepmother included, just as he has seen her do.
The rest of the conversation is more interesting for a discussion of Brigitte's ego state than that of Louis, but it does show his role as observer. The outbursts of short, staccato questions reveal a change to her Child ego-state with her deepest emotions, her obsession with human love and sexuality, barely disguised beneath a façade of Parental platitudes. She switches to her genuine protective Parent when she realises Louis concern over future contact with Puybaraud. The observer Louis notes for us "d'un ton vif", "avidement"(p. 25) and "les dents serrées et avec une brusque violence",(p. 27) which all point to Brigitte being in her Child.

The events of the summer at Larjuzon bring to a head this conflict between the Natural Child and the Brigitte-influenced Parent in Louis' personality. The love that binds Jean and Michèle from the first day they meet robs Louis of his sister, the one constant emotional support of his past troubled life, his previously reliable source of pure gold strokes, and at the same time of the promise of new strokes in the form of a friend.

His suffering is intense, man-sized within his child's being.(p. 61). Triggered from the older Louis' repressed Natural Child by his recounting of Brigitte's tale, it surges through his otherwise measured prose as though it needs to be exorcised. According to the older
Louis the "jalousie" he began to suffer then has affected him adversely throughout his whole life. It is the "source de cette souffrance qui a pénétré et corrompu ma vie". (p. 57). A little later the older Louis further analyses the nature of jealousy. For him it is born of "l'insoutenable vision du plaisir qu'une créature aimée reçoit d'un autre et lui prodigue". (p. 82). Here is neither incestuous nor homosexual love for the person as might conceivably be supposed. Indeed the older Louis rules out any sexual undercurrents as the young Louis is physically as yet unawakened. He speaks of "ma chair encore endormie". (p. 82). It is the state of loving someone and of being loved by someone that Louis craves; he wants an infinite source of strokes, an intimacy to dispel his loneliness. The person chosen by Louis for this cherished intimacy could be either Michèle, as in the past, or Jean. As he says, "Je n'eusse pu démêler si j'étais atteint dans ma tendresse pour Michèle ou dans l'amitié que je vouais à Jean". (p. 58). Their togetherness accentuates his feelings of loneliness: "Leur complicité me séparait d'eux davantage encore". (p. 59). In their eyes, "j'appartenais au néant" (p. 83) and indifference engenders neither positive nor negative strokes; it engenders no strokes at all.
Obsessed with his own concerns, the thirteen year old spends his days desperately trying to part the other two. The older Louis even suspects his younger self of spitefully betraying Michèle and Jean to Brigitte. (p. 96). By the end of the summer Louis recognizes the finality of his loss. He becomes confirmed into the existential position of "I'm not OK, you're OK" for which his earlier years would seem to have destined him, but which he had been resisting. Subconsciously, he feels unlovable, not worthy of love, incapable of inspiring lasting love. For him love and suffering are forever linked. He says "Il m'a toujours fallu souffrir pour savoir que j'aimais". (p. 168). He is certainly not in harmony within himself or with the world.

With such convictions, in the light of the summer's events, Louis decides subconsciously that loving is too painful an experience to be risked. On the first afternoon that the three youngsters spend together at Larjuzon, the older Louis reads the mind of his younger self. "Mieux valait renoncer à lui (Jean), ne plus le voir jamais, qu'éprouver ce serrement à la gorge, cette contraction au creux de l'estomac, cette douleur, ce mal sans remède puisque le remède se trouvait éloigné infiniment de mes plaies". (p. 59). What is said here,
specifically concerning Jean is valid for all other relationships that touch Louis too closely and could be hurtful. Henceforth he will guard against closeness with anyone. Such a decision will entail repression of his Natural warm Child but will make life bearable, an existence neither blissfully happy nor miserably painful. In common with the vast majority of people he settles for second best, becoming eventually comfortable within the confines of his banally unhappy script.

"We are lonely because of our fear of love" says Tanner and indeed the principal concomitant of a loveless script is loneliness. Louis is and remains all his life intensely lonely. Even years later, at the outbreak of the 1914-18 war, he has still no one to love or by whom to be loved. He says, "Je mesurai ma solitude à ce que je n’avais personne à qui dire adieu, hors Brigitte Pian". (p. 295). He is not dupe of his situation. In recalling the frightful day when the young Louis realizes that he will be without Jean, Michèle and Puybaraude that academic year, there is this revealing paragraph:

Ce jour-là, j’ai vu pour la première fois à visage découvert, ma vieille ennemie la solitude, avec qui je fais bon ménage aujourd’hui. Nous nous connaissons: elle m’a assené tous les coups imaginables et il n’y a plus de place où frapper. Je ne crois avoir évité
So, by the end of his life, Louis has learnt to do without people and has attained a kind of peace, but at what cost to his psychological development?

The adoption of a premature loveless script entails of course the repression of the Natural Child. It still functions but on a much reduced scale. Louis finds that the intensity of his feelings for Jean and Michèle gradually fades over the months, though his jealousy can flare up occasionally.

To comply with a loveless script, modifications within the personality must take place, other ways must be found for obtaining strokes. Louis' Pig Parent develops apace as his Natural Child function is reduced. Those characteristics which we have already seen him adopting under Brigitte's influence — hypocrisy, need to be superior, to control and manipulate others — become more evident. He acquires her self-control and the calculating coldness, even cruelty that often accompany it. In addition he takes on many of her attitudes and concepts — her scorn for others and particularly her views on sex and marriage. Let us consider some episodes which reveal these developments.
Young Louis is scathingly superior in his attitude to lawyers. In his view at that time, "tout ce qui est humain leur demeure étranger". (p. 204). It will be remembered that his father had been a lawyer. Could there be a subconscious link between the two attitudes?

Like Brigitte, Louis has little else but scorn for Puybaraud by the time the latter comes to him for advice, (p. 178) both on account of his physical appearance and his social disgrace and because of his fall from what Louis considered - as did Brigitte - the higher state of celibacy. Puybaraud has only himself to blame for his situation. Louis can feel superior to his erstwhile teacher, thereby gaining self-strokes.

When Puybaraud explains his inability to get teaching employment, Louis seizes the opportunity to give himself further strokes. "Quel dommage que je n'aie pas besoin de répétiteur, déclarai-je d'un ton satisfait (and we might add, hypocritically). Mais je suis toujours premier...". (self-stroke). (p. 182). Louis cannot resist playing a game here, that is, he deliberately engineers a situation which will procure him a stroke. As Louis accurately foresees, Puybaraud automatically, and genuinely, at once says admiringly "Oh toi, tu en sais déjà autant que moi". The stroke is the more valuable as the admiration is sincere.
Like Brigitte, Louis becomes self-controlled after his adoption of the script. He considers the effects of what he says, rather than pettily revealing hurt as he did when younger, for instance, with the use of his bicycle. His reception of the letter which Jean sends him begging for his aid is significant of the change in him. First he manipulates Brigitte so that the treatment of the letter is left to his discretion. There is no emotional outburst when he realizes Jean's total lack of interest in him. Icy anger is what he registers. As old Louis says "l'irritation dominait le chagrin". He again reads the mind of his younger self, "Puisque c'était ainsi, mieux valait n'y plus songer, faire place nette..." and adds, speaking for his older self "l'aurai-je souvent ressenti, au cours de ma vie, ce désir brusque de couper court, de jeter les gens par dessus bord!". (p. 169). Louis would seem to have been affected by his script throughout his life. True to his new self, the young Louis hands over Jean's letter to Brigitte with no remorse.

Like Brigitte, Louis is cold in his relations with others, with Puybaraud and Calou, and especially with Brigitte herself. His coldness is a source of power. He withholds strokes from others. He does not say what they
wish him to say; that is, he refuses to play their game. Brigitte seeks reassurance from Louis that she is not to blame for Octavie's death.

Elle me dévisageait, et son rire anxieux mendiait un mot, une protestation; mais le silence obstiné que je lui opposais, manifestait assez que j'étais d'accord sur tous ces points avec M. Puybaraud et avec Michèle". (p. 249).

What power he now wields! Again, "J'écouteais avec une politesse froide et sans lâcher un mot d'approbation ou de réconfort". (p. 252). So well does the head rule the heart that Louis indulges in clever irony when he insists upon the saintliness of Octavie and cruelly suggests that his tortured stepmother, the would-be saint, pray to Octavie to intercede for Puybaraud!

If Brigitte is deserving of Louis' coldness, Calou is not. When they meet outside the town house we see that Louis' coldness is, as yet, a protective sheath around his weakened Natural Child. He feels sorry for his behavior. The older Louis says "Etais-je si dur alors? Non, puisque rien ne m'échappait de la détresse du pauvre prêtre... et puisque après tant d'années, je suis sensible encore au remords qui, dès ce moment-là, me pénétrait." (p. 171).

Why do the three "grandes personnes" confide so freely in the young Louis and seek his advice? Brigitte
bares her soul to him. Calou tells him much and seeks his help even though he knows Louis is under the influence of Brigitte. Puybaraud tells him "beaucoup plus qu'il n'est d'usage d'en livrer à un enfant". (p. 77). All three sense within his personality the dominant Parent ego state, and mistake this Parent for a nurturing protective authority figure to whom to turn when in their troubled Child ego state. It is in fact a Pig Parent, taken directly from Brigitte. No wonder she feels free to talk in front of him as to herself! His Pig Parent acts the part of a Parent without any genuine concern. He admits to caring nothing for them. (p. 75).

Let us consider briefly the conversation Louis has with Puybaraud just prior to Octavie's death. Addressing him as "mon petit Louis", (p. 178) Puybaraud openly asks the boy to act as judge between himself and Brigitte. Here is an odd reversal of roles. The master asks judgment, help and advice of his former pupil. What a stroke, one would suppose, for a child! Yet Louis accepts it as the norm, as it is in his case. "Je ne crois pas que beaucoup d'enfants aient été, aussi souvent que je le fus, choisis comme arbitre par les grandes personnes". (p. 178). Louis explains that Puybaraud has a belief in
the special "lucidité d’esprit" (p. 178) which belongs to certain boys and that this has caused him to be singled out as confidant in this instance. He does not explain the other instances.

Puybaraud pours out at length the intimate details of his situation and Louis gives his replies shortly. We, the readers, feel a certain unease, a dissatisfaction at the conversation, which does not only stem from embarrassment for Puybaraud and Louis’ sickening righteousness. We feel the exchanges are forced and should not have continued. They only do so because of Puybaraud’s desperation, the warmth in the room and because Puybaraud was very fond of Louis. They are, in fact, a number of crossed transactions, and crossed transactions do not usually permit a continuation of strokes. We have here Puybaraud in his Child addressing Louis in whom he senses the dominant Parent ego state (C→P). For a satisfactory transaction, Louis should reply out of a Nurturing Parent, but his is a pseudo-Parent. He therefore either replies in his Pig Parent for his own gratification (p. 182) (C→C) or everywhere else in his other well-developed ego state, proffering comments.
and solutions out of his unemotional, rational Adult
(A → A). Although not feeling much better in himself,
Puybaraud at least leaves the room with an idea of what to
do next.

We have seen that Louis acquires strokes and self-
strokes in a variety of ways. In view of these frequent
strokes, how does he still consider himself "not OK"? All
depends upon the value that the receiver of strokes sets
upon the specific strokes. Self-strokes are obviously of
lesser worth. Nor does Louis rate Puybaraud's admiration
highly, for, as the model wants to be praised for her
acting, not her figure, so Louis wants to be loved for
himself, not admired for his intellect.

It will have been noticed that the older Louis always
points to his younger self's failings and unpleasant
traits, as if to remind himself and us that he is "not
OK". This can be seen readily in the scene discussed
above, e.g. "Je revois cet enfant implacable que j'étais".
(p. 181) and "Déclarai-je d'un ton satisfait". (p. 182).
He never pleads mitigating circumstances. It is clear
that Louis always perceived of himself as "un grand
nigaud" (p. 284) in that sphere that mattered to him most,
that is, human relations. A child whose self-image is so
poor that he could only conceive of himself as being loved
because he was "la preuve vivante du péché de la première Mme Pian," (p. 174) is too well entrenched in his existential position to be shaken from it by strokes, which he values lightly.

Because he likes confirmation of his own "not OK" position, Louis willingly accepts Calou's rebuke in the priest's letter to him. Calou, a relatively new and admired authority figure, exerts a lasting influence on him which counteracts to some extent that of Brigitte. Louis says of the letter: "de cette page que je recopie ici avec respect et amour, je puis dire, qu'après l'avoir lue, je ne fus plus tout à fait le même garçon". (p. 256). In his Adult, Louis becomes aware of how he has been behaving in his Pig Parent and can therefore consciously modify his conduct and attitude, keeping his Pig Parent in check.

The older Louis continues to do this. He writes the book in his Adult and his Adult obliges him to be fair to Rausch and the colonel, even to Brigitte, who really was very charitable, giving not only of her money but of her person, and who did love him in her way. He says he pities her but he cannot, even in his old age, reason away the bitter dislike he bears her. "Aujourd'hui, j'incline à penser qu'elle me montrait tout l'attachement dont elle était capable et que j'intéressais en elle ce peu d'entrailles qui subsiste dans les femmes les plus
insensibles". (p. 174).

It is principally Brigitte he has to thank for his attitude towards sex and marriage, though, given his father's two troubled marriages, it would be hardly likely that Louis consider wedlock a happy state. Brigitte abhors, and yet is obsessed by, all that is connected with passion and sex. She agrees with the church's teaching of celibacy as "un état supérieur". The young Louis has these same attitudes. Of sexual attraction and the desire to marry he says he was "déjà enclin à le considérer avec méfiance et dégoût". (p. 176).

These are no passing aversions or teenage embarrassment. These attitudes remain with him into his old age. We see them not only in the older Louis' repugnance to speak of his father's sexual problems but also in his discussion of Puybaraud's marriage. There the older Louis states his present convictions:

J'ai peu changé sur ce point: je crois que tout le malheur des hommes vient de ne pouvoir demeurer chastes et qu'une humanité chaste ignorerait la plupart des maux dont nous sommes accablés (même ceux qui paraissent sans lien direct avec les passions de la chair). (p. 176).

Brigitte herself, prior to her conversion, could scarcely have spoken more strongly against sex. Religious teaching of virtue and a future reward do not enter into Louis' reasoning. He is concerned entirely with happiness
here below. He continues "Le bonheur en ce monde par la bonté et par l'amour, un très petit nombre d'êtres m'en ont donné l'idée, chez qui le coeur et le sang étaient souverainement dominés". (p. 176).

Being of such a mind, how could Louis ever have entertained the thought of marriage?

The reason he proffers is "cette hantise, dès ma première jeunesse... pour tenter l'expérience du bonheur" which "naissait des tourments obscurs d'un coeur où je craignais de me perdre". (p. 282). Afraid of feeling he is, just like Brigitte, obsessed with it. His "no-closeness" script makes life comfortable but lacking a dimension; it deprives his emotive side of full development. He has around him the example of a society wherein marriage is deemed an estimable, happy state. His fiasco of an engagement, which he recounts with such wry humour, is therefore a counterscript.

A counterscript is a life plan that runs contrary to the script. Whereas the script is formed as a result of injunctions and attributes coming from the Pig Parents of the authority figures, the counterscript is based on messages from their Nurturing Parent or even from the accepted tenets of society. Counterscript messages are generally given overtly, verbally, whereas script messages
are non-verbal, implicit and the more powerful. Brigitte never says to Louis "Don't get close to anyone; don't marry"; she even praises the married state to Octavie. Louis' attempt at a counterscript is short-lived. Such is generally the case, according to Steiner, who says "It is characteristic of a counterscript's behavior that it is highly unstable and brittle, for the reason that it runs counter to the much more powerful tendency represented by the script". Indeed, premature - "très tôt" (p. 282) - and ill-founded (for Louis does not fall for the girl herself but for an idealised portrait of the "ange"), the relationship is doomed to failure from the start. To his surprise, but scarcely to ours, Louis recovers quickly from his rejection. There is almost a sense of relief that he has been refused. He can return to his familiar loveless script, and live and love vicariously through the pages of Balzac.

This rejection also serves to reinforce his existential position. The older Louis reads the mind of his younger self again: "en dépit de toutes les preuves rassurantes que je pouvais avoir par ailleurs, j'étais incapable de plaire" and "il y avait en moi un je ne sais quoi qui avait écarté l'ange". (p. 284). There is almost a sense of inevitability, of "There, I told you so, I'm not
OK, I'm not lovable!" behind his words. He is "un grand nigaud"; he has given proof of it to himself and to the world.12

Resigning himself to a manageable existence, albeit loveless, lonely and with no chance of intimacy, because of his own poor self-image, does not mean that Louis does not realize what he is missing. Brigitte's conversion as regards love surprises and irritates him. He treats it with a cruelty and a tinge of uncharacteristic coarseness which reveals his regret, envy and bitterness that she should be smugly enjoying this warmth, while he is not. (pp. 290-1).

Clearly the older Louis, speaking in his own right, has mellowed from what he was in his youth. He is often appalled at his younger self's actions and speeches. He feels remorse for his treatment at various times of Brigitte, Calou, Puybaraud, Jean and Michèle. His increasingly powerful Adult with its philosophical tendencies curbs the dictates of his Pig Parent and encourages emotions within his repressed Child. However it is reasonable to deduce that he maintains the same existential position and that his whole life is governed by the same basically loveless banal script. Louis could be writing his own epitaph when, with a self-pity that
well suits his "I'm not OK" stance, he describes the young man in himself thus: "il souffrait, mais seul, et sans que personne le secourût". (p. 294).

**Jean**

The childhood of Jean bears marked similarities to that of Louis. Both boys are the product of unsatisfactory marriages. Both boys lose a parent at an early age. Both the parents who die are replaced by oppressive authority figures; however, whereas Louis loses a loving figure in his mother, Jean's uncle would seem to be a replica of his dead brother. (pp. 124-5). In his case therefore there is little change in the message disseminated from the authority figure. Both boys are more influenced by the female figure than by the male in their environment. We have already seen this in Louis' case and shall be witness to it in Jean's case also. There however the similarities end.

Let us consider the influences on Jean. The comte de Mirbel, "le zouave pontifical" (p. 8), is presented to us by the older Louis as a quintessential martinet. The caricatural nature of the portrait is probably the older Louis' way of coping with his Child's fear of the man. (p. 9). For the "colonel comte", dapper, a military man in bearing and character, pride in his family and its
traditions are ruling passions. Determined to do his duty by his dead brother, he genuinely believes that only severity and beating will make a man out of Jean. Physical violence and oppression are his principal answers to Jean's obstinacy and non-conformity with family wishes, though he hurts Jean more when he deprives him of his summer holiday at home.

We can reasonably suppose that his own treatment as a child differed little from that which he prescribes for his nephew. Perhaps the results can be glimpsed in the little we can see of his personality. His Natural Child is not in evidence; he shows no love or warmth for Jean, even on leave-taking. His Adult is quite overshadowed by his potent controlling Parent. He seems unable to express himself except in sarcasm or in repeated and oppressive terms. His imagery is taken from horse training; for him, Jean is "un cheval vicieux" (p. 45) and must be treated as such. The compte gives the curé "carte blanche pour user de tous les moyens qui vous paraîtraient propres à le dompter" (p. 45) provided that Jean's health is not impaired, as Jean is the family's sole heir. The count's negative oppressive attitude is further emphasised by Calou's positive approach. When Calou asks what Jean likes doing; Mirbel is taken aback and unable to reply at once. The question has never entered his head.
Such a man is diametrically opposed, both temperamentally and morally, to Jean's mother. There is obvious conflict between the two. Both allude to their differences in their contact with Calou. (p. 47/pp. 50-3). Jean's mother, a self-centered, well-known beauty, is as determined to escape from and undermine Adhémar's control as he is intent upon constricting her person and her influence. Their common ground is snobbery. Both are convinced of their social - and therefore, in their view, overall - superiority.

While the comte's dominant ego state is his oppressive Parent, the countess' is her Child. Indeed, both her Adult and her Parent are subject to, rather than capable of moderating, her Child. Her capacity to reason works out a scheme to spend a night with her lover and plans it well ahead for, to her Child, that night is very important. However, she lies blatantly and inconsistently to Jean; (p. 125) she underestimates Calou's intelligence in her letter to him. For the Countess, use of her Adult, which does not bring gratification to her Child, is not worth the effort.

Her Nurturing Parent is virtually non-existent. The loving parent she exhibits is an elaborate role. She ends thus her letter to Calou: "J'attends votre réponse avec
l'impatience d'un coeur de mère et je vous prie, monsieur le curé, de croire au sentiment de gratitude exaltée, que j'éprouve déjà pour le bienfaiteur d'un fils unique et bien-aimé". (p. 53). As readers we can sense her satisfaction (self-strokes) at the facility with which she writes, her turns of phrase, the charm she imagines she is exerting on Calou, and at the vision of the suffering tender mother she creates. Calou, summing her up succinctly, classes her with the "simulatrices". (p. 54).

When Jean obstinately argues to spend the night with her, thus thwarting her wishes, she at once abdicates her parental role to Calou; irritably, she sides with his hated uncle, calling Jean "intraitable" (p. 111) in much the same way as the former would have done. We have here an evident case of Pig Parent. Never once does the countess consider what is really best for Jean. She is not concerned when he is ill, though admittedly the count and Calou do not tell her the serious nature of his illness.

Clearly her own wishes and pleasure, physical pleasure included, are of paramount importance to her. It is only when Jean seems to surrender to her will that she puts her arm round him and speaks tenderly (p. 112) — at last, a stroke for Jean, but one that is conditional upon his compliance.
She gains strokes from the admiration she sees in other people's eyes. She likes to please - "elle avait le goût de plaire", says Louis (p. 114) - and goes out of her way to be charming if it is possible with little inconvenience to herself. However, the abbé, observing her behavior during her visit to Larjuzon, noted in his journal "Elle avait opposé à Jean une résolution têtue, farouche, presque haineuse... Il (the abbé) connaissait cette espèce de créatures: leur exigence (dont Jean avait hérité) cette frénésie qui leur ferait fouler aux pieds le corps même de leur propre fils". (p. 118).

Such are the two unbalanced, contrasting and conflicting personalities that make up the authority figures surrounding Jean since his earliest infancy.  

Be it remembered that he is an only child. He has no sibling to support him as Michèle supported Louis. How does this family unit, father/uncle - mother/sister-in-law, affect the "prince" that has been born to them?

It would be reasonable to suppose that from a very early age the young Jean hated and feared the man, loved and adored the woman. The terrible uncle, the cold, controlled disciplinarian openly demands self-control, an almost mindless obedience and conformity from his nephew. Physical punishment, as we have seen, is the immediate
result of non-compliance. Calou notices Jean's automatic defensive positions - elbow raised to protect his head from blows, back to the wall - that are typical of the frequently beaten child.

Many children would have suppressed their own instinctive desires and adapted to suit the oppressor. Jean is however what Steiner calls a "spunky" child, that is, he defies and resists the oppression and aims to keep his autonomy. His resistance is mostly passive and silent but sometimes flares into open defiance or argumentation. As his uncle tells Calou "Il n'est pas toujours aussi muet que vous le voyez, et quand il se met à vous tenir tête, il a la langue bien pendue". (p. 45). He only gives in to brute force. Jean has refused to consider a career in the army which would be in accordance with family tradition. Although intelligent he refuses to study and so gain entry to Saint Cyr.

Yet, while he has not adapted to satisfy the "colonel comte", Jean's Parent in the Child is well imprinted with much that comes from his uncle. Consider the first afternoon at Larjuzon. Jean wishes to have the loan of Louis' bicycle. When his request is refused, Jean expresses himself as would his uncle: "voilà ce que c'était que de ne pas lui avoir permis de me mettre à la raison! Il {Jean} savait comment il fallait traiter les
momes..." (p. 63). Accustomed as he is to his uncle's strong arm methods for imposing his will, Jean does not hesitate to manhandle Louis. As "bourreau" and "brute" are terms applied to his uncle, so they are applied to Jean by Louis, and justifiably.¹⁶

From his adored mother he gains general support in his resistance to his uncle's will although, he understands, she is unable to resist herself. Her interest in literature has probably given rise to Jean's interest in books, which is much to his uncle's disquiet. It is however her determination to brook no opposition to her own will, wishes and pleasure that affects Jean's personality most profoundly. Calou saw this clearly in the coach drive. (p. 118). In accordance with her example, far from being repressed, Jean's Child knows little restraint. What Louis mentions à propos Jean's fascination with books could be applied in all that regards him. "Jean ne pouvait rien contre ses désirs". (p. 67). Later Louis notes again "Jean ne renonçait jamais à ce qu'il désirait". (p. 109).

From the constant injunctions and negative attributes that are showered upon him by his uncle, by Rausch, by society - the school thought him "un sale type" (p. 59) - even by his mother, we would expect Jean's existential
position to be "I'm not OK" and indeed it is so. He writes of himself to Louis, "Moi, je ne suis pas un chic type, voilà le malheur". (p. 169).

Yet two factors prevent him from considering himself totally at odds within himself and with the world. The first, and the lesser in importance, is the feeling of social superiority, taken from both authority figures and society in general. Jean is a de Mirbel. It shows itself when he arrives at the presbytery. A de Mirbel does not lay the table or water the garden: "Je ne suis pas votre domestique" says Jean to Calou. (p. 47). The second is his unquestioning belief in his mother's love for him. It is his prime source of strokes.17 Unfortunately for Jean he mistakes her Pig Parent for a genuine, nurturing Parent.

At the opening of the book, Jean is aged fifteen, alone, and on the verge of manhood, which is a particularly difficult and critical stage in any life. The balance in his personality would seem to be as follows (see diagram in Chapter 1). The Nurturing Parent is not in evidence. The Adult is not well developed. He rarely shows a reasoned approach to any problem. He blames Michèle for not contacting him when he is sick. "Quand on aime, on passe par-dessus les défenses", he says, (p. 154)
forgetting that Michèle is a fourteen year old girl with a vigilant oppressive stepmother.

The Child is dominant, as can be seen in his speech and his actions. Be it remembered that this Child, fixated at an earlier age, is composed of: a) the Parent in the Child - that is in Jean's case Pig Parents taken from his uncle and his mother; b) the Adult in the Child - intuitive, rather than reasoned, as reasoning was hardly encouraged to grow by either authority figure. It therefore seems limited in Jean, and is certainly incapable of any moderating influence on either the Natural Child or the Pig Parent; c) the Child in the Child, the Natural Child, which is unrepressed, and, together with the selfish Pig Parent which comes from his mother, leads to self-centered, impulsive, emotional wayward behavior.

Such an unbalanced personality would suggest an early decision and script adoption. Indeed we suspect that it was intuitively, that is, even before the development of any form of rational Adult, that Jean adopted the script that can be summarized thus: "I'll do what I want, when I want, and I'll not give in". It is a banal version of a mindless script, the type which in its tragic forms can lead to madness, as the reasoning factor in the personality is not allowed full development.
How does this analysis of personality help us to understand Jean's behavior in the course of the book? The un压制的, and all but uncontrolled Natural Child explains the foolishly leaping from the moving carriage in a rage. It explains the night bicycle ride as an example of willfulness, determination to have his own way at all costs. It explains the intense but lasting love that is aroused in Jean within the few first weeks of meeting Michèle.\textsuperscript{18} It explains the violent hatred he bears his uncle and Rausch. It explains the bravado and audacity of drinking the curés' armagnac. It explains the clashes with his mother; one demanding Child meets head on with another: "La mère mettait autant de volonté dans son refus que lui dans son insistance". (p. 110). It explains the sensuality that encourages a liking for drink, cigarettes, long horse rides. It explains the sexuality that reveals itself at first in the horse play in which Michèle and Jean indulge\textsuperscript{19}, where, as the older Louis says, "les coups ont la même signification que les caresses" (pp. 73-4) and later, in the affair he has with the village girl.

Jean is aware - his Adult is not wholly repressed of course - of the countess' "sècheresse" and "insincérité", (p. 125) and that she lies to him, but he still idolizes her, the more easily when he is separated from her. He needs to do so. Her love is the source of the strokes
that prevent him from being overwhelmed by his "not OK-ness". She and her love for him enable him to feel, despite appearances, that the rest of the world is OK. To admit his idol has feet of clay, that she is shallow and her love superficial, is to threaten the precarious balance within his own personality, a balance which alone permits him to function, albeit unsatisfactorily, in society. For as long as possible, he unconsciously blocks out acceptance in his Adult of her falseness. The night at Vallendrault forces realization upon him. It nearly kills him.

Fortunately for Jean's continuing to perform as a person - albeit "à jamais blessé et empoisonné de ce qu'a fait sa mère", (p. 255) he had already met Michèle and obtained her love before the revelation of his mother's true worth is thrust upon him. For a while Jean is blissfully happy - being loved by two people, strokes in plenty, with the promise of intimacy. His mother's haste to leave the presbytery prevents him from telling her of his relationship but he does admit to being very happy at Calou's. Although Michèle's love for him prevents immediate tragedy after the night outside the hotel (Jean says, and Calou believes him, that if Michèle had deserted him then, he would have committed suicide) her recent support cannot completely compensate him for his loss and
disillusionment as regards his mother. When contact with Michèle is also withdrawn from him, all that remains to sustain him is a child's promise and a locket. (p. 153). Small wonder that over a two-year period without the strokes that come from Michèle's love, his existential position should change from "I'm not OK, you're OK" to "I'm not OK, you're not OK", and his banal mindless script should threaten to become tragic.

Why does not the abbé's love and presence help bolster Jean's failing spirits?

Calou sees Jean's growing despair and tries to combat it. He contacts Louis so that Michèle may write to Jean - "Ça pourrait être le salut". (p. 172). He provides distraction (a horse, fishing, reading). He shows affection and is lenient. All is of no avail. Only one understanding friend is necessary to alleviate the misery of loneliness, says Tanner;²⁰ Calou would willingly be that friend, but, although Jean considers the curé "un chic type" (p. 169) there is within Jean a resistance to Calou that nullifies much of what the latter does for him. Louis writes: "Mirbel ressentait une répulsion instinctive, un dégoût de l'homme professionnellement chaste". (p. 229). The sexuality in Jean's Child cannot understand the sacrifice of itself within the priest. More importantly still, for Jean's fixated Child, male
authority figures are anathema and always will be so. The fact that Calou shows "douceur" cannot dispel, indeed only adds the confusion of the unknown, to his fixated Child's abhorrence of male authority. "Il hait ma douceur", says Calou, and he is correct. (p. 74).

The thwarted unhappy Child hits out irrationally against all constraints, for, without an effective Nurturing Parent, he has learnt no beneficial self-control. (p. 233). With a weak Adult he cannot cope with the contradictions and confusion in his feelings. He is cruel and spiteful to Calou. Everything in life is hateful to him except Michèle, whom he despairs of ever seeing again. He does not read, works poorly and takes long solitary walks or rides at night. Early in his stay at the presbytery Jean wrote to Louis that he feared life there would drive him crazy (p. 169); it now seems to be doing just that. Calou describes him as a "fauve en cage"; (p. 237) Hortense sees in him "l'animal...soumis déjà à son instinct, à cette exigence aveugle, irrépressible". (p. 237).

When all contact with Michèle is severed and Jean's faith in her love for him weakens, the problems of lovelessness and loneliness are added to those created by
his script. "Je déteste qu'on m'aime" he says. (p. 230). We recognize the fear of love with its accompanying risks and pain.

Yet in some measure it is Calou's love for him that delays the destabilization of Jean's mental composition. Even though despising the abbé's affection, he counts on it for strokes. It is only when he feels Calou no longer cares for him - "il se crut lâché, rejeté par le seul homme qui possédât tous ses secrets," that Jean decides "de fuir ce monde abominable". (p. 247). As he is in disharmony with himself and with the world, mindlessness takes over and drives him headlong into the crazy elopement whose main attraction for him would seem to be its hopelessness and irremediability. "I'm not OK, you're not OK." in all its black despair is evident in the following lines:

Bien sûr, avec Hortense, il savait que ça ne durrait pas toujours, ni même très longtemps... Mais telle était sa vocation du malheur et ce qui l'attirait le plus dans cette aventure: qu'elle fût sans issue, sans espoir, qu'elle le fit sortir du port et le jetât dans un courant qu'il ne monterait pas. (p. 247).

The crisis forces Jean's family to comply with his wishes and to accept that Michèle is necessary to his well-being. Jean is thus rescued from the brink of self-destruction.
Before speaking of their meeting and subsequent life together, let us consider the composition of Michèle's personality.

Michèle

The composition of Michèle's personality differs from that of either of the two boys. Superficially the influences upon her have been the same as those upon Louis. There are however two major differences: she was one year older than he when their mother died and a year is a long time in a small child's development; her father was absolutely sure she was his daughter. There is no question of her possible illegitimacy. Octave Pian loved her with no reservation, and she him.

Naturally "spunkier" than Louis, aggressive and physically strong, Michèle has resisted the domination and influence of Brigitte both on social and psychological levels. She defies her stepmother on all possible occasions, mostly by resorting to silence or by withdrawing from her presence, sometimes by verbal retaliation to the point of insolence. She admits to being afraid of Brigitte and, wary of her at all times, sees ulterior motives behind all she says and does. (pp. 29-30).
This critical attitude towards everything about Brigitte renders psychologically null and void any injunction or attribution from that source. Where Brigitte may say Michèle is "une enfant de contradiction et de colère", (p. 24) and mean it negatively, Michèle will take it as positive criticism and glory in it. She is encouraged in such a reaction by her father who lightly brushes aside his wife's remonstrances: "Mais non, ma chère... Vous dramatisez toujours! Elle est un peu cabocharde, elle a le tempérament soupe-au-lait de ma pauvre mère... Mais un bon mari arrangerà tout ça..." (p. 24). In a sense this is programming of her Parent, but reverse programming, and works towards a healthy balance within Michèle's personality rather than otherwise. It does drive her to be critical of religious principles as presented by Brigitte, but as these concern so often the letter rather than the spirit of the law, her religious faith is not shaken.

We meet her first at fourteen in early adolescence. Although referred to so often as a child, Louis considers her a woman, by which he means, from the context on this occasion, sexually awakened.

As she has resisted Brigitte's influence, we see little sign of an oppressive Parent. She does not seem to feel a need to be superior or dominant, even with her
younger brother. To him she is generally nurturing or protective, comforting and patient when he cries, springing to his defense when Jean threatens him: "Je vous défends de toucher à mon frère". (p. 62). Yet she does not "mother" him excessively; indeed he complains that she is too brusque with him. She can control herself well on occasion. She does not allow herself to cry in front of Brigitte except when she knows the enemy is in too weakened a state to be able to take advantage of her tears. (p. 215).

Her Adult seems well developed also. We are given no reason to suppose she has any difficulty in studying; the nuns only mention her difficult temperament. She certainly uses her reason where Brigitte’s machinations are concerned and Louis agrees with her conclusions (p. 13). She is just in assessing the blame on both boys in the bicycle affair.

Within her Child, her Natural Child seems in no way repressed. She is loving of her father and mother: her grief for her father is genuine but not excessive, her memory of her mother fond. She is warm towards her brother, wanting to share with him her happiness, and sincere in her devotion to Jean. Her distress over Jean’s elopement is restrained at first by her Adult, which wishes to know all the details, then dignified (under the
control of her Parent), despite her tears, when she realizes the depths to which Jean has sunk by stealing Calou's savings. We have here an example of the three ego states interreacting as they should in a balanced personality. Her hatred of "la femme de notre père" is excessive but justified, a part of her defense mechanism. According to Jean, she is "une nature spontanée" (p. 92) and Louis vouches for her openness, vibrancy and joy in life: "Je n'ai rencontré personne au monde qui ait eu autant que Michèle, et dès sa quinzième année, un tel appétit de bonheur". (p. 94). It is a happiness which she actively seeks, for he continues: "Elle n'attendait jamais passivement du dehors toute jouissance". (p. 95).

From the text there is no reason to suppose any repressed Adult in the Child. Nor is there any noticeable Pig Parent. Indeed it seems more the teachings and stricures of the church and society that are imprinted within her Parent in the Child rather than those of Brigitte. She feels some guilt despite her Adult's protestations of the social correctness of Jean's kissing her, since they are engaged. She needs to say two De Profundis at her father's grave before going to see Jean.
The charge of sensuality, not to say of sexuality, levelled at her by Brigitte is probably accurate: "Michèle est une fille qui aime l'homme". (p. 141). She is indeed a physical being, conscious of her body, proud of her legs; she bites into fruit with gusto and breathes in the heady scent of flowers with delight. She responds with pleasure to Jean's kisses. Inexperienced as she is, she senses with unafraid excitement the pleasure of their future union when Jean is no longer the "lamb" he poses to be with her at the moment. (p. 96).

At fourteen Michèle would seem to have a reasonably balanced personality. Her brother sees it thus: "Elle était de ces êtres si équilibrés et si purs que leur instinct (Child) presque toujours se confond avec leur devoir (Adult)". 22 Prior to this period in her life, ever active and unrepessed, she has been no candidate for a premature decision and the formation of a script. As she is unafraid of loving and of being loved, and never described as "lonely", her existential position would seem to be the fortunate: "I'm OK, you're OK".

Although she decides on a life-plan (that is, to be Jean's wife) so quickly after they meet and when still so young, it is a decision that is taken consciously in her Adult and cannot be considered a script. She knows Jean's
difficult character and the problems it will create but, as Calou assures Jean, she loves him as he is. (p. 159).

Their first meeting after over two years is extremely difficult. (pp. 271-6). Physical changes added to the traumatic events of those years make them virtual strangers. Let us consider their reunion in detail.

Jean, as usual, acts in his Child, smoking unasked, jumping to the conclusion that Michèle no longer cares for him because she does not immediately accept his dismissive account of his affair with Hortense Voyod. Because of his uncontrolled Child, which gives rise to self-centered behavior, and his under-developed Adult, which gives rise to thoughtlessness, Jean never realizes how other people will feel and react. Such an imbalance is always detrimental to his cause and to his functioning in society. We witnessed an earlier example of this in his letter to Louis who, hurt by Jean’s lack of concern for him personally, refused Jean aid. (p. 169). We see it again here. Jean, blind to Michèle’s feelings, to her hurt, to her sexual jealousy, continues with all the dismay of his Child, to cry out to her Parent for understanding.
She in her turn cries out from her Child to receive comfort from a Nurturing Parent, which unfortunately Jean does not possess to any degree. She had probably never had occasion to find this out before.

We have then a series of crossed transactions (C→P, C→P). Between those who formerly had been able to "se parler des yeux", (p.83) there is no real communication.

Still in his Child, with what is one of the oldest of childish (with a small "c") ploys, Jean blames all on Michèle - "Mais oui, c'est toi qui es cause de tout". (p. 273). This backhanded compliment which informs her that she is still vital to his existence is a flattering stroke for Michèle, but she is used to resisting and is not swayed.

Finding himself in an impasse, Jean switches to his Adult and relieves the tension between the two by directing the center of attention to a third party, Hortense, and then to a fourth, Calou, as he relates what happened in Biarritz. Even here, in his Adult, he belittles himself - "Elle se moquait de moi" - and again "Moi, je ne pesais pas lourd" (p. 273) - in an attempt to draw upon the Parent in Michèle.
Michèle has been too sorely hurt and is too used to fighting for her autonomy, to withstanding pressure from Brigitte, to surrender with her Child unappeased. There is again silence. In his confusion and despair at failing to communicate with Michèle, the painful scene at Vallendraut returns to his mind. Jean begins to cry.

It is only tears that can summon forth her Nurturing Parent in an almost reflex action as they must have done many a time in the past with Louis. She dries Jean's eyes and places her hand on his hair, offering him that basic and most valued of all strokes, touch.

Louis describes their love thereafter as "cet interminable orage". (p. 278). He hints at trouble between the couple even during the honeymoon and talks of being involved in "le tourbillon de ses luttes et de ses raccommodements". (p. 294).

We have here a marriage between two very different personalities, the one ruled unconsciously by a script and in a precarious state of balance at the best of times, the other balanced. Both have been "spunky" children and are used to resisting injunctions. One part of the Pig Parent in Jean's Child will seek at times to oppress in the manner of his uncle and will meet with resistance in Michèle; the other part of the Pig Parent in his Child
will seek compliance with his every wish, playing often to her Nurturing Parent. When Michèle is in the latter ego state, all will be well. However Michèle's balanced personality will need to exercise each ego state to remain so. She will not wish to be predominantly in her Parent ego state.

It would be highly unlikely that such a couple live "happily ever after". We could speculate that life for Jean would have been easier with a woman whose Child was repressed and who had an oversized Nurturing Parent. However, this would not have suited either, as Jean has a strong appetite for sexual enjoyment which needs, for full satisfaction, a responding partner with equal sexuality. We foresee ecstatically happy moments, when both their Child wish for the same thing at the same time but far more frequent scenes similar to the scene in the Bordeaux parlor discussed above, when neither would "fais un pas l'un vers l'autre". (p. 276). Tears would soon no longer be able to effect a reconciliation.

We would therefore agree with Emile Glénisson when he says that Michèle and Jean's life together is "vouée à l'échec" 23, but we would differ with him over the reasons. He says their engagement is without mutual love. In our view Michèle loves Jean sincerely. She says she does and the pain of her jealousy proves it. (p. 274).
The adolescent Jean, with his dominant fixated Child, loves her genuinely also, but in his own demanding way. He continues to do so during the years preceding their marriage, writing to her several times a week, whenever they are apart. Self-centered as ever, Jean knows she is the pivot of his existence (a stroke-producing, if tiring, position for Michèle) because he needs her to maintain the balance in his personality and thus to enable him to function in society.

Glénisson contends that Jean idealized Michèle and that, in their reconciliation scene, he is disillusioned with her, as he was with his mother. She is too down-to-earth for him. "Elle n'incarne pas le rêve d'une présence aimante et protectrice de tous les instants" that he had projected upon her.²⁴ We do not consider that he idealized Michèle to the same extent that the infant Jean had idealized his mother. The fifteen year old Jean sees Michèle objectively when he speaks to Louis prior to his mother's visit, (pp. 92-3) and again to Calou he talks of her as being just a little girl. (p. 158). Presumably the fact that Jean tells Louis he would have felt it sacrilegious to allow himself other than a chaste kiss (p. 96) gives Glénisson cause to claim his idealization of Michèle. We understand it to mean that for Jean, the aristocrat, the sister of his friend, to whose house he
was invited as a guest, the girl he intended to marry, occupied a special place in his life, whereas he might seduce a village girl to satisfy his sexual impulses with no second thought. Where Louis mentions "le culte d'adoration", (p. 231) he does so to draw the general comparison between love of heart and mind and love that is purely physical. Certainly Jean's feelings for Michèle are different from those he has for other women, as hopefully is the case with most proposed marriage partners. This does not imply idealization. The infant Jean idealized his mother with no Adult at his disposal to moderate his opinion. In the fifteen year old, as a result of his experience in the world, not least his mother's behavior and Calou's teaching, the Adult, whilst it cannot compete in strength with his Child, is yet far more developed and influential than it was in the infant Jean. It is this moderating Adult that is in some measure responsible for the delay of two years before the elopement.

Glénisson does not discuss Louis. This is understandable as Glénisson is dealing with characters whose loving relationships can be analyzed to show his theory. Louis, much as he is concerned with love, does not achieve a loving relationship with anyone.
Having discussed these three young people and their, in our view, very different personalities, let us consider the "grandes personnes" of the book.
CHAPTER 3 : THE ADULTS

Nowadays divorce would have quickly ended the unsatisfactory marriage between Octave Pian and Brigitte Maillard, but at the turn of the century such a solution, as the Countess says in her letter to Calou, was unthinkable. The loveless Pians delay until Louis is fifteen before agreeing mutually, if mutely, to live apart, by which time Octave loathes his wife and she looks upon him with hatred and scorn. Louis explains their obviously ill-assorted union as a product of circumstances, misapprehension and grief.

Meeting him, as we do, only towards the end of his life, what can we deduce about Octave's personality?

Octave

We are told that, when young, he had worked voluntarily in a lawyer's office in Bordeaux and had acquired the knowledge to advise Brigitte in her proposed legal suit. Law is a rational exercise. We can therefore presume a developed Adult.

When we first meet him, he has already abdicated the control of his household and children to Brigitte. We do see glimpses, however, of a Nurturing Parent. He makes sure Michèle puts on enough clothes when going out in the evening — using, incidentally, the same phrase his first wife always used, which shows us where his thoughts really
lie. He is tender and supportive of Michèle at the time of the Vignotte accusations. He agrees, admittedly at Brigitte’s goading, to live in Bordeaux during term time so that Louis may be a day boy. He carries Louis back to his bed when the young boy is caught trying to go to say goodbye to Jean.

This abdication must have been a gradual process, for Louis can remember when his father was very different from the self-indulgent, indolent person he seems in the book, a man who under the paralysing influence of grief withdraws from society wherever possible, and, literally, passes his time in shooting, eating, drinking and sleeping. We see him become his former self when Vignotte’s accusations stir him to defend Michèle and to cope with a family crisis. Here he reveals himself to be clear-thinking, wise in his decisions, forceful and yet quietly spoken, as one used to commanding and to being obeyed. Such was the father Michèle and Louis had known and loved.

We are told nothing of the influences that could have made up his Child. It is clear, however, that his Natural Child has not been repressed. He is capable of loving, and of loving deeply, but so obsessive a love as that he bears Marthe, both alive and dead, signifies an imbalance
in the personality. It seems that his emotions are being allowed free rein at the expense of the proper functioning of the Parent and the Adult.

Whatever Octave's existential position was prior to the thirteen years before the book opens, it is reasonable to suppose that emotional impotency and Marthe's probable scornful mockery of it would create a poor self-image within Octave. He would assume an "I'm not OK" position dating from at least that period. Belief in his wife's physical fidelity in spite of her love for another makes it possible for Octave to function in the world, albeit on a reduced scale. In order to maintain the position "I'm not OK, you're OK", the doubts that trouble him about his wife's possible adultery must be suppressed. It is probably for that reason that he never mentions her name. A mention of Marthe might invite information, comment or criticism.

With so much "unfinished business", as Tanner calls it, from his first marriage, there was never any hope that his second would succeed. Having loved and lost, fear of the pain of love would be far too great to be risked by Octave, even were he to have met a congenial woman.

Octave married Brigitte because she had helped him, by her lucidity, with his marital problems prior to Marthe's death, and because he trusted she would continue to help him to recover from his obsession. His hurt Child
sought an alliance with a Nurturing Parent. He did not bargain for the oppressive Pig Parent he also found within Brigitte, the Pig Parent that made him change to formal clothes in the evening in Bordeaux, that scorned him, that finally revealed to him her knowledge of his doubts about Marthe's adultery and her belief in Marthe's guilt.

This last blow that Brigitte deals him casts him back into the "stupeur" from which he had so recently emerged. ³ Severely shaken, his existential position shifts to "I'm not OK, you're not OK". He seeks isolation in the country. He begins to drink heavily, to "drown his sorrows", only stirring himself from his lethargy to visit his children, primarily Michèle, once a month.⁴ Finding the note in Marthe's handwriting which proves so conclusively that she was physically unfaithful leads him to the final acts of destroying the proof of Marthe's guilt and then himself. The last drinking bout is tantamount to suicide.

If we can understand to some extent why Octave married Brigitte, it is harder to explain what led her to marry him. To do good by curing him of his obsession and to find out the truth about Marthe are Louis' suggestions. These explanations while ringing true, seem but part of the story, the rest of which we hope to find within the personality of "la Pharisienne" herself.
Brigitte

Apart from the fact that her father had held the post of Prefect of the Gironde, we know nothing of the authority figures of her early childhood, therefore we must seek the make-up of her Child from evidence of it in her "grande personne". Her Parent, both nurturing/protective as well as controlling, is highly developed. Naturally Louis stresses the controlling side, but in fairness it must be said that she looks after the physical state of the two children at all times, she tends the sick and gives charity to the poor. She even meets Louis' and Michèle's psychological needs on various occasions. She foresees Louis' problem over Puybaraud's letter and solves it; she advises him on how to deal with Michèle's and Jean's teasing; realising Michèle's "spunkiness", she does not confront her head on but keeps an uneasy peace and some semblance of normality. While Brigitte does not care for children in general, she does devote herself to Octave's - and thereby, it must be admitted, gains self-strokes for her goodness in doing so. She is dependably there, writing letters to them, seeing to their education. That her control becomes oppressive is due to the make-up of her Child.
Her Adult is not repressed as is often the case with women. She reasons well and draws logical conclusions from her observations. This is proved by the number of times her predictions come true. She sees clearly the problems the Puybarauds will encounter (though it is she herself who makes those problems insurmountable). She is aware of the unsuitability of Michèle's and Jean's meetings, the sensuality of Michèle and the sensitivity of Louis.

However she is subconsciously unwilling to apply any objective approach to herself. She has occasional and quickly suppressed moments of self-knowledge, when "elle se voyait". (p. 197). Such moments are sparked by contact with Octavie, when Brigitte's Adult cannot but notice the difference between genuine inner goodness for its own sake and Brigitte's own variety with its hidden motivations. Calou sees this and predicts in his diary how severely Brigitte would suffer under any prolonged self-scrutiny by her own formidable Adult. (p. 152).

What of her Child? She has an outsize Pig Parent wherein control becomes not beneficial but oppressive to the person controlled. It shows itself clearly in her need to dominate others, particularly her immediate family and dependents. Her manipulation of Octavie in their first scene together is a case in point and is analysed for us by Louis as he recounts it. She uses her social
position and the Pian money to control and punish, if they flout her authority, those who come within her sphere of influence. We see this all too clearly in the Puybaraud case and with abbé Calou.

At times she is even unnecessarily severe with herself. Physically this severity manifests itself in the high-necked restricting garments she always wears whatever the weather and the rigid posture that she never relaxes. Mentally it is seen in the tight control she has over her reactions. She generally quells the temptation to pour out annoyance or information until her Adult deems the time ripe and to her advantage.

With so strong a Pig Parent, it is not surprising that her Natural Child, that is, all that is loving, warm, impulsive and joyful with which we are blessed at birth, has been severely repressed. Why this imbalance occurred, we cannot tell, as we have no knowledge of her childhood. Perhaps it stems from some family favoritism where plain Brigitte was ignored or rejected because of her attractive cousin, Marthe. If so, this would account both for her dislike of Marthe and also for her preoccupation with her. It would be another reason for her to wish to supersede Marthe, both as mother and wife.
Linked with the repression of her Natural Child, and grounded in her own unlovableness, is a fear of love, both affective and physical. This manifests itself in her repugnance for marriage, sex, motherhood, sensibility, even terms of endearment, a repugnance which amounts to an obsession. In her early life something quite traumatic must have happened to have affected her so deeply, to have kept in control the "fiery nature" she claims for herself and which we see when her temper occasionally flares. (p. 189).

Whatever the initial cause for her feeling of unlovableness, Brigitte has found a way of compensating for it. Not for her is the acknowledgment of any insufficiency within herself or any self-doubt. She chooses rather to blame the sense of ill-ease within her personality on others. She adopts the existential position "I'm OK, you're not OK". Tanner says "People in this position give the appearance of sureness, arrogance and snobbery, but it is a posture devised to keep others at a distance". He adds "People who use power as a means of controlling others are among the loneliest people of all". As far as we know Brigitte has no friends.

Hand in hand with this existential position, of course, goes her script, which is one of superiority, superiority not so much in the social sense - though Louis
does say that "C'était sans doute le nom de Mirbel qui avait ouvert à Jean les portes de Larjuzon" as in the mental and moral senses. (p. 94). Brigitte believes herself to be always right, right in all she says and does, right in what is best for her, but also, and more importantly, for others. Louis says she is never at a loss for a word or an opinion and never retracts anything once it has been said. Moreover she deems any moral judgment she makes to be right. Herein lies her belief in her own near sainthood, that she is a medium for expressing God's wishes. At one point she implies as much to Puybaraud. (p. 177). Surely a sense of superiority can go no further!

Any "I'm OK" position needs constant strokes to maintain it. While self-strokes are important, far more valuable are those which come from others. Brigitte therefore spends her whole life putting herself in positions which will incite others to stroke her. She is playing a repetitive series of games, as Berne terms it. Her good works, her religious observances, even her being a devoted substitute mother - yet another reason for marriage perhaps - are all part of her game plan. Little that she does must be allowed to go unnoticed, unsung and therefore unrewarded in the stroke sense. Anonymous donations would not be Brigitte's preferred form of charity!
It follows by extension that, if she is always right, those who do not agree with her must be wrong and, for their own good, must be corrected with all the Pig Parent oppression that lies within her personality. Likewise, if she is superior, all others are inferior. Every time they are proved inferior or in the wrong, her "I'm OK" position is reinforced. Occasionally she is surprised by her far from Christian moment of joy at hearing of other's wrong-doing or misfortune. Her initial reaction to the news of Michèle's liaison with Jean is delight, a delight for which her Adult has difficulty in providing an adequate explanation. We realize that it springs from the boost Michèle's wrong-doing gives to Brigitte's sense of superiority.

A husband who is his former masterful self is a threat. Brigitte subconsciously prefers him as he has been for the last six years, clearly her inferior and to be scorned. It is no careless slip that she insinuates her suspicions of Marthe's guilt to him at this moment, thereby casting him back to his "état de stupeur" and so ensuring the health of her own existential position.

Nor is it for Octavie's moral benefit, as Puybaraud knows full well, that Brigitte insists he reveal the source of their income to his sick wife. We feel it is to satisfy Brigitte's desperate need for strokes as she senses her sphere of influence diminishing. The children
are growing older and becoming self-sufficient. Octave has removed himself from her presence. The Puybaraups' marriage in defiance of her wishes, a severe blow in itself, has robbed her at the same time of their genuine admiration and respect, golden strokes in the past. To maintain Brigitte's "I'm OK" position, Octavie must be induced to acknowledge how disastrous their marriage has been, how wise Brigitte had been to condemn it, and how good she is to continue nevertheless to support them. The plan backfires. Brigitte loses her temper and indulges in a fit of vindictiveness. She leaves the lodgings much diminished in her own eyes and, what is more important to her, in the eyes of the scorned Puybaraups. Hence her great distress.

Though it is not the case in the episode mentioned above, where she is irritated at the sight of the piano and annoyed with herself for upsetting the very sick Octavie, Brigitte subconsciously uses anger whenever irrefutable proof of her not-OK-ness is presented to her by others. Anger is a well-known weapon for self-preservation, frequently utilised by bullies — and, after all, Brigitte is a mental bully. Anger shuts down a threatening dialogue. When Puybaraud reproaches her on an earlier occasion with being a Pharisee and continues that it is always "le prochain qui faisait les frais de ses scrupules et que c'était toujours contre quelqu'un qu'elle
manifestait la délicatesse et les rigueurs de sa conscience", (pp. 177–8) the charge is too true to be denied and yet cannot be accepted by Brigitte. She resorts to anger and sweeps from the room.

In addition anger can be skilfully used to put in the wrong those who come too close to destabilizing the "I'm OK" position. Puybaraud refutes Brigitte's arguments against his marriage when they are at Larjuzon. She cannot tolerate that "un esprit subalterne" should win. (p. 87). She therefore loses her temper. Predictably anger begets anger. Puybaraud also loses his temper at her unreasonableness. She can then turn the other cheek and put him in the wrong. Louis notes that she often uses these tactics. (p. 88).

We have seen her dislike of marriage and all it entails. Why then did she marry? To do good and to be seen to do good, to revenge herself on Marthe are reasons that have already been suggested. To these we must add money. She had lost most of her fortune in the convent project and possibly needed financial support to permit her other charitable undertakings.

There are however other considerations. We suspect that the unlovableness which causes her abhorrence of sex and marriage stems from something in her early childhood. It is reasonable to presume that she
intended to lead a celibate life, perhaps at the head of the convent she wished to found. It is even probable that her marriage with Octave remained, and was planned to remain, un consummated, in which case the beds that Louis notes as being so far apart in his parent’s bedroom are no mere sign of growing estrangement but signify a non-physical union.

On the other hand this marriage may have been part of a counterscript, a vain attempt on Brigitte’s part to achieve a warm relationship, to break a loveless script. If Brigitte married hoping for a full and happy family life after she had cured Octave of his obsession with his first wife, how bitterly she must have been hurt when Marthe continued to hold sway. The failure of the marriage could only serve to reinforce her deep-seated feeling of unlovableness, and give rise to or accentuate the jealousy - the "jalousie inavouée" (p. 148) hinted at by Louis - that she felt towards Marthe. It is this jealousy that makes her finally, after six years of deliberately withholding it, leave the note in Marthe’s handwriting to be found by Octave, the note that precipitates his death.

Bullies are only able to operate as long as their power base is secure. Once it crumbles they are as nothing, just lonely, frightened individuals. Such is the
case with Brigitte. Blamed by herself for her husband's death, by Puybaraud for that of his wife, by Michèle for Calou's disgrace and Jean's elopement, Brigitte must finally face the truth about herself. Shocked into an "I'm not OK" position, the change in her is dramatic. Hoping to regain her "I'm OK" position she goes over her actions and their motives endlessly. She seeks reassurance of her goodness and her rightness from Michèle and Louis at various times, reassurance which they naturally refuse. She becomes "timide et suppliante", (p. 262) admits she does not see things clearly any more and that she can be wrong. Louis notices that she seems even to shrink in stature. The once indomitable Brigitte finds herself in total confusion.

In giving her absolution, Calou redirects her life. Her visits to him shortly thereafter are tantamount to a course of therapy. He stops her from magnifying her wretchedness in the same way as she formerly magnified her goodness and suggests certain acts of reparation, giving her back some measure of self-esteem. Awareness of the balance within the personality is what the therapist hopes to give his patient. The "converted" Brigitte realizes how false has been her concept of saintliness and of religion in general and that she must no longer seek to dominate. The basic Brigitte does not change, but once
made aware, her Adult can control the dictatorial Pig Parent and allow more freedom to her Natural Child. She even begins to feel good about herself again. (p. 281).

The change in emphasis is shown not only in the notable relaxing of her religious preoccupations but, more importantly, in her new-found interest in all that concerns human love. She is, as it were, learning about it all for the first time. She devours books relating love stories and observes meticulously what happens in the love life of Louis, Jean and Michèle. Brigitte has the good fortune to meet, love and be loved by Doctor Gellis. In harmony within herself and with the world, with a new existential position of "I'm OK, you're OK", she achieves an intimacy with another which, according to Berne, should be the aim of us all.

Glénisson treats with disbelieving sarcasm the whole possibility that these two lonely, elderly and unattractive people should find genuine mutual love. He is not convinced by Brigitte's metamorphosis when he sees that the "amoureuse de la onzième heure demeurait possédée de l'horreur de la chair, que des "orages" troublaient son idylle pourtant si brève et que cher Monsieur Gellis... était plus proche d'elle après sa mort que de son vivant".
"Horreur de la chair" refers to Brigitte's reaction to Louis' taunt that Doctor Gellis and she cannot enjoy physical passion together. Her reply is one typical of the former dictatorial Brigitte and her face assumes the disgusted expression she used to have when love was mentioned. It must be remembered that it is only the balance within Brigitte's personality that has altered. No factors have been eliminated altogether; their influence is merely restricted. Old habits die hard and in moments of stress are bound to reappear. The "orages" to which Glénisson refers are those occasioned, as Louis supposes, by Brigitte's wish for physical union. Occasional storms do not nullify a deep relationship nor does regret that a physically loving experience can no longer be achieved.

After Doctor Gellis' death, when she has got over the initial distress, Brigitte tells Louis "Cher Monsieur Gellis n'a jamais été si proche, même durant sa vie mortelle". (p. 293). Louis is convinced that this is no attempt to avoid the acceptance of death. He is witness to her composure and sanity. She says herself that she could not speak thus to anyone else other than Louis. To understand it, we must refer to Tanner's distinction between loneliness and aloneness. To be lonely is to be emotionally separated from others - Brigitte's tragic
state for most of her life; to be alone is to be physically separated from a loved one. Brigitte is now alone, but Gellis' physical absence does not diminish the love she feels for the doctor and knows he felt for her. In that sense he is still with her and she is no longer lonely in the way she used to be.

For us this is no counterscript, but a genuine change of script of the type that Berne, Steiner and Tanner hope to effect in their work with patients. In view of this change in her existential position and in the balance of her personality, together with the active role she plays in her world, we cannot accept that Brigitte is "un adulte fixé à un stade caractériel infantile", as Glénisson would have us believe.¹⁹

Calou, Octavie and Puybaraud

Of the three remaining characters of note in the book, Calou, Octavie and Puybaraud, we know too little to give a detailed commentary. At most we can discuss a few significant factors. They have much in common. All three are believing Christians, who live their lives according to their faith to the best of their ability.²⁰ While nothing is known of the authority figures in their childhood, it is perhaps reasonable to assume that the church and its teachings had much to do with the formation of their Parent in the Child. All Parents in the Child
need not of course be Pig Parents; indeed most imprinting in infancy is hopefully beneficial. Certainly the speech patterns and thought processes of all three are influenced by religious texts and ideas.

Possibly as a result of this religious faith, all three have a life-plan of service to God and to others. We say "life-plan", which implies a conscious decision to adopt a certain course, thought it may well be that, from early childhood, attributes of "good", "gentle" and "clever" conditioned them to follow unconsciously paths that the balance of their own ego states would not necessarily select for them. We know that clever little Léonce was selected by the community of lay brothers to be raised free of charge and that it was automatically assumed that he would continue living there as a teacher. While practising their profession teachers must use their Parent and Adult ego states and suppress their Child to a large extent, reserving indulgence of their Child for their private lives. In the case of Puybaraud, his private life was also spent at the school as he even slept in the boys' dormitory. Therefore his Child would have to be controlled most of the time.

Octavie and Calou are also teachers. They both have strong Parents. We see this evidenced in Octavie's treatment of Puybaraud after Brigitte's visit, where she
is in both her protective and controlling Parent. Calou shows it with the young teacher who became the object of Hortense's desire, and with Jean nearly all the time. Whether Octavie became a teacher in the same way as Puybaraud we cannot tell. For Calou, teaching is now but a part of his duties as a village priest. He had however been a director of a seminary. We consider that Calou was too much of an independent spirit - did he not lose his directorship because of charges of unorthodoxy? - to be subject to programming to the same degree as Puybaraud.

Hand in hand with their banal script/life-plan of service to others, and bred in them from their religious background, is a certain humility, most noticeable of course in Octavie. They are all three imbued with a sense of their own unworthiness, primarily vis-à-vis their God, but by extension vis-à-vis their fellow beings as well. This makes them generous in their assessment of others' worth and intentions, though in the crises in which we meet all three in the book, this generosity is severely tried and we find Calou and Puybaraud castigating Brigitte. Even Octavie permits herself criticism of Brigitte.

Given the tendency to see the good in others and their own unworthiness, they are predisposed to an
existential position of "I'm not OK, you're OK". Such an existential position in their case does not necessarily imply a fear of love. Indeed, their faith encourages love, but a spiritual love, a love of God and of "thy neighbor". Their religion however makes them wary of specific personal human love, especially physical passion, which always poses problems in the Church's eyes. We know certainly that Puybaraud and Octavie, as well as Brigitte and Louis, consider celibacy "un état supérieur". We have already read Louis' views on chastity. (p. 176). Until the period at which we first meet them in the book, all three, Puybaraud, Octavie and Calou, have eschewed human love on a one-to-one basis.

Let us consider Calou and his crisis. His powerful Adult enables him to see Brigitte and her problems, to sum up the countess' nature and to understand Jean to a large extent. Calou has been imprinted with church teaching, especially as regards sex and women. He has a tendency to class all women as either white or black, a Virgin/Eve concept. This is seen most clearly in his views on the saving efficacy of Michèle (which ignores her own needs as a person) and the wickedness of Hortense.

With his reading and his philosophic bent, which we see revealed in his diary, he has a certain pride in his mental ability and cannot resist the quips that show it off - and cause him problems socially.
He clearly has a strong Nurturing Parent, as we have said. He willingly sacrificed real fatherhood on becoming a priest and has had no regrets on this score. When he came to Larjuzon, he hoped to be able to use this Parent to the benefit of his parishioners, but they rebuffed him and showed scant need of him. For years therefore this Parent has been largely unexercised, apart from with the catechumens and a few private pupils.

Calou's Natural Child is not repressed. His love of God is fervent and almost personal in the closeness he feels to Him in the church. He grieves that he cannot hand it on to Jean. The violent temper we are told broke loose in his youth from time to time is also part of his Natural Child. We are witness to his Parent holding it in check with difficulty after the visit of Monsieur Voyod to the presbytery. Such interaction between the ego states is what is to be desired.

Until his early old age, Calou has functioned satisfactorily with his banal script of service and his existential position of "I'm not OK, you're OK". What goes wrong?

Jean arrives and his unhappy Child calls forth Calou's unexercised Parent. A love is kindled in his Child which, focussed upon one person, as has never happened to him before, transcends that which he feels for his entire flock and even his God. Jean becomes the
center of his existence. For Jean he bends his rules and relaxes moral standards of a lifetime. The dictates of his Adult are overridden by the demands of the Child in its newfound pleasure in a human relationship on a one-to-one basis. Such a love is a betrayal of his calling and distances him from God.

The conflict within him tears him apart. Indeed physically he shrinks in size. His existential position becomes more exagerrated "I'm not OK" as his Adult registers his own greater unworthiness and his unloveliness in the eyes of God.

He never regains his former equilibrium. We hear from Brigitte that he dwells on his problems constantly. He almost welcomes suffering as an atonement for his lapse even at his death.

Octavie and Puybaraud are subject to a further factor which only concerns Calou to a small degree. Of a lower socio-economic class than the other characters in the book, they are both financially dependent upon the goodwill and influence of patrons such as Brigitte Pian. Such dependency, when it is of long standing, is bound to affect the thought-patterns, the Adult, of those who are subjected to it. Puybaraud has been dependent upon charity since his childhood. Dependency and fear of losing favor induces an adaptation of the will, the Child, to suit the wishes of the patron, even if it is only
temporary. It encourages flattery on a sickening scale. Wherever we see Puybaraud and Octavie with Brigitte, this factor must be borne in mind.

We see Octavie only in the last two years of her life. Of the three, she has the strongest sense of service. Loving and loved by the children she teaches, with a very strong Nurturing Parent, her Child yet craves to love and be loved on a personal, more permanent one-to-one basis, to give and receive strokes freely, liberated from the obligation to flatter which dependency has forced on her. Her Adult knows that marriage is the only way whereby to achieve this, given her moral temperament and the society in which she lives. Brigitte intends her for a celibate life but Octavie wants to marry. Prior to the opening of the book she and Puybaraud have met and have decided to do so.

As a respected teacher and esteemed charity worker, Puybaraud has suppressed his strong Child and lived in conformity with his script. We feel script is the appropriate term in Puybaraud's case in view of his special circumstances. In all probability because of his life within the community, he will have had very little experience of practical daily life and his Parent and Adult will have received only a limited input, restricted to religious teachings and arguments and his classical reading. He is more conditioned to dependency than
Octavie. Indeed his script of service should be qualified to obedient service. He is not an originator of ideas and is more comfortable when being directed.

Brigitte's urgings for him to enter the novitiate programme in a monastery prompt a rebellion in his Child. He is in fact, for the whole time we see him in a counterscript, with his Child claiming the right to free development. Its suppression has made him very lonely, "un homme tellement abandonné qu'il avait recours à un enfant de treize ans pour se sentir moins seul". (p. 27).

If Rausch is a representative example, we can appreciate that he has not found an understanding friend among the lay brothers. Like Octavie he wants to love and be loved within a personal relationship. The goodnight kiss from an unhappy little boy from time to time, although a stroke at the moment itself and welcomed no doubt, is not sufficient for his life. In the past, the cult of youth he proclaimed has probably been a cover or an outlet for his need for a close relationship.

Brigitte, with her acute Adult, is aware of the stirrings of his Child. She classes it as a "sensibilité maladive" (p. 21) and "dangereuse". (p. 18). Her adjectives are aptly chosen. Such a Child renders the balance in his personality unhealthy. It is dangerous for Puybaraude's position in society and dangerous too for the plans she has for him.
He meets Octavie. Their love for each other is born of their being in the same place at the same time with the same needs. It is nevertheless a genuine love. They are elated. Octavie works badly. Puybaraud indulges his Child's new-found freedom in sentimental outpourings as injudicious as the one he writes on the back of the envelope he gives to Louis.

However, their future happiness and this chance of intimacy in the psychological sense, are beset by two major problems.

The first is Puybaraud's own programming within his Parent in the Child which insists upon the higher state of celibacy and his duty to God. They find a way to combat this. Children are blessed in the eyes of the church. To have a child is therefore a justification for giving up celibacy. They speak of a child all the time; a genuine desire is thereby given added stress for another purpose. It is for this reason that Octavie plays constantly on this theme in the letter she writes to Puybaraud at Larjuzon, a letter whose primary mission is to keep Puybaraud strong in his intent to marry her. By reinforcing his desire for a child with religious arguments she hopes to counteract the effects of Brigitte's views, which are bound to encourage his anti-marriage tendencies. It is also a genuine love letter. For the lonely Puybaraud, the strokes it brings him are
invaluable. Its promise of unlimited strokes in the future keeps him firm in the face of Brigitte's ire.

Octavie's need for a child is less pressing than is Puybaraud's. When she realizes that she may miscarry, she can face it with relative equanimity. In a way Puybaraud, in his counterscript, is already a child for her to protect and comfort, to control and guide with religious formulae, to love and by whom to be loved.

The second problem is far more difficult to solve. Although they have obtained permission from his superiors for Puybaraud to leave the community and marry, they desperately need Brigitte's positive help to find him employment. Octavie in her interview with Brigitte, Puybaraud during the time he is at Larjuzon — indeed we feel the underlying reason for his going to Larjuzon in the first place was to gain Brigitte's approval for their marriage — are not speaking as their true selves but in an effort to win her support. Puybaraud loses his temper when he realizes how adamantly opposed to their plan she is. They attempt flattery; they conform with her ideas wherever these do not affect their cause adversely; they are even reduced to lying.

Their true feelings are voiced in Puybaraud's journal and when the couple are alone together at home after Brigitte's angry departure. The scene is touching. It
shows how close they are. Physically affectionate, they indulge in a little wry humour together at Brigitte's expense. Puybaraud can indulge his Child to the full and be gently restrained, comforted and directed by an Octavie in her element as a Parent. Complementing each other as well as they do, Octavie and Puybaraud together would probably have been able to function well in society and Puybaraud would have maintained his counterscript for many years, without the active antagonism of Brigitte and Octavie's ill-health. United in their religious faith they join in evening prayers. As his wife falls asleep Puybaraud picks out a favorite hymn on the piano they have hired - hired as an impulsive gesture of their liberated Child.

With Octavie's death, Puybaraud's Child resents intensely having its satisfaction taken away. His existential position changes to "I'm not OK, you're not OK". Yet after a brief period of religious and social rebellion the counterscript fails and his script reasserts itself. He retires to a monastery, as Brigitte had always intended he should, and as he had probably been programmed to do since early childhood.

Glénisson does not believe in the Puybarauds' mutual love. He makes no distinction between their behavior and speech in the presence of Brigitte and when they are their true selves. Nor does he accept their total
dependency upon Brigitte in the matter of finding employment.

For him, then, Octavie in her letter to Puybaraud in praise of physical union, is contradicting what she said previously to Brigitte — "elle oublie que, quelques jours avant, elle qualifiait l'acte de mariage de 'basses convoitises'". However, for us, Octavie in the earlier episode is pleading before a powerful woman whose attitude to sex is well-known; in the later one she is speaking to her future husband. Because he does not realize Octavie's ploy in the letter, Clénisson says "on ne peut pas ne pas remarquer que la perspective d'avoir des enfants pour des raisons de symbolisme mystique l'enthousiasme bien plus que celle d'avoir un mari".

He goes on to say that she loves Puybaraud to spite Brigitte — "le désir de damer le pion à la pharisienne l'emporte chez elle". He later criticizes Octavie for praising Brigitte and suggesting to her husband, even after Brigitte has cruelly humiliated him, that he go back next morning to beg her pardon. This is expediency.

Octavie is level-headed. She knows Brigitte well enough to be sure she will have reconsidered her position. She also knows that pride is not a luxury those who are dependent can afford. Flattering her husband — "un homme
de ta valeur" (p. 192) – to soften the blow, she insists he see Brigitte again, for without her they are penniless.  

Glénisson shares Brigitte’s scorn for Puybaraud. A certain weakness of character linked with a rather effeminate appearance, a few examples of poor judgment and lapses of self-control, an inability to cope practically with the problems of life, while they may invite scorn, do not necessarily imply an incapacity to love someone else. He criticizes him for kissing her hand with fervor after their quarrel at Larjuzon, "annulant de la sorte sa tentative de libération".  

We see it as a vain attempt to pacify Brigitte while still maintaining his will against her. Immediately after this gesture, he solicits her help in getting him employment.

M. Glénisson further criticizes Puybaraud’s poor showing as the head of a family: he tinkers on the piano when he should have been busy seeing to the material household problems; he ought to have used his unemployed period to pass his examinations; "Il ne bouge pas d’une semelle pour remédier efficacement à la détresse matérielle de son foyer".  

This last point is not strictly true, Louis tells us – "Le reste du temps {apart from visiting Brigitte} il courait la ville à la recherche d’une introuvable place". (p. 176).
Glénisson points to the physical deterioration and neglect of his person and says this shows little of the "épanouissement qui est le signe d'un mariage heureux". Poverty and anxiety such as the Puybarauds are experiencing, while they may not destroy love between two people, certainly hamper any obvious "épanouissement". Glénisson even intimates that Puybaraud does not love Octavie because, when Brigitte leaves on that fateful afternoon, he tries to calm her by begging her not to endanger the baby, but with no mention of concern for her own safety. Puybaraud knows his wife's humility would not make her do something for her own sake, whereas she would do all within her power to protect another, in this case their unborn child.

Glénisson sums up his comments on this couple thus:

Ce n'est donc pas la pharisienne, comme le voudrait le romancier, c'est Puybaraud qui, en s'avilissant lui-même, en s'accrochant à "son chou" { this is a reference to Louis} détruit son foyer, et Octavie y met du sien en sacrifiant la dignité de son mari à un attachement désordonné pour la pharisienne.33

We cannot agree with him.
CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study of the personality structures in La Pharisiennne was to determine whether we could agree with Emile Glénisson that all Mauriac's characters were but slight variants on the same character or whether we were convinced that they were individuals, differing clearly one from the other. Where M. Glénisson dealt with all the Mauriac novels, discussing only selected characters from each of them, we have restricted ourselves to the one book and considered all the characters of any depth within that book. We chose La Pharisiennne because its format offered us data about several people on which to base our findings.

With the concepts of Berne and his followers in mind, we have found examples of all four existential positions. We have examples of existential positions that change and of those that remain the same. We have people whose dominant ego state is their Parent, others their Child and another his Adult. We have various scripts, both banal and tragic. We have examples of people who attempt to change their script and fail, and one who is shocked into a change and succeeds in making a new life. We have examples of people who seem dominated by their duty, others by their heads, others by their hearts, and still
others by their desires. Therefore, even given that social psychiatry is an inexact science and that our knowledge of it is rudimentary, we are led by our findings to disagree with M. Glénisson. These people are decidedly different from one another. They are individuals.

Glénisson doubts the credibility of those of Mauriac's characters who do not fit the mold he proposes. He is thinking of Puybaraud and Brigitte in particular. Credibility in fiction is very subjective. It depends upon the experiences and interpretation of each individual reader. For us, all the characters in _La Pharisienne_ are credible, three-dimensional, with the possible exception of the "zouave pontifical", who seems a somewhat cardboard figure.

To Glénisson's further charge of monotony occasioned by the alleged sameness of the characters and repetition of the same events, we would say that human nature, while it is infinitely diverse, is also predictably the same. In the sphere of family relations, certain compositions within the personality will recur and will tend to have the same outcome.

If he objects that most of the people depicted are unhappy and unbalanced psychologically and that there is little laughter and joy, let us remind him that this is still fiction. In the same way that novels are rarely written about happy love affairs, indeed they usually end
the moment conflict is resolved, so many of Mauriac's characters have imbalance in their personalities because it is the problems that imbalance causes that interest the reader. It will be noticed that Michèle, the most balanced of the young people, has also the smallest role and is rarely the center of attention; that as soon as Brigitte has achieved a lasting "équilibre d'esprit", or very soon thereafter (a matter of four or five pages), the book about her ends; and that other characters with banal scripts over a period of years only enter the book at critical moments in their lives, when that balance is in jeopardy.

Glénisson says further of the single character he finds in Mauriac's novels that he is an adult with an emotional development arrested in a childhood state. Here we have some common ground. It is what happens in infancy that determines the composition of the Child. The Child thereafter affects the balance of the whole personality for the entire life. When the Child, or part of it, is repressed or uncontrolled, the repercussions are apparent and can be disastrous. Jean is a case in point. With his Child as his dominant ego state, he could be deemed to fit Glénisson's description - but only if we give the notion of "infantile" a very different meaning and if by
`arrested` we understand that this character's psychological evolution is differently oriented from that of other characters in the book and our own.

Transactional analysis suggests a new approach to understanding fictional characters. To our knowledge, aspects of this branch of social psychiatry have been used on only four other occasions in literary criticism.¹ In our opinion it offers a better means of analysing personality and interrelationships than any other perspective so far available.

Jean's predicament is the result of his mother's and his uncle's influence. Steiner, the social psychiatrist, who warned that the Child ego states of the parents are the main determining factors in the formation of their offspring's scripts,² would endorse Calou who, when speaking as Brigitte's confessor, said "chacun est un héritier pitoyable, chargé des pêchés et des mérites de sa race, dans une mesure qui échappe à notre estimation". (p. 270). The sins of the fathers...We should all take heed.
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14 With such unbalanced personalities, it is more than likely that Jean's mother and uncle have scripts of their own.
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22 P. 203. The bracketed "Child" and "Adult" are of course our interpolations. Louis is speaking from a religious point of view, we with Berne's theories in mind.

23 Glénisson, p. 31.

24 Ibid, p. 47.

Chapter 3
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6 Tanner, p. 31.

7 Tanner, p. 32.

8 We call this a script, presuming that it was unconsciously adopted in early childhood and only allowed to reveal itself so openly when Brigitte's circumstances (ironically, through her marriage) permitted her the social and financial position for it to do so.

9 Tanner, p. 32. All the energy of the "I'm OK, you're not OK" person "will be spent in using power and
control in an effort to prove to himself and others that he is OK (more OK).  

10 Steiner, p. 66. A defense against accusation of unworthiness from within oneself "can be passed on to another person as in a game of "hot potato", so that proving that another person is not OK relieves one of the feeling".

11 Steiner, p. 66. "A person will often feel strongly more vital and powerful if he can control and influence others. In other words, if he can make another person feel less OK than he does, then, relatively speaking, he is OK".

12 Tanner, pp. 31-2.

13 Tanner, p. 32. "We can be reasonably sure of how someone will react if we become angry; they will in all likelihood become angry too. Because we know this in advance, at the point in communication where we are reacting with increasing hurt or feelings of rejection or fear, we will sometimes become angry".

It is noticeable that Puybaraud always loses his temper when she loses hers.

14 As her Adult appears to have no control over nor gives any logical reason for her attitude, it would seem that this abhorrence was in situ prior to the fixation of her Child.
15 Steiner, p. 48. The Parent in the Child is "decathected and not allowed to exert its influence on the rest of the personality".

16 Steiner, p. 91. "A radical change in time structuring and the development of (new) avenues of enjoyment...are crude indicators of a script change".

17 Glénisson, p. 56.

18 Tanner, pp. 47-8.

19 See Introduction, Notes 3 and 6.

20 The contrast is marked between their religion and that of Brigitte. It reveals the degree to which her concept of religion was formed by her personality make-up in order to satisfy her script, rather than that her behavior resulted from her faith.

21 This is probably the most common existential position and, in a mild form, gives rise to a banal script. Steiner (p. 104) "... banal scripts are the rule, hamartic (tragic) scripts the minority, and script-free lives the exception".

22 While Berne did not wish to include the effect of social pressures upon the development of personality (in his view, to do so was politics), Steiner (p. 99) says that social context is an "important determinant of behavior". "Oppressive conditions which force people into scripts exist in all social classes, but they are more obvious in the lower socio-economic classes...".
Octavie is an example of the type-casting of women over the centuries. Steiner says (p. 313) that girls are told at birth that "a good woman should be a very nurturing, supportive person; so much so that every time someone in her family needs something she can provide it".

Louis describes Puybaraud as "en pleine mue, à mi-chemin du siècle" (p. 76) during that summer. He is referring to his changing the style of his clothes from those of a semi-cleric to those of a man in civil life. The change is symbolic of the change within the man.
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