INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

UMI®

800-521-0600

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.

61

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI

FRANKENSTEIN AND *GREAT EXPECTATIONS*:

THE ROMANTIC CHILD AND THE VICTORIAN ADULT

Chris Koelbleitner

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

English

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

October 1997

© Chris Koelbleitner, 1997

National Library of Canada

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Acquisitions et services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-39423-9

Canadä

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.

ii

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI

ABSTRACT

<u>FRANKENSTEIN</u> AND <u>GREAT EXPECTATIONS</u>: THE ROMANTIC CHILD AND THE VICTORIAN ADULT

CHRIS KOELBLEITNER

This thesis examines the interplay between Romantic and Victorian discourses in Great Expectations. At the heart of my argument is the contention that Pip has a Romantic childhood and steadily grows into a Victorian adult. The work of some critics suggests that Dickens was not able to reconcile the presence of Romantic and Victorian values in his text. These critics argue that in order to transform Pip into a respectable adult, committed to Victorian values of duty, forgiveness, social harmony, and steady employment, the text repudiates much of what it initially endorses about Pip the child. In defence of Dickens' portrayal, I situate Pip's progress in relation to several texts which impinge upon the novel, either directly or indirectly. Chief among these texts is Frankenstein. I propose that, like Frankenstein, Dickens' novel argues that the egotistical resentment of childhood must be relinquished in order to make possible a healthy adulthood. In this way, Pip may be seen not to repudiate the Romanticism of his youth, but merely grow out of it. However, I also suggest that Pip's Victorian values disguise a strategy by which he subverts the authority of those who have manipulated him.

A GUIDE TO FREQUENTLY CITED TEXTS

Collings, David. "The Monster and the Imaginary Mother"

Collings, David. "The Monster and the Imaginary Mother: A Lacanian Reading of Frankenstein" in Frankenstein: Case Studies in Contemporary Criticism. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Connor, Steven. Charles Dickens

Connor, Steven. Charles Dickens. New York: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1985.

Crawford, Iain. "Pip and the Monster."

Crawford, Iain. "Pip and the Monster: The Joys of Bondage" in Studies in English Literature 1500 - 1900. Vol. 28. 1988

Dickens, Charles. Expectations
Dickens, Charles. Great Expectations. Toronto: Bantam Books, 1981.

Rawlins, Jack. "The Betrayal of the Child"
Rawlins, Jack. "Great Expiations: Dickens and the Betrayal of the Child." in New Casebook: Great Expectations London: The Macmilan Press Ltd, 1994.

Shelley, Mary. Frankenstein
Shelley, Mary. Frankenstein (1831). Toronto: Penguin Books, 1994.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction..1

Chapter one: Dickens and Psychoanalysis.............6

Chapter two: Childhood in Frankenstein.............20

Chapter three: Childhood in Great Expectations.......53

Chapter four: Pip and Victorian Adulthood...........79

Bibliography.......................................153

INTRODUCTION

This thesis examines the interplay between Romantic and Victorian discourses in Great Expectations. At the heart of my argument is the contention that Pip has a Romantic childhood and steadily grows into a Victorian adult. The work of some critics suggests that Dickens was not able to reconcile the presence of Romantic and Victorian values in his text. These critics argue that in order to transform Pip into a respectable adult, committed to Victorian values of duty, forgiveness, social harmony, and steady employment, the text repudiates much of what it initially endorses about Pip the child. In defence of Dickens' portrayal, I attempt to situate Pip's progress in relation to several texts which impinge upon the novel, either directly or indirectly. Chief among these is Frankenstein. Dickens' novel makes numerous allusions to Frankenstein, including two occasions when Pip refers directly to the novel.

The connection between Frankenstein and Great Expectations has been frequently noted by critics. In many discussions of Great Expectations one is likely to find a paragraph pointing out that the relationship between creator and creature in Frankenstein is reproduced in the relationship between Magwitch and Pip, as well as that between Miss Havisham and Estella. It is also often noted that Magwitch also functions in Pip's life as Victor's monster does in

Frankenstein. However, Dickens' use of Shelley's novel is more far-reaching than this. One of the central themes of both novels is the destructive consequences of long-standing resentment against the conditions of one's existence. By making allusion to Shelley's novel, Pip's story suggests that we must evaluate his development in terms of his escape from a fate like Victor Frankenstein's.

In order to better understand Pip's passage to adulthood, as well as Victor Frankenstein's less successful development, I view both novels from a psychoanalytic perspective. Both novels, Frankenstein in particular, have been the subject of numerous psychoanalytic readings.[1] The lives of the protagonists of both novels are shaped by tensions with parental and quasi-parental figures to such a degree that some attention to Oedipal strife is useful and instructive. However, readings that utilize a psychoanalytic paradigm are frequently reductive.[2] Wherever possible, I have sought to temper my own use of psychoanalysis with a recognition of the ways that the novels defy pat formulations.

1. Steven Connor's Lacanian analysis of Dickens' work, Charles Dickens, figures prominently in this thesis. Among other texts that incorporate a psychoanalytic perspective on Great Expectations and that are refered to in this thesis are Anny Sadrin's Parentage and Inheritance in the Novels of Charles Dickens, and Pam Morris's Dickens' Class Consciousness. This thesis makes extensive use of two psychoanalytic readings of Frankenstein: David Collings' "The Monster and the Imaginary Mother: A Lacanian Reading of Frankenstein"; and William Veeder's "The Negative Oedipus: Father, Frankenstein, and the Shelleys". Two other psychoanalytic studies of Shelley's novel that are alluded to are Marc A. Rubenstein's "'My Accursed Origin': The Search for the Mother in Frankenstein" and Kaplan and Kloss's "Fantasy of Paternity and the Doppleganger: Mary Shelley's Frankenstein."

2. One such reading is Kaplan and Kloss' "Fantasy of Paternity and the

My thesis evolves from an interpretation of various acts of childhood reading performed by the main characters in both novels. Pip's idiosyncratic reading of his family's headstones, Victor's interest in the books of alchemists, and Walton's enthusiasm for his uncle's travel books, become related to the way the characters read and misread their origins. Reading and misreading becomes a prelude to the characters' attempts to rewrite the narrative of their lives in an effort to free themselves from the strictures of their origins. I examine the ways in which these strategies of rewriting the self initially fail, and then, in Pip's case, how they succeed and finally allow him to enter the full authority of adulthood at least somewhat on his own terms.

Despite some important similarities between the early portion of Dickens' novel and Frankenstein, the first part of my thesis focuses on the difference between the two texts' response to Romantic ideals. The first three chapters of my thesis situates the depictions of the protagonists of both novels in terms of their response to Romantic notions of childhood imagination. The early part of Dickens' novel details Pip's alienation from a vital and spontaneous

Doppleganger: Mary Shelley's Frankenstein." The basis of their argument is that only psychoanalysis can provide a full account of Shelley's novel. However, according to their work, it would seem that not even psychoanalysis yields very impressive results. Throughout their article there are phrases like "the equation may sound surprising, even improbable, but nothing else explains..." (p. 126). Given the myriad interpretive approaches available to contemporary readers, Kaplan and Kloss's reluctant commitment to Freud's ideas does not make for a persuasive argument.

childhood self and his growing identification with the class-based ideals of the adult world around him. Frankenstein, on the other hand, examines the consequences of its protagonists' continued resistance to adult authority. Both novels read childhood imagination in terms of Wordsworthian Romanticism, but from different perspectives. The early part of Pip's story represents a Romantic lament for the loss of a childhood self that is unfettered by a sense of guilt and shame. Meanwhile, Shelley's novel uses Victor Frankenstein's and Robert Walton's attempts to sustain this childhood self to express anxiety over a propensity toward extremism among those who pursue Romantic ideals.

In the fourth chapter, I propose that, like Frankenstein, Dickens' novel argues that the resentful ego of childhood must be relinquished in order to make possible a healthy adulthood. Thus the second part of Dickens' novel does not reject the young Pip's dreams of Romantic self-making, but rather suggests that what is acceptable and even admirable in childhood can be destructive in the adult. However, I also propose that Pip's triumph over resentment by means of humility and forgiveness is problematized by a tendency of his newly-discovered values to obscure and at the same time to facilitate a subtle shift in power between himself and those who have controlled him. Although Pip may have repudiated the Romantic ideal of complete self-authorization, he nevertheless achieves Victorian respectability at least partly on his own

terms. A brief note on the structure of my thesis is in order. The first three chapters are intended to provide an introduction to the psychoanalytic and generic context that will form the basis of comparison between Dickens' and Shelley's work. Accordingly, these chapters outline the way in which childhood is viewed in each novel. The fourth chapter, much longer than the previous three, seeks to come to terms with the various ways critics view Pip's passage to adulthood. The narrow focus on this issue makes further chapter divisions untenable.

CHAPTER ONE:
DICKENS AND PSYCHOANALYSIS

In a work that seeks to discuss connections between Great Expectations and Frankenstein the question inevitably arises as to whether the audience for which Dickens wrote would have been attuned to references to the earlier novel. Dickens was a novelist sensitive to the demands of his mass readership and he is unlikely to have made extensive allusions to Frankenstein if he had not been confident they would resonate in the minds of the Victorian reading public. There is, in fact, ample evidence that Frankenstein was well known to Dickens' readers. Iain Crawford calls Shelley's novel, "the Victorians' most familiar contact with the impulse of Romanticism" ("Pip and the Monster", p.625). He cites several examples of its popularity, including five separate stage adaptations by 1823, the popularity of the 1831 edition, as well as an allusion to the novel in a speech by Secretary Canning ("Pip and the Monster", p. 626). The novel's second edition was also incorporated into the popular Bentley's Standard Novels, which Dickens is known to have owned ("Pip and the Monster", 626).

Crawford describes the relationship between Dickens and Frankenstein in terms borrowed from Harold Bloom: writers of one generation create a distinct identity for themselves by misreading the work of their predecessors. Although major writers must always confront their predecessors, by the late 1850s Dickens was already too well established a writer to fit

Bloom's model. Crawford, alluding to the title of Bloom's The Anxiety of Influence, concedes that "Great Expectations nevertheless ultimately embraces the influence of Shelley's text with more resilience than anxiety..."("Pip and the Monster", p. 625). Bloom's theory is perhaps better applied to the protagonists of both novels, whose struggles toward a viable personal identity are cast in terms of reading and misreading their origins.

The opening of Great Expectations presents in miniature a pattern common to several of Dickens' novels as well as to Frankenstein. The first pages of the novel recount a violent transition from Pip's "first fancies" regarding his surroundings to a stark, unpleasantly "vivid and broad impression of the identity of things" (Expectations, p. 2). His "first fancies" involve a rather idiosyncratic reading of his family's tombstones:

> My first fancies regarding what they were like were unreasonably derived from their tombstones. The shape of the letters on my father's gave me an odd idea that he was a square, stout, dark man, with curly hair. From the character and turn of the inscription, "Also Georgiana Wife of the Above," I drew a childish conclusion that my mother was freckled and sickly. To five little lozenges, each about a foot and a half long, which were arranged in a neat row beside their grave, and were sacred to the

memory of five little brothers of mine -- who gave up the universal struggle -- I am indebted for a belief I religiously entertained that they had all been born on their backs with their hands in their trouser pockets, and had never taken them out in this state of existence. (Expectations, p.1)

An individual bearing witness to his family's burial plot initially suggests an affirmation of origins and kinship. However, Pip's account of his family tends to express his instinct for self-invention more than providing solid information about his ancestors. Even the presentation of the name given to him by his parents demonstrates an impulse toward self-determination:

> My father's family name being Pirrip, and my Christian name Philip, my infant tongue could make of both names nothing longer or more explicit than Pip. So I called myself Pip, and came to be called Pip. (Expectations, p. 1)

Pip's inability to pronounce the first and last name given to him by his family results in a self-naming that serves to replace both. Similarly, Pip's imaginitive reconstruction of his parents' identities, based on the details of their tombstones, eclipses any information about what they were really like. In the first two paragraphs of the novel Pip is the centre of a world of his own imagination. Though he is without the support of a living family, Pip seems able to

create a rich, and coherent, though utterly fanciful, sense of himself and his surroundings. A growing awareness of the bleak realities of his life intrudes into this world of childhood fancy and, even before Magwitch's appearance, Pip experiences an unpleasant "vivid and broad impression of the identity of things"(Expectations, p.1). The imaginary life he grants his absent family gives way to a bitter recognition that they were "dead and buried" (Expectations, p.1). He no longer perceives himself as the centre of his own world but as merely a "small bundle of shivers"; a mere speck on the landscape of the marshes, dwarfed by the immensity of the sea which he imagines as "the distant savage lair from which the wind was rushing" (Expectations, p.2).

I wish to argue that Pip's crisis on the marsh represents a key developmental moment that links him with the protagonists of some of Dickens' other novels as well as Frankenstein. In order to make this connection I will draw on a psychoanalytic framework. In particular, Jacques Lacan's distinction between the Imaginary and the Symbolic is useful in understanding the passage from childhood to adulthood in Dickens' and Shelley's work. In Lacan's formulation, the child in the Imaginary realm feels itself to be the centre of a private world overseen by the mother. The early part of the Imaginary stage is defined by the mirror period, in which the child has its first experience of itself as a subject with a separate existence from the objects around it. The chief

object of this period is the mother. Other objects (such as the father) are only dimly perceived. Despite the child's faint recognition of other people, the early part of the mirror stage represents a moment in its development "before it is objectified in the dialectic of identification with the other, and before language restores to it, in the universal, its function as subject" (Ecrits, p. 2).

The child's acquisition of language gradually leads to an awareness of its relative position within a larger social context. Lacan calls this larger social context the Symblic order. The fundamental linguistic abstraction within the Symbolic order is the name of the father. It determines the relative place of every other signifier within the Symbolic order.

A child's awareness of the significance of the name of the father is accompanied by a sense of the law of the father, which is a prohibition against desire for the mother. According to Lacan, the father's law is a

> primordial law [...] which in regulating marriage ties superimposes the kingdom of culture on that of a nature abandoned to the law of mating. The prohibition of incest is merely its subjective pivot, revealed by the modern tendency to reduce the mother and the sister to the objects forbidden to the subject's choice, although full licence outside of these is not yet entirely open.
>
> (Ecrits, p. 66)

The result of the child's identification with the linguistic abstractions of the Symbolic order is repression of identification with the mother of the Imaginary realm. In Dickensian terms, a child moves from the "first fancies" of the Imaginary realm to an increasingly "vivid and broad impression of the identity of things", culminating in the entry into the Symbolic order. Before we consider Pip's situation in more detail, we will examine the early part of David Copperfield's and Esther Summerson's development.

The opening of David Copperfield well describes a maternal world of "first fancies" in which the child creates his own idiosyncratic reading of the world. The young David decides that crocodiles are vegetables and encounters no disagreement from those around him (David Copperfield, p. 7). Like Pip, David closely connects the headstone and the actual person of his deceased father. Looking out at the headstone, David can't help feeling his father has been cruelly locked out of the house. In both cases, the father is a distant, poorly understood, and entirely unthreatening figure. James Kincaid describes the early part of David Copperfield as a "land of cuddles, one where the connections between mother, child, and nurse are so fibrous and tactile that there are hardly clear demarcations among the bodies" (Child-Loving, p. 306). Strictly speaking, an individual within Lacan's Imaginary realm perceives the division between self and other. It is only in the pre-imaginary, pre-verbal world of complete

fusion between infant and mother that "demarcations among bodies" are unclear. Chapter 2 ("I Observe") describes the emergence into the Imaginary:

> The first objects that assume a distinct presence before me, as I look far back, into the blank of my infancy, are my mother with her pretty hair and youthful shape, and Peggotty with no shape at all, and eyes so dark that they seemed to darken their whole neighbourhood in her face... (David Copperfield, p. 11)

Here David's first sense of himself as a subject (the "I" who "observes") is defined against two "first objects". In David's vague first impression, the maternal body seems to encompass both his real mother and the shapeless Pegotty. He remembers the two "at a little distance apart....and I going unsteadily from the one to the other." (David Copperfield, p.11). Thus "the first objects" are really one object: the mother. Here David's perception is consistent with psychoanalysis, which describes the mother as the child's "primary object."

In accordance with Lacan's formulation, David's earliest impression of the threat of paternal power does not involve contact with an actual father-figure. Johanna M. Smith provides an excellent summary of the child's earliest sense of the law of the father:

> A child has little doubt who its mother is, but who is its father -- and how would one know? The father's claim rests on the mother's word that he is in fact the father;

> the father's relationship to the child is thus established through language and a system of marriage and kinship -- names -- that in turn is basic to rules of everything from property to law. Thus gender, for Lacan, is intimately connected in the mind of the developing child with names and language. Or, rather, the _male_ gender is tied to that world in an association analogously as intimate as is the mother's early, physical (including umbilical) connection with the infant.
>
> ("Psychoanalytic Criticism and _Frankenstein_", p.239)

In Dickens' novels, there tends to be a distinction made between a maternal figure linked to an early Imaginary phase of existence, and another that delivers the message of the law of the father. An awareness of the former is based on a memory of direct physical experience, as it is in David's case. The child's connection with the latter is defined in terms of relation with the father. These terms are based on linguistic and legal abstractions of the Symbolic order. David's first intimations of the law of the father arise from Betsy Trotwood's presence. She is "an aunt of my father's, and consequently a great-aunt of mine" (_David Copperfield_, p. 2). She is described as the "principal magnate of our family" (_David Copperfield_, p. 2). The phrase "principal magnate" with its political and financial overtones further suggests that she represents a masculine world of power. Through hearing

about her experiences with a husband who once made "arrangements to throw her out of a two pair of stairs' window" (David Copperfield, p.3) David learns a little about paternal aggression. Like other female representatives of the Symbolic order in Dickens' work, Miss Betsy disapproves of the mother. She respected David's father, who "had once been a favourite of hers", but "was mortally affronted by his marriage, on the ground that my mother was 'a wax doll'" (David Copperfield, p. 3).

David's memory of his happy relationship with his mother is an anomaly in Dickens' work, since usually the maternal body is absent from his characters' memories. Such an absence is in keeping with Lacan's notion that a condition of entry into the Symbolic is a repression of identification with the maternal body of the Imaginary realm. In Bleak House, Esther describes her earliest memories as a time when "I had never heard of my papa...,but I felt more interested about my mama" (p. 63); however, no first-hand details concerning her mother seem available to her. The early part of Esther's narrative describes an Imaginary world of "first fancies", supervised by her godmother, Miss Barbary. Esther was

> brought up, from my earliest remembrance -- like some of the princesses in the fairy stories, only I was not charming -- by my godmother. (Bleak House, p. 63)

Esther describes Miss Barbary as if she were a fairy tale maternal figure of the Imaginary period. Yet what is lacking

here is the child's sense of the potency of being the centre of a private world. Miss Barbary is eager to interrupt Esther's daydreams with her own version of the "vivid and broad impression of the identity of things". Miss Barbary acts as a transitional figure between the Imaginary and the Symbolic. She is a maternal figure of the late Imaginary stage. Her message to Esther is to "forget your mother" (Bleak House, p.65). She seeks to impart a fear of the father's law by quoting threatening passages from the Old Testament. She sets an injunction against Esther's bond with her mother, Lady Dedlock, who bore her out of wedlock, by quoting from the Old Testament, telling Esther that she must "pray daily that the sins of others be not visited upon you, according to what is written" (Bleak House, p. 65). Here Miss Barbary is referring to Exodus 20.5: "for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me." Miss Barbary's last words before she becomes mute, also taken from the Bible, prepare Esther's entry into the Symbolic world of Jarndyce and Jarndyce in a more specific way. She quotes a passage from Mark 13.35-7, admonishing Esther to "Watch ye therefore! lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto all, Watch!" (Bleak House, p. 67). Miss Barbary's use of the quotation from Mark is in response to Esther's reading of the story in John's gospel of Christ's defence of an adultress, in which he dissuades a mob from stoning a woman

by turning their attention to their own sins. Clearly, Miss Barbary intends the warning as a reminder of the enormity of Lady Dedlock's crime and its reflection upon Esther. It is an injunction against forgiveness. But Miss Barbary misquotes slightly this passage that warns of the second coming. The line in the Bible is "Watch ye: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh..." The passage foreshadows the appearance three pages later of John Jarndyce, ostensibly the "master" of Bleak House. This section becomes one of the ways that Esther's relationship with her mother is set in opposition to her membership to the Symbolic world defined by the Jarndyce estate. Certainly, when soon after, Esther meets a heavily disguised John Jarndyce within the coach, he appears to Esther as an ominous and perplexing figure consistent with Miss Barbary's biblical warning.

Mrs. Joe plays a role similar to that of Miss Barbary in Pip's development. She represents the highest authority in Pip's life, while Joe, whose role is closer to that of an older brother, proves to be as much subject to her "hard and heavy hand" (<u>Expectations</u>, p. 6) as Pip. Pip concludes that "I supposed that Joe Gargery and I were both brought up by [her] hand" (<u>Expectations</u>, p. 7). Mrs. Joe resents the absence of masculine authority, and, with the aid of Tickler, tries to make up for it. Like Esther's godmother and Betsy Trotwood, Mrs. Joe has little respect for motherhood. She complains that, "it's bad enough to be a blacksmith's wife (and him a

Gargery) without being your mother" (Expectations, p.8). She distances herself from the nurturing maternal image of the early Imaginary phase and positions herself as the father's representative. She exhibits a subtle linguistic connection to the authority of Pip's father, Philip Pirrip, when she says,

> "You'll drive me to the churchyard betwixt you, one of these days, and oh, a pr-r-recious pair you'd be without me!" (Expectations, p. 8)

Mention of the churchyard brings to mind the family resting place, where Pip has just returned from. Mrs. Joe demonstrates her linguistic superiority over Pip by rolling her r's, something that Pip, reading his family name, Pirrip, could not do. It is a reminder that Mrs. Joe derives authority over Pip from proximity to the father. If we recall that Pip's self-naming arises from his pronunciation difficulties, then we may see Mrs. Joe here challenging Pip's sense of self-empowerment by reminding him of his place in the familial hierarchy. Like Miss Barbary, Mrs. Joe seeks to wean her charge from its Imaginary notions of self, on behalf of the Symbolic order. That is, she seeks to replace his "first fancies" with a "broad impression of the identity of things."

Mrs. Joe meets with a fate similar to Miss Barbary's. Soon after Pip departs for the Symbolic world of London, Mrs. Joe, a maternal figure of the late Imaginary phase, is also rendered mute. We will examine Mrs. Joe's role in Pip's development in further detail once we have considered the

conditions of childhood in Frankenstein.

CHAPTER TWO:

CHILDHOOD IN *FRANKENSTEIN*

The circumstances of Pip's childhood are similar to those of Robert Walton and Victor Frankenstein. Walton and Frankenstein also spend their childhoods developing their own imaginative view of the world. Like Pip's misreading of his family's tombstones, the first impressions Victor Frankenstein forms regarding the origins of life are utterly fanciful. They are derived from the outdated theories of Cornelius Agrippa. Robert Walton similarly entertains fanciful notions of the world. Based on his interpretation of the "travel books that composed the whole of our good uncle Thomas's library" (Frankenstein, p.14), he believes that he is destined to discover a region of warmth at the north pole. In all three cases, the boys' misreadings are positioned as an assertion of the Imaginary self. However, as we shall see, the early part of Dickens' novel details Pip's alienation from this childhood self and his growing identification with the Symbolic Order. Frankenstein, on the other hand, examines the consequences of its protagonists' continued resistance to Symbolic forces. Both novels read childhood imagination in terms of Wordsworthian Romanticism, but from different perspectives. The early part of Pip's story represents a Romantic lament for the loss of the innocence and independence of a child's imaginary world. Meanwhile, Shelley's novel uses Frankenstein's and Walton's attempts to sustain this childhood self to expresses anxiety over a propensity toward extremism among those who

pursue Romantic ideals.

As David Collings ("The Monster and the Imaginary Mother", p. 247) points out, Frankenstein's choice of studies betrays the persistance of his interest in the Imaginary realm, despite being a young man about to enter the Symbolic world of Ingoldstadt. He is interested in "neither the structure of languages, nor the code of governments, nor the politics of various states...(Frankenstein, p.36), subjects which are the domain of the Symbolic order. Modern science also fails to impress him at first, since its practitioners seem to him to be dedicated "to the annihilation of those visions on which my interest in science was chiefly founded" (Frankenstein, p. 50). It is the grandiose dreams of "immortality and power" (Frankenstein, p. 50) offered by ancient philosophers that first appeal to Frankenstein's childish imagination. Just as Pip is forced to relinquish the rich, imaginative world of his "first fancies", so too does Frankenstein feel that to enter the discipline of modern science would "require [that he] exchange chimeras of boundless grandeur for realities of little worth" (Frankenstein, p.50). Frankenstein's orientation toward the Imaginary is also expressed in his nostalgia for the relationship he enjoyed with his mother as a child. Early in his account, he describes a happy time when his mother's physical presence predominated in the form of "tender caresses" (Frankenstein, p. 32). During this period of existence, he was "guided by a

silken cord" (Frankenstein, p. 32). This image of a quasi-umbilical "silken cord" clearly indicates the connection he enjoyed with the maternal body, during the Imaginary period. At this point, Frankenstein's father was a distant figure who was not yet recognized as a threat. He was known only by his "smile of benevolent pleasure" (Frankenstein, p. 32).

Frankenstein's interest in science seems everywhere informed by this longing to recapture the intimate relationship he had with the maternal body of the Imaginary realm. He describes his initial frustration with the limitations of modern science using imagery that plays heavily on the familiar trope of nature as mother:

> The untaught peasant beheld the elements around him, and was acquainted with their practical uses. The most learned philosopher knew little more. He had partially unveiled the face of Nature, but her immortal lineaments were still a wonder and a mystery. (Frankenstein, p. 45)

After Frankenstein goes to Ingoldstadt, Professor Waldman piques his interest in modern science, when, as Collings points out, he "describes modern chemistry in terms resonant with maternal sexuality" ("The Monster and the Imaginary Mother", p. 247). Waldman claims contemporary science is able to "penetrate into the recesses of nature, and show how she works in her hiding places" (Frankenstein, p. 51). By recalling the image of eroticized maternality Frankenstein utilized to describe his interest in natural science, Waldman

seems inadvertenly to speak directly to Frankenstein's unconscious desire to reconnect with the lost mother of the Imaginary realm. Waldman also expresses respect for Frankenstein's alchemists as "men of genius" (Frankenstein, p.47) to whom modern science owes a debt. Waldman's support of Frankenstein's interests stands in marked contrast to Professor Krempe's, for whom "every instant that [Frankenstein has] wasted on those books is utterly and entirely lost" (Frankenstein, p. 49). Krempe enacts the Symbolic order's imperative that the individual give up identification with the "chimeras of boundless grandeur" of the Imaginary realm. Waldman on the other hand seems to offer the possibility of compromise between the needs of the Imaginary self and the demands of the Symbolic world of Ingoldstadt. That is, by praising Frankenstein's early interests, while also introducing him to contemporary science, Waldman offers the possibility that the aspirations of childhood are not wholly incompatible with his university studies.

Ostensibly, Frankenstein becomes Waldman's "disciple" (Frankenstein, p.47). But Frankenstein soon adapts Waldman's lessons to his own forbidden purposes. His scientific work becomes an unconscious substitute for the lost world of the Imaginary and the maternal, and his research becomes a deluded attempt to revive and reclaim those missing qualities. Meanwhile, on a conscious level, he clings to an illusion of scientific respectability which he believes will grant his

work a degree of Symbolic acceptance. In fact, before the creature's birth, Frankenstein is capable of a certain brazen defiance of paternal authority. For a while, Frankenstein's scientific work seems to him to offer not only a Symbolically authorized means of regaining the Imaginary mother but, ultimately, a way of undermining the authority of the patriarchy.

William Veeder's reading of Frankenstein's scientific work focuses on this tension with the father. Veeder argues that for Frankenstein alchemy represents a way of sidestepping the father's authority. In Veeder's account, Victor is drawn to Agrippa et al. because their theories concerning the origin of life offer a way of "supplanting the very biological process which made the father a father" ("The Shelleys", p.380). By discovering an alternative process of bringing life into the world, Frankenstein, as "the only begetter of a new system of begetting" ("The Shelleys", p. 380), hopes to step outside a generative hierarchy that requires that he sacrifice the independence and vitality of the childhood self before he can ascend to a position of power. In support of Veeder's argument, we may note that the novel provides ample evidence of the rebellious spirit of Frankenstein's scientific interest. He applies himself to his alchemical texts in spite of his father's dismissal of them as "sad trash" (Frankenstein, p. 37). His choice of study is a means of self-empowerment against a father who "was not scientific" (Frank-

enstein, p.38). As further evidence of the rebellious nature of his interests we may note his reaction to the explanations of "a man of great research in natural philosophy" that "threw greatly into the shade Cornelius Agrippa, Albertus Magnus, and Paracelsus" (Frankenstein, p. 40). As a result of his encounter with this man, he loses interest in this "would-be science, which could never even step within the threshold of real knowledge" (Frankenstein, p.40). He briefly abandons the entire field of natural science when the alchemists no longer seem a threat to the established order of things.

Despite all that Frankenstein's work seems to promise, the birth of the creature is a bitter disappointment to him. Once the creature comes to life, Frankenstein finds that "...the beauty of the dream vanished, and breathless horror and disgust filled my heart" (Frankenstein, p. 58), suggesting he recognizes the transgressive nature of his project. The veneer of respectability that science lent his project seems to disappear and, not surprisingly, there is a marked change in Frankenstein's attitude toward the patriarchy. Frankenstein's relationship with Professors Waldman and Krempe becomes characterized by intense anxiety. Although he initially admired Waldman, the professor now "inflicted torture when he praised, with kindness and warmth, the astonishing progress I had made in the sciences" (Frankenstein, p.65).

Frankenstein always disliked the "uncouth" Professor

Krempe, but he did not initially feel the need to keep the nature of his interests secret from him. Upon first entering university, he spoke "recklessly" (Frankenstein, p. 44) of his interest in alchemists, despite Krempe's contempt for them. He found it easy to dismiss "that little conceited fellow" (Frankenstein, p. 45). After the creation of his monster, Victor is no longer able to shrug off Krempe's hostility toward him. He experiences a condition of "insupportable sensitiveness" in which Krempe's "harsh, blunt encomiums gave me even more pain than the benevolent approbation of M. Waldman." (Frankenstein, p.66) Krempe, speaking of his own youth, is said to have "commenced a eulogy on himself, which happily turned the conversation from a subject that was so annoying to me" (Frankenstein, p.66). The annoying subject is that of Victor's accomplishments, and includes Krempe's jest that if Victor "is not soon pulled down, we shall all be out of countenance" (Frankenstein, p.66). Victor seems to be "happy" about Krempe's change of topic on two counts. First, Krempe turns from a subject that points to Victor's sense of rivalry with the father (i.e. the need that Victor be "soon pulled down"). Second, Krempe turns to a "eulogy on himself", which is a subject that satisfies Victor's hostility towards father-figures.

On another level, the creature's gender points to another possible source of disappointment for Frankenstein. Although he sought to resurrect his lost Imaginary mother, he is not

even able to give her female form. He has already begun to identify with the Symbolic Order, in which, as Luce Irigaray argues, "a genuine feminine body is inconceivable: woman is either an inferior version of man, or she does not exist ("The Blind Spot of an Old Dream of Symmetry", p. 31. Quoted in "The Imaginary Mother", p. 249). The best that Frankenstein can do is create a reflection of himself that represents a regression to the mirror stage of the late Imaginary phase. Narcissistic mirroring is, as we shall see, a common way to empower the Imaginary self in Shelley's novel. However, instead of reflecting an image of potent self-sufficiency, the creature represents the meagreness of the individual's Imaginary identifications once they achieve reification within the Symbolic order. Frankenstein here resembles Lacan's portrait of the frustrated analysand, who, the more he or she attempts to body forth his or her Imaginary self in a way that will appear coherent to the analyst, the more insubstantial it seems:

> Does the subject not become engaged in an ever-growing dispossession of that being of his, concerning which -- by dint of sincere portraits which leave its idea no less incoherent, of rectifications that do not succeed in freeing its essence, of stays and defences that do not prevent his statue from tottering, of narcissistic embraces that become like a puff of air in animating it -- he ends up by recognizing that this being has never

been anything more than his construct in the Imaginary and that this construct disappoints all certainties.
(Ecrits, p. 42)

Similarly, Frankenstein realizes that his "being has never been anything more than his construct in the Imaginary" and that it can never acheive a viable existence within the Symbolic world. The creature is a kind of narcissistic "statue", or monument to the Imaginary self, that cannot help "tottering". Instead of empowering the Imaginary self, it merely embodies Frankenstein's longing for such empowerment. It desires a mate through whom it could become "linked to" a "chain of existence" (Frankenstein, p.127) at some remove from human civilization. Collings suggests that this separate order of existence would be "a systematic network of relation akin to the Symbolic order" ("The Monster and the Imaginary mother", p. 251). However, fearing that "she might become ten thousand times more malignant than her mate" and may produce "a race of devils" "who might make the very existence of the species of man a condition precarious and full of terror" (Frankenstein, p.140), Frankenstein enacts the Symbolic intolerance of the Imaginary mother by destroying the creature's mate. The result is that the creature dedicates itself to revenge. Though the creature is intended to bolster the Imaginary self, ultimately it merely reflects Frankenstein's resentment against Symbolic authority.

Frankenstein's scientific work is not the only indicator

of his resistance to entering the Symbolic order. It is also hinted at in his hesitation to marry Elizabeth. As has been frequently noted,[1] from a psychoanalytic point of view, Elizabeth represents the ideal object of desire. She resembles Victor's mother, and takes her place after she dies. She is also a marriage partner chosen by the parents. As a substitute for Frankenstein's mother that is sanctioned by his father, Elizabeth represents an ideal marriage partner. Marrying Elizabeth would provide Victor safe passage into the Symbolic order. Yet Victor has little interest in marrying Elizabeth. He is devoted to the memory of Elizabeth when the two of them "called each other familiarly by the name of cousin. No word, no expression could body forth the kind of relation which she stood to me -- my more than sister..." (Frankenstein, p.34). He prefers their relationship when it was unmediated and undefined by others. That is, he liked Elizabeth when she was a companion of the Imaginary realm, before she was promoted to the position of maternal substitute of the Symbolic order.[2] Victor's failure to accept Elizabeth as a substitute for his lost mother is demonstrated by his

1. See Colling's "The Monster and the Imaginary Mother", Kaplan and Kloss's "Fantasy of Paternity and the Doppleganger: Mary Shelley's Frankenstein", and Rubenstein's "My Accursed Origin': The Search for the Mother in Frankenstein"

2. In the 1818 text Elizabeth is the daughter of Victor's father's sister. As a female version of the Frankenstein line, Elizabeth is more clearly a part of Alphonse's sphere of influence. However, in the 1831 text the contrast is stronger between the unmediated intimacy of Victor and Elizabeth's relationship as children, and the Symbolic relation they later grow into.

nightmare, after the creature has come to life:

> I slept indeed, but I was disturbed by the wildest dreams. I thought I saw Elizabeth, in the bloom of health, walking in the streets of Ingolstadt. Delighted and surprised, I embraced her; but as I imprinted the first kiss on her lips, they became livid with the hue of death; her features appeared to change, and I thought that I held the corpse of my dead mother in my arms; a shroud enveloped her form, and I saw the grave-worms crawling in the folds of the flannel. I started from my sleep with horror; a cold dew covered my forehead, my teeth, and ever limb became convulsed; when, by the dim and yellow light of the moon, as it forced its way through the window shutters, I beheld the wretch--the miserable monster whom I had created...
>
> (Frankenstein, p.56)

Frankenstein's nightmare represents an unravelling of his Oedipus Complex. Elizabeth as sanctioned object of desire fails to divert Victor's libidinal investment in the forbidden image of his lost Imaginary mother. Because of his awareness of the father's prohibition, both his memory of the Imaginary mother and his attempts to resurrect her (i.e. his scientific research) appear hideous reflections of his transgressive desire. As Collings puts it, "Victor's search for a substitute mother does not take the normative Oedipal path. Typically, the son relinquishes his mother and desires a

person who resembles her" ("The Monster and the Imaginary Mother", p. 247). This is also the conclusion of other psychoanalytic accounts of Frankenstein.[1] Yet the cause of Victor's obstructed development is never made clear. Why can't Victor accept Elizabeth as a substitute for the mother? Why can't he resolve Oedipal tensions with the father? What compels him to attempt to recover the lost maternal body? Why, in the language of Great Expectations, does he cling to his "first fancies" and turn away from a "broad impression of the identity of things?" Some possible solutions are offered by examining more closely the novel's attitude toward the Romantic tendency to idealize childhood imagination. Later we will consider Mary Shelley's journals and other supporting material in an attempt to resolve some of these issues concerning Victor Frankenstein's development.

Robert Walton's desire for exploration is characterized in terms similar to Victor Frankenstein's scientific interests. Frankenstein's father's disapproval of his son's interests is reflected in Walton's father's "dying injunction...forbidding my uncle to allow me to embark on a seafaring life" (Frankenstein,p.14). Like Frankenstein, Walton is pursuing an image of himself as a pioneer. He hopes to

> satiate my ardent curiosity with the sight of a part of the world never before visited, and may tread a land

1. See William Veeder's "The Negative Oedipus: Father, Frankenstein, and the Shelleys"; Marc A. Rubenstein's "'My Accursed Origin': The Search for the Mother in Frankenstein"; and Kaplan and Kloss's "Fantasy of Paternity and the Doppleganger: Mary Shelley's Frankenstein."

> never before imprinted by the foot of man.
>
> (Frankenstein, p. 14)

Just as Frankenstein looks to the work of alchemists as a way of sidestepping his father's power, Walton seeks to discover a realm free of pre-existing authority. In Walton's case, it seems that the fanciful world of childhood, under the protection of his sister, met with no discouragement. In fact, Walton's sister is evidently complicit in his dream of achieving a sense of self free of antecedents. Walton hints at this understanding between them when he jokingly asks permission to place his confidence in the experiences of previous explorers. He writes, "... for with your leave, my sister, I will put some trust in preceding navigators...." (Frankenstein, p.14). Walton's devotion to the "first fancies" of childhood set him apart from the adult world that is represented by his crew members. His sensitivity to the coarse nature of his crew members is clearly linked to his idyllic childhood spent with his sister, to whom he complains that

> A youth passed in solitude, my best years spent under your gentle and feminine fosterage, has so refined the groundwork of my character, that I cannot overcome an intense distaste to the usual brutality exercised on board ship. (Frankenstein, p.18)

Pip's story echoes Walton's upbringing and subsequent sensitivity to the ill behaviour of those around him. Pip's relationship with his sister who "brought him up by hand"

functions as a parody of Walton's sister's "gentle and feminine fosterage." Unlike Walton's sister, who seems to encourage Walton's opposition to the world of male authority, Mrs. Joe is, as we have already noted, positioned as a grudging stand-in for this world.

Among Walton's crew members, there is only one individual who does not earn his wholehearted contempt. Robert's attitude toward the master is similar to Pip's feelings toward Joe. Despite Walton's respect for the master's "gentleness" and honourable behaviour, he nevertheless objects to his lack of social graces:

> "What a noble fellow" you will exclaim. He is so but then he is so wholly uneducated: he is as silent as a Turk, and a kind of ignorant carelessness attends him, which, while it renders his conduct the more astonishing, detracts from the interest and sympathy which otherwise he would command. (Frankenstein, p.19)

Walton's admiration for the master's "gentleness" and loyalty, mixed with distaste for the man's "ignorant carelessness" match Pip's later ambivalence towards Joe. However, there is an important difference here between Walton and Pip. Walton's disdain is associated with his sheltered upbringing, in which the childhood self and its fancies were nurtured. The special circumstances of his upbringing have made him both egotistical and oversensitive. Pip's condescension toward Joe is associated, not with the wildly imaginative child we meet at the

start of the novel, but with a young man who has internalized a sense of the class divisions of the adult world. This difference between Walton and Pip points to a major disparity between Frankenstein and Great Expectations. In Dickens' novels, a character's virtue may be measured by his or her proximity to a child-like view of the world. Any attempt to regulate a child's imagination is always presented as a great evil. Pip's sense of superiority over Joe is a byproduct of a process that increasingly stifles his childhood sense of self. The shame Pip feels towards his childhood self comes to include disdain for Joe's child-like manner. This process begins with Magwitch's demand for silence ("hold your noise") and is continued with the help of virtually all the adults in Pip's life. We shall consider this process in greater detail after an examination of the issue of the regulation of childhood imagination in Frankenstein.

In Frankenstein, childhood imagination is presented in less idealized terms. As already noted, Walton's inability to merge with adult society is due to an upbringing in which his imagination knew no constraints. The result of this unstructured childhood, according to Walton, is that

> I am twenty-eight, and am in reality more illiterate than many schoolboys of fifteen. It is true that I have thought more, and that my day dreams are more extended and magnificent; but they want (as the painters call it) keeping; and I greatly need a friend who would have sense

enough not to despise me as a romantic, and affection enough for me to endeavour to regulate my mind. (Frankenstein, p.18)

Frankenstein similarly blames his unhappy life on his inability to free himself from ideas born of childhood imagination. The contemporary scientific explanations of electricity and galvanism which Frankenstein learned as a teenager caused him to doubt briefly the wisdom of his ancient books. As an adult, he views this

> almost miraculous change of inclination and will [as if it were] the immediate suggestion of the guardian angel of my life -- the last effort made by the spirit of preservation to avert the storm that was even then hanging in the stars, and ready to envelop me. Her victory was announced by an unusual tranquillity and gladness of the soul, which followed the relinquishing of my ancient and latterly tormenting studies. It was thus that I was to be taught to associate evil with their prosecution, happiness with their disregard. (Frankenstein, p.40)

A little earlier in the text, Victor singles out for blame, not the insufficient influence of "the guardian angel of my life", but his father for his inability to free himself of the destructive ideas of his childhood. When his father calls his ideas "sad trash" Victor objects not to the fact that his father sought to discourage his interests, but that he did so

in a way that proved ineffective:

> If, instead of this remark, my father had taken pains to explain to me, that the principles of Agrippa had been entirely exploded, and that a modern system of science had been introduced, which possessed much greater powers than the ancient, because the powers of the latter were chimerical, while those of the former were real and practical; under such circumstances, I should certainly have thrown Agrippa aside, and have contented my imagination, warmed as it was, by returning with greater ardour to my former studies. It is even possible, that the train of my ideas would never have received the fatal impulse that led to my ruin. But the cursory glance my father had taken of my volume by no means assured me that he was acquainted with its contents; and I continued to read with the greatest avidity. (Frankenstein, p. 37)

It must be noted that, as Veeder points out, Frankenstein's reading of his father's unkind manner is somewhat problematic. Veeder accuses critics of granting Victor's narration too much reliability and ignoring what the text is telling us. Veeder argues that Victor's sense of Alphonse as a cruel and vengeful father is not really the impression conveyed by the text. Frankenstein's complaint about Alphonse's rough dismissal of Agripppa as "sad trash" is out of proportion to the moment. In the 1818 version, Alphonse Frankenstein indulges his son's interest in electricity, but nevertheless is subsequently

blamed for this, even though Alphonse Frankenstein behaves in the way Victor wished he had in the episode where Alphonse dismissed Agrippa. It would seem it is Victor Frankenstein, not Mary Shelley, attempting to depict Alphonse as a bad father. ("The Shelleys", p. 375)

Although Frankenstein struggles to justify his rejection of his father's authority, he nevertheless feels his life requires external control. Like Walton, who feels his mind needs "keeping", Frankenstein, as we have seen, blames his father for providing insufficiently rigorous counsel, and speaks in terms of a "guardian angel" whose guidance he has "disregarded". Though adults, Frankenstein and Walton are like wayward children who believe themselves in need of "regulation."

In lieu of identification with paternal authority, both Walton and Frankenstein seek a companion in whom they may see the reflection of the self-authorizing, self-chastening ideal self of the Imaginary realm. Walton expresses his longing for,

> a friend who would have sense enough not to despise me as romantic, and affection enough for me to endeavour to regulate my mind (Frankenstein, p. 18).

Walton despairs that such a friend can be found among his crew, but feels that Victor is precisely the companion he has been waiting for. Unfortunately for Walton, Frankenstein already has such a companion in Henry Clerval. Clerval is a superior object of narcissistic mirroring because, unlike both

Walton and Frankenstein, he does not require external control. Henry's "wild and enthusiastic imagination" is "chastened by the sensibility of his heart"(Frankenstein, p. 151). He seems to enjoy a more secure identification with the Imaginary self. Veeder has pointed out that Henry's father, who at first forbids Henry to attend university, is a far more convincing image of the tyrannical father of the Oedipus Complex than is Alphonse Frankenstein (Frankenstein, p.378). Yet Henry reacts to his father's prohibitions with an admirably "restrained but firm resolve, not to be chained to the miserable details of commerce" (Frankenstein, p. 43). For Victor, Henry represents "an image of my former self" (Frankenstein, p. 153). In Henry, Victor sees a reflection of the early Imaginary self, when the paternal threat had not yet wholly undermined the potency of the Imaginary self.

Henry Clerval's chief role in Frankenstein stems from his embodiment of Romantic ideals. He is little more than a dresser's dummy for Wordsworthian notions of the virtues of remaining true to childhood, nature and poetry. The text goes so far as to quote a section of "Tintern Abbey" in order to identify him as the Wordsworthian child of nature par excellance. Victor is similarly interested in nature and true to his childhood self; yet in his case, both of these characteristics take on a sinister aspect. While Henry "loved with ardor" "the scenery of external nature" (Frankenstein, p. 151), Victor, "with unrelaxed and breathless eagerness,

pursued nature to her hiding-places" (Frankenstein, p.52). Henry is like the boy in the quoted passage of "Tintern Abbey" (quoted in Frankenstein, p. 151) for whom nature "had no need of a remoter charm,/By thought supplied, or any interest/ Unborrow'd from the eye." Next to this contentment with the surface aspect of nature, Victor's need to discover its inner workings seems perverse. When compared with Henry, Victor is revealed to be far from the virtuous "child of nature" that his friend is.

The one characteristic that Frankenstein does not share with Henry is an interest in poetry. Walton strove to be a poet and "for one year lived in a Paradise of my own creation..."(Frankenstein, p.14). Walton loses his place in this ideal Imaginary world when he realizes he is a bad poet. He ultimately experienced "failure" and "disappointment" (Frankenstein, p.14) and his "thoughts turned into the channel of their earlier bent" (Frankenstein, p.14). There seems to be an important distinction in Shelley's novel between a scientific and an artistic or poetic approach to life. As Laura Crouch suggests, "Frankenstein's life seems to suggest that if science is really going to improve the world, the scientist must have a bit of the poet in him" (quoted in Making Monstrous, p. 167). However, there is some critical disagreement concerning the relationship between arts and sciences in Frankenstein which we will have to consider before we proceed. There are certain critics, notably Fred Botting,

who argue that it is a mistake to impose what he believes are twentieth-century distinctions between the two categories on the nineteenth-century. Botting argues that

> The gulf which now conventionally separates science and humanism, however, may not have been so visible or clearly delineated around the time of Frankenstein's composition. (Making Monstrous, p.168)

Botting notes that both Shelley and Godwin were keenly interested in science. He quotes a passage from Enquiry Concerning Political Justice in which Godwin states, "few works of literature are held to be of more general use than those which treat in a methodical and elementary way the principles of science" (Making Monstrous, p. 170). Botting interprets this to mean that for Godwin science was not to be separated from other works of human thought. Science and the arts strive toward the same human truths. Botting also refers to the work of Ernest de Selincourt which presents Wordsworth

> as another literary figure keenly in favour of science, and admirer of Newton in particular: 'the poet and the man of science were to him "twin labourers, and heirs of the same hopes'". (Making Monstrous, p. 167)

Botting concludes that

> Science, then, is considered in the period, not in opposition to literature and human values, but as a powerful force linked with the aspirations and fortunes of enlightened human progress (Making Monstrous, p.168).

Botting's argument is problematic in a number of ways. To assume that Mary Shelley's views would be the same as Godwin's or Percy Shelley's seems foolhardy in the light of critical work that reads Frankenstein as a reaction against the philosophical beliefs of those individuals (more about that later). More fundamentally, Botting demonstrates a poor grasp of these individuals' view of science. Percy Shelley felt that "Poetry...is at once the centre and circumference of knowledge; it is that to which all science must be referred" (Dale, p. 33). Here poetry is positioned as a larger context in which science must find its ultimate significance. Shelley's view is closely related to Wordsworth's. Botting's major error lies in not being attuned to the regulatory effect Wordsworth felt "the poet" was to have on "the man of science." When we look to Wordsworth's "Preface to Lyrical Ballads", we find that the distinction between the poet and the scientist is drawn in very clear terms. For Wordsworth

> the knowledge of the [poet] cleaves to us as a necessary part of our existence, our natural and unalienable inheritance; the other [that of the scientist] is a personal and individual acquisition, slow to come to us, and by no habitual and direct sympathy connecting us with our fellow-beings. The man of science seeks truth as remote and unknown benefactor; he cherishes and loves it in his solitude: the poet, singing a song in which all human beings join with him, rejoices

in the presence of truth as our visible friend and hourly companion. Poetry is the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge; it is the impassioned expression which is in the countenance of all science....In spite of difference of soil and climate, of language and manners, of laws and customs, in spite of things silently gone out of mind and things violently destroyed, the poet binds together by passion and knowledge the vast empire of human society, as it is spread over the whole earth, and over all time...

If the time should ever come when what is now called science, thus familiarized to men, shall be ready to put on, as it were, a form of flesh and blood, the poet will lend his divine spirit to aid the transfiguration, and will welcome the being thus produced, as a dear and genuine inmate of the household of man.

("Preface to Lyrical Ballads", pp. 76-77)

Wordsworth here describes the process by which scientific thought and innovation finds a meaningful place within the lives of ordinary people. According to him, this process depends on the work of poets to provide a meaningful context within which human society may relate to science. Poets will bring science to life and find a place for it in the "household of man."

Frankenstein clearly draws on Wordsworth's ideas. The nature of Walton's and Frankenstein's work is such that they

can only "cherish and love it in [their] solitude". Frankenstein's scientific pursuits are conducted without thought to society as a whole. The result of his work is a murderous creature who, after being driven from the DeLaceys' cottage, feels bitterly alienated from the "household of man."

Yet neither science nor, for that matter, childhood imagination is the ultimate target of Frankenstein's critique. As Warren Montag, ("'The Workshop of Filthy Creation'", p. 309) among others, points out, there is very little scientific detail in the book. Ostensibly, Frankenstein is careful to leave precise scientific detail out of his account in order that Walton not be tempted to follow in his footsteps. We also find that some science is presented as benign. Science as practised by Professor Waldman and the "man of great research in natural philosophy" that "threw greatly into the shade Cornelius Agrippa, Albertus Magnus, and Paracelsus" (Frankenstein, p. 16) is set apart from Frankenstein's destructive pursuits. To further complicate the issue, the text makes much of the distinction between the outdated theories of alchemy and modern scientific practices. Frankenstein's early interest in alchemy in preference to the sanctioned practices of modern science seems to serve primarily as an indicator of his resistance to Symbolic forces. However, the separation between good and bad science suggests that it is probably a mistake to view the novel as a sweeping attack on the scientific mind.

As for <u>Frankenstein</u>'s views on childhood imagination, Henry Clerval's child-like wonder persisting in adulthood is endorsed by the text. It seems that neither the persistence of childhood imagination nor scientific ambition can of themselves be blamed for Victor Frankenstein's problems. The closest the text seems to come to explaining the cause of Frankenstein's dilemma is to suggest that he lacks the self-regulation of which Henry Clerval is capable. Early on in the novel, Frankenstein blames the immoderation of his pursuits for his unhappiness:

> A human being in perfection ought always to preserve a calm and peaceful mind, and never allow passion or a transitory desire to disturb his tranquility. I do not think that the pursuit of knowledge is an exception to this rule. If the study to which you apply yourself has a tendency to weaken your affections, and to destroy your taste for those simple pleasures in which no alloy can possibly mix, then that study is certainly unlawful, that is to say, not befitting the human mind. If this rule were always observed; if no man allowed any pursuit whatsoever to interfere with the tranquility of his domestic affections, Greece had not been enslaved; Caesar would have spared his country; America would have been discovered more gradually; and the empires of Mexico and Peru had not been destroyed. (<u>Frankenstein</u>, p. 57)

Consistent with the nature of these human endeavours, the

birth of the creature is a goal which Frankenstein "desired with an ardour that far exceeded moderation" (Frankenstein, p. 58). The novel's ideas concerning the dangers of "any pursuit whatsoever [that] interferes with the tranquility of [a person's] domestic affections" find elaboration in the use of the word "glory". Walton, pursues "glory" at the cost of a comfortable life:

> My life might have been passed in ease and luxury; but I preferred glory to every enticement that wealth placed in my path. (Frankenstein, p. 15)

Victor similarly states that

> Wealth was an inferior object; but what glory would attend the discovery, if I could banish disease from the human frame, and render man invulnerable to any but a violent death! (Frankenstein, p. 39)

At the end of the novel, despite the regrets he expresses to Robert concerning his life's work, Victor inadvertently reveals that the original impulse that set him on his way is still very much alive. As we have noted, Walton's explorations also represent a destructive assertion of the Imaginary self. When Walton's crew become discouraged from their goal by inclement weather, Victor seems to take a strong interest in the continuation of their expedition, urging the crew not to abandon their "glorious explorations" (Frankenstein, p. 207).

Walton and Frankenstein's prime objective is to achieve a personal sense of "glory". Perhaps to highlight their

egocentricism, the text offers the possibility of other, less self-involved, ways in which their potential achievements could be viewed. Even if he fails to find a region of warmth at the North Pole, Walton's mission holds the potential consolation of more mundane achievements:

> But, supposing all these conjectures to be false, you cannot contest the inestimable benefit which I shall confer on all mankind to the last generation, by discovering a passage near the pole to those countries, to reach which at present so many months are requisite...
>
> (Frankenstein, p. 14)

These benefits to "all mankind" are only of secondary interest to Robert, who is primarily interested in seeking "undiscovered solitudes" (Frankenstein, p.14). We find that Victor's wish to "banish disease from the human frame and render man invulnerable to any but a violent death" (Frankenstein, p. 39) is similarly put aside once his scientific work begins. What is significant here is that the pursuit of these socially beneficial goals would represent identification with a larger social context. The pursuit of "glory", however, enhances their sense of isolation.

The creature's narrative provides further clarification of what a quest for "glory" means in Frankenstein. A reading of "Plutarch's Lives" leads the creature to "admire peaceable lawgivers" (Frankenstein, p. 124). The influences of his reading and of the harmonious life of the DeLaceys complement

one another. The creature claims that the cottagers' "patriarchal lives" "caused these impressions to take a firm hold on my mind" (Frankenstein, p.124). The creature's respect for the "law givers" of the past, and for "patriarchal lives" stands in marked contrast to Robert's and Victor's hostility to the law of the father. The creature is able to imagine the possibility of a very different world-view, had its "first introduction to humanity been made by a young soldier, burning for glory and slaughter." (Frankenstein, p. 125) The creature understands a destructive desire for "glory" in opposition to identification with the patriarchy.

In order to appreciate the full significance of this quest for glory, we need to turn to Mary Shelley's journal. In an entry dated October 21, 1838, she writes,

> Some have a passion for reforming the world; others do not cling to particular opinions. That my parents and Shelley were of the former class, makes me respect it [...] For myself, I earnestly, I earnestly desire the good and enlightenment of my fellow creatures, and see all, in the present course, tending to the same, and rejoice; but I am not for violent extremes, which only brings on an injurious reaction [...]
>
> To hang back, as I do, brings a penalty. I was nursed and fed with a love of glory. To be something great and good was the precept give my by my father; Shelley reiterated it [...] But Shelley died, and I was

> alone [...] My total friendless-ness, my horror of pushing, and inability to put myself forward unless led, cherished and supported--all this has sunk me in a state of loneliness no other human being ever before, I believed, endured -- except Robinson Crusoe [...]
> (Mary Shelley's Journal, p. 172)

"Glory" is clearly a word associated with the aspirations manifested in the activities of Percy Shelley and her parents. Mary distances herself from their system of values, unable to accept its "violent extremes." As previously noted, Wordsworth believed that the poetic impulse provided restraint and a meaningful context in which life may lived in opposition to the self-isolating and destructive scientific impulse. Percy, as we saw, seemed to agree with this view. Yet, in Frankenstein, Mary Shelley seems to have aligned Romantic notions of selfhood with Victor Frankenstein's destructive scientific will. That is, Mary Shelley joins together Wordsworth's cult of childhood imagination with a metaphor of extremism borrowed from his critique of the scientific mind to express her anxieties over the extreme quest for Romantic "glory". In order to see this point more clearly it is useful to compare the story Frankenstein tells Robert Walton to a section of Wordsworth's The Prelude:

> And here, O Friend! have I retraced my life
> Up to an eminence, and told a tale
> Of matters which not falsely may be called

The glory of my youth. Of genius, power
Creation and divinity itself
I have been speaking, for my theme has been
What passed within me. Not of outward things
Done visibly for other minds, words, signs,
Symbols or actions, but of my own heart
Have I been speaking, and my youthful mind.

(The Prelude, Book Third, 170-79)

Frankenstein's story certainly deals with the "glory of my youth". He, like Robert, followed the fantasies of his "youthful mind." As a creator of life, Victor's is certainly a "tale" dealing with "genius, power/Creation and divinity itself". Furthermore, Victor and Robert shun "outward things", and the authority of "other minds" in order to pursue the impulses that "passed within me." Yet for Victor the consequences of turning away from "outward things" have been disastrous. For Frankenstein, continued identification with the "glory of youth" means that he fails to outgrow his role of son. He suffers Oedipal tensions with a series of father-figures. A rejection of "outward things" in favour of "what passed within me" leads him to fail to identify with an idealized version of Romanticism as embodied by Henry and into the solipsistic isolation of his relationship with his creature.

As we have seen, Walton's explorations also betray an impulse for a destructive personal "glory". But Walton also

embodies Mary Shelley's place in her relationship with Percy Shelley and the other powerful figures in her life. Walton's role as the narrator of Frankenstein's life reflects an aspect of Mary Shelley's relationship to Percy. Just as Percy Shelley exercised editorial authority over the text of Frankenstein, Frankenstein "corrected and augmented [Walton's notes] in many places..." (Frankenstein, p. 203).

As we have seen, there is evidence that under his sister's care, Robert Walton, like Mary Shelley, was "nursed and fed with a love of glory." We also find a hint of Shelley's "horror of pushing" in Walton's distaste for his "lieutenant, for instance, [who] is a man of wonderful courage and enterprise; [...] madly desirous of glory: or rather, to word my phrase more character-istically, of advancement in his profession" (Frankenstein, p. 18). There is also a suggestion of Mary Shelley's need to be "cherished and supported" in Walton's desire for "a friend who would have sense enough not to despise me as romantic, and affection enough for me to endeavour to regulate my mind" (Frankenstein, p. 19). Walton thus represents aspects of both Percy and Mary Shelley; both the impulse for Romantic "glory" and the consequence of being raised in its shadow. These two roles are also expressed through Frankenstein's relationship with his creature. The irony of Victor's act of creation is that he succeeds only in duplicating his own dilemma in another being. His attempts to recover the mother and usurp the father's authority result

only in creating a creature who embodies his longing for a lost mate and his resentment toward the Symbolic Order.

CHAPTER THREE:

CHILDHOOD IN *GREAT EXPECTATIONS*

In Frankenstein, we found that Robert Walton's and Victor Frankenstein's allegiance to childhood imagination interfered with their ability as adults to form healthy emotional connections with those around them. Both Robert and Victor forsake domestic happiness in order to pursue boyhood fantasies. In Dickens' novels, on the contrary, a child-like imagination is the agency by which meaningful human relations can be nurtured under difficult circumstances. In his ability to enrich his meagre life with an imaginative reading of his family's tombstones, Pip is similar to Lizzie Hexam in Our Mutual Friend, who reads the future in the flames of the fireplace. She imagines a better future, freed from the limitations of low origins, not for herself, but for her brother Charlie. In this respect, Dickens follows the Romantic notion, propounded by William Hazlitt, that the faculty of imagination allows us to identify and sympathize with others (The Uses of Time, p. 101). Charlie Hexam's later selfishness is an illustration of the corollary situation. Though he proves to be willful, he lacks both the imagination to have envisioned his future without Lizzie's help and any feeling of loyalty to his sister. Forest Pyle identifies a similar link between imagination and sympathy in Wordsworth's The Prelude:

> If the Imagination is both "theme" and "feeding source" of the The Prelude, and if the imagination must withdraw from the "o'erpressure of the times," the "way" of

> the imagination --the course of its enshrinement -- ultimately leads from the "element of the nature's innner self" to "love of humankind" (1805, V111. 514, 518). As it is narrated in The Prelude, "love of humankind" is "another name" for "sympathy," a term that identifies the imagination's spiritual as well as social capacity as Wordsworth inherited and developed it. Sympathy, as James Engell summarizes it, is "the special power of the imagination which permits the self to escape its own confines" and to establish genuine intersubjectivity; sympathy could thus "be considered the cohesive force behind the organic view of the universe". At the level of society, sympathy is the "cohesive force" that underwrites organic notion of community.
>
> (The Idealogy of Imagination, pp. 61-2)

In Great Expectations, Joe illustrates a clear connection between a child-like perspective and the ability to sympathize with another's predicament. When Magwitch confesses to having stolen the pork pie, Joe responds, "we don't know what you have done, but we wouldn't have you starved to death for it, poor miserable fellow-creature. Would us, Pip?" (Expectations, p.35). Joe's reaction is in marked contrast to the cruelty Magwitch is accustomed to. Joe's child-like perspective is the standard of virtue by which all other characters are measured. Later in the novel, Pip's moral progress reaches its height when he learns to share Joe's compassionate view of Magwitch.

Pip also illustrates this connection between imagination and sympathy early in his dealings with Magwitch. It is important to recognize the complexity of Pip's first reaction to Magwitch since it is implicated in his later psychological development. When Magwitch suddenly appears on the scene and interrupts Pip's revery, the boy's active mind creates a confusing impression of the man. Despite his dread of the "fearful man" who "glared, and growled" he nevertheless notices that Magwitch is

> a man who had been soaked in water, and smothered in mud, and lamed by stones, and cut by flints, and stung by nettles, and torn by briars; who limped and shivered...(Expectations, p.2)

Although Pip begins by viewing the convict as a menacing assailant, he also recognizes that the man himself has been a victim of considerable misfortune. In Pip's mind Magwitch is a confusing mix of aggressor and victim. In fact, Pip seems to find something of his own unhappiness reflected in Magwitch. Pip underscores the identification between the two by applying similar descriptions to both. Pip is a "bundle of shivers" while Magwitch similarly "shivered" (p. 2). The impression of Pip's identification with Magwitch is strengthened by this scene's echoes of King Lear. Anny Sadrin observes this connection with Shakespeare's play when she calls Pip, "a king without a kingdom, as helpless as Lear on the heath..." (Parentage and Inheritance in the Novels of Charles Dickens,

p.97). Pip shares not only Lear's helplessness, but also his identification with "wretches." Lear's predicament causes him to declare his sympathy for

> Poor naked wretches, whereso'er you are,
> That bide the pelting of this pitiless storm,
> How shall your houseless heads and unfed sides,
> Your looped and windowed raggedness, defend you
> From seasons such as these? O, I have ta'en
> Too little care of this! Take physic, pomp;
> Expose thyself to feel what wretches feel,
> That thou mayst shake the superflux to them
> And show the heavens more just. (King Lear, 3.4 28-36)

After Magwitch is caught, Pip similarly looks at the stars and sympathetically imagines how "awful it would be for a man to turn his face up to them as he froze to death, and see no help or pity in all the glittering multitude" (Expectations, p.45). Elsewhere, Kent refers to the storm as "The wrathful skies [that]/ Gallow the very wanderers of the dark" (Lear, 3.2 43-44). This image is similar to Pip's impression that Magwitch was a "pirate come to life, and come down, and going back to hook himself up again" (Expectations, p.5) to a gibbet. These echoes of Lear's sympathy for "wretches" are salient to the critical controversy about Pip's initial impression of Magwitch, a controversy fueled by a tendency to seek an overly reductive reading of Magwitch's first appearance in the text.

Most critics cast Magwitch in the role of a father-figure of some sort. Peter Ackroyd notes that Dickens harboured an irrational fear that his father's corpse would rise from the garden (Dickens, p. 3). Others have also read biographical details into Magwitch. Brooks-Davies argues that the "demanding aspect of Magwitch is, as it were, Dickens's father John in his role of constantly impecunious and demanding beggar, dunning his son for everything he can get from him" (quoted in Charles Dickens: The Major Novels, p. 124). To argue that Magwitch may have been associated with the beggarly John Dickens in Charles Dickens' mind is to lose sight of the complexity of Pip's first impression of Magwitch. There is no question that Magwitch is needy and manipulative, but Pip's reaction is fear and pity, neither of which would seem to accord with the contempt and anger one might feel towards a parent eager to "dun his son for everything he can get from him." Central to this debate is the question of what motivates Pip to comply with Magwitch's wishes. Rawlins summarizes the controversy as follows:

> Some see him motivated, as I do, by charity; others see him motivated by fear. It hardly matters, since fear equals self-preservation and charity is a recognition of the communal self one shares with others. Pip is acting rightly, either in terms of morality or in terms of the ego. ("The Betrayal of the Child", p.96, note 7.)

This debate misses the primary significance of Pip's first

encounter with Magwitch, which is that it is a profoundly confusing moment, made up of both fear and identification.

At this point, we must return to a Lacanian framework for Pip's development. Steven Connor has performed an extensive Lacanian reading of Pip's initial encounter with Magwitch. Connor's reading is extremely insightful, but it too proves to be overly reductive in its insistence on a narrowly psychoanalytic definition of Magwitch as father-figure. Connor sees the entire opening sequence of Great Expectations as an allegory of the individual's passage from the Imaginary to the Symbolic. He argues that

> For Lacan, the entry into the Symbolic order is hardly to be achieved without some violence to the infant, a violence inflicted by the father with his prohibition of the desire for the mother backed up by the imagined threat of castration, as well as by the splitting or distancing effect of language itself, and this violence is also to be found in the opening pages of Great Expectations, where Pip's sudden access to self awareness is accompanied by the command, uttered by a terrible and unidentifiable voice, of "hold your noise!"....Having silenced Pip, Magwitch immediately demands that Pip "give mouth" to his name, and this curious sequence makes a striking association between language and prohibition. Pip no sooner comes into possession of his name than he is forced to give it up. For Lacan, too, the coming

> awareness of the Symbolic order involves an unconscious awareness of the prohibition implicitly contained in the father's name, the `nom-du-pere,' which is also a `non-du-pere'....In the case of Magwitch, Pip's surrogate father, the name `Magwitch' remains hidden for most of the narrative. (Charles Dickens, pp.116-7)

Connor's reading is problematic in a number of ways. He begins by claiming that the opening of Great Expectations enacts a paternal violence that is partly defined as a "prohibition of the desire for the mother backed up by the imagined threat of castration." This prohibition is in no way enacted by Magwitch's presence. Much later in the novel, once Pip has arrived in London, such a prohibition is enacted by a more obvious representative of the Symbolic order. Jaggers forbids Pip to inquire about Miss Havisham's role in his new life. Jaggers' rule lends itself to being read as the paternal injunction against desire for the mother much more readily than Magwitch's threats at the beginning of the novel.

We need also to note that the nom-du-pere is not something that exerts power by "remain[ing] hidden for most of the narrative" as Connors observes Magwitch's name does. To "remain hidden" is to suggest repressed material. The nom-du-pere has no cause to be repressed, since it is itself the agent of repression.

In addition to these problems, there is also the issue of Magwitch's status of escaped convict pursued by the police. An

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI

Here Magwitch is not a ghoul risen from his grave, but is himself in danger of being seized by the dead.

Although Magwitch is not an agent of the Symbolic order, Connor is correct in noting that Magwitch disturbs Pip's Imaginary view of the world. Prior to Magwitch's appearance, Pip, though unhappy and isolated, possessed an imaginative self-sufficiency. That is, he was able to create an idiosyncratic reading of the world around him that was fanciful but coherent. In a profoundly disorienting moment, Magwitch disrupts Pip's understanding of the world to such an extent that he no longer is able to make sense of his surroundings. This disruption is symbolized by Pip being turned upside down by Magwitch so that "he made [the church] go head over heels before me, and I saw the steeple under my feet --"(Expectations, p. 2). This inability to "read" his encounter with Magwitch coherently causes an abrupt shift in Pip's sense of self and its relation to the world. In order to understand this moment in the text we must broaden our use of Lacan's theory. The problem with Connor's analysis is that it limits itself to two of Lacan's concepts, the Imaginary and the Symbolic, without considering the third Lacanian register, that of the Real. François Peraldi describes the Real in these terms:

> Something suddenly emerges that at first has no name, for the subject is confronted with the unthinkable, with the real....Confronted with the unbearable aspect of the

nonrepresentable and nonsymbolized real, the subject can either escape in the imaginary world (the only possible escape for a psychotic subject) or can symbolize what at first glance appeared as a nameless `Thing'.

(The Purloined Poe, p.341)

Initially, Magwitch appears to Pip as a bewildering, undefinable and "nameless 'Thing'". Pip's first response is to recede further into the Imaginary. Although his response is not psychotic, he nevertheless takes the fanciful view that Magwitch is a pirate who is going to re-hang himself.

Frankenstein's nameless creature is also a manifestation of the Real insofar as it threatens the coherence of both the Imaginary and the Symbolic. Frankenstein's scientific work at the university seems like an institutionally sanctioned way to pursue the Imaginary mother, but when the creature comes to life Victor is horrified. The Imaginary mother cannot be recovered once one has entered the domain of the Symbolic, and neither could such clear evidence of transgressive desire appear as anything but monstrous. For Victor, the Real is a glimpse of the true nature of his scientific work. Of course, this is only one of numerous ways of interpreting the creature's significance. Over its years of critical attention, the creature has provoked myriad readings.[1] The creature has proven to be a somewhat unruly literary entity. The most per-

1.Critics have cast the creature in many roles, including mother (Marc A. Rubenstein), father (Kaplan and Kloss), sister (Liela Sivana May), and the proletariat (Warren Montag), to name a few.

suasive readings of it tend to avoid limiting its significance to a single symbol, since definitive readings are usually reductive. In this respect the creature has functioned as a manifestation of the difficult-to-Symbolize Real.

Victor's reaction to the creature is complex in the confusing mixture of disgust, fear, and pity, resembling what Pip feels toward Magwitch.[1] Although Victor's dread and fear predominate in the published versions of the novel, in Shelley's early manuscripts there is a more pronounced undercurrent of his compassion toward the creature. As we shall see, some of the later changes in wording that served to dampen the impression of Frankenstein's sympathy were made in Percy Shelley's hand,[2] while others were made by Mary Shelley herself. Nevertheless, we have cause to suspect P.B.'s influence at play here. In one instance, Shelley had originally had Frankenstein describe his decision to listen to the monster's tale as follows:

> I weighed the various arguments which he had used and I felt inclined to listen to his tale -- I was partly urged by curiosity, and compassion confirmed me.
>
> (Frankenstein p. 97.3)

P.B. changed "inclined" to "determined at Least." "Inclined"

1. In the following discussion, citations refer to James Reiger's edition of the 1818 text. Page and line numbers refer both to the published version of the text, as well as to the approximate place of the unpublished section under discussion.

2. For the sake of clarity, P.B. will refer to Percy Bysshe Shelley, and Shelley to Mary Shelley.

seems to imply that Frankenstein is drawn to the monster in some way. Compassion, rather than curiosity, seems to be the stronger motive here. P.B.'s word, "determined", suggests overcoming one's revulsion, or doing something that is distasteful out of a sense of obligation. The notion of sympathy has been eliminated from the line. Perhaps following Percy Shelley's lead, Mary Shelley makes similar modifications to this section. The originally milder "these motives urged me to comply with his request", Mary changes to "these motives urged me to comply with his demand"(Frankenstein, 97.10). The word "request", which suggested a degree of civility, has been changed to an emphatic "demand."

Slightly later in the original manuscript, Frankenstein says, "But I consented to listen and seating myself by the fire which he lighted he thus began his tale" (Frankenstein, 97.14). There is a domestic intimacy evoked by this image of Victor sitting placidly by the fire which his creature makes for him. Shelley eliminated this impression by changing the line to "by the fire my odious companion had lighted". The sense of domestic intimacy has been counteracted in two ways. She has inserted Frankenstein's feelings of disgust with his "odious companion." She has also changed the construction of "and seating myself by the fire which he lighted" to "had lighted". The original described consecutive actions (first he sits, and then the creature lights the fire) which served to draw out this originally domestic moment and drew attention to

the creature's act of building the fire explicitly for Frankenstein. The changed version places the act of lighting the fire further in the past -- "which he lighted" to "had lighted" -- and eliminates the sense of drawn-out consecutive action, as well as obscuring the creature's act of lighting the fire as a service performed especially for Frankenstein. Elsewhere we find that Shelley has lessened Frankenstein's compassion for the creature in her change from "placed his [the creature's] abhorred hands before my eyes" to "placed his hated hands before my eyes" (Frankenstein, 96.23). "Hated" seems much stronger here. "Abhorred" suggests something merely disgusting, and leaves room for compassion. "Hated" seems closer to an unequivocal rejection of the creature. Nevertheless, even in the published versions Frankenstein, reacts with "compassion" for (Frankenstein, 97.3), as well as dread of, the monster.

Frankenstein's experience with the Real leads him to delve ever deeper into Imaginary solitude in which he is pursued by his creature. Similarly, Pip's Imaginary perspective comes to include the threat of Magwitch's "young man [who] has a secret way pecooliar to himself of getting at a boy, and at his heart, and at his liver"(Expectations, p.4). What is significant here is that he has begun to defer to a view of the world that is derived from the imagination of other people. The self-sufficient world of Pip's imagination has been shattered.

Ultimately, Pip begins to "symbolize what at first glance appeared as a nameless 'Thing'". In order to make sense of his encounter with Magwitch, Pip defers to Mrs. Joe's view of the world. As we have previously discovered, Mrs. Joe is a self-elected representative of the Symbolic order. Her role is to bring about the repression of both the Real and the Imaginary in favour of the abstractions of the Symbolic order. Mrs. Joe's response to Pip's inquiries is to discourage the natural inquisitiveness and perspicacity of childhood. Mrs. Joe explains that

> People are put in the Hulks because they murder, and because they rob, and forge, and do all sorts of bad; and they always begin by asking questions.
>
> (Expectations, p. 12)

The wickedness which Mrs. Joe feels is a natural condition of childhood becomes intertwined with Pip's newly learned sense of Magwitch's criminality. Of course, Mrs. Joe is not the only one who holds this view of childhood. As Rawlins points out, virtually all of the adults in Pip's life "encourage Pip to cultivate a sense of original sin; they know he's guilty, because he's a boy -- they're just waiting for the crime to be manifested" ("Betrayal", p. 84). Such is the climate of Pip's childhood, that as Rawlins notes, "when he hears George Barnwell's history, he feels somehow responsible for the murder" ("Betrayal", p.84).

Under his sister's influence, Pip's initial feelings of

sympathy for Magwitch now become a further source of self-alienating guilt. In a moment that both identifies Pip with convicts, as well as makes clear to him the forbidden nature of the subject, Joe silently mouths an explanation of what a convict is. Pip understands only the last word of this explanation: "Pip" (Expectations, p. 11).

The measure of Mrs. Joe's success in initiating Pip to the Symbolic order can be seen in the change that his perspective undergoes between his first and second meeting with Magwitch. Pip's projection of his inner world on surrounding livestock provides us with an index of his psychological development. When Pip, along with the cattle (or so he imagines) watches Magwitch, he experiences no feelings of guilt over his association with the convict, despite having promised to steal for him. At this point, he perceives Magwitch as frightening and pitiful and feels that the cows may share his perspective:

> The man was limping on towards this latter [the gibbet], as if he were the pirate come to life, and come down, and going back to hook himself up again. It gave me a terrible turn when I thought so, and as I saw the cattle lifting their heads to gaze after him, I wondered whether they thought so, too. (Expectations, p. 5)

On his return to the marshes, the cattle assume quite a different form in his imagination. No longer are they imagined to share his innocent and fanciful speculations. Instead, they

represent threatening authority figures who perceive his sense of guilt:

> The cattle came upon me with suddenness, staring out of their eyes, and steaming out of their nostrils, "Halloa, young thief!" One black ox, with a white cravat on -- who even had to my awakened conscience something of a clerical air -- fixed me so obstinately with his eyes, and moved his blunt head round in such an accusatory manner as I moved around, that I blubbered out to him, "I couldn't help it, sir! It wasn't for myself I took it!" Upon which he put down his head, blew a cloud of smoke out of his nose, and vanished with a kick-up of his hind-legs and a flourish of his tail. (Expectations, p. 14)

There has been a shift in Pip's perception of the external world. Under Mrs. Joe's tutelage, he has undergone what Connor describes as "a transition from Imaginary looking to Symbolic looking, with Pip realising that he is not the originating centre of the scene but just an element in a kind of text which plays itself out through him" (Charles Dickens, p. 173). Pip is no longer the subjective reader of a text of his own making, as he was in the opening paragraphs of the novel. He now feels himself to be the object of another's readerly gaze, and hence subject to a form of social definition over which he has little control.

The process of Lacanian Symbolization of the child's imagination in Great Expectations accords with the text's

echoes of a Wordsworthian account of childhood development. Traces of Wordsworth's "Ode: Intimations of Immortality" can be felt throughout the opening pages of Dickens' novel. "Ode" describes the passage from carefree childhood to the workaday cares and diminished consciousness of adulthood. It describes the onset of this transformation in a way that aptly describes Pip's dilemma:

> Shades of the prison-house begin to close
> Upon the growing Boy ("Ode",lines 68-9)

Pip's experience is a literal manifestation of Wordsworth's lines: Magwitch, the escaped convict from the "prison-house", rising from behind the tombstones, is very much like a "shade", though in the sense of a ghost, not a shadow. Mrs. Joe continues the work begun by Magwitch of weaning Pip from the innocent world of his childhood self. She functions as a parody of the kind-hearted "homely Nurse" who, without intending any harm, hastens the child's development into the strictures of adulthood:

> And, even with something of a Mother's mind,
> And no unworthy aim,
> The homely Nurse doth all she can
> To make her Foster-child, her Inmate Man
> ("Ode", lines 81-4)

In keeping with Wordsworth's poem, Mrs. Joe shapes Pip's feelings of guilt over his association with Magwitch. He becomes her "Inmate Man" in so far as he is made to feel

implicated in her judgment of Magwitch's criminality.

It must be noted that Dickens neglects entirely the Ode's intimations of immortality, and confines himself to the plight of the child. In addition, Pip could scarcely be described as a "Child of Joy" ("Ode", line 34). Nor does Pip playfully imitate the adults around him like "The little Actor [who] cons another part;/ Filling from time to time his `humorous stage'/With all the Persons, down to palsied Age," ("Ode", lines 103-5). However, the first paragraphs of Pip's story shares with the "Ode" a vision of the child as one who experiences the world in a direct and personal way. We noted that one of the effects of Pip's initiation into the Symbolic order was a change in the way he perceived the external world. Under Mrs. Joe's tutelage, he loses the sense of a sympathetic connection between himself and it, as evidenced in the change in the way he sees farm animals. This shift in perspective also recalls Wordsworth's "Ode". In his preface to "Ode", Wordsworth describes his own childhood experience of being

> unable to think of external things as having external existence, and I communed with all that I saw as something not apart from, but inherent in, my own immaterial nature. (p.208, Norton.)

Wordsworth describes here a state in which the world is felt to be an extension of the child's sense of self. At first, Pip similarly experiences his surroundings (tombstones, cows) as not "apart form, but inherent in, my own...nature." As Connor

puts it, Pip feels himself to be the "originating centre of the scene" (Charles Dickens, p. 173). This sense of meaning arising from within yields to an awareness of the "identity of things" imposed from without. If we turn to The Prelude we find an echo of this shift from "first fancies" to a sense of the external "identity of things". In The Prelude Wordsworth describes a fall from "the glory of youth" to an adult's preoccupation with "outward things/ Done visibly for other minds, words, signs,/ Symbols or actions" (Bk third, lines 76-78). In terms of Pip's view of Magwitch, we may say that his direct experience of the man has become mediated by "other minds". The word or sign "convict", and all its socio-legal freight, has displaced the multi-faceted impression initially afforded Pip by his childish perspective.

As we have seen, Magwitch and Mrs. Joe are chief among many characters who together impart a sense of guilt that causes Pip to become alienated from his true self. But guilt alone does not adequately cover the influences of Pip's formative years. As Q.D. Leavis has pointed out, Pip is shaped by guilt and shame (Dickens: The Novelist, p. 280). Pip's first experience of shame occurs at Satis House, where he is first made aware of his class-related shortcomings. Estella succeeds in making Pip conscious of the coarseness of his manners and his appearance:

> "He calls the knaves, jacks, this boy!" said Estella with disdain, before our first game was out. "And what coarse

> hands he has! And what thick boots!"
>
> (*Expectations*, p. 55)

Pip's reaction to his first brush with Estella's cruelty resembles his experience with Magwitch. Just as Magwitch created an overwhelming impression that disturbed the coherence of Pip's world-view, so too does his first encounter with Estella result in feelings he is unable to understand:

> She put the mug down on the stones of the yard, and gave me the bread and meat without looking at me, as if I were a dog in disgrace. I was so humiliated, hurt, spurned, offended, angry, sorry -- I cannot hit upon the right name for the smart -- God knows what its name was -- that tears started to my eyes. (*Expectations*, p. 57)

At the opening of the novel, Pip is a powerful and imaginative reader/writer. The record of his family's identity, contained in their headstones, is scant and, to a young boy, cryptic. Yet Pip's fertile imagination is able to derive a coherent sense of self from these meagre details. Although he is unable to pronounce the name given to him, he is capable of providing himself with one that he can pronounce. His experiences with Magwitch and Estella undermine this ability to define himself. Estella provokes feelings that he "cannot hit the right name for." He is no longer the author of his own existence. He has lost the ability to misread/write over that which is illegible. He now seeks valorization in the reading of an other.

As Pam Morris, among others, has noted, Estella's name points to her position as a distant ideal that guides Pip's attempts to achieve middle class respectability. In his efforts to win love and approval from the heartless Estella, one is reminded of Robert Walton's misguided goal of discovering a region of warmth at the north pole. Walton tries "in vain to be persuaded that the pole is the seat of frost and desolation; it ever presents itself to my imagination as the region of beauty and delight" (Frankenstein, p. 13). In conversation with Herbert, Pip similarly has an inkling of the foolhardiness of his affections, but he, like Robert, cannot be persuaded to change course. There is an important difference between the two, though. Robert's project represents an attempt to affirm the ultimate authority of the Imaginary self. For Pip, Estella represents an ideal set above that of the self. Pip has sacrificed the self-authorizing Imaginary self in order to pursue an image of what Pam Morris describes as "the self valorized and glamorized within social structures" (Dickens' Class Consciousness, p. 112).

As Pip begins to see himself as others see him, his ability to correctly interpret the behaviour of those around him is compromised. One of Pip's chief misinterpretations in the novel involves Miss Havisham's role in his upward mobility. Although readers are led to share Pip's incorrect estimation of Miss Havisham's part in his good fortune, the

text provides early hints that Pip may not be reading the situation clearly. Allan Grant points out that the language that Pip uses to describe his good fortune should make the reader suspicious (A Preface to Dickens, p.136). Grant points to Pip's statement that

> My dream was out; my wild fancy was surpassed by sober reality; Miss Havisham was going to make my fortune on a grand scale. (Expectations, p. 129)

Allan suggests that Pip's choice of words -- "dream", "wild fancy" and "grand scale" -- should alert the reader to the possibility that Pip is merely indulging his fantasies. The text provides another clue to Miss Havisham's true role in Pip's life in her response to Pip's expressed desire to better himself:

> I told her I was going to be apprenticed to Joe, I believed; and I enlarged upon my knowing nothing and wanting to know everything, in the hope that she might offer some help towards that desirable end. But she did not; on the contrary, she seemed to prefer my being ignorant. (Expectations, p.87)

As evidence of this preference, we should note that Miss Havisham seems to favour listening to Pip's rendition of "Old Clem" as he walks her around her room, over hearing him speak of his aspirations. "Old Clem" is a song that "Joe used to hum fragments of at the forge" (Expectations, p. 88). Miss Havisham clearly seems to have little interest in transforming Pip

from a blacksmith's boy into a gentleman.

Our Lacanian framework provides further cause to suspect Pip's interpretation of his windfall. One of the conditions of his new life is that he retain the name of Pip. Pip's act of self-naming was performed in an Imaginary space in which the father's authority was not recognized. From a psychoanalytic point of view, we may wonder at a move from the Imaginary to the Symbolic that would involve the retention of a name that asserts the authority of the Imaginary self. Pip's existence in London is much like Victor's at university. Both occupy a precarious position within the Symbolic order. They are there under false (though unconsciously so) pretences. Victor's covert scientific work at the university points to his Imaginary orientation. His secret connection to the Imaginary realm is ultimately manifested in the existence of a being that he must hide from his professors.

Pip likewise ends up hiding Magwitch from the Symbolic figures in his life. Magwitch as both a convict and an uneducated illiterate is excluded from the Symbolic order of language and law. Though unknown to Pip, he is compelled to retain his childish nickname in accordance with Magwitch's wishes. Pip's name points to the illegitimate source of his veneer of respectability.

Pip finds respite from his struggles with the paternal figures of the Symbolic order in a relationship of narcissistic mirroring with a boyhood companion. As in Robert's

description of an ideal companion, Herbert is for Pip, "a friend who would have sense enough not to despise me as romantic, and affection enough for me to endeavour to regulate my mind" (Frankenstein, p. 17). Without despising Pip's romantic notions concerning Estella, or his lowly origins, Herbert tutors Pip on his table manners and guides him through the complexities of genteel life.

There is an importance difference between Frankenstein's and Pip's relationship to a narcissistic object. Frankenstein values Clerval as a reflection of the Imaginary self, and its resistance to the authority of the Symbolic order. As previously noted, this resistance is evidenced in Clerval's opposition to the career path laid out for him by his tyrannical father. Clerval is resolved not to "be chained to the miserable details of commerce" (Frankenstein, p. 43). On the contrary, Herbert Pocket's wish to enter the shipping business represents an eagerness "to be chained to the miserable details of commerce." Herbert's position anticipates Pip's place in the same company. For Pip, Herbert is a transitional narcissistic object that makes way for his entry into the Symbolic order. Herbert's role is further clarified by the fact that he renames Pip, Handel. Critics have tended to interpret Herbert's act of naming as representing his acceptance of Pip's roots. Herbert chooses this name for its connection with Handel's "Harmonious Blacksmith", and thus, for many critics, signalling his affirmation of Pip's origins.

But we may also see Herbert's act of renaming as a way of replacing the grim details of life on the marsh (and connection to convicts) with an idealized image of rustic life. At this point, Pip is no longer positioned as the Romantic child in revolt to the adult world. Instead, he is striving toward acceptance within Victorian society. It is to the terms of this gradual transformation from Romantic child to Victorian adult that we now turn.

CHAPTER FOUR:

PIP AND VICTORIAN ADULTHOOD

Earlier in this discussion, a process was examined in which Pip is made to feel guilty and ashamed by virtually all the people in his life. It was found that like the passage to adulthood represented in Wordsworth's "Ode: Intimations of Immortality", Pip gradually internalizes society's class-related ideals, resulting in his alienation from an authentic childhood self. These feelings of guilt and shame lead him to view his new life in London as an opportunity to efface his origins by pursuing a superficial ideal of respectability. The crisis that undermines his social climbing is the realization that it is Magwitch, not Miss Havisham, who has underwritten his quest for respectability. Pip finds that far from being a means of escaping from his low origins, his life in London ultimately reinforces a connection with their most unsavoury aspect -- his association with convicts.

Pip's disillusionment with his great expectations and subsequent moral development have been the subject of much critical debate. I would like to consider three ways in which critics have viewed this development. Some critics focus on Pip's snobbery toward Joe, and view his humility at the end of the novel as a moral triumph over it. Others emphasize Pip's struggle with the guilt and shame imposed on him in childhood. In this second group there are two camps. There are those who believe that the humility and forgiveness of others by the end of the novel free Pip from the guilt and shame of his child-

hood. Others argue that the novel ultimately fails to deliver Pip from the influences of his childhood. For these critics, the text sacrifices Pip's personal psychological needs in order to satisfy an ideal of social harmony.

The first point of view is best represented by Humphry House's phrase, popularized by Q.D. Leavis's refutation of it, that Pip's is "a snob's progress." (Dickens: The Novelist, p.291). This argument focuses on Pip's social prejudice against those he was close to as a child (primarily Joe), without recognizing that, as Leavis argues, "Pip is framed as a victim, an unconscious victim deceived by accident and intention,..." (Dickens: The Novelist, p. 291). For Leavis, Dickens' novel is about how Pip frees himself "from the compulsions of childhood guilt and from shame imposed by the class distinctions that closed round him in his boyhood" (p. 290). Robin Gilmour in "Pip and the Victorian Gentleman" sums up the merit of Leavis's point concisely:

> What the view of the novel as a "snob's progress" ignores, as Q.D. Leavis has convincingly demonstrated, is the sympathy and complexity with which Dickens treats Pip's predicament: to call him a snob is to suggest that he was wrong to feel discontented with life on the marshes and could have chosen to act otherwise than he did, whereas much of the energy of Dickens' imagination in the early part of the novel goes in showing how mean and limiting that life is, and how helpless Pip himself

> is in the face of the contradictory forces at work on him. (" Pip and the Victorian Gentleman", p. 111)

However, Leavis' argument (and Gilmour's endorsement of it) is perhaps not as far away from House's as she claims. At one point, she draws a parallel between Pip's final confrontation with Orlick and Christian's with Apollyon in The Pilgrim's Progress. She writes that

> the ordeal that culminates in the admission of guilt, and in repentance, suffering, humiliation and a fight for life was in a popular English tradition treating spiritual experience. (Dickens the Novelist, p. 321)

By her account, Pip's ordeal in the sluice-house recalls this tradition, as it also

> entailed physical and moral suffering and endurance but this was subsidiary to admissions of guilt in forms that Pip had never allowed to come to the surface before now, when under stress and duress from Orlick, he has to answer accusations that reach depths of guilty conscience he cannot avoid with death staring him in the face.
> (Dickens the Novelist, p. 321)

The result is that "he prays for forgiveness in the face of his miserable errors..." (Dickens the Novelist, p. 321) and sheds "his acquired egoism and false views of life..."(Dickens the Novelist, p. 322). Leavis begins by saying that Pip is originally fettered by guilt and shame imposed on him by others, and concludes by suggesting that Pip achieves

"spiritual regeneration" by making "admissions of guilt". If the formation of Pip's identity was solely the result of the manipulations of others, why should his "spiritual regeneration" involve the acknowledgement of guilt and a prayer for forgiveness? Leavis' conclusion is contradictory, but it seems consistent, not only with Dickens' novel, but his general view of his characters. In a letter to Rev. D. Macrae, (Dickens and Religion, p. ix) Dickens comments on the influence of the New Testament on his work, saying of his characters that "all my good people are humble, charitable, faithful, and forgiving." By the end of the novel Pip has certainly become one of the "good people." However, in doing so, Pip seems to have failed to throw off the terms of his subjugation and instead, as Jeremy Tambling argues,

> remains the passive victim whose reaction is to blame himself for every action he is in: his willingness to see himself as his sister's murderer, is of a piece with his final ability to see himself as characteristically unjust to Joe. (Prison-Bound: Dickens and Foucault, p. 131)

Tambling's argument represents the third way of viewing Pip's development. According to this view, Pip's self-castigation at the conclusion of the novel fails to satisfy the original dilemma of his existence. To put it another way, one might say that Pip's final transformation represents a rejection, not only of the conceited young man of Little Britain, but also of the boy who grew up on the marshes bitterly resenting corrupt

adult authority. This is the chief insight of Jack Rawlins' "Great Expiations: Dickens and the Betrayal of the Child". In the first part of this discussion we noted that Pip's passage to adulthood involved the diminishment of the Imaginary self, under the pressure of imposed guilt and shame. Similarly, in Rawlins' account,

> Pip feels guilty because his ego isn't strong enough for him to outface the adult world and say, `I know you're all wrong.' But to such a place we hope he will grow. ("Betrayal", p. 85)

Rawlins argues that although Pip's eventual moral development is marked by becoming like Joe, in some respects it is originally his difference from Joe that is his greatest virtue. Rawlins notes that Joe's brand of goodness requires a degree of perceptual distortion, as evidenced by his insistence that, despite his father's perpetual "hammering" at him and his mother, "my father were...good in his hart" (Expectations, p. 42). The young Pip does not share Joe's generous view of his father. He knows that Joe's father behaved cruelly. Rawlins argues that

> It is precisely this refusal to commit himself to Dickens' virtuous blindness that makes Pip Dickens' best hope for solving the puzzle of living in a world curiously good and bad at the same time. The dramatic question at this point in the book seems clear: can Pip continue to acknowledge the wrong he sees in the world,

> and still find a means to moral living without sealing himself off from the flawed human race in a private fantasy society of innocents, as Dickens's other heroes tend to do? ("Betrayal", p. 83)

In Rawlins' account, Pip resolves his conflicts with the people who have controlled him by lapsing into the same state of "virtuous blindness" from which Joe suffers. Rawlins examines Pip's problematic "virtuous blindness" in respect to a number of characters, including Joe, Jaggers and even Trabb's boy. For the moment we need only consider the change in Pip's view of Magwitch as that is what originally initiates his moral transformation. Pip overcomes his prejudice against Magwitch and comes to see in him only "a much better man than I had been to Joe" (Expectations, p. 428). He chastises himself for his initial rejection of Magwitch, reminding himself that he returned to England "for my sake" (Expectations, p. 420). Pip is here made to overlook the darker motives of Magwitch's project: besides whatever genuine affection he has for Pip, Magwitch is clearly also motivated by his wish to mock the class-based system that he feels excluded from. Magwitch describes himself to Pip as "that there hunted dunghill dog wot you kep life in got his head so high that he could make a gentleman -- and Pip, you're him!" (Expectations, p. 298). As a member of a criminal underclass, one who transforms a blacksmith's boy -- not that far above a "dunghill dog" himself -- into a gentleman, he undermines the

assumptions of a social order that views a strict separation betweeen, as Gilmour puts it, "those classes who were "civilised" and those who were manifestly not" ("Pip and the Victorian Gentleman", p. 116). Gilmour focuses on Victorians' desire to believe that the persistance of crime in an era of prosperity was due entirely to, as W.R. Greg argues in an article in the Edinburgh Review of 1851, "professional criminals" whom he viewed as a "class apart" (quoted in "Pip and the Victorian Gentleman", p. 117). By attributing criminal activity entirely to the actions of the members of this "class apart", Greg was able to assure his readers that a rise in crime "in no degree militates against the idea of the progress of morality and civilisation among all other classes" (quoted in "Pip and the Victorian Gentleman", p. 117). As Gilmour points out,

> Greg might reassure his middle-class readers with the comforting view of an altogether separate and self-contained criminal population but Dickens's vision reveals a world in which the hero owes his respectability to his involvement with a criminal outcast ("Pip and the Victorian Gentleman", p.117).

Magwitch clearly enjoys the irony of being a convict who makes possible the refinement of a blacksmith's boy. This aspect of Magwitch's scheme problematizes his relationship with Pip. As Crawford observes, Magwitch's

> dog-like affection for Pip and repeated addressing him as

> "Master" are thus qualified and undermined by his all too apparent delight in the joy of owning a 'brought-up London gentleman' (Expectations, p. 339) who will enact his revenge ("Pip and the Monster", p.628).

Magwitch's pleasure in this aspect of his scheme may be understand-able, but it detracts from the noble image Pip seems to have of him. Like Dickens, Crawford focuses on Pip's struggle to "escape the bondage of class-determined perceptions" ("Pip and the Monster", p. 629). It seems unfair of Dickens only to allow Pip to blame himself for the snobbish "repugnance" (Expectations, p. 298) he initially feels toward the unkempt Magwitch and not permit him to resent being the tool of his vengeance. As a child, Pip valued his autonomy and surely would have reacted differently. As Rawlins puts it,

> In terms of the novel's original vision, Magwitch is the epitome of a basic adult perversion: the desire to create, own and exploit human beings as property and extensions of the ego ("Betrayal", p.88).

Yet in the second half of the novel, Dickens seems to change the focus from the wrongs of Pip's manipulators to Pip's shortcomings as a conceited London gentleman. As an adult, Pip may indeed have to take responsibility for his behaviour towards others; however, for Rawlins, the text nevertheless leaves the chief crisis of his development unresolved. Pip's guilt becomes a valid moral force in the text, although, according to Rawlins, it was originally the result of a

"dissonance" between his values and those of the adults around him. Rawlins argues that, as a child,

> Pip sees the truth of things; he is born with a rage for justice and a commitment to the preservation and nurture of the ego; he is racked with guilt, but we see that the guilt is the result of his attempt to integrate the dissonant voices of true ego and false superego. ("Betrayal", p. 85)

In support of Rawlins' argument one may note that the first section of the novel dwells on Pip's "perpetual conflict with injustice" (Expectations, p. 57), as he rages against the cruelty and hypocrisy of the adults around him. It also makes clear that Pip's outrage is undermined by being "morally timid and very sensitive" (Expectations, p. 57). This leads Rawlins to believe that originally the novel presents Pip's timidity as the primary obstacle to his development. Rawlins is disappointed when in the second half Pip does not grow more confident in his sense of injustice, but instead seems to blame himself for the harshness of his childhood analysis of the adult world. In Rawlins view, the text ultimately confirms Pip's childhood sense of guilt and shame, and thus abandons its initial valorization of Pip's attempts to sustain a vital and authentic self.

Rawlins is probably correct in arguing that the "virtuous blindness" Dickens imposes on Pip is not an entirely satisfying resolution to the problem of "moral living...in a world

curiously good and bad at the same time" ("Betrayal", p. 83). Nevertheless, Rawlins' account of the early part of the novel suffers somewhat by focusing exclusively on the text's apparent valorization of the young Pip's resentment toward the adults around him. What Rawlins does not seem to notice is the object lesson provided by Pip's tormentors. From the outset, the text presents characters whose chief flaw is not timidity but an all-consuming sense of injustice over the indignities perpetrated against the ego. It is precisely through the faculty of Pip's keen insight that we are able to see the debilitating effects on these characters of nurturing one's sense of outrage against the unfairness of life. The three people who have the greatest formative influence on Pip's life -- Mrs. Joe, Miss Havisham and Magwitch -- are all creatures of resentment. They have in common a desire to avenge past events which they blame for their present unhappiness. They view themselves as victims of circumstance, and this perspective on the past has brought them paralysis in the present. The most obvious example of this paralysis is provided by Miss Havisham. She has made her life into a memorial to Compeyson's assault on her narcissism. She suffers from a masochistic fascination with the day of her abandonment at the altar. Pip describes her face as

> ...having dropped into a watchful and brooding expression --most likely when all the things about her had become transfixed -- and it looked as if nothing could

ever lift it up again. (Expectations, p. 56)

Like the clocks that have stopped at the precise hour of Miss Havisham's rejection at the altar, she is "transfixed" by her trauma. More accurately, it is her passionate desire for revenge that "transfixes" her.

James Marlow argues that underlying Miss Havisham's attitude toward the past is the novel's critique of a growing tendency in the nineteenth century to view human development deterministically. Marlow proposes that

> in the nineteenth century, the paradigm of material causality was imported by mechanistic philosophy and science into human affairs. Since the present is in succession to antecedents, it must also be a consequent of antecedents. Hence, the present should be seen to be a "victim of circumstances" determined in the past.
>
> (The Uses of Time,p. 39)

Marlow describes the dilemma of many thinkers of the time as one in which, "committed to a materialist conception of the universe, one could not see how the individual could be free when everything that forms him extends beyond his reach into the past" (The Uses of Time, p. 39). Marlow calls Dickens "only an occasional materialist" who, like "Carlyle, felt that mere material causes could be transcended" (The Uses of Time, p. 39). Marlow is here probably referring to Carlyle's criticism of an overly deterministic view of psychological formation, expressed on one occasion in his essay on Boswell's

Johnson:

> Yes, Reader, all this that thou hast so often heard about 'force of circumstances', 'the creature of time', 'balancing of motives', and who knows what melancholy stuff to the like purport, wherein thou, as in a nightmare Dream, sittest paralysed, and hast no force left, -- was in very truth...little other than a hag-ridden vision of death-sleep.
>
> (quoted in The Victorian Frame of Mind, p. 337)

Carlyle goes on to argue that the lives of great men reveal each of them to be "not the thrall of Circumstances, of Necessity, but the victorious subduer thereof" (quoted in The Victorian Frame of Mind, p. 337). At first glance, Dickens would seem to have little in common with Carlyle here. Despite Marlow's suggestion that Dickens was "only an occasional materialist" the novelist's work seems to everywhere reveal people as entirely "the thrall of Circumstances". The prime example in Great Expectations is perhaps Magwitch, whose criminality is so clearly a result of indifference and social injustice. Magwitch makes a persuasive argument that criminologists have overlooked an obvious explanation for his criminality:

> "'This is a terrible hardened one,' they says to prison visitors, picking out me. 'May be said to live in jails, this boy.' Then they looked at me, and I looked at them, and they measured my head, some on 'em -- they had better

a-measured my stomach -- and others on 'em giv me tracts to read what I couldn't read, and made me speeches what I couldn't unnerstand. They always went on agen me about the devil. But what the devil was I to do? I must put something into my stomach, mustn't I?"

(Expectations, p. 322)

The novel mocks elaborate theories of innate criminality and argues that Magwitch's gruff exterior and criminal behaviour can be attributed to a simpler material cause: that of necessity. Elsewhere, Pip, after his first visit to Satis House, suggests that we are entirely "bound" by past events:

> That was a memorable day to me, for it made great changes in me. But it is the same with any life. Imagine one selected day struck out of it, and think how different its course would have been. Pause you who read this, and think for a moment of the long chain of iron or gold, of thorns or flowers, that would never have bound you, but for the formation of the first link on one memorable day.

(Expectations, p. 66)

Despite the novel's deterministic view of the past's influence on the present, there is nevertheless a great deal of importance placed on how characters respond to the seeming intransigency of the past. Along with Pip's assertion that the past is an unbreakable "chain", there is a suggestion that whether, for his readers, this chain is "of iron or gold, of thorns or flowers" is something they must decide for them-

selves. Although we are "bound" by the past, its precise effect on the present is open to interpretation. Marlow elaborates on this point by quoting another nineteenth century philosopher opposed to a rigid belief in material causes, Friedrich Nietzsche, who vehemently argued

> against the doctrine of the influence of the milieu and external causes: the force within is infinitely superior; much that looks like external influence is merely adaptation from within. The very same milieus can be interpreted and exploited in opposite ways: there are no facts. -- A genius is not explained in terms of such conditions of his origin.
>
> (quoted in The Uses of Time, p. 39)

Miss Havisham's self-imposed isolation certainly seems due more to "[mal]adaptation from within" than to "external causes". Compeyson was wrong to betray Miss Havisham, but the novel also views her withdrawal and her crippling resentment critically. Nietzsche shares with Dickens a belief that it is often resentment against the past that governs the interpretation of a "milieu". Nietzsche's radical critique of the doctrine of material causes posits that "the belief in cause and effect has its place in the strongest of the instincts, the instinct of revenge" (Works, 12:305). In fact, for Nietzsche, the desire for revenge against the past is one of the chief forces defining human understanding:

> Wherever responsibilities have been sought, it was the

> instinct of revenge that sought. This instinct of revenge has so mastered mankind in the course of millennia that the whole of metaphysics, psychology, conception of history, but above all morality, is impregnated with it.
>
> (Will to Power, p. 401)

Nietzsche argues that a desire for revenge against the past is characterized by lapsing into the position of an "angry spectator" who feels "powerless against what has been done" (Zarathustra, p. 251). Rebecca Comay summarizes Nietzsche's view of the problem with this "instinct of revenge" against the past, as betraying "a paralysis in the face of history's "it was" ("Redeeming Revenge", p. 25). She describes this paralysis as a

> simple passivity and acquiescence before the pastness of the past, turning the past into a rigid ground or cause, the present into a consequence, unleashing a psychology of moral responsibility determined by an entire metaphysics of the subject.
>
> ("Redeeming Revenge", p. 25)

Underlying a desire for revenge against the past is thus a belief that the present is a mere "consequence" over which one has little influence. However, the problem with this vengeful attitude is not only a paralysis of the present, but a tendency to seek alternate forms of satisfaction for one's ressentment. According to Nietzsche, a frustrated desire for revenge against the past -- "an inability to go backwards" --

becomes redirected toward "all who can suffer" (Zarathustra, p. 252) This consequence of a frustrated wish for vengeance against the past partakes of a general notion in Nietzsche's thought that if an impulse toward revenge cannot be vented on its original object, it will always seek alternate means of satisfaction. Nietzsche uses the term ressentiment to refer to a "tendency among natures that are denied the true re-action, that of deeds" to "compensate themselves with an imaginary revenge" (The Genealogy of Morals, p. 36).

In Dickens' novel, Miss Havisham, Magwitch, and to a lesser degree, Mrs. Joe, demonstrate a similar set of consequences arising from resentment of past events. Mrs. Joe provides the most obvious example of ressentiment. Frustrated by the limited opportunities of her life, she takes her revenge on Joe and Pip. Similarly, Miss Havisham resents Compeyson's treatment of her, but unable to change the past, she seeks to make all those who cross her path suffer. However, as the stopped clocks at Satis House suggest, her resentment towards the past has brought her life to a stand-still, so that her will can only express itself vicariously, through Estella's actions. She raises Estella to "Break their hearts, my pride and hope, break their hearts and have no mercy!" (Expectations, p.88). Transfixed by a past event she cannot confront directly, Miss Havisham takes pleasure in the pain Pip suffers over his feelings for Estella. She urges him to "love her, love her, lover her!" (Expectations, p.223).

Soon after, Miss Havisham defines the sort of "real love" she wishes Pip to experience:

> "It is blind devotion, unquestioning self-humiliation, utter submission, trust and belief against yourself and against the whole world, giving up your whole heart and soul to the smiter -- as I did!" (<u>Expectations</u>, p. 224)

She demands something more than mere heartbreak from Pip: she wants Pip to love Estella not despite her cruelty, but because of it. She wants him to experience the same masochistic fixation that has arrested her life.

Magwitch also seems to have forsaken a healthy existence rooted in the present in favour of seeking revenge against the circumstances that have shaped his unhappy life. As a convict, his sense that he has little power over his own life is perhaps more understandable than in Miss Havisham's case. However, in both instances their choice to seek "imaginary revenge" vicariously highlights the degree of their sense of paralysis. Additionally, there is perhaps some satisfaction in controlling another's life as they themselves feel they have been controlled by exterior forces.

Overall, what emerges from the novel's account of Mrs. Joe's, Miss Havisham's and Magwitch's all-consuming desire for revenge is that resentment can lead to a kind of perverse devotion to the terms of one's oppression. Magwitch's resentment of the ideals of class is accompanied by a fetishistic interest in outward signs of success. The gentleman

that Magwitch sets out to make of Pip is a peculiarly hollow construction. He prizes Pip primarily for his empty display of respectability. He fixates on Pip's outer appearance, exclaiming "that's a gentleman's, I hope!" (Expectations, p. 299) over every item of his jewelry and clothing. He looks forward to having Pip read to him from his many books, although "if they're in foreign languages wot I don't understand, I shall be as proud as if I did" (Expectations, p. 299). He values Pip's erudition merely as a reflection of wealth and power. He wants Pip to "show money with lords for wagers, and beat'em." (Expectations, p. 298). For Magwitch, Pip is a counterfeit currency intended to allow him a symbolic role within the sphere of power that excludes him. While on one level Magwitch's creation successfully parodies notions of class superiority, one cannot help recalling Biddy's advice to Pip concerning his desire to spite Estella, that it could be "more independently done by caring nothing for her words" (Expectations, p. 121). Magwitch's resentment is directed at the entire system that favours those with affluent connections like Compeyson over those of more modest origins, yet it expresses itself in a narrow fascination with the outer trappings of social privilege. His perception of the social system seems fragmentary: unable to grasp the operations of the whole, he imbues the parts with magical power.

Magwitch's tendency to fetishize objects of social power is also revealed through his "greasy little clasped black

Testament" (*Expectations*, p. 309). The rough treatment he has received from the judicial system has left him with a special respect for its rituals. He carries a Bible (which we are told was probably stolen from a courtroom) solely for the purpose of swearing oaths. Magwitch's familiarity with a Bible's use in a courtroom, "gave him a reliance on its powers as a sort of legal spell or charm" (*Expectations*, p. 309). His awe toward that which he most resents, expressed through fetishization of the instruments of his own subjugation, is akin to Miss Havisham's irrational fascination with her mouldering bridal effects. In both cases, their *ressentiment* takes the form of a love of their "smiter." Mrs. Joe's case reflects a similar fetishistic tendency. She relieves her resentment toward the limitations of her life at the forge through a self-aggrandizing display of her misery. She insists that she is a "slave with her apron never off" (*Expectations*, p. 19). Pip notes that "she made it a powerful merit in herself, and a strong reproach against Joe, that she wore this apron so much" (*Expectations*, p. 7). She wears this emblem of her servitude as a testament to her wounded egotism. The masochistic pleasure she receives from maximizing her misery is betrayed when she says, "I'm rather partial to carols myself, and that's the best of reasons for my never hearing any" (*Expectations*, p. 19). On one level, she means that her life will not allow for such outings, but there is also the suggestion here that she enjoys the self-pity that comes from

begrudging herself such pleasures. Even Tickler, which seems at first glance a way of expressing domination over Pip and Joe, should perhaps be more accurately viewed as a means of dramatizing what she claims is the chief misfortune of her life at the forge: a dearth of masculine authority. By constantly harassing Joe with Tickler she highlights the humiliation of having such an ineffectual husband. The issue of Joe's passivity is brought to the fore, when, during her argument with Orlick, she complains,

> "To hear the names he's giving me! That Orlick! In my own house! Me, a married woman! With my husband standing by! Oh! Oh!" (Expectations, p. 106)

Mrs. Joe's confrontation with Orlick becomes the occasion for histrionic display:

> Here my sister, after a fit of clappings and screamings, beat her hands upon her bosom and upon her knees, and threw her cap off, and pulled her hair down -- which were the last stages on her road to frenzy. Being by this time a perfect fury and a complete success.
>
> (Expectations, p. 106)

Mrs. Joe derives a peculiar sort of exaltation from her sense of the enormity of her humiliation. Once she is beaten into stupefication her masochistic fixation with the notion of her servitude is revealed for what it is. After being assaulted by Orlick she trades in the pleasure of wielding Tickler for a simple- minded love for, literally, her "smiter", expressed in

a fascination with Orlick's hammer.

It is against these instances of self-destructive resentment that Pip's development must be evaluated. Not coincidentally, the page following Pip's initial encounter with Miss Havisham deals with his own "injured feelings" (Expectations, p.57) regarding his sister's cruelty toward him. As a boy, he "nursed this assurance" of the unfairness of his sister's behaviour, "in a solitary...way" (Expecations, p. 57). "Communing so much with it" leads him to be "morally timid and very sensitive" (Expectations, p. 57). The text here seems to suggest that, even before he meets Miss Havisham and Estella, Pip is in danger of becoming, like Miss Havisham, "transfixed" by resentment. Certainly his already burgeoning sense of guilt and disaffection makes him vulnerable to Estella's cruelty. Once Pip is smitten, it is Biddy who articulates for him the mixture of resentment and inferiority that Estella makes him feel:

> "Do you want to be a gentleman to spite her or to gain her over?" Biddy quietly asked me, after a pause.
>
> "I don't know," I moodily answered.
>
> "Because if it is to spite her," Biddy pursued, "I should think -- but you know best -- that might be better and more independently done by caring nothing for her words. And if it is to gain her over, I should think -- but you know best -- she was not worth gaining over." (Expectations, p. 121)

Biddy's choice of words -- that it might be "more independently done by caring nothing for her words" -- points to one of the novel's central themes: that spite long nurtured can be enslave-ment. Pip's confused sense of resentment and inferiority leads him to seek freedom from the humiliation of his low origins by becoming a gentleman. However, the allure of social status proves false, and even after he has achieved respectability he is capable of "slipp[ing] hopelessly back into the coarse and common boy again" (Expectations, p. 219) when in Estella's presence.

It must be noted that the text is not opposed to a desire for refinement. It is merely a certain superficial view of middle class respectability with which it takes issue. An image of the true gentleman emerges from Mathew Pocket's condemnation of Compeyson. Herbert Pocket refers to his father's evaluation of Compeyson as

> "a showy man...not to be, without ignorance or prejudice, mistaken for a gentleman, my father most strongly asseverates; because it is a principle of his that no man who was not a true gentleman at heart, ever was, since the world began, a true gentleman in manner."
>
> (Expectations, pp. 167-8)

As Marlow proposes, in the novel's view, it is "not in the perfunctory externals that a man is a true gentleman, but in the heart -- in his dynamic and spontaneous responses to life" (The Uses of Time, p. 100). Pip's view of middle class res-

pectability is flawed primarily because he believes that it cuts him off from those of a lower station. Once established in London, he reflects on the enormous divide that he perceives between who he has become and those he was once close to:

> That I could have been at our old church in my old church-going clothes, on the very last Sunday that ever was, seemed a combination of impossibilities, geographical and social, solar and lunar.
>
> (Expectations, p. 171)

At this point, Pip has yet to learn that family ties and simple fellowship can transcend class boundaries. The superficiality of his notion of respectability is revealed by his reluctance to be seen with Joe. Pip experiences "mortification, and a keen sense of incongruity" (Expectations, p. 203) at the thought of his London acquaintances seeing him with Joe. However, he is not concerned that Joe should be seen by Herbert or his father "for both of whom I had a respect", but rather it is Drummle, "whom I held in contempt" (Expectations, p. 203) from whom he wishes to hide Joe. That Pip's behaviour has become dictated by those he most dislikes leads him to reflect,

> So throughout life our worst weaknesses and meannesses are usually committed for the sake of the people whom we most despise (Expectations, p. 204).

At this point in his development, Pip is yet to learn the

extent to which his attempts to free himself of his past have in fact led, as Marlow argues, to a form of "slavery, a determination by outside forces -- in this case, by several forms of revenge" (The Uses of Time, p. 102). Marlow here refers to the fact that Miss Havisham's and Magwitch's ability to control him are predicated on his desire to erase his past and attain superficial respectability. Pip's dilemma illustrates the naivety of believing that one can free oneself from the past merely by suppressing it. Among the chief flaws of this strategy is that Pip's eagerness to maintain the illusion of freedom from the past blinds him to its continuing influence on the present. The result is that Pip's pursuit of superficial respectability leads him continually to overlook evidence of the true nature of the social forces that control his life. As noted in the first part of this discussion, Pip fails to notice signs that suggest Miss Havisham is not his benefactor. Once he arrives in London he is plagued by a disturbing sense of interconnection between social levels. Despite the freedom from his low origins that Pip believes becoming a London gentleman offers, he nevertheless cannot help reflecting on

> how strange it was that I should be encompassed by all this taint of prison and crime; that, in my childhood out on our lonely marshes on a winter evening, I should have first encountered it; that it should have reappeared on two occasions, starting out like a stain that was faded

but not gone; that should in this new way pervade my fortune and advancement. While my mind was thus engaged, I thought of the beautiful young Estella, proud and refined, coming towards me, and I thought with absolute abhorrence of the contrast between the jail and her.

(Expectations, p. 245)

It is no accident that Estella comes to mind while Pip contemplates the traces of his encounter with a convict on the marshes, "pervading my fortune and advancement". Estella embodies all of Pip's class-based ideals, and yet he is haunted by a presentiment of her roots in the criminal underclass. At one point, Pip seems to intuit the connection between Estella and Molly, but subconsciously avoids pursuing the idea:

I should have been chary of discussing my guardian too freely even with her, but I should have gone with the subject so far as to describe the dinner in Gerrard Street, if we had not then come into a sudden glare of gas. It seemed, while it lasted, to be all light and alive with that inexplicable feeling I had had before; and when we were out of it, I was as much dazed for a few moments as if I had been in lightning. So we fell into other talk....The great city was almost new new to her, she told me, for she had never left Miss Havisham's neighbourhood until she had gone to France, and she had merely passed through London then in going and

returning. (<u>Expectations</u>, p. 251)

The "inexplicable feeling" that stops him seems to refer to his (previously quoted) sense of the "stain", "faded but not gone", of his encounter with a convict on the marshes. For Pip to have gone on to describe his dinner with Jaggers would have probably meant bringing up the subject of Molly, Estella's mother. Pip instinctively shies away from pursuing this line of thinking, seeming to sense, on a deeply-imbedded level, the connection between the two women, and the disastrous consequences it has for his notions of class division. To distance Estella from Molly in his mind he seems compelled to dwell on her link with Miss Havisham.

Estella herself seems to possess a strong sense of the unseen social forces that manipulate the two of them. She tells him, "We are not free to follow our own devices, you and I." (<u>Expectations</u>, p. 247) She foreshadows what Pip is yet to discover: that his rise in social status has inevitably failed to free him from the past.

Pip's response to the circumstances of his life is flawed because it leaves his resentment toward past humiliations intact. This resentment drives him to attempt to erase all signs, including his relationship with Joe, of the blacksmith's boy with "coarse hands" and "thick boots" he once was. Such a response renders Pip a victim resentful of a past that can never be changed, only hidden from view behind a show of middle class respectability. Pip sums up the problem with his

response to the circumstances of his life by describing himself as a kind of counterfeiter who "knowingly reckons the spurious coin of my own make as good money" (Expectations, p. 210). The particular incident that leads him to this insight is a trip back home during which he "invents reasons and makes excuses for putting up at the Blue Boar" (Expectations, p. 210) in order that he not have to stay with Joe. Deep down, Pip seems to know that his attempt to obscure his origins via the maintainance of a counterfeit self that prevents him from staying with Joe. A few pages later, Pip reads an account of his "recent romantic rise in fortune" in a hometown paper that refers to him as "a young artificer in iron" (Expectations, p. 215). On one level, the notion that Pip is a "young artificer" is related to the metaphor of counterfeiting, and points to his attempts to efface his low origins with an appearance of middle class respectability. On another level, that Pip is "a young artificer in iron" is a reminder of his connection with Joe, who, in contrast to a counterfeiter, -- i.e., someone who merely substitutes a "forgery" in place of something genuine -- reshapes or "forges" the past. Joe confronts the figures of his past with a generosity that represents a refusal to allow his unhappy childhood to cloud the present with a futile desire for revenge. Joe's interpretation of the past probably does not accord with most contemporary notions of psychological health, usually based on achieving clear perspective on past events. In fact, in some

ways Joe seems to be entirely a product of circumstances. In marrying Pip's sister, he seems to merely repeat the victimized role he learned as the child of an abusive father. The novel itself seems to suggest that there are some limitations to Joe's strategy. Joe's docile nature sometimes makes him an ineffectual father, as he himself admits when he regrets that his "power to part [Pip] and Tickler in sunders were not fully equal to his inclinations" (Expectations, p. 436). However, on the other hand, he is one of the few characters in the novel capable of a spontaneous and vital response to life that is rooted in the present rather than in resentment against the past. It must also be noted that despite Joe's frequent ineffectuality, he is capable of aggressive outbursts. He fights Orlick when it is necessary to do so, and he responds to Jaggers' condescension with rage. The important feature of these outbursts is that they represent an immediate and total release of resentment. Joe's ability to deal with occasional moments of indignation in a way that prevents them from consuming his life, while usually being able to avoid experiencing resentment all together, is consistent with Nietzsche's profile of the "noble man":

> Ressentiment itself, if it should appear in the noble man, consummates and exhausts itself in an immediate reaction, and therefore does not poison: on the other hand, it fails to appear at all on countless occasions on which it inevitably appears in the weak and impotent.

> To be incapable of taking one's enemies, one's accidents, even one's misdeeds seriously for very long -- that is the sign of strong, full natures in whom there is an excess of the power to form, to mold, to recuperate and to forget. Such a man shakes off with a single shrug many vermin that eat deep into others.
>
> (The Genealogy of Morals, p. 39)

Joe's humble and generous attitude toward those around him represents his ability to "form, to mold, to recuperate" the circumstances underpinning life at the forge in such a way that frees him and Pip to indulge in "larks" (Expectations, p. 438). Eventually, Pip strikes an attitude similar to Joe's toward the limitations of his life. We find that, although there are hints of the depths of his early resentment, the story Pip tells is remarkably generous to those who cause him to suffer. In fact, as Crawford notes,

> in re-telling his life he constantly reshapes its raw material so as to diminish the pain caused by his ambivalent relations with quasi-parental figures...
>
> (Expectations, p. 630)

The lessons of forgiveness and generosity Pip learns from Joe win him freedom from resentment. At the end of the novel, Pip refers to Joe as "this gentle Christian man" (Expectations, p. 431). As Robin Gilmour notes,

> Pip (and Dickens) separate the word "gentleman" into its classless elements, the gentle man who, living by the

Christian ideals of love and forgiveness, is the one type of gentlemanliness which the novel at the end unequivocally affirms.

("Pip and the Victorian Idea of the Gentleman", p. 121)

Joe's ultimate act of generosity is his forgiveness of Pip's behaviour toward him. Similarly, Pip forgives those who have manipulated his life for their selfish ends. He forgives Miss Havisham for allowing him to believe that she was responsible for his rise in society. He is disappointed to find that his veneer of respectability was financed by a convict, but blames himself for his prejudice rather than resenting the fact that Magwitch has made him into a parody of a gentleman. He discovers a degree of affection for Magwitch, and expresses his newly-found values by reading to him from the Bible. This act is especially significant if we remember that for Magwitch the Bible was merely an instrument of the court, and as such represented an almost magical means of coercion. Pip eschews notions of retribution and replaces them with ideals of forgiveness and humility, thus freeing both himself and his manipulators from the cycle of resentment and revenge that has destroyed the lives of many of the novel's characters.

At this point, we are better equipped to consider the apparent inconsistency between the first and second part of the novel that is the subject of Rawlins' account. This inconsistency can perhaps be partly attributed to the presence of two separate issues that are important to Dickens, but that

are without obvious connection to one another. In the first section of the novel Pip's story criticizes those who, like Mrs. Joe and Pumblechook, inculcate children with a sense of guilt and shame. The text utilizes terms borrowed from Wordsworthian Romanticism to lament the loss of Pip's authentic childhood self to the influence of this sadistic form of adult authority. The corruption of the adult world is revealed to us through Pip's childish and resentful, though entirely accurate, perspective, as he struggles unsuccessfully to resist internalizing the hypocrisy and pettiness of those around him. However, the novel also reveals that what is often to blame for this corrupt adult behaviour is long-standing resentment toward the circumstances of one's life. Contrary to Rawlins' and Tambling's notion that Pip needs to strengthen his sense of injustice concerning the wrongdoings of the people around him in order to achieve psychological health as an adult, the novel argues that he must leave behind the egotism of his childhood before it hardens into a resentment against the unfairness of life that would rob it of all its vitality. In a sense, Pip can be said to escape the self-destructive obsession with personal "glory" that features in the lives of Victor Frankenstein and Robert Walton. Like the young Pip, Walton and Frankenstein are also motivated by resentment against the encroachment of Symbolic authority. Unlike the older Pip, their quest to prolong and nurture the life of the Imaginary self drives them ever further from human

society. Pip is able to outgrow his self-centredness and make peace with the social forces that have shaped him. The contrast between the two novels is made clearer if we examine the way in which Pip and Magwitch each echo both Victor and his creature.

When Pip initially discovers the true circumstances underpinning his life in London, his position is not unlike Frankenstein's creature upon learning that his creator has broken his promise to create a female companion for it. If Miss Havisham is not Pip's benefactor, then neither is he being groomed to be Estella's husband, as he had assumed. In _Frankenstein_, Victor's broken promise leads the creature to abandon its plans to live peacefully, at a safe distance from humankind. Instead it becomes dedicated to avenging Victor's betrayal. Unlike the creature, Pip is able to see beyond the injury to his ego.

Pip makes an overt allusion to Shelley's novel to describe his distress at Magwitch's reappearance in his life, this time drawing a similarity between himself and Victor Frankenstein:

> The imaginary student pursued by the misshapen creature he had impiously made was not more wretched than I, pursued by the creature who had made me, and recoiling from him with a stronger repulsion the more he admired and the fonder he was on me. (_Expectations_, p. 314)

Unlike Victor Frankenstein, Pip ultimately accepts his res-

ponsibility to his "creature". And while Victor's ongoing conflict with the creature represents an ever-deepening alienation from healthy social attachments, Pip's acceptance of his connection with Magwitch marks his discovery of values that also reconnect him with Joe and the "simple faith and clear home-wisdom"(Expectations, p. 444) that he and Biddy represent.

As Pip learns to respond with humility and forgiveness to the those around him, he also seems to abandon his childhood aspirations of Romantic self-authorization. Yet we need also to note that the complex web of social relations that emerge in the novel renders the young Pip's early efforts to be the author of his own existence somewhat naive. Robert Walton's and Victor Frankenstein's dreams of finding psychological space in which they are entirely the authors of their own identities remains a possibility in the isolated wilderness settings which they favour. In Dickens' novel, the possibility of escaping social ties disappears. Identities are found to be inextricably bound up with one another and the social ties that undermine illusory notions of class division also make Romantic self-making seem an unlikely project.

The one character who, for a time, seems exempt from social forces is Orlick. In the first part of the novel Orlick is a lot like the young Pip in that he too lives in a world of "first fancies." Although, as previously noted, the text celebrated Pip's ability to be the center of his own

imaginative world, in Orlick the same ability comes across as nihilistic and menacing. Like Pip, he is self-named. Yet Orlick's act of self-naming is viewed as malicious:

> He pretended that his Christian name was Dolge -- a clear impossibility -- but he was a fellow of that obstinate disposition that I believe him to have imposed that name upon the village as an affront to its understanding.
>
> (Expectations, p. 104)

Pip's self-naming results partly from innocent childhood fancy, and partly from a simple inability to pronounce his last name. He eclipses the authority of his father wholly without malice. As a child, Pip constructs his own reality strictly because, in his isolation, it is the only way he can achieve a meaningful connection between himself and the world. Orlick also invents a world of private meaning that he imposes on the outer world. Yet he is moved to do so out of nihilist glee. He makes up words, unbothered by the fact that no one else knows what they precisely mean. He insists on walking Pip and Biddy home by saying, "I'm jiggered if I don't see you home!" (Expectations, p. 123). Pip explains Orlick's use of the word "jiggered" in the following way:

> This penalty of being jiggered was a favourite suppositious case of his. He attached no definite meaning to the word that I am aware of, but used it, like his own pretended Christian name, to affront mankind, and convey an idea of something savagely damaging. When I was

younger, I had had a general belief that if he had jiggered me, personally, he would have done it with a sharp and twisted hook. (Expectations, p. 123)

Here again what is right for the child appears wrong for the adult. Despite Dickens' Romantic lament for Pip's loss of the pure freedom of the childhood self, he also clearly valorizes social responsibility. The threat that Orlick represents is that of the unsocialized self. It seems that although a little childhood fancy is an important quality in adulthood, it should not cut you off from meaningful community relations. In this respect Dickens' novel is not so different from Shelley's in its anxieties over the consequences of Romantic self-creation.

The relationship between Orlick and Pip is something like that between Victor and his creature. Readers have long accepted that the creature acts as an alter-ego onto which Victor's aggression towards those closest to him are displaced. Shelley's text invites this interpretation through the creature's choice of victims and by Victor's rather suggestive sense of culpability expressed in statements like "...I am the cause of this -- I murdered her. William, Justine, and Henry -- they all died by my hands" (Expectations, p. 156). After Orlick assaults Mrs. Joe, Pip similarly states that "with my head full of GB I was at first disposed to believe that I must have had some hand in the attack upon my sister..." (Expectations, p. 112). In case

readers are slow to see that Orlick's actions might satisfy Pip's own hostility toward his sister, Mrs. Joe, upon being insulted by Orlick asks Pip, "What did that fellow Orlick say to me, Pip?" (Expectations, p. 106). Pip does not answer, but we know that he agrees with Orlick's judgement of her. In some respects, the implied satisfaction Pip takes in Orlick's assault on Mrs. Joe is reminiscent of the vicarious forms of revenge enjoyed by Magwitch and Miss Havisham. However, once again the novel makes a distinction between the terms by which the behaviour of a child and that of an adult should be evaluated. Miss Havisham's and Magwitch's acts of vicarious revenge are symptomatic of lives paralyzed by long-standing resentment. What makes these acts morally reprehensible is that they involve the control and manipulation of persons innocent of wrongdoing. Pip's youth and lack of guile make his vicarious revenge a very different thing. He by no means manipulates Orlick, and this unsought form of vicarious revenge is not symptomatic of a life brought to a standstill by resentment but merely an indication that Pip is in danger of having such a life. This distinction points to an important difference between Orlick and the creature: while the creature expresses Victor's unconscious wishes, Orlick is perhaps more of a reflection of what Pip could become if he did not curb his resentment toward adult authority.

In the second part of the novel, as the possibility of Romantic self-making disappears from the text, Orlick is no

longer depicted as living in an imaginative world of his own invention. He is revealed to be subject to social forces by becoming yet another character manipulated by Compeyson. At first, Orlick's aggression seems free floating, more symptomatic of his nihilistic instability than the rage of resentment toward the unfairness of life experienced by others in the novel. Later, he becomes bent on settling the score with Pip whom, it is revealed, he has always envied. Thus Orlick becomes another of the novel's monsters of resentment. He insists that Pip is implicated in the attack on his sister, recalling the text's earlier connection between the young Pip's resentment and Orlick's monstrous behaviour:

> "I tell you it was your doing -- I tell you it was done through you," he retorted, catching up the gun, and making a blow with the stock at the vacant air between us. "I come upon her from behind, as I come upon you tonight. I giv' it her!... But it wasn't Old Orlick as did it; it was you. You were favoured, and he was bullied and beat. Old Orlick bullied and beat, eh? Now you pays for it. You done it; now you pays for it."
>
> (Expectations, p. 396)

Orlick's suggestion that he has acted as Pip's alter-ego -- that it was "done through" Pip -- has quite the opposite effect of highlighting how much Pip has changed. Pip has left behind his younger self who "nursed" his "assurance" (Expectations, p. 57) of his sister's unjust treatment of him "in a

solitary way". Although, like Orlick, he was "bullied and beat", he refuses to be blindly driven to self-destruction by resentment. Most of all, Pip's ordeal in the sluice-house represents an escape from egocentric isolation and an affirmation of his place in human society. The scene does this by initially emphasizing his seclusion. He goes to his appointment at the sluice-house secretly. As he nears his destination, he "seemed to have the whole flats to myself" (Expectations, p. 392). Once caught, he considers calling out for help, but "few knew better than I the solitary nature of the spot" (p. 396). To die under such conditions, with the appearance of having deserted Magwitch, would make Pip feel as socially disconnected as Orlick. Pip's isolation at the sluice-house is reinforced by echoes of the young Pip's experiences at Satis House. Orlick himself becomes connected with Satis House when he is employed there as its porter. The dark, lonely squalor of his room is a miniature version of Miss Havisham's isolation. He seems even to share Miss Havisham's arrested sense of time: he finds that "one day is so like another here" (Expectations, p. 217) that he cannot say how long he has been there. The isolation of the sluice-house and the anti-social secrecy that Pip's journey there requires recalls his former experiences at Satis House. Just as Miss Havisham's and Orlick's wounded egotism lead them into anti-social seclusion, so too did the young Pip's shame over his low origins lead him to isolate himself from Biddy and

Joe. In the second half of the novel, his recognition of the error of Miss Havisham's (and his own) ways is couched in spiritual terms. He realizes that Miss Havisham

> in shutting out the light of day, had shut out infinitely more; that, in seclusion, she had secluded herself from a thousand natural and healing influences; that her mind, brooding solitary, had grown diseased, as all minds do and must and will that reverse the appointed order of their Maker; I knew equally well.
>
> (Expectations, pp. 370-1)

As Dennis Walder points out, "in her proud isolation, she has gone contrary to the divine plan according to which we are essentially social beings" (p. 190, Dickens and Religion). During his imprisonment in the sluice-house, Pip symbolizes his escape from this isolation by reaching out in his imagination to the sites of his newly found social acceptance:

> Mill Pond Bank, and Chinks's Basin, and the Old Green Copper Rope-Walk, all so clear and plain! Provis in his rooms, the signal whose use was over, pretty Clara, the good motherly woman, old Bill Barley on his back, all drifting by, as on the swift stream of my life fast running out to sea! (Expectations, p. 398).

At first glance, one might wonder why the household on Mill Pond Bank, and the relatively minor characters that inhabit it, seems so vivid to Pip. Despite its apparent trivial importance, at the end of the chapter it seems to be asso-

ciated with Pip's new perspective on life. He asserts that "a veil seemed to be drawn" from him (p. 403), and a moment later Herbert concludes the chapter by exclaiming, "When it turns at nine o' clock...Look out for us, and stand ready, you over there at Mill Pond Bank!" (Expectations, p. 403).

In order to understand the significance of the house on Mill Pond Bank we need to recognize that the concern with a "divine plan" --a natural order ordained by God -- that Walder notes in connection with the treatment of Miss Havisham becomes of increasing importance in the text. Satis House, especially in contrast with Mill Pond Bank, is revealed to be grossly in breach of this natural order. Just as Pip refers to the "impiety" (Expectations, p. 314) of Victor Frankenstein's creation when describing his relationship with Magwitch (see p. 100 above) he also comes to see Miss Havisham's influence on Estella as part of the way in which she has "reversed the appointed order of the Maker" (Expectations, p. 371). Pip charges Miss Havisham of "keeping a part of [Estella's] nature away from her" (Expectations, p. 371). Elsewhere, upon encountering the depth of Estella's heartlessness, he protests "...You, so young, untried, and beautiful, Estella! Surely it is not in nature." (Expectations, p. 336). Estella answers that "it is in my nature...It is in the nature formed within me." (Expectations, p. 336) Pip comes to see Estella as an aberration of nature. She has been formed by Miss Havisham into something counter to the "appointed order" of a supreme

Maker.

Mill Pond Bank offers a counterpoint to the Gothic gloom of Satis House. The house is occupied by Mrs. Whimple, and her step-daughter, Clara. Despite the cantankerous, bedridden Mr. Whimple upstairs, Mrs. Whimple is not resentful of her lot in life, which represents a significant triumph in the world of this novel. Although her circumstances are far from ideal, she is a woman of "pleasant and thriving appearance" (Expectations, p. 347). Unlike the dark and dusty home of Miss Havisham, her rooms are "fresh and airy" (Expectations, p. 350), and overall the place was "remarkably well kept and clean" (Expectations, p. 348). Unlike the cold-hearted and headstrong Estella whose character is "surely not in nature" (Expectations, p. 336), "there was something so natural and winning in Clara's resigned way" (p. 349). The cruel pleasure Miss Havisham takes in arranging Pip's heartbreak at Estella's hands stands in sharp contrast to Mrs. Whimple's role in Herbert and Clara's romance. Herbert and Clara had "confided their affection to the motherly Mrs. Wimple, by whom it had been fostered and regulated with equal kindness and discretion ever since" (Expectations, p. 349). Although Pip originally saw Herbert as ineffectual and unlikely to meet with much success, he now seems to envy him. His relationship with Estella and the social status it requires of him pales in contrast. Herbert's happiness with Clara puts him in mind of "Estella and of our parting and I went home very sadly"

(Expectations, p. 352).

Pip's admiration of Mrs. Whimple's home represents his embrace of "redeeming" qualities of "trust and hope" (Expectations, p. 350) over the "unnatural" dramas of imaginary revenge he was involved in at Satis House. The shift in ideals that is embodied in the contrast between the two houses reflects Edward Lytton-Bulwer's[1] comments regarding the change from Romantic to Victorian values. In his England and the English he writes,

> When Byron passed away,...we turned to the actual and practical career of life: we awoke from the morbid, the dreaming, 'the moonlight and dimness of the mind,' and by a natural reaction addressed ourselves to the active and daily objects which lay before us. (p. 286)

We have noted that in the latter half of Dickens' novel there is a similar emphasis placed on the virtue of "natural reactions". Both Bulwer-Lytton and Dickens are perhaps echoing Carlyle, who, in Sartor Resartus, valorizes "natural" modes of thought and behaviour. Once Teufelsdröckh undergoes his "Baphometic Fire-baptism" and rejects the Romantic pretentions of the "old inward Satanic School", the Editor suggests that he has assumed "a much more natural state" (p. 136, Sartor Resartus).

Pip wakes up "from the morbid, the dreaming", as Satis

1. The relevance of Lytton-Bulwer's perspective arises in part from his influence on Dickens' work. It was he who persuaded the author to revise the original ending of the novel (Dickens, Peter Ackroyd, p.902).

House and the egocentric self-obsession it represents cease to be the guiding principle of his life. There is also a sense that Pip's moral progress is marked by a waking up from his idle dream-like life in London and a turning to what Bulwer-Lytton calls, "the actual and practical career of life...". Pip describes his and Herbert's life in London as one in which

> We spent as much money as we could, and got as little for it as people could make up their minds to give us. We were always more or less miserable, and most of our acquaintance were in the same condition. There was a gay fiction among us that we were constantly enjoying ourselves, and a skeleton truth that we never did. (Expectations, p. 256)

Pip's and Herbert's bookkeeping also constitutes a kind of "gay fiction." Pip's method of accounting is comprised of making lists of debts and placing ticks next to them. These exertions promote a "calm, a rest, a virtuous hush" (Expectations, p. 258), but solve nothing. In estimating what they owed, he "left a margin" (Expectations, p. 258) of error that gave the boys a further illusion of plenty.

After he discovers that it is Magwitch who has been sustaining him financially, he abandons the indolence and the illusions that sustained the "gay fiction" of his life in London and turns to "the actual and practical career of life", ultimately taking a job in the shipping industry. Once employed at Clarriker & Co, Pip "lived happily with Herbert and

his wife, and lived frugally, and paid my debts, and maintained a constant correspondence with Biddy and Joe" (Expectations, p. 446). The tone is somewhat melancholy, but Pip, however reluctantly, seems to be affirming the virtue of steady employment celebrated by Carlyle and others of his era. For Carlyle it was essential that

> Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy whole might. Work while it is called Today; for the Night cometh, wherein no man can work.
>
> (Sartor Resartus, p. 157)

Pip's endorsement of a Victorian work ethic is perhaps better expressed in his admiration for "Herbert's ever cheerful industry" (Expectations, p. 447). In Pip's final portrait of Herbert, based on his years working beside him, we find something of Carlyle's notion that work leads inevitably to self-knowledge:

> A certain inarticulate Self-consciousness dwells in us; which only our Works are the mirror wherein the spirit first sees its natural lineaments. Hence, too, the folly of that impossible Precept, Know thyself; till it be translated into this partially possible one, Know what thou canst work at. (Sartor Resartus, p. 132)

Pip's final words concerning Herbert suggests his years at Clarriker's have brought him insight that enforces the humility he discovered after giving up the idle life of a London gentleman:

> We owed so much to Herbert's ever cheerful industry and readiness that I often wondered how I had concieved the old idea of his inaptitude, until I was one day enlightened by the reflection that perhaps the inaptitude had never been in him at all, but had been in me.
> (_Expectations_, p. 447)

The most significant indicator of Pip's development is probably his relationship with Magwitch. As previously noted, as a child, Pip responded to Magwitch with a mixture of sympathy, identification and fear, linked to Romantic notions of the imagination. Later, as a young London gentleman, Pip reacts to Magwitch with snobbish repugnance. By the end of the novel, Pip overcomes his revulsion toward Magwitch and discovers a degree of fellowship with him. However, in contrast with his earlier dealings with the convict on the marsh, Pip now possesses a degree of psychological distance in his relationship with Magwitch. His relationship with his one-time benefactor becomes characterized primarily by a sense of obligation and duty toward "a man who had meant to be my benefactor, and who had felt affectionately, gratefully, and generously towards me with great constancy through a series of years" (_Expectations_, p. 415). In the relationship between the two, it is Magwitch who seems to feel most of the affection. However, Pip resolves "to never stir from [Magwitch's] side" (_Expectations_, p. 416), thus disregarding Wemmick's advice to "lay hold of his [Magwitch's] portable

property" (<u>Expectations</u>, p. 346), and distance himself from its source, before it is "forfeited to the crown" (<u>Expectations</u>, p. 416). Magwitch makes clear the choice Pip must make between his obligation to his benefactor and his life as a gentleman of leisure when he advises that "It's best as a gentleman should not be knowed to belong to me now" (<u>Expectations</u>, p. 346). Pip's decision to disregard personal profit and realize his responsibility to Magwitch is entirely in keeping with Victorian notions of duty. In <u>Sartor Resartus</u>, Professor Teufeldsdrokh stresses the importance of renouncing an egocentric quest for personal happiness in favour of applying oneself to a life of duty. Teufeldsrockh expresses nothing but contempt for those overly concerned with their happiness:

> "What is this that, ever since earliest years, thou hast been fretting and fuming, and lamenting and self-tormenting, on account of? Because the Thou (sweet gentleman) is not sufficiently honoured, nourished, soft-bedded, and lovingly cared-for? Foolish Soul! What Act of Legislature was there that thou shouldst be Happy?"
>
> (<u>Sartor Resartus</u>, p.153)

In part, he urges his readers to renounce a selfish quest for personal happines because it leads people into savage conflict:

> "Hast thou in any way a Contention with thy broth, I advise thee, think well what the meaning thereof is. If

thou gauge it to the bottom, it is simply this: 'Fellow, see! thou art taking more than thy share of Happiness in the world, something from my share: which by the Heavens, thou shalt not; nay I will fight thee rather.' -- Alas, and the whole lot to be divided is such a beggarly matter, truly a "feast of shells," for the substance has been spilled out: not enough to quench one Appetite; and the collective human species clutching at them ! -- Can we not, in all such cases, rather say: 'Take it, thou too-ravenous individual; take that pitiful additional fraction of a share, which I reckoned mine, but which thou so wantest; take it with a blessing: would to Heaven I had enough for thee !'"

(Sartor Resartus, p. 156)

The alternative to this selfish struggle for personal happiness, is to "Do the Duty which lies nearest thee," which thou knowest to be a Duty!" (Sartor Resartus, p. 156). To apply onself to one's duty is to emerge from the egocentricism in which "man has been dimly struggling and inexpressibly languishing to work." (Sartor Resartus, p. 156). Pip's decision, motivated out of a sense of duty, to forsake his benefactor's money, and remain by the convict's side as he lies dying, is clearly in keeping with Carlyle's ideas. In short, Pip becomes a good Carlylean Victorian -- industrious, socially responsible, selfless and humble.

Thus far my efforts to account for what Rawlins sees as

Dickens' "betrayal of the novel's original ego-centred impetus" (_Betrayal_, p. 80) have led to a fairly conventional interpretation of Pip's moral progress: I have argued that the novel is about Pip's personal salvation from a destructive egotism. Recalling the terms of the first section of this work, one may say that Pip has abandoned Romantic self-authorization -- the destructive, isolating search for personal "glory" -- that characterizes the lives of Robert Walton and Victor Frankenstein. He has discovered Christian values of forgiveness and humility and has made peace with the people in his life. This is essentially Crawford's point. He argues that

> where Shelley's work posits an ideology of assertive individual self-reliance in a godless world, Dickens's text emphasizes the values of human community and, especially, of submission to divine grace.
>
> ("Pip and the Monster", p.625)

As we have seen, Rawlins and Tambling also read the second half of _Great Expectations_ as the story of Pip's victory over the egotism of his youth, but they are disappointed by Pip's "submission to divine grace." However, these critics fail to take sufficient account of the shift in the balance of power between Pip and those who have shaped his life that occurs in the latter half of the novel. Rawlins outlines his view of Pip's dilemma by comparing Pip to Dorothea Brooke, suggesting that both are victims of, in the words of George Eliot, "a

certain spiritual grandeur ill-matched with the meanness of opportunity" ("Betrayal", p. 92). In detailing what he sees as Dickens' "betrayal of the child" ("Betrayal", p. 89), Rawlins argues that "Pip is much like Dorothea Brooke, but Dickens is not like George Eliot; his need to exonerate the parents is stronger" (p. 92, "Betrayal"). By "exonerate the parents", Rawlins means that Pip frees from blame all those who have manipulated him. Yet I would like to argue that Pip in the latter half of the novel also succeeds in "exonerating" those who have exercised power over him in the sense of relieving them from duty. That is, in freeing himself from the resentment and sense of inferiority that subjugated him to the power of others, he also frees himself from their grasp. Rawlins might argue that Pip overcomes his resentment by embracing the sense of inferiority others have encouraged him to feel. However, there is evidence that Pip's new values actually improve his self-esteem. Early in the novel, Pip writes that he has reason to believe that his childhood "dread of not being understood" is a common experience since "I have no particular reason to suspect myself of having been a monstrosity..." (Expectations, p. 60). This is certainly the perspective of the adult Pip, and it stands in marked contrast to the young Pip's sense of both his isolation and inferiority. If we recall all the people in the novel who, in one way or another, made Pip feel like a "monster" or a "wretch", we can see that Pip seems to have overcome the self-image imposed on

him by others.

Following Crawford's notion of Pip's "submission to divine will" one might argue that Pip trades in subjugation to the class system for an even more thoroughgoing sense of inferiority and guilt in the form of Christian values. Yet Crawford attributes to Pip a degree of piety not supported by the text. Crawford argues that Pip and Magwitch both learn

> to see the insignificance of their desires when set against the larger truth of divine Providence. It is Pip who must lead the way here, since he has at least been educated and trained to be more receptive to conventional religion than the outcast convict and may thus return Magwitch's gifts in a manner their donor little anticipates. ("Pip and the Monster", p. 644).

The values Pip discovers, those of "simple faith and clear home-wisdom" (Expectations, p. 444), seem to have more to do with the kind of natural generosity that Joe exhibits than with formal religious training. In fact, when Pip does bring scriptural wisdom to bear in his relationship with Magwitch, he doesn't quite get it right. Pip, attending Magwitch at his deathbed, "knew there were no better words I could say beside his bed, than 'O Lord, be merciful to him, a sinner!'" (Expectations, p. 428). The passage from Luke 18 actually reads "God be merciful to me a sinner". Pip's misquoting, though probably unconscious, points to the tendency of the text's assertions of divine authority over human will to exert

a subtle shift in power between Pip and those who once controlled him. In fact, it is hard not to read Pip's humility and generosity of spirit as a strategy intended, in part, to both obscure and help satisfy aggression against those who have manipulated his life for their own purposes. That is, it would seem that although Dickens wants Pip to become one of the "good people", he also wishes to enact the triumph of the child over the overbearing parent. Luke 18 concludes with the words, "for everyone that exalteth himself shall be abased: and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted". Nietzsche argues that these lines should be rewritten as "he that humbleth himself _wishes_ to be exalted" (_Human, All Too Human_, p. 91). In support of Nietzsche's view we may note that although Pip's new values grant him a degree of freedom from the past, these same values promote in Magwitch a passive acceptance of the forces that have brought about his destruction. Pip notes that he

> sometimes derived an impression, from [Magwitch's] manner or from a whispered word or two which escaped him, that he pondered over the question whether he might have been a better man under better circumstances. But he never justified himself by a hint tending that way, or tried to bend the past out of its eternal shape.
>
> (_Expectations_, p. 424)

Magwitch submits to the "eternal shape" of the past, and dies serenely. Pip gives up his resentment toward the past and

experiences liberty from its grasp, the death of Magwitch contributing no small part to his new autonomy. Overall, the kindness that Pip shows Magwitch seems to have an increasingly subduing effect on him. During their failed escape Pip notes Magwitch's passive obedience to him:

> Yet he was as submissive to a word of advice as if he had been in constant terror, for, when he we ran ashore to get some bottles of beer into the boat, and he was stepping out, I hinted that I thought he would be safest where he was, and he said, "Do you, dear boy?" and quietly sat down again. (Expectations, p. 407)

Pip's covert aggression has not escaped critical attention. Crawford notes Pip's suspiciously inept deportment during the escape. He suggests that Pip's

> failure to throw pursuit off the track by any diversion, and, above all, his refusal to be warned by the figures who lurk around the boast, are all appalling blunders that, despite Wemmick's later assertion of the impossibility of getting Magwitch away, surely hint at Pip's underlying complicity in his patron's capture and death. ("Pip and the Monster", p. 642)

In Pip's bungling, Crawford "detects something of Victor's covert desire to rid himself of those closest to him" ("Pip and the Monster", p. 642). In Frankenstein, we know of Victor's "covert desire to rid himself of those closest to him" through the murderous activities of his creature.

Victor's perpetually horrified surprise over his creature's choice of victims borders on the histrionic.

Perhaps Dickens is picking up on the transparency of Victor's unconscious aggression when in his novel he makes Pip's parricidal impulses into something of a running joke. During a harrowing reading of George Barnwell, Pip is made to identify with the events of the novel. Pumplechook tells him to "Take warning, boy, take warning!" (Expectations, p. 109). To which Pip reacts by commenting to the reader, "...as if it were a well-known fact that I contemplated murdering a near relation, provided I could only induce one to have the weakness to become my benefactor" (Expectations, p. 109). Later, when Pip does acquire a benefactor in Magwitch, he again raises the issue of his murderous intentions. Pip is concerned about the effect that his rejection of Magwitch's money might have on the man. He worries that "under the disappointment", Magwitch might put himself "in the way of being taken", which "would make [Pip] regard myself, in some sort, as his murderer" (Expectations, p. 318). As Anny Sadrin notes,

> if Dickens had read Freud, he would never have dared to write this sentence!....In expressing his fear of being the `murderer' of the man who calls him `my son', how could Pip fail to draw our attention to the parricidal drive of his nature and to remind us of Pumblechook's oracular words. (Parentage and Inheritance in the Novels of Charles Dickens, p. 108)

However, Dickens doesn't need Freud to know that good sons do not think about murdering their fathers. What appears to allow for these suggestions of Pip's aggression is the counterpoint offered by his exaggerated humility and propensity toward forgiveness. He dissolves the financial ties that bind him to Magwitch, but he does so secretly in order not to upset Magwitch. He appeases the father without submitting to his power, thus retaining his autonomy without becoming embroiled in Oedipal conflict. The point is highlighted by comparison with Frankenstein. In that novel, resentment against Symbolic authority causes Victor Frankenstein to seek to undermine the basis of his father's authority. The result of his labours is a creature who is also resentful of its creator, and who ultimately asserts dominance over him. After Victor destroys the companion he promised to create for it, the creature's rage of disappointment places Victor in a subordinate role. The creature says, "you are my creator, but I am your master; - obey!" (p. 142). The creature's vengeful assertion of power over Victor signals the nearing of the destruction of both of their lives.

There are distinct echoes of this scene in Dickens' novel. In Frankenstein, the creature leads up to its assertion of dominance by detailing its hardships:

> "You have destroyed the work which you began; what is it that you intend? do you dare to break your promise? I have endured toil and misery; I left Switzerland with

> you; I crept along the shores of the Rhine, among its willow islands, and over the summits of its hills. I have dwelt many months in the heaths of England, and among the deserts of Scotland. I have endured incalculable fatigue, and cold, and hunger; do you dare destroy my hopes?"
>
> (Frankenstein, p.142)

Herbert outlines the danger of disappointing Magwitch in terms that recall the creature's words:

> ...think of this! He comes here at the peril of his life for the realization of his fixed idea. In the moment of realization, after all his toil and waiting, you cut the ground from under his feet, destroy his idea, and make his gains worthless to him. Do you see nothing that he might do under the disappointment?
>
> (Expectations, p. 317)

In Dickens' novel "toil and misery" becomes "toil and waiting", "destroy my hopes" becomes "destroy his idea" and the creature's final question "do you dare destroy my hopes?" is similar to Herbert's "Do you see nothing that he might do under the disappointment?" On one level, the echo of Shelley's novel reinforces the importance of both Pip's and Magwitch's escape from the destructive effects of revenge. Beyond that, we may note that instead of representing a diminishment of the protagonist's autonomy, this scene is replayed in Dickens' novel to point to Pip's mastery over those who have controlled him. As we have noted, Pip's

greatest anxiety is that Magwitch's self-destruction may cause him to "regard myself, in some sort, as his murderer" (p. 318). Here we are hearing from Pip the writer, anxious that the story he tells is not one of a resentful son's Oedipal revenge. Pip's strategy of disguising unconscious aggression through exaggerated humility has its limitations. It requires that he remain, as Crawford notes, "his own worst accusor" ("Pip and the Monster", p. 628). Dickens seems to have felt that to free Pip from the grasp of his manipulators without turning him into another anti-social monster of resentment required that he be burdened by an excessively generous view of those he overcomes. However, it must be noted that aggression against parental figures, expressed through Pip and other characters, is at times given fairly free play. While at Magwitch's side at the prison hospital, Pip reflects, "...it was dreadful to think that I could not be sorry at heart for his being badly hurt, since it was unquestionably best that he should die." (Expectations, p. 415). In this rather circuitious statement, Pip expresses all the right feelings concerning Magwitch's impending death -- regret, sadness -- but not quite for the right reasons. He regrets not so much Magwitch's demise but that he "could not be sorry at heart for his being badly hurt."

Herbert joins Pip in his feelings about paternal authority by marvelling over Clara's lack of family ties: "But what a blessing for the son of my father and mother to love a

girl who has no relations, and who can never bother herself, or anybody else, about her family!" (Expectations, p. 348). Herbert's choice of words recalls the "blessing" young lovers traditionally seek from parents. The only blessing Herbert seeks is that of Bill Barley's death and the end of parental control. Pip is the first to broach the subject of Bill Barley's death, thus repeating his sentiment that it is sometimes "unquestionably best that" parental figures "should die" four pages after he has left Magwitch's deathbed. When Pip learns that Clara cannot marry until her ailing and cantankerous father dies, he says, "Not to say an unfeeling thing,...he cannot do better than go" (Expectations, p. 419). Herbert, striking the same key of melancholy regret in which Pip expresses his parricidal wishes, answers, "I'm afraid that must be admitted" (Expectations, p. 419). Herbert then elaborates on his own feelings about familial authority. After Clara's father dies, Herbert plans to

> "...walk quietly into the nearest church. Remember! The blessed darling comes of no family, my dear Handel, and never looked into the red book, and hasn't a notion about her grandpapa. What a fortune for the son of my mother!"
>
> (Expectations, p. 419)

Herbert's vision of a simple marriage ceremony free of familial interference is made real on the following page, when Wemmick appears and, with as little formality as possible, marries Miss Skiffins. The only family in attendance is the

Aged P., who seems, in his loveable ineffectuality, to represent the novel's notion of the ideal living parent. We need also note that with their air of cheerful domestic harmony, Wemmick's castle and the first floor of Mrs. Whimple's household (Barley is upstairs) both illustrate the same values of "simple faith and clear home wisdom" (Expectations, p. 444) which Joe and Biddy's life at the forge represents. That is, all the sites representing Pip's new-found virtues also seem to quietly celebrate the absence of paternal authority. We never know Wemmick's father by any other name than the one given to him by his son. This act of a son renaming his father is repeated a number of times. Magwitch, born Abel Provis, is renamed Mr. Campbell (Expectations, p.352). He is hidden away in Mrs. Wimple's house where Clara's father, Bill Barley, is renamed Old Gruffandgrim by Herbert (Expectations, p.348). This business of sons' renaming fathers highlights the power children enjoy over their parents in the last part of the novel. In each case, the father is at the end of his life. He is either entirely submissive to the son (Aged P.), or else the difficulties posed by the lingering persistence of his paternal prerogative are about to be brought to an end by his impending death (Barley, Magwitch). Pip's retention of the name he gave himself foreshadows that the story he tells would resolve itself, not through submission to parental authority, but through a surreptitious triumph over it. In the end Pip has gained some of the self-authorization that he had in the

opening passage. Standing before the graves of his family, he was the author of his identity. He disregarded the authority of his predecessors, but he did so without malice toward them, and thus was free of Oedipal conflict. Pip's vague ideals of "simple faith and clear home wisdom" (Expectations, p. 444) bestow on him a humble innocence that goes a long way to restoring that same conflict-free self-authorization. He wins back the innocence of his childhood, but augments it with a recognition of the inescapability of social forces. In order to connect Pip's resolution to the terms of the first part of our discussion we might say that Pip has abandoned the Romantic defiance and isolation of his childhood, but has preserved some of the integrity of the Imaginary self in the process. However, such a scenario does place certain limitations on his life as an adult. Although he learns how to balance the integrity of his childhood self with the demands of society, he remains a son in a world of tamed fathers. Fatherhood eludes him but he lives to see himself reflected in Pip junior. Instead of becoming a father, Pip tells a story that ends with most of the sons and one daughter living in a world free of oppressive parental power.

The one daughter is, of course, Estella, and she has two mothers from which she is liberated: Miss Havisham and Molly. Estella rebels against Miss Havisham in a scene that takes some of its emotional force from an echo of Victor Frankenstein's destruction of the female monster. Soon after Estella

"gradually began to detach herself" (Expectations, p. 283) from her place by Miss Havisham's side she responds to her stepmother's request for love by saying,

> "Mother by adoption, I have said that I owe everything to you. All I possess is freely yours. All that you have given me is at your command to have given. Beyond that, I have nothing. And if you ask me to give you what you never gave me, my gratitude and duty cannot do impossibilities." (Expectations, p. 284)

Estella's outburst devastates Miss Havisham, and when Pip reenters the room he finds that

> Miss Havisham had settled down, I hardly know how, upon the floor, among the faded bridal relics with which it was strewn. I took advantage of the moment -- I had sought one from the first -- to leave the room, after beseeching Estella's attention to her with a movement of my hand. ...Miss Havisham's grey hair was all adrift upon the ground, among the other bridal wrecks, and was a miserable sight to see. (Expectations, p. 286)

Similarly, Victor Frankenstein reenters his laboratory where "the remains of the half-finished creature, whom I had destroyed, lay scattered on the floor" (Frankenstein, p. 144). The analogy to Shelley's novel underlines the shift in power that has occurred. As Miss Havisham's destroyer, Estella usurps her stepmother's Frankenstein-like role of creator. That is, Estella's uprising is more than a creature's revenge.

Her actions are the first in a series that bring about a complete transformation in Miss Havisham's character. Soon after Estella's outburst, peace seems restored with Estella once again "sitting at Miss Havisham's knee", but now the image has changed from destruction to re-creation. Estella was "taking up some stitches in one of those old articles of dress that was dropping to pieces,..." (Expectations, p. 286). The scene ends with Estella and Pip playing at cards "as of yore -- only [they] were skilful now" (Expectations, p. 286). Card-play "of yore" was the site of Pip's humiliation as Estella, obedient to Miss Havisham's sadistic needs, tormented him for calling the "knaves jacks." But now Miss Havisham's power is gradually undermined as Estella and Pip grow "skilful" at manipulating those who once controlled them.

Estella's own efforts to free herself of Miss Havisham's influence are only partially successful. She remains, for a time, what Miss Havisham made her: cold-hearted and bold. The change in Miss Havisham is, following this episode, only slight. Her "manner toward Estella " remains the same except that it had "something like fear infused among its former characteristics" (Expectations, p. 287).

Despite her limited success, Estella seems to stage the revolt against the parent correctly. Her attempt to "gradually detach herself" (Expectations, p. 283) from Miss Havisham's influence is informed by a dispassionate recognition of psychological forces, and it is executed with the requisite lack

of resentment. However, as a strong female, she has a long way to go before she becomes one of the "good people", enjoying true liberation from parental control. As Lucy Frost shows in "Taming to Improve: Dickens and the Women in Great Expectations", the novel is hard on strong women. Estella, Mrs. Joe and Molly are all subjected to masculine violence that serves to subdue them. The text's position that powerful women need to be tamed is perhaps stated most clearly in Estella's case. Estella is not truly free of Miss Havisham's influence until she is "bent and broken into better shape" (Expectations, p. 451). The goal of this abuse seems to be to render aggressive women as passive as Clara, whose "natural" and "resigned way" (Expectations, p. 349) is, as we have previously noted, contrasted with Estella's "unnatural" bold heartlessness.

The ultimate triumph over Miss Havisham is Pip's, although Estella's case is instrumental to his success. During the scene of her final destruction, Pip's humility and sense of forgiveness are at their most excruciatingly earnest, but the text everywhere hints at what is really going on. Great pains are taken to distance Pip from a motive of revenge. Ostensibly, Pip is visiting Miss Havisham for the honourable purpose of secretly asking for a favour in Herbert's behalf. Miss Havisham agrees and supplies a note that was "direct and clear, and evidently intended to absolve me from any suspicion of profiting by the receipt of the money" (Expectations, p. 369). In this odd detail there is a

faint echo of Pip's concern about seeming like Magwitch's murderer. Here again, just as his manipulator is to die the issue of Pip's culpability suddenly arises. Yet it is hard to imagine that Pip might not experience some "profit" from hearing the woman who caused him so much unhappiness say,

> "Can I only serve you, Pip, by serving your friend? Regarding that as done, is there nothing I can do for you yourself?" (Expectations, p.369).

But if Pip were to admit to such small pleasures of vengeance, then the scene, soon after, of her final emotional and physical devastation would cast him as a monster of resentment, worse even than those who have controlled his life. Pip urges Miss Havisham to "dismiss me from your mind and conscience" but then goes on to say "but Estella is a different case..." (Expectations, p. 371). Pip forgives her, claiming that he himself "wants forgiveness and direction far too much to be bitter with you" (Expectations, p.370), but is careful to outline her crimes against Estella. Miss Havisham's request for forgiveness is made in deeply symbolic terms. She removes the pencil with which she wrote the note from its chain and gives it to Pip, telling him that

> "My name is on the first leaf. If you can ever write under my name, "I forgive her," though ever so long after my broken hear is dust, pray do it."
>
> (Expectations, p. 370)

Pip has been "unchained" from Miss Havisham's power over him.

More than that, as autobiographer, he has the last word, and in the story he tells, he does not so much rebel against his tormentors as rewrite them. The Miss Havisham we have come to know as cruel and self-obsessed dies, but a character with her name lives on for a while longer. Critics have noted the implausibility of Miss Havisham's transformation. Most often in question is this glimpse into Miss Havisham's innocent girlhood:

> She turned her face to me for the first time since she had averted it, and to my amazement, I may even add to my terror, dropped on her knees at my feet; with her folded hands raised to me in the manner in which, when her poor heart was young and fresh and whole, they must often have been raised from her mother's side.
>
> (Expectations, p. 370)

Frost traces this image of "picture book girlhood" to the "shallowest platitudes of Victorian sentimentality" (Taming to Improve, p. 73) and points out it could not be true since, as Herbert tells us, Miss Havisham's mother died when she was a baby. But the text betrays a desire to punish her, primarily for her behaviour toward Pip, and it can only do so by humanizing her sufficiently that she is able to die repeating "Take the pencil and write under my name, "I forgive her!" (p. 374) which would seem, given its connection to the earlier scene, a request for Pip's forgiveness, although Pip made clear that she should only concern herself with Estella's case.

The task Dickens seems to have set himself -- to have Pip subdue and assert dominance over parental figures, wholly without betraying a sense of vengeance -- presents certain obstacles to the novel's plausibility. Miss Havisham's treatment is not the only one in which the reader is asked to make rather abrupt changes in the way he or she sees a character. Jaggers offers another example of the sort of change in perspective we are asked to make. Rawlins outlines the problem succinctly:

> In the beginning, Jaggers is very nearly the Devil. He works from a desk chair like a coffin, 'sets man-traps' for everyone (Expectations, p. 221), hires false witnesses, torments Molly for his own amusement in front of his dinner guests while boasting of his courtroom dishonesty, and generally in his dealings with the human race 'has 'em, soul and body' (Expectations, p. 283). He is the archetypal adult in Pip's world: a puppet-master the world smiles on, who controls by inducing groundless guilt in others. ("Betrayal", p. 86)

Rawlins then notes that once Pip learns of Jaggers' part in Estella's case, we are asked to view the man in an entirely different light:

> Pip, armed with incriminating secret knowledge about Jaggers -- that is, when the power balance between them seems finally to have tipped in Pip's favour -- calls Jaggers to account. But the scene goes horribly wrong,

and Pip is forced to exonerate Jaggers of all charges. Jaggers explains that his behaviour in Estella's case has been humane; he 'saved' her from the fate of the criminal's child, he 'sheltered' Molly and `kept down the old wild violent nature', and so on (Expectations, pp. 424-6). Finally Jaggers persuades Pip to keep Jaggers' secret, thus making him an accessory and winning from him tacit sanction for Jaggers's behaviour. The oppressive parent has been discovered to be wise and loving -- and what of Pip? He looked and saw the devil -- there must be something wrong with him. ("Betrayal", p. 86)

There is no question that the change we are asked to make to our opinion of Jaggers is difficult to accept. However, we need to recognize that Pip's story is first and foremost about his escape from the destructive cycle of revenge and resentment. Rawlins believes Pip needs " a confrontation with the hypercritical parent and an exorcising of the negative self-concept through a raging attack on the icon" ("Betrayal", p. 86). Yet, as we have seen, in Dickens' novel, "raging attacks" do not exorcise "negative self-concepts" but only deepen fixations of resentment. If Pip were to expose Jaggers his actions might smack of vengeance. But perhaps more importantly there is a sense here also that Jaggers, as an embodiment of institutional power, cannot be overcome by the individual.

To fully appreciate the nature of Pip's relationship with Jaggers we must consider it against the background of Victor

Frankenstein's similar dealings with the patriarchal figures of Ingoldstadt. Dickens' Jaggers and Wemmick are analogous to Shelley's Krempe and Waldman. Both Jaggers and Krempe are wholly institutional creatures that seem to enact the Symbolic order's intolerance of the Imaginary self. To state the case in more sociological terms, we may say that they illustrate the tendency of institutional systems to subdue and regulate individuals into what Michel Foucault calls a "docile body" that "may be subjected, used, transformed and improved" (Discipline and Punish, p. 251). Foucault argues that when institutions set out to control individuals, they begin by "asking how much of the child he has in him, what secret madness lies within him, what fundamental crime he has dreamed of committing" (Discipline and Punish, p. 193). In Shelley's novel, Krempe has nothing but scorn for Victor Frankenstein's background in alchemy. He requires that Frankenstein "exchange chimeras of boundless grandeur for realities of little worth" (Frankenstein, p. 50). Krempe's view is that Frankenstein must abandon the fancies of childhood if he expects to thrive at Ingoldstadt. Waldman, like Wemmick, is somewhat of a bipartisan figure: a member of the patriarchy who is sympathetic to Victor's penchant for "chimeras of boundless grandeur". Waldman seems to offer the possibility that a compromise can be reached between the needs of the authentic self and the demands of socialization. But this possibility is entertained only briefly in the novel, and Victor Frankenstein's early

defiance against paternal authority ultimately translates into an antagonistic relationship with institutional power. Frankenstein realizes that his project transgresses patriarchal law and that there is no place for the Imaginary self within the Symbolic world of Ingoldstadt. However, Victor's failure to integrate his goals with those of the patriarchy is not only a consequence of Romantic extremism but also a part of the novel's (Romantic) anxiety over institutional power. The novel everywhere valorizes relationships based on domestic intimacy, but suggests they are opposed by powerful institutional forces. Once Justine is suspected of murdering William, a false institutional knowledge of her guilt is imposed on those who know her to be incapable of such a crime. It is as if the logic of the judicial system had its own momentum, powerful enough to override the intuitions of the human heart. Frankenstein's father, upon learning of the seemingly irrefutable evidence of Justine's guilt, "would rather have been for ever ignorant than have discovered so much depravity and ingratitude in one I valued so highly" (Frankenstein, p. 75). Alphonse Frankenstein accepts the judgement of the impersonal judicial system over his own personal sense of Justine's innocence. Ultimately, even Justine is compelled to accept this false guilt in order to gain absolution from the church. It would seem that in Shelley's novel, although an authentic self may thrive within a private, domestic sphere, it has little chance of survival within institutional systems of

power. We may perhaps trace the ambivalence in the treatment of Victor Frankenstein as divided between admiration for the tragic heroism of his defiance of institutional authority and a lament over the fact that his extremism also leads to his alienation from the domestic sphere.

As Tambling's account shows in detail, Dickens' portrayal of Jaggers reveals a similarly grim view of the pervasive and oppressive nature of institutional power over the individual. Jaggers' influence seems limitless. As Estella suggests, Jaggers seems "more in the secrets of every place" (Expectations, p. 251). Jaggers' special insight into the hidden recesses of both London and the hearts of its citizens seems an echo of Shelley's Krempe who is "an uncouth man, but deeply imbued in the secrets of his science" (Frankenstein, p. 49). They are both a little like the Freudian superego, which derives its power from its familiarity with the id: it knows things that it compels the ego to repress. Krempe's "uncouthness" and his deep knowledge of science seem to allow him to sense that Victor's scientific work is transgressive, even before Victor does. Similarly, Jaggers' power derives from knowing more about the forces controlling Pip's life than Pip himself. He is instrumental in sustaining the illusion of Pip's respectability by insisting that he not investigate its source.

Jaggers appears to embody the process that alienated Pip froman authentic childhood self via the inculcation of a false

sense of guilt and shame. As Rawlins ("Betrayal", p. 86) points out, even Herbert, "whose conscience is clear, meets Jaggers and concludes that he 'must have committed a felony and forgotten the details of it, he [feels] so dejected and guilty'" (Expectations, p. 311). Joe is among the few characters able to resist Jaggers' criminalizing influence. He refuses to be drawn in by Jaggers' subtle coercion, insisting, "Which I meantersay...that if you come into my place bull-baiting and badgering me, come out!" (Expectations, p. 86). However, Joe's immunity to Jaggers' influence seems related to his marginalized position in society. In this respect the forge is a little like the castle-house in Walworth. When Pip, "curious to know how the old gentleman stood informed concerning the reputation of Mr. Jaggers" [roars] "that name at him", the deaf Aged P. does not hear and responds by "laughing heartily" (Expectations, p. 273). Jaggers' institutional power has no influence within Wemmick's castle. However, the idealized life of domestic intimacy in both forge and castle seems to depend on its isolation from larger society. The question remains whether Pip will be able to live in a larger world, without succumbing to the influence of the dehumanizing social systems that dominate it. Wemmick's strict division between his lives at Walworth and Little Britain suggests he can only enjoy a degree of autonomy from institutional control through, as Tambling puts it, "schizoid behaviour" ("Prisonbound", p. 133). However, Pip inadver-

tently brings about a confrontation between the two Wemmicks when he asks for advice regarding the best way to help Herbert. He makes his request at Walworth, but needs Wemmick to draw on his "experience and knowledge of men and affairs" (Expectations, p. 274) which requires the perspective of the Wemmick of Little Britain. Pip asks Wemmick to "help [him] to be good", to which Wemmick answers, "that's not my trade" (Expectations, p. 276). Wemmick eventually does agree to "go to work for" Pip's cause. He even thanks Pip, "for though we are strictly in our private and personal capacity, still it may be mentioned that there are Newgate cobwebs about, and it brushes them away" (Expectations, p. 276). Wemmick's actions suggest that it is possible to sometimes bend dehumanizing institutional forces to serve virtuous ends. A similar strategy seems to be at work in Pip's endorsement of Jaggers' suppression of the connection between Molly and Estella. On the face of it, Pip seems to be participating in a reenactment of Jaggers' suppression of his link with Magwtich. However, there is an important difference between Pip's case and Estella's. Jaggers' suppression of Pip's connection to his true benefactor facilitated Magwitch's covert quasi-parental control. On the other hand, keeping the secret of Estella's relation to Molly grants her freedom from parental interference.

Ultimately, Pip's position at the end of the novel is far more ambiguous than Victor Frankenstein's. Based on the terms

of the first part of this discussion one may conclude that Victor Frankenstein sacrifices the social self in pursuit of the preservation of the integrity of the Imaginary self. His defiance of social forces leads to egocentric isolation and self-destruction. In some ways, Dickens seems so eager to save Pip from such a fate that he wholly sacrifices the young Pip's independent spirit to the demands of socialization. Rawlins argues that in the Victorian period, such a sacrifice is to be expected. He suggests that

> to presume the inherent validity of feelings is to make an idol of the self, as Tennyson's career reminds us again and again. Tennyson's protagonists risk loss of sanity through immersion in the self, and with luck find salvation in a commitment to externals. The object of devotion may be an illusion or (or as in the case of the Crimean War) an atrocity, but it takes the protagonist out of himself, and thus the commitment is healthy -- like Joe's devotion to a bad father and a bad wife. ("Betrayal", p. 93)

In Pip's failure to denounce Jaggers, and his propensity to blame himself for the misdeeds of others, there is certainly evidence that Dickens sacrifices the vitality and autonomy of the child in order to integrate him into adult society. Such a view would suggest that Dickens, in his portrayal of Pip, is a little like Joe who is so afraid of "going wrong in the way of not doing what's right" that he'd "fur rather of the two go

wrong the t'other way, and be a little ill-conwenienced myself" (Expectations, p. 45). However, as we have seen, Dickens' treatment of Pip's adulthood is shaped by not only the desire to affirm the value of human community over individual egotism but also a need to assert a degree of resistance against the bondage of social ties, particularly those between parent and child. In the end, Pip may have acquired Joe's exaggerated humility, but, in his case, it grants him a measure of power over those who would assert control over him.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams et al. (Eds.) The Norton Anthology of English Literature. Marham Ont: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc, 1986.

Ackroyd, Peter. Dickens London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1990.

Bloom, Harold. The Anxiety of Influence. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Botting, Fred. Making Monstrous: Frankenstein, Criticism, theory. New York: St. Martin's Press Inc., 1991.

Bradbury, Nicola. Charles Dickens' Great Expectations. Toronto: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1990.

Bulwer-Lytton, Edward. England and the English. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Butt, John, and Tillotson, Kathleen. Dickens at Work. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1957.

Carey, John. The Violent Effigy. London: Faber and Faber limited, 1991.

Carlyle, Thomas. Sartor Resartus. New York: AMS Press, 1969.

Coleridge, S. T. Biographia Literaria. Ed. James Engell and W. Jackson Bate. Bollingen Series LXXV. Princeton: Pinceton UP, 1983.

Collings, David. "The Monster and the Imaginary Mother: A Lacanian Reading of Frankenstein." in Frankenstein: Case Studies in Contemporary Criticism. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Comay, Rebecca. "Redeeming Revenge: Nietzsche, Benjamin, Heidegger, and the Politics of Memory." in Nietzsche as Postmodernist. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

Connor, Steven. Charles Dickens. New York: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1985.

Cosslett, Tess. The "Scientific Movement" and Victorian Literature. New York: The Harvester Press, 1982.

Costell, Michael. (Ed). Critical Essays on Charles' Dickens's Great Expectations. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co, 1990.

Cottom, Daniel. Text and Culture: The politics of interpretation
Univ of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis: 1989.

Cowles, David. L. "Methods of Inquiry, Modes of Evidence: Perception, Self-deception, and Truth in Bleak House." The Dickensian. Vol. 34, Fall. 1987.

Crawford, Iain. "Pip and the Monster: The Joys of Bondage" in Studies in English Literature 1500 - 1900. Vol. 28. 1988

Cunningham, Valentine. In the Reading Gaol Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell Publishers, 1994.

Dickens, Charles. Great Expectations. Toronto: Bantam Books, 1981.

Dickens, Charles. David Copperfield. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Dickens, Charles. Bleak House. Markham, Ont: Penguin Books, 1853.

Dickens, Charles. Oliver Twist. Toronto: Bantam Books, 1981.

Dickens, Charles. Our Mutual Friend. Markham, Ont: Penguin Books, 1864-5.

Freud, Sigmund. Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis. London: Penguin Books, 1962.

Freud, Sigmund. On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis Markham: Penguin Books, 1962.

Frost, Lucy. "Taming to Improve: Dickens and the Women in Great Expectations." in New Casebook: Great Expectations London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1994.

Gilmour, Robin. "Pip and the Victorian Idea of the Gentleman." in New Casebook: Great Expectations London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1994.

Grant, Allan. A Preface to Dickens. New York: Longman Group Ltd, 1984.

Hannon, Patrice. "The Aesthetics of Humour in Great Expectations." in The Dickensian. London: The Dickens House, Summer 1996, No. 439 Vol. 92 Part 2.

Hardwick, Michael and Mollie. Dickens's England. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1970.

Holbrook, David. Charles Dickens and the Image of Woman. New York: New York University Press, 1993.

Houghton, Walter, E. The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830-1870. New York: Yale University Press, 1957.

Ingham, Patricia. Dickens, Women & Language. Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 1992.

Irigaray, Luce. "The Blind Spot of an Old Dream of Symmetry." In The Speculum of the Other Woman. Trans. Gillian C. Gill. Ithaca: Cornell Up, 1985.

Jameson, Fredric. The Political Unconscious. New York: Cornell University Press, 1981.

Jenkins, Harold. The Arden Shakespeare: Hamlet. New York: Methuen, 1981.

Jordan, John O. "Partings Welded Together: Self-Fashioning in Great Expectations and Jane Eyre." in Dickens Quarterly. Vol XIII No. 1. March 1996.

Kalin, Martin G. The Utopian Flight from Unhappiness. Freud against Marx on Social Progress. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Co. Chicago, 1974.

Kaplan, Morton. and Kloss, Robert. "Fantasy of Paternity and the Doppleganger: Mary Shelley's Frankenstein." In Kaplan, The Unspoken Motive: A Guide to Psychoanalytic Literary Criticism New York: New York Univesity Press, 1973

Kaufmann, Walter. (Ed.) The Portable Nietzsche Markham: Viking Penguin Inc, 1954.

Kincaid, James, R. Child-Loving: The Erotic Child and Victorian Culture. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Leavis, F.R. and Leavis, Q.D. Dickens: The Novelist. London: Chatto & Windus, 1970.

Liu, Yu. "Revaluating Revolution and Radicalness in the Lyrical Ballads" in Studies in English Literature 1500-1900. Rice University, Vol 36, Autumn 1996, No. 4.

Lacan, Jacques, Ecrits. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1977.

Lacan, Jacques. The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1973.

Lucas, John. Charles Dickens: The Major Novels. Toronto: Penguin Books, 1992.

Marlow, James E. Charles Dickens: The Uses of Time. Toronto: Associated University Press, 1994.

May, Leila Silvana. "Sibling Revelry in Mary Shelley's Frankenstein" in Studies in English Literature 1500-1900. Hoston: Rice University, Vol. 35, 1995.

McKnight, Natalie: Idiots, Madmen, and other Prisoners in Dickens. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

Montag, Warren. "'The Workshop of Filthy Creation': A Marxist Reading of Frankenstein." in Frankenstein: Case Studies in Contemporary Criticism. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Morris, Pam. Dickens's Class Consciousness. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1991.

Muller, John P, and Richardson, William J. (Eds.) The Purloined Poe: Lacan, Derrida, and Psychoanalytic Reading. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Nabokov, Vladimir. Lectures on Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Javanovich, 1980.

Nietzsche, Freidrich. On the Genealogy of Morals. New York: Random House, Inc, 1989.

Pyle, Forest. The Ideaology of the Imagination. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Rawlins, Jack. "Great Expiations: Dickens and the Betrayal of the Child." in New Casebook: Great Expectations London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1994.

Rubenstein, Marc A. "'My Accursed Origin': The Search for the Mother in Frankenstein." in SiR, 15 (Spring 1976).

Sadrin, Anny. Parentage and Inheritance in the Novels of Charles Dickens. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Schneider, Elisabeth. The Aesthetics of William Hazlitt. New York: Octagon Books, 1969.

Sell, Roger D. (Ed.) New Casebook: Great Expectations London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1994.

Shelley, Mary. Frankenstein. Toronto: Penguin Books, 1994.

Reiger, James. Ed. Frankenstein. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Shelley, Mary. Frankenstein. Ed. Johanna M. Smith. Boston: Bedford Books, 1992.

Shelley, Mary. Mary Shelley's Journal. Ed. Frederick L. Jones. Norman, Oklahoma, University of Oklahoma Press, 1947.

Shakespeare, William. King Lear in Shakespeare Series: 1. New York: The Oddyssey Press, 1968.

Tambling, Jeremy. "Prison-Bound: Dickens and Foucault." in New Casebook: Great Expectations London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1994.

Tambling, Jeremy. Dickens, Violence and the Modern State. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc, 1995.

Van Ghent, Dorothy. The English Novel New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953.

Veeder, William. Mary Shelley and Frankenstein. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Veeder, William. "The Negative Oedipus: Father, Frankenstein, and the Shelleys." Critical Inquiry 12 (Winter 1986): 365-90.

Walder, Dennis. Dickens and Religion Winchester, Mass: George Allen & Unwin (Publishers) Ltd, 1981.

Wordsworth, William. The Prelude: A Parallel Text. Ed. J.C. Maxwell. Toronto: Penguin Books Ltd, 1986.

Wordsworth, William. Lyrical Ballads. Ed. Michael Mason. New York: Longman Group, 1992.

Worth, George J. Great Expectations: An Annotated Bibliography New York: Garland Publishing Company, 1986.