

Ghosts and Money in *Great Expectations*

Takashi Nakamura

Quite recently, Catherine Gallagher has raised a question about *Great Expectations* in connection with *Hamlet*. As her invaluable study starkly shows, the structure of the play-within-the-novel turned *Hamlet* into a thing Victorian; phrased differently, the Shakespearian play in the novel assumes mid-Victorian and capitalistic significance.¹ Even trifling matters are overtly Victorian; a pair of Hamlet's stockings is, for instance, not "fouled" nor "ungartered" but a "fetish" costing as much as five-and-thirty shillings. When Wopsle, by whom *Hamlet* is rendered as downright farce, peels off his stockings after the performance, the owner of "that property" boasts that "Shakespeare never was complimented with a finer pair" (ch. 31, 256). More importantly, the Dickensian and Shakespearian *Hamlets* have one thing in common: both, as it were, love ghosts. Ghost-figures haunt such characters as Hamlet the prince of Denmark and Pip the narrator from beginning to end, and ghosts, more often than not, drive protagonists to various degrees of madness. It is of note that Miss Havisham's ghost which reappears "hanging to the beam" (ch. 49, 401) is particularly Victorian in that it reflects the so-called medical discourse of the day. In the mid-nineteenth century, doctors were generally troubled by the uncertainty of the life-death boundary due to notions of "suspended animation" and "apparent death."²

Moreover, "premature burial" in which humans resurrected like ghosts happened time and again. It is no wonder that those somewhat supernatural events resulted in the "Society for the Prevention of Premature Burial"; among members of this occult association we find at one extreme those who were fascinated by "zombies." Occultism of this sort in the late Victorian period, along with mesmerism,³ alias animal magnetism, produced what might be termed "ghost discourse," hence the discourse orchestrated the rise of many phantoms in Victorian culture; sensation fictions of 1860s are thus abounding with ghosts, and so is *Great Expectations* written just after Collins's *Woman*

in *White*, one of the most celebrated sensation novels. In fact, a host of phantasmagorical ghosts appear and reappear in Dickens's novels so persistently from the Christmas stories through *Great Expectations* that his contemporaries considered Dickens's ghost to be a product of his psychopathic hallucination. According to G. H. Lewes, Dickens once said that he could hear distinctly "every word said by his characters" even before they were written down, by which Lewes concluded that Dickens was "a seer of visions" (Forster Vol. II, 269-71).

I: The Numerals of Statistics

Great Expectations is full of ghost visions embodied by virtue of the collaboration between Miss Havisham and Pip; so, one might argue, the novel is a work of commentary on ghosts. With reference to the ghost motif in this novel, not a few critics have discussed it from multifaceted viewpoints; among others, Milbank deals with the novel in the Gothic tradition that dates back to the late eighteenth century. Notably, as seen in Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto* or Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolfo*, favorite themes of the Gothic are incarcerated heroines, prisons, ruined abbeys, medieval castles, great labyrinthine houses, and the like. Milbank maintains that in *Great Expectations* the "female Gothic mode" is reversed, so that Pip comes to be the victim of confinement by women (Milbank 16-17, 127-29).⁴

Ghosts in Dickens are certainly prominent, and yet I would argue, the ghosts in *Great Expectations* still deserve to be further discussed. First of all, the novel has brought into question the troublesome relationship between ghosts and realistic fiction. The so-called English realist novels, which can be traced back to Richardson, Defoe or Charlotte Lennox,⁵ are fond of, or on good terms with conceptions of specified time and place. As Ian Watt puts it, "the novel is a full and authentic report of human experience," and according to him, reading novels is "like reading evidence in a court of Justice" (Watt 35-37). Forensic particularities in the novel therefore contribute to "verisimilitude" or "lifelikeness" (Frye, *Anatomy* 134). For this very reason, English realist fictions are on bad terms with unrealistic, supernatural matters; ghosts are one of the most blatant examples of this antirealism or "super-realism."⁶ However it seems also fairly certain that novels have great difficulty in describing "reality"; rather, for better or worse, novels are not without a distortion of reality. One possible and simple explanation for this is that the language of novels must be "figurative"

in order to appeal effectively to the reader's imagination.

Even George Eliot is no exception, despite the fact that she harshly criticized Dickens's unreality, while ironically praising "his precious salt of humor, which compels him to reproduce external traits, that serve, in some degree, as a corrective to his frequently false psychology" (George Eliot, *Essays* 271). Although Eliot admires the strength of Dickensian humor, she deplors the lack of elaboration in characters' psychological reality. Probably what Eliot implied was that Dickens was so preoccupied with characters' externalities — faces, bodies, clothes, jewels, shoes, boots, or what not — that he had no time to describe psychology and emotion. Indeed the realist novelist as a rule "is fond of synecdochic details." As Roman Jakobson's epochal study has shown, a multiplicity of details is the very character of the late-nineteenth-century realist novel. Its literary style is described as metonymic. By contrast, the language of poetry, especially that of the Romantics, tends to be metaphorical; a typical example would be Blake's powerfully rendered "The Tiger."⁷ In this poem, the "tiger" is like fire "burning," and the poet sees in the tiger a "fearful symmetry." In this way, metaphor becomes the language of poetry, while metonymy that of the novel.⁸

Jakobson's formula is on the whole true, but it is not always applicable to all fictions without reservation, as Dickens's splendid works amply demonstrate. Dorothy Van Ghent and Hillis Miller, to name but two, illustrate how metaphors and metonymies are so interrelated that discrimination between metaphor and metonymy is all but meaningless. Miller goes so far as to say that in Dickens "metonymy is the foundation and support of metaphor" (Miller, "The Fiction of Realism" 97). The point is that novels are locked in words, which are inevitably figurative. Hillis Miller observes: "All language is beside itself. There is no 'true' sign for the thing."⁹ Language of prose fiction is inescapably figurative, mainly because of its use both of metaphors and metonymies. Metaphor presents two different things simultaneously, providing the reader with reality (within the bounds of realism) on the one hand. However, on the other hand, metaphor gives us quite a different image by boldly saying A is B. What is remarkable is that when such tropes are employed, the deeper significance is often revealed, such as Eros, desire, passion, the Unconscious, or whatever. In the case of Dickens, who is extremely fond of extraordinary figures, a multitude of metaphors and metonymies invariably distorts reality. Dickens's ghosts are, I believe, an exemplum of

metaphor that constructs and deconstructs reality; this double movement betrays the paradox of the fictional real; the Dickensian ghost therefore never fails to produce discord between realism and supernaturalism.

George Eliot the radical realist is not free from this novelistic distortion of reality, whether she likes it or not. Gillian Beer has pointed out that metaphors are “culture-bound,” and that “Web imagery is to be found everywhere in Victorian writing.” Victorians were generally affected by Darwinian ideas that produced such culture-bound words as “web” and “labyrinth” (Beer 167-71). In Eliot’s *Silas Marner*, for example, we can spot a “spider,” when Silas Marner as a solitary weaver is likened to be a “spinning insect” (ch. 2, 64). Eliot’s acute sense of metaphor is also working in her description of Silas’s frugal supper in which the miser fancifully views his saved guineas as “golden wine” (ch. 5, 92). The color “gold” comes to be all the more important when Eppie, the fair little heroine, appears. In heavy snowfall, Eppie’s mother has died in front of Eppie, and the motherless child unwittingly strays into Silas’s cottage. In this scene, Eppie seemed at first “a heap of gold” (ch. 15, 167) to Silas. The author’s sensitive treatment of Eppie is overtly figurative: “. . . the little golden head sank down on the old sack, and blue eyes were veiled by their delicate half-transparent lids.” (ch. 15, 166). What’s more, when Eppie is presented as “the bright living thing” (ch. 15, 165), there can be little doubt that she is likened to Jesus, the child, whereas Silas, like the Virgin Mary, saves Eppie from the wilderness of snow.

The double vision created by metaphors, or tropes in general, transforms reality into something else. At the same time, novelists, who are obsessed by *mimesis*, try to reproduce what their eyes actually witness. In this paper, I argue, ghosts in Dickens are a representative of unreality, and that ghosts are antithetical to “monetary realism,” which is strictly represented by numerals, as will be discussed later on. In what follows, I will discuss the problems of reality and unreality in *Great Expectations* bearing in mind that this opposition is epitomized by the binary opposition between ghosts and money. It is evident that almost all novels are deeply concerned with money, and that money is always presented by arithmetical numbers. To Pip, money is one of the most important things, as exemplified in the scene where he was given “a bright new shilling” and “Two One-Pound notes” by the stranger in the pub (ch. 10, 78); still later on, money has exerted a decisive power over Pip to such an extent that his destiny is drastically

changed by it.

Similarly, numbers have to do with realistic facts as well as money, since facts are well embodied by numbers. The case in point is Gradgrind, for *Hard Time* begins with his famous, dogmatic key-note speech upon facts: “Now, what I want is, Facts. Teach these boys and girls nothing but Facts. Facts alone are wanted in life. Plant nothing else, and root out everything else. . .” (book I, ch. 1, 47). Bitzer is a favorite pupil of the Gradgrind school because he can account for everything in terms of numerals, so when asked by Gradgrind to define a horse, he dwells dryly on numbers:

Quadruped. Graminivorous. Forty teeth, namely twenty-four grinders, four eye-teeth, and twelve incisive. Sheds coat in the spring; in marshy countries, sheds hoofs, too. Hoofs hard, but requiring to be shod with iron. Age known by marks in mouth.

(book I, ch. 2, 50)

Like Bitzer, novels are generally good at facts and numbers. What is remarkable about *Hard Times* is that this novel can be read as an implicit critique of novelistic enumeration. *Hard Times* abounds with numbers to such an extent that even a human being is turned into a number: Sissy Jupe is identified as “girl number twenty.” By the same token, Gradgrind’s daughter, Louisa is scolded by his father, as she happens to say, “I wonder.” The father remarks snappishly to his daughter: “Louisa, never wonder!” (book I, ch. 8, 89). In this way, *Hard Times* by putting an emphasis upon arithmetical language, discloses little by little what is wrong with arithmetical people like Gradgrind; numerals are able to teach facts, but cannot tell what human emotions are. Neither Louisa nor Tom knows anything about their filial affection, and to Gradgrind’s disgrace, Tom commits a crime and Louisa eventually flees from her husband Bounderby to reproach her father who had arranged her marriage.

Gradgrind’s obsession with numbers and facts is, however, not accidental, because the character is evidently created against the background of one of the influential discourses of the day: namely, the ideology of statistics, of which Thomas Malthus is the father and Chadwick the son. As is well known, Malthus’s *An Essay on Population*, the first version of which was published 1798, had an enormous influence on early- and mid-Victorian Britain. Malthus’s general argument was simple enough to permeate the whole Victorian England; the following is his guiding principle: “Population, when unchecked,

increases in a geometrical ratio,” but, “Subsistence increases only in an arithmetical ratio.” Accordingly “a redundant population” (i. e. the poor) has to be removed by means of war, pestilence and famine (Malthus [Penguin] 71, 90, 109-19). These evils are the positive checks, whereas Malthus also stresses the importance of “preventive checks,” thereby “a man of liberal education” would delay his marriage if he considers that this would lower his rank in society.¹⁰ A noticeable characteristic of Malthus’s language is its reliance on numbers, his words are both arithmetical and algebraic:

According to a regular census made by order of Congress in 1790, which there is every reason to think is essentially correct, the white population of the United States was found to be 3,164,148. By a similar census in 1800, it was found to have increased to 4,312,841. It had increased then, during the ten years from 1790 to 1800, at a rate equal to 36.3 per cent, a rate which, if continued, would double the population in twenty-two years and about four months and a half. (Malthus [Penguin] 227)

Malthus meticulously counts up the figures. This avid aspiration for numbers, counting and tabulation underlines Malthusian statistics; and this cult of numbers was handed over to Edwin Chadwick.

Chadwick was a leading figure, firstly, of the New Poor Law of 1834, and secondly of the Victorian sanitary reforms.¹¹ Political economy in the earlier half of the nineteenth century was represented by Malthus and Chadwick; and to put it briefly, the language of political economists was arithmetical, referring repeatedly to myriads of numbers. A predilection for numbers and numerals — of course, “facts” are composed of these — is reflected in a profusion of Blue Books, which filled Gradgrind’s room to the extent that it appeared wholly “blue” (book I, ch. 15, 131). In this respect, Gradgrind is evidently a victim of the abuse of the political economists’ worship of numbers and facts.¹² If Gradgrind is the victim of the Malthusian politico-economical discourse of the period, so is Pip, who is to be persecuted by Malthusian numbers throughout the novel, with money as a symbolic instrument of this Malthusian persecution.

II: Miss Havisham’s Ghost

It is inevitable that characters of the novel are faced with time and money. As Frye has shown, novel creates “real people,” whereas in romance, there are basically three stereotyped protagonists — hero,

heroine and villain, who correspond to libido, anima and shadow respectively. Unlike romancer, novelist deals with “characters wearing their *personae* or social masks” (*Anatomy* 304-05); consequently, characters in the novel are forced to live in a real, “capitalistic” society, if so, it becomes impossible for them to escape from the power of time and money. In the mode of romance, however, characters are neither aware of time nor money; in other words, they are essentially free from politico-economical reality that is restricted by arithmetic numbers. That romance is antithetical to novelistic numbers and money is illustrated paradoxically by *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, which is, broadly speaking, an English *Don Quixote*; like *Don Quixote*, *The Knight* is a travesty of old-fashioned chivalric romance. Beaumont’s satire on romance is laid bare when the play, by referring to particular money, makes fun of Rafe, a would-be knight-errant who holds the “Burning Pestle” instead of a “Burning Sword.”¹³ In the sense that *The Knight* is anti-chivalry, I argue that *Great Expectations* is anti-romance, for in the novel Pip overtly fails as “the young Knight of romance” (ch. 29, 231) despite the fact that he fervently wishes to rescue Estella, “the Princess” (ch. 29, 231) who is imprisoned in a labyrinthine manor named Satis House. With no obvious reason at all, Estella chooses not Pip but Drummle, who has “a compound of pride, avarice, brutality, and meanness” (ch. 59, 482). To Pip’s further misfortune, he loses both love and money. What is noticeable about Pip is that money is a curse upon him rather than a blessing.

But before discussing *Great Expectations*’s Mammon, the god of realism, let us turn to the ghost to see how antirealism functions in the book. In *Great Expectations*, it is Miss Havisham who from time to time appears as a ghost. She is described as the “Witch of the place” (ch. 11, 85) and for this reason, is endowed with power to transform herself into anyone she likes. She, as the mistress of Satis House, allures Pip into the house to give pain to Pip by means of the arrogant, ice-cold, pretty girl, Estella, to whom the step-mother whispers, “Well, you can break his heart” (ch. 8, 60). In every way, Miss Havisham is “the strangest lady” Pip has ever seen (ch. 8, 57). In her house, time is stopped, or suspended at the very moment she knew that she was betrayed by her fiancé (Compeyson) on the eve of her wedding ceremony: it was “twenty minutes to nine” (ch. 8, 59). Note that the indexed time is strictly registered referring to the minute hand; this suggests that Miss Havisham is not free of time altogether but rather is bound for ever by time, unlike a witch in a romance (or fairy tale).

She is no longer a young lady, but is now an old, ogress-like spinster, wearing a wedding dress of “rich materials.” That dress might have been snowy white, yet Pip finds it “faded and yellow,” which indicates the destructiveness of time (ch. 8, 58). One might say that Miss Havisham’s existence is divided into two worlds: she is living in the world of fairy tale romance, whereas she remains partly in the world of novels and realism. The supernatural element connected with the mode of romance is patently dominant in Satis House, as embodied in the ghost-like lady, Miss Havisham. To Pip she looks as if she were a dead woman; she is a “corpse-like” woman, Pip thinks of her as a “waxwork and skeleton” (ch. 8, 58, 60).

The deadly image given to her enables her to metamorphose into a ghost. On the day when Pip is first invited to Satis House, he is struck by Miss Havisham’s ghost. The haunted place is the decayed brewery which her ghost frequents hereafter:

It was in this place, and at this moment, that a strange thing happened to my fancy. . . . I turned my eyes . . . towards a great wooden beam in a low nook of the building near me on my right hand, and I saw *a figure hanging there by the neck*. A figure all in yellow white, with but one shoe to the feet; and it hung so, that I could see that the faded trimmings of the dress were like earthy paper, and that the face was Miss Havisham’s, with a movement going over the whole countenance as if she were trying to call to me. . . . *I at first ran from it, and then ran towards it*. And my terror was greatest of all, when I found no figure there.

(ch. 8, 64, my italics)

The ghost of Miss Havisham thus appears and disappears. This female ghost becomes all the more horrible when Pip sees that she looks as though she has been hanged like a convict at Newgate Prison. It is of interest to note here that Pip paradoxically feels both repulsion and attraction towards the ghost, for he says, “I at first ran from it, and then ran towards it.” He loves and dislikes it, because in half of himself, Pip is a “dreamer” who fancies himself living in a fairy tale world, while, on the contrary, in another half, he is a Victorian realist, who is not allowed to believe in ghosts. Accordingly the ghost of Miss Havisham disappears at the moment when he comes to himself. A vision of this kind, however, keeps on following Pip until it is felt to be all but omnipresent.

A vision of the ghost is seen again in chapter 49 where Pip catches a glimpse of “Miss Havisham hanging to the beam”:

A *childish* association revived with *wonderful force* in the moment of the slight action, and I *fancied* that I saw Miss Havisham hanging to the beam. So strong was the impression, that I stood under the beam shuddering from head to foot before I knew it was a fancy — though to be sure I was there in an instant.

The mournfulness of the place and time, and the great terror of this illusion . . . caused me to feel an indescribable awe.

(ch. 49, 401, my italics)

The repetitiveness of this ghost vision in Pip starkly shows that the ghost is Pip's "anxiety." Anxiety, in Freud's formulation, brings about a "traumatic neurosis" in which past uncomfortable, unpleasurable experiences are repeated in the form of dreams; this is what is called the "compulsion to repeat." The compulsion to repeat is, Freud argues, an index of the "death instincts." He simply says that "the aim of all life is death" (*Beyond* 311). Since Pip is frequently troubled by a Death-like ghost, he seems to encapsulate Freudian notions of the compulsion to repeat and the death instinct. Pip is tortured not merely by Miss Havisham's ghost but by the Freudian Thanatos. He is a dark figure who is enthralled by Death and by ghosts.

It is to be remembered that Miss Havisham's ghost does exist not in objective reality but in Pip's subjective and psychological reality. In this sense, the ghost vision is not incompatible with realism or *mimesis*, providing that ghost is confined exclusively to the realm of Pip's mind. A ghost, if it is only perceived by the mind, does not infringe the conventions of realism. Even in a sensation novel like Collins's *The Woman in White*, the ghost is not an external figure but is seen through one's mind's eye; in the novel, the recurrent ghost vision is not really a ghost but Anne Catherick's ghastly figure in white. For instance, there is a scene where a pupil, Jacob Postlethwaite claims that he "saw t' ghaist," "Arl in white," appearing "Away yander, in t' kirkyard" (110). At this clumsy insistence, the schoolmaster punishes the boy by making him stand on a "stool in a corner," asserting that there can not possibly be ghost. Collins's novel appears to disown the existence of ghosts in reality, but it is also true that there is a tinge of sarcasm when the author mentions the schoolmaster's matter-of-fact denial of the ghost: "There are no such things as ghosts, and therefore any boy who believes in ghosts believes in what can't possibly be. . ." (108). Here Mr. Dempster the schoolmaster is presented as hard-nosed and stubborn as Gradgrind, who does not make allowances for any fanciful ideas.

Another example in which an argument about ghosts is developed is in *Hamlet*. Hamlet's mother, Gertrude cries, "Alas! he's mad!" (3. 4. 105) when she sees her son talk to the vacuum where the son recognizes his father's Ghost. The mother laments that he is out of his mind to "hold discourse" with an empty space. The following is the dialogue between the son and the mother:

HAM. Why, look you there, look how it steals away!
 My father, in his habit as he lived!
 Look where he goes, even now, out at the portal!

Exit Ghost.

QUEEN. This is the very coinage of your brain,
 This bodiless creation ecstasy
 Is very cunning in. (3. 4. 134-39)

Hamlet claims to see his father's ghost, while his mother sees nothing. The discrepancy between the two on the notion of ghosts testifies to the psychological gap between them; the son is internally accusing his mother of treachery, and the mother is lamenting her son's madness ("ecstasy"). Hamlet, like Pip and Jacob, is obliged to visualize the ghost. In this connection, it is to be noted that all the three are young; to be more precise, the three are by and large boys. Pip, even after growing up, is made a fool of by Estella: "you visionary boy" (ch. 44, 364); and Pip cannot but be a boy before Miss Havisham, who plays the role of an evil godmother. Hamlet is also rendered a boy in the scene because he is placed between his father and mother. In *The Woman in White*, Jacob, who persists in his seeing the ghost, is a boy pupil. Hence it becomes clear that only a boy or child is allowed to, or fain to, see ghosts. To put it another way, the ghost is often accessible to a (male) child. In the scene where Pip glimpses Miss Havisham's ghost, he says: "A childish association revived with wonderful force in the moment of the slight action, and I fancied that I saw Miss Havisham hanging to the beam." Obviously here is the equation of childishness and fancy, both of which enable Pip to see what does not exist in the outer reality. But why is it that the child is given a special power to "coin" the ghost?

The most essential quality of children is, I suppose, play; they play for pleasure and in earnest. As every child likes to play, a child is a typical example of "*homo ludens*" as Huizinga once put it. To follow his argument, though, not only children but people in general like to play; many games and races in a variety of different cultures are illustrations of this. Huizinga regards humans' play as "a cultural phenom-

enon,” and remarks that “civilization arises and unfolds in and as play” (*Homo Ludens* “Foreward”). Literature is a major cultural phenomenon, so Huizinga writes:

One of the basic features of lyrical imagination is the tendency to maniacal exaggeration. Poetry must be exorbitant. . . . The desire to make an idea as enormous and stupefying as possible is not peculiar to the lyric; it is a typical play-function and is common both in child-life and in certain mental diseases.

(Homo Ludens 142-43)

He also observes that “Really to play, a man must play like a child” (*Homo Ludens* 199). It is certain that playing belongs to the proper sphere of children, and it is obvious that Dickens as a writer is engaged with, or fascinated by, playing himself in his works; in this respect, it is worth recalling that in *The Old Curiosity Shop*, Quilp plays with “a large fierce dog” in his “ecstasy” while “taunting the dog with hideous faces” and “hissing and worrying the animal till he was nearly mad” (ch. 21, 170). Quilp’s extraordinary sport with the dog culminates in his queer dance “with his arms a-kimbo” in which he performs “a kind of demon-dance round the kennel, just without the limits of the chain, driving the dog quite wild” (ch. 21, 170-71). Quilp, the dwarf finds himself playing in earnest in the midst of a carnivalesque and grotesque space.¹⁴ Such characteristics as excessiveness, madness, abnormality, cruelty and so forth are the distinctive features of Quilp’s “serious” play. There is little doubt that Dickens’s works as a whole tend to enter this Quilpean world: the play-field of madness, laughter and nonsense. Likewise, Miss Havisham’s ghost is seen as an embodiment of madness, nonsense, and childish play.

III: Two Casts

The Dickensian ghost is an expression of children’s play in which excessive, supernatural elements are more encouraged than condemned or discouraged. In this sense, the ghost in Dickens is a product of the ideology of a conventional fairy-tale dreamworld. It should be noted, however, that fairy-tale romance is made up of evil and devilish aspects as well as enjoyable wish-fulfilment elements. In addition to good-natured characters such as princes, princesses and fairies, fairy tales are full of such evil creatures as monsters, ogres, dwarfs, bluebeards, witches, godmothers, stepmothers or what not. These evil ones signal that they are the representatives of Death. To use Freud’s

phrase, they embody the “death instinct,” which is related to violence, destruction, murder and death. As Harry Stone’s excellent study shows, Dickens was introduced to many fairy stories from his infancy by means of oral tradition, so that they formed “part of his life” (Stone 33). Two women played crucial roles in instilling the fairy-tale elements into the young Dickens: one was his paternal grandmother, Elizabeth Ball Dickens and the other was his nursemaid, Mary Weller, both of whom are said to have been gifted as exceptional story-tellers. The wickedness and demonic evil that fairy tale inherently contains influenced Dickens as a child through countless stories; in later years, the fairy-tale tradition helped Dickens create many characters who “are marvelously transmuted evocations of the nightmare component in the fairy-tale world of Dickens’ childhood” (Stone 39).

In *Great Expectations*, this nightmarish component is reflected not only in such characters as Miss Havisham and Orlick, but in other things such as the two fearful “casts” in Jaggers’s office. Jaggers is a lawyer who mainly deals with criminal cases connected with Newgate Prison. In every way, he is a grotesque person with “an exceedingly large head and a correspondingly large hand” (ch. 11, 83). When Pip sees Jaggers for the first time in Satis House, Pip senses that Jaggers’s hand smells “of scented soap” (ch. 11, 83). The reason for this is that whenever the lawyer sees his clients — criminals — he washes his hands as if to scrape off the invisible blood. It is Jaggers that informs Pip of his “great expectations”:

“I am instructed to communicate to him,” said Mr. Jaggers, throwing his finger at me, sideways, “that he will come into a handsome property, that he be immediately removed from his present sphere of life and from this place, and *be brought up as a gentleman* — in a word, as a young fellow of great expectations.”

My dream was out; my wild fancy was surpassed by sober reality; Miss Havisham was going to make my fortune on a grand scale. (ch. 18, 138, my italics)

This scene depicts the moment when the bond of apprenticeship between Pip and Joe is broken; Pip’s dream seems to come true, though, of course, his fortune will turn out to be tainted afterwards. It is notable that the story of the “great expectations” is not detailed at all; instead, it is rather opaque: the reader is not given any idea how great that property is, nor who the benefactor is, although Pip speculates that Miss Havisham is the person who secretly gives him the Satis House property. It is Pip’s habit that when facing “reality” — in

this case, monetary reality — he fabricates a “fiction” about money.

Believing in the fiction that he is to be a wealthy gentleman under the guardianship of Miss Havisham, Pip comes to London. Significantly, the first impression of the metropolis is odious to Pip: he had “faint doubts whether it [London] was not rather ugly, crooked, narrow and dirty” (ch. 20, 163). Jaggers’s address is Little Britain “just out of Smithfield,” in the neighborhood of Newgate Prison. Jaggers’s office is, as it were, sandwiched between Smithfield and Newgate, both of which are evocations of the gloomy Death image. It is well-known that in the Victorian period, Smithfield was the place where live cattle were driven to “the huge central slaughter house” (Porter, *London* 193) offending urban sensibilities; Pip is surely one of the most offended, as he senses Smithfield to be “all asmeared with filth and fat and blood and foam” (ch. 20, 165). After being made aghast by the grim picture of Smithfield, Pip is frightened by the gatekeeper (“minister of justice”) of Newgate, who shows him the gallows and the Debtor’s Door, explaining that four prisoners will be hanged “the day after to-morrow at eight in the morning, to be killed in a row” (ch. 20, 166).

Evil images of Death are thus made palpable when Pip arrives in London; above all, the “two dreadful casts” draw the reader’s attention as they do Pip’s. Pip’s delineation of Jaggers’s room indicates that the lawyer, who specializes in criminal cases, is by profession well versed in deadly crimes and severe punishments:

Mr. Jaggers’s room was lighted by a skylight only, and was most dismal place; the skylight, eccentrically patched like a broken head, and the distorted adjoining houses looking as if they had twisted themselves to peep down at me through it. There were not so many papers about, as I should have expected to see; and there were some odd objects about . . . such as an old rusty pistol, a sword in a scabbard, several strange-looking boxes and packages, and two dreadful casts on a shelf, of faces peculiarly swollen, and twitchy about the nose. Mr. Jaggers’s own high-backed chair was of deadly black horsehair, with rows of brass nails round it, like a coffin; and I fancied I could see how he leaned back in it, and bit his forefinger at the clients. (ch. 20, 164)

In Jaggers’s gloomy room, the most prominent things that correlate death with the agony of death may be the two dreadful casts, whose faces are “peculiarly swollen.” The two casts are depicted as “swollen” and “twitchy” as if they were at that moment in the agony of death on the gallows; both casts were of clients in all probability executed in public at Newgate Prison. In addition, Jaggers’s room

abounds in odious things and images; one can spot “a broken head,” “an old rusty pistol,” “a sword in a scabbard,” “deadly black horse-hair,” a “coffin” and so forth. In the quotation, it is noteworthy that two modes of metaphors and metonymies are mutually utilized to disclose that Jaggers’s office is the site where one must confront death.

As I mentioned earlier with reference to Jakobson’s theory, metonymy is the language of realist fiction, in which details are delineated one by one through a series of close-ups; whereas, metaphor is a substitution of one thing with another, the most celebrated example of which is found in the poetry of Romanticism and symbolism. In Miller’s phrase, metonymy is the “lie which says A leads to B,” in contrast, metaphor is the “lie which says A equals B” (*Fiction of Realism* 124). Here, as elsewhere, realism is at least partly realized by metonymy that is designed to shed light on “odd objects” such as the pistol, sword, boxes, packages and casts point by point. At the same time, however, this *mimesis* is instantly shattered when it becomes clear that the narrator is as a whole ruled by the principle of metaphor, since Pip feels as though he were looked at by “the distorted adjoining houses” which, like humans, “twisted themselves to peep down at me,” through the skylight overhead.¹⁵ Pip’s fancy equates the “high-backed chair” with a “coffin”; besides, this coffin-like chair conjures up a vision of Jaggers who is “real” enough to make Pip see Jaggers biting his forefinger and staring at the clients. By implication, Jaggers’s office is a place where Death or deadly things come to reside. The invisible Jaggers is rendered visible by means of metaphor and metonymy. These tropes, as noted earlier, tend to become “maniacal exaggeration,” disclosing the desire to “play.” As Huizinga observes, the function of imaginative language is similar to that of child’s play, because literature, perhaps of a Dickensian persuasion, likes to please itself with the “desire to make an idea as enormous and stupefying as possible” (*Homo Ludens* 143).

Pip as a fanciful child plays with words, and in this process he all but unwittingly tells a lie; namely, he fabricates a lot of “fictions.” In this regard, Pip can be said to be a child who is driven by the compulsion to repeat his fictions and lies. One of Pip’s distinctive traits is his willingness to invent his lies as chance directs him. It should be taken into account, however, that children generally like telling a lie as if it were a matter of fact. Children are fond of fanciful ideas, and childish fancy tends to generate a lie, as Freud comments on jokes.¹⁶ Pip’s fancy, which gives rise to Miss Havisham’s ghosts, otherwise produces

an enormous lie when his sister asks him about Miss Havisham after his first visit to Satis House. Mrs. Joe Gargery and Pumblechook are too curious to resist flinging numerous questions at Pip. But Pip, being harassed by their inquisitiveness, begins in desperation to tell a series of lies, to their bewilderment. Pumblechook asks Pip how Miss Havisham was like in her room: “Now, boy! What was she a doing of when you went in to-day?” (ch. 9, 67). Pip gives a puzzling answer:

“She was sitting,” I answered, “in a black velvet coach.”

Mr. Pumblechook and Mrs. Joe stared at one another — as they well might — and both repeated, “In a black velvet coach?”

“Yes,” said I. “And Miss Estella — that’s her niece, I think — handed her in cake and wine at the coach-window, on a gold plate. And I got up behind the coach to eat mine, because she told me to.”

“Was anybody else there?” asked Mr. Pumblechook.

“Four dogs,” said I.

“Large or small?”

“Immense,” said I. “And they fought for veal cutlets out of a silver basket.”

Mr. Pumblechook and Mrs. Joe stared one another again, in utter amazement. (ch. 9, 67)

A polarity between child’s fancy and adult’s factualism is here comically presented, making fools of the confounded Mrs. Joe and Pumblechook, who are now discussing in earnest what the meaning of Pip’s word might be. Grown-ups need logical and reasonable explanations, Pip’s fancy, however, is so unbridled that he is able to invent anything he likes. Pip keeps on telling “a cock-and-bull story” as follows:

“We played with flags,” I said. . . .

“Flags!” echoed my sister.

“Yes,” said I. “Estella waved a blue flag, and I waved a red one, and Miss Havisham waved one sprinkled all over with little gold stars, out at the coach-window. And then we all waved our swords and hurrahd.” (ch. 9, 68)

In Pip’s mind, he is even prepared to go so far as to say that there were “balloon in the yard” and “a bear in the brewery” (ch. 9, 69). In fact, this “maniacal exaggeration” is not brought forward because of a serious consultation between Pumblechook and Mrs. Gargery, who are preoccupied with “discussing the marvels.” In the citations, some attributes are found in Pip’s fancy; firstly, Pip’s fancy and his lies are childish in that they are quite illogical, and have no meaning at all. In short, Pip’s fanciful story about Miss Havisham and Satis House is

nothing but “nonsense,” like Lewis Carroll’s *Alice* stories. The Carrollian Pip is also apt to like animal images such as four immense dogs and a bear. It is worth remembering that in fairy-tale romance, animals are as a rule indispensable.

Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland is an admirable example with a host of animals — from a rabbit, cat, dog, mouse, dormouse, fish, lizard, caterpillar through to a dodo; and moreover, in the mode of romance and fairy tale, it is fairly natural that these animals should talk. Needless to say, it is not impossible for Dickens to create such a talking animal: notably, Grip the raven, which now and then wildly pours out a shower of nonsensical words: “. . . Hurrah, hurrah, hurrah! I’m a devil, I’m a devil, I’m a ket-tle on, Keep up your spirits, Never say die, Bow, wow, wow, I’m a devil, I’m a ket-tle, I’m a — Polly put the ket-tle on, we’ll all have tea” (*Barnaby Rudge*, ch. 17, 194). In this way, Grip transforms itself into various creatures and things; the raven is at once a “devil,” “kettle,” “Polly,” and a dog. Pip, however, does not turn himself into anyone or anything, and yet he, by virtue of his power of fancy, can visualize what an ordinary eye can’t see: a black velvet coach, huge dogs, a bear, colorful flags, a balloon, and Miss Havisham’s ghost.

Animal images aside, things like flags and a balloon are of significance, in relation to the playfulness of fairy-tale romance. Both flag and balloon float in the air; similarly, floating or suspension in the air is a prominent characteristic of ghosts — just as Miss Havisham’s ghost is “hanging to the beam” (ch. 49, 401). This aspect of floating, embodied by the flag, balloon and ghost, implies that the mode of romance is contrasted with “realism.” Floating or hovering in a Dickensian novel is hence an expression of antipathy towards the earthly commonplace that is far from imagination and fancy. Curiously enough, the characters of romance are equally attracted to the underworld as well as the upper world; as is well-known, Alice’s wonderful story begins with her fall into the underworld, the entrance of which is “a large rabbit-hole under the hedge” (8). If, in the mode of romance, characters enter the upper world, they must fly in the air; on the other hand, if they are placed at the bottom, they are to encounter grotesque creatures just as Alice does.¹⁷ In any case, whether the stage is the world above or below, the structuring principle of romance is liberation from the bondage of earthly reality. That is why Pip’s fanciful eye goes upward to find Miss Havisham’s ghost in the air.

Pip is not the only person whose principle is fancy and playfulness;

in Wemmick we find another fanciful figure, a person of double personality. In the City, as a clerk in Jaggers's office, he wears a social *persona* so fixedly that he appears an unsympathetic, matter-of-fact person; his inflexible personality goes so far as to make him seem a kind of post-office: "His mouth was such a post-office of a mouth that he had a mechanical appearance of smiling" (ch. 21, 172). On the contrary, at his "Castle" home, he turns himself into quite a different person; he lives with his old father "the Aged" cheerfully. But Wemmick's tenderness and gentleness are only revealed in his Castle: his warmth is phrased as his "Walworth sentiments" (ch. 36, 291) upon which Pip relies when he is in jeopardy. Wemmick is positively an eccentric person, and his oddity is articulated by the strange structure of his house; it is a fortified house with a drawbridge and the "Stinger" (ch. 25, 206). While the house's hard front symbolizes the state of a man's strife in the city, with warlike drawbridge and gun ("Stinger"), at the back of it Pip finds an Eden-like small garden that recalls peaceful country life: there Wemmick breeds "a pig . . . fowls and rabbits," besides, he builds "a bower" and makes "an ornamental lake" and "a fountain" (ch. 25, 207). This division of the house between war-like hostility and idyllic country life mirrors Wemmick's dual personality. He is both a "hard" Victorian and a good-natured, amiable man.

Wemmick's eccentricity is linked with his playful character, for it is clear that his Castle — with drawbridge, gun, arbor, lake and fountain — is a manifestation of his childish and fetishist tendency to play with things. The fact that he calls his home "Castle" signifies that he too is a *homo ludens*, like Pip and Grip. The scene below exemplifies his fondness for play; he converses with the two "casts":

"Pray," said I [Pip], as the two odious casts with the twitchy leer upon them caught my sight again, "whose likenesses are those?"

"These?" said Wemmick, getting upon a chair, and blowing the dust off the horrible heads before bringing them down. "These are two celebrated ones. Famous clients of ours that got us a world of credit. This chap (*why you must have come down in the night and been peeping into the inkstand, to get this blot upon your eyebrow, you old rascal!*) murdered his master, and, considering that he wasn't brought up to evidence, didn't plan it badly."

"Is it like him?" I asked . . .

"Like him? It's himself you know. The cast was made in Newgate, directly after he was taken down. . . ."

(ch. 24, 200, my italics)

It is palpable that Wemmick, by comically conversing with the cast, parodies the famous scene from Shakespeare where Hamlet, faced with “Yorick’s skull, the king’s jester,” laments: “Alas poor Yorick!” (5. 1. 156). Seen from another perspective, it may be that Wemmick alludes to the parody by Laurence Sterne. In *Tristram Shandy*, Yorick the parson is bemoaned by his friend Eugenius, who dedicates “three words of inscription, serving both for his epitaph and elegy, Alas, poor YORICK!” (vol. I, ch. 12, 61-62). Shakespeare and Sterne are, one might argue, parodied by the comical Wemmick; in this relation, it should be noted that parody functions as literary “play.” If so, it is worthwhile remembering Bakhtin’s theory of polyphony. Bakhtin reminds us that in parody there exist different voices or languages (*The Dialogic Imagination* 75). At least four different voices can be heard in the scene where Wemmick is talking to the cast: mixed together are the voices of Hamlet, Eugenius, Wemmick and the criminal, from whom the cast is “made in Newgate.” These voices have something in common: they all refer to the motif of Death and ghosts. The linkage of the cast with ghosts is realized by Wemmick’s playful remarks on the cast: “why you must have come down in the night and been peeping into the inkstand, to get this blot upon your eyebrow, you old rascal!” The death mask, which flies at night is certainly a kind of ghost; it does float in the air, being free of gravity. Gravity, as discussed earlier, is an emblem of earthly realism, contrasted with unrealistic fancy. The cast-ghost relationship, however, indicates also some realistic element: actual gruesome murders of the Victorian period. Wemmick gives an account of the murderer pointing at the cast: “this chap . . . murdered his master.” The cast, as a ghost and murderer, is therefore divided into two realms: the antirealist realm of romance and the bloody criminal realism.

The motif of the skull (a death mask) and beheading is apparently one of the Dickensian themes; before dealing with the cast in *Great Expectations*, Dickens, in *David Copperfield*, highlighted the beheading of King Charles the First. A case in point is Mr. Dick, a mild lunatic. Dick’s obsession with the late king’s head is so strong that he cannot but pose a question to Pip: “Do you recollect the date . . . when King Charles the First had his head cut off?” (ch. 14, 194). For years Dick has been engaged with his Memorial of “the Lord Chancellor, or the Lord Somebody or other” (ch. 14, 197) but he has not finished his Memorial yet, because once the slightest idea of the late King’s head comes across his mind, his pen is stuck; hence his writing is always far

from completion. Just like Pip's obsession with Miss Havisham's ghost, Dick is annoyed by the so-called "compulsion to repeat"; in this case, Dick is afraid of the head or skull of King Charles the First, which is associated with the cruel execution by which the Father of the nation was declared impotent.¹⁸ We have seen the playfulness as regards Wemmick's conversation with the cast. By the same token, Dick's playful character is unmistakable; Dick is wont to play with his great kite almost everyday after his fruitless daily work: "Dick and I [David] . . . very often, when his day's work was done, went out together to fly the great kite" (ch. 15, 207) which was patched up all over with Dick's "manuscript, very closely and laboriously written" (ch. 14, 195). Seeing Dick's kite soaring high into the air, David would think thus: "I used to *fancy* . . . that it lifted his mind out of its confusion, and bore it . . . into the skies" (ch. 15, 207, my italics). David's comment on Dick's kite reminds us of the airy objects like ghosts, flags, balloons and the casts in *Great Expectations*, all of which are floating or hovering in the air.

IV: *Memento Mori*

It should be borne in mind that the motif of Death, as seen in the ghost scene of Miss Havisham and the casts in Jaggers's office, have to do with a certain European medieval tradition: *memento mori* ("remember you must die"), this thought is brought into focus in the fourteenth century, for the ideology of *memento mori* has been developed along with the spread of the Black Death. One of the most fatal epidemic is known as "the Great Pestilence of 1347-51" that killed around a quarter of Europe's population. Victims of the Black Death suffered various symptoms such as chest pains, vomiting of blood, high fever and dark skin blotches. The plague was so virulent resulting in millions of deaths that people were helpless in the face of the plague. As physicians had no power against the disease, many people counted on religious beliefs. Even some Protestants regarded the plague as "God-sent" or as a Job-like trial of faith. This is why the Black Death reinforced religion in a Christian society. Roy Porter writes:

Religion retained its hold at the death-bed. How a person died was crucial, for it determined whether they went to heaven or hell. From medieval times the *ars moriendi* (the art of dying) had taught believers how to die well.
(*Benefit* 241)

Ars moriendi caused by the plague is related to the ideology of the



fig. 1 Wolgemut, *Dance of the Dead* from *Nuremberg Chronicle* (1493)

memento mori; death was immanent, medieval European literature were therefore full of *memento mori* symbols. It goes without saying that *memento mori* developed with another medieval doctrine of death: *danse macabre* (dance of death). The motif of *danse macabre* enjoyed unusual popularity especially in the later Middle Ages, broadly, for the same reason as *memento mori* flourished. *Danse macabre* together with *memento mori* left their mark in the history of such medieval culture as woodcuts, paintings, sculptures, verses and dramatic performances.

In *danse macabre*, a dancing master leads living people of all kinds and professions — emperor, nobleman, monk, child, fool, etc. — to the grave. Originally, the dead person was drawn as a decayed body, however, “around 1500 does the figure of the great dancer become the skeleton” (Huizinga, *Autumn* 166). Wolgemut’s woodcut (fig. 1)¹⁹ produced in 1493 is of interesting, for it delineates skeletons with flesh, thereby indicating this is an intermediate form of drawing between the rotten body and “pure” skeleton. While in medicine, the notions of *memento mori* and *danse macabre* have been evolved, particularly, through the formation of anatomy in Renaissance. In those days, many books on anatomy were published with accurate anatomical drawings; among others, Andreas Vesalius’s *De humani corporis fabrica* (*On the Fabric of the Human Body*, 1543) marked a watershed



fig. 2 A Renaissance anatomical illustration for *Historia de la composición del cuerpo humano* (1556)

in anatomy. Figure 2 is a celebrated example displaying the complete skeleton. As Roy Porter maintains, this skeleton lost in contemplation facing the skull prefigures Hamlet's meditation in a later, but largely contemporary period.²⁰

After Shakespeare, the tradition of *memento mori* and *danse macabre* survived; the Hamlet who laments before Yorick's skull is reproduced by Sterne. As a contemporary of Sterne, Hogarth is important in relation to his *memento mori* engraving, *The Reward of Cruelty*, the fourth plate of *The Four Stages of Cruelty* (fig. 3).²¹ In this plate, the protagonist, Nero receives public revenge upon his body. In the preceding plates, Nero has done such wrongs as abusing animals, theft, and the cruel murder

of his lover (Ann Gill); consequently, Nero is forced to make atonement with his life, doubly, since he is not only executed but experiences public dissection. In the print, the motif of *memento mori* is realized through two skeletons at either side in the background, which seem to say, "Remember viewer, sooner or later, you must die."

After Hogarth, it is obvious that the ideology of death persists; for instance, the doctrine of *memento mori* and *danse macabre* is embodied in a *Punch* cartoon of 1858, "The silent highway man. Your money or your life!" (fig. 4)²² This cartoon, contextualizing the public health question of the day, brings forward a skeleton in a black cloak, who juxtaposes life and death. The motif of death can be also traced in the Newgate novels of the 1830s,²³ *Oliver Twist* being a supreme example of the genre. Needless to say, *Great Expectations* also incorporates the ideology of the *memento mori*. Newgate Prison appears in the novel, first and foremost, as a reflection of the motto: "remember thy death."

As a site of discipline and punishment, Newgate Prison had long been notorious especially after the age of Tyburn. At Tyburn, a multi-



fig. 3 Hogarth, *Four Stages of Cruelty*, plate 4 (1750/51)



fig. 4 A *Punch* cartoon (10 July 1858)

tude of criminals were executed in public; as Paulson points out, though the origin of Tyburn dates back to the twelfth century, the first permanent gallows were set up in 1571. Apart from Tyburn, there were other places for executions like Smithfield, Newgate, Tower Hill and Execution Dock (Paulson, *Hogarth's Graphic Works* 136, Porter, *London* 153). Originally, public executions were held as a warning against crimes to instill the fear and agony of death in the spectator. It was therefore at Tyburn that the *memento mori* was highlighted. The story was not so simple, however; instead, as the phrase “Tyburn Fair” betokens, a day of public execution became a holiday, when a huge number of spectators gathered. Sometimes it amounted to as many as 100,000 (Paulson, *Hogarth's Graphic Works* 136). Among them there were pickpockets, harlots, hawkers, fanatic preachers and the like, as envisioned by Hogarth's drawing *The Idle 'Prentice Executed at Tyburn*. At Tyburn the gallows were demolished in 1783, and moved to Newgate. Still, Newgate Prison only proved to be another Tyburn, with many spectators preying upon public hangings. Dickens in his work describes how the crowd turned into a mob:

Every window was now choked up with heads; the house-tops teemed with people — clinging to chimneys, peering over gable-ends. . . . The church tower, the church roof, the church yard, the prison leads, the very water-spouts and lamp-posts — every inch of room — swarmed with human life.

At the first stroke of twelve the prison-bell began to toll. Then the roar — mingled now with cries of “Hats off!” and “Poor fellows!” and, from some specks in the great concourse, with a shriek of groan — burst forth again. It was terrible to see — the world of eager eyes, all strained upon the scaffold and the beam.

(*Barnaby Rudge*, ch. 77, 691)

The narrator traces meticulously the crowd and the location with “heads,” “house-tops,” “gable-ends,” “church tower,” “church roof,” “prison-bell,” “water sprouts,” “lamp-post,” “eager eyes,” “scaffold,” “beam” and so forth. These parts and details are put together to reproduce the cries, the push and shove among the spectators.²⁴ As Dickens's vivid evocation testifies, in spite of the intention of invoking a *memento mori*, public executions in fact gave people official occasions to “enjoy” cruel executions. Nonetheless, it is undeniable that public executions affected some; for example, Dickens thought the Courvoisier execution “loathsome, pitiful and vile,” whereas Thackeray felt himself “ashamed and degraded at the brutal curiosity which

took” him “to the brutal sight” (Philip Collins 225).

Dickens, again in *Great Expectations*, deals with prison and execution, but he changes the subject of *memento mori* from brutal sensationalism to pathetic sentiment. On one occasion, Pip visits Newgate Prison, where he is surprised to see Wemmick going to and fro among the convicts as if they were his friends. Seeing Wemmick among the prisoners, Pip’s fancy transforms Wemmick into “a gardener” and prisoners into “his plants.” Moreover, the prisoners are turned into “Wemmick’s greenhouse” (ch. 32, 261). By this vegetable metaphor, a dark truth is paradoxically brought into open, for the metaphor reveals that the convicts are almost dead plants ruled by “disciplinary power” of the prison; to use Foucault’s terms, Newgate Prison is a panoptical institution with prisoners under constant surveillance.²⁵ Wemmick’s gaze is directed to one prisoner called “Colonel.” The prisoner is a criminal not of the brutal type but of the intellectual: he is “A Coiner, a very good workman” (ch. 32, 262). Colonel is glad to have a chance to give a parting salutation to Wemmick, for the former is to be executed the following Monday:

“I think I shall be out of this on Monday, sir,” he said to Wemmick.

“Perhaps,” returned my friend, “but there’s no knowing.”

“I am glad to have the chance of bidding you good-by, Mr. Wemmick,” said the man, stretching out his hand between two bars.

“Thankye,” said Wemmick, shaking hand with him. “Same to you, Colonel.”

. . . “By-the-by; you were quite a pigeon-fancier.” The man looked up at the sky. “I am told you had a remarkable breed of tumblers. Could you commission any friend of yours to bring me a pair, if you’ve no further use for ‘em?”

“It shall be done, sir”

“All right,” said Wemmick, “they shall be taken care of. Good afternoon, Colonel. Good-by!” (ch. 32, 262)

So far as Wemmick is on duty in London, he wears a novelistic *persona*; in this sense, he is a *locus classicus* for a Jekyll-and-Hyde type: he habitually splits himself into his public self — represented by “office sentiments” — and, conversely, into his private one, known as “Walworth sentiments.” In the public sphere, he is a stern, stiff and dry person despite his fundamental good-heartedness. His “post-office” mouth is a remarkable emblem of his dry and “wooden” character: in the City “His mouth was such a post office of a mouth that he

had a mechanical appearance of smiling” (ch. 21, 172). He never betrays his soft, vulnerable heart to anyone except in his fortified home. And yet in the passage quoted, he seems unwittingly to show his “Walworth sentiments” giving a heartfelt valedictory salutation to Colonel. But, curiously, Wemmick abruptly changes the subject so as to talk about “a remarkable breed of tumblers” kept by Colonel, who is “a pigeon-fancier.” Wemmick then offers to take care of Colonel’s tumblers in case those birds should die owing to the death of their owner. Wemmick appears to say, “I cannot by any means save your life but can possibly save your pigeons.” In this way, this valedictory scene becomes more and more sentimental, in spite of the fact that the *memento mori* motif is functioning in the background; the motif is implied by Colonel’s death on the gallows on Monday.

Wemmick’s conversation with Colonel is firstly sentimental because it points to pathetic emotions aroused by death and separation. Secondly, this scene shapes what may be termed “monetary realism,” for the realistic meaning of money is disclosed by Wemmick’s straightforward phrase: “Still you see, as far as it goes, a pair of pigeons are *portable property*, all the same” (ch. 32, 262, my italics). This mercenary statement reveals a hidden “realistic” meaning that the pigeons connote. His seemingly kind offer accomplishes a double significance as he is himself a complex, double figure. Wemmick proposes to save the “tumblers” not merely because he feels pity, but also because they are “portable property.” That the comical Wemmick should pretend that he is a shrewd economic person signals the author’s acute awareness that Wemmick is willy-nilly enmeshed into capitalist networks of value.

As many critics and historians point out, in the mid-century, money (or capital) was so ubiquitous as to be both divinized and fetishized. Following the lead of Bulwer-Lytton, Carlyle, Ruskin, Matthew Arnold, J. S. Mill and Engels among others, after the ordeal of the “hungry forties,” Grahame Smith notes that the mid-century was swayed by the capitalist cult of money-making. Concerning greed for money in the Victorian period, Smith quotes Ruskin’s virulent critique of industrial capitalism: “The first of all English games is making money. That is an all-absorbing game; and we knock each other down oftener in playing at that, than at football, or any other roughest sport.”²⁶ One might argue, in fact, that the desire for money had been a constant throughout history, but Smith claims that what is new in the nineteenth century is “the notion that greed for money lies at the very

heart of almost all personal and social evils” so that the traditional literary figure of the miser is not quite enough to cover the spirit of the age (Smith 64-65). Smith goes so far as to say that Wemmick is “a sinister scavenger, willing to take his last possession from a man who stands condemned to death” (Smith 207). Here the words “his last possession” refer clearly to Colonel’s “tumblers.” Gentle and good-hearted as he is, Wemmick has at one and the same time something distasteful and evil in him. As he is linked to the peaceful domestic life at his “Castle” living with his Aged P, so Wemmick is linked to a capitalist society full of strife and conflict. Similarly, Christopher Herbert focuses on the topic of the cult of money in Victorian Britain, demonstrating a destabilizing ideological schizophrenia in regard to money and wealth. In discussing Dickens’s fictions and Mayhew’s writings, Herbert has persuasively argued that both Dickens and Mayhew make it amply clear that money is holy and all-powerful as well as dirty and nasty. Mr. Merdle in *Little Dorrit* is a blatant example of this: Merdle, the great financier and money incarnate, is “one version of what would become the Freudian conundrum of the identity of money and excrement,” for Merdle is an ironical pun on the word, *merde* (Herbert 206).

The evil inherent in a greedy money-making age is deeply instilled in Wemmick. Also, because of his split personality, Wemmick in his public life has to experience the bourgeois capitalist condition in which something of the Hobbesian dictum is at work: “every man is enemy to every man.” The Janus-faced Wemmick is thus dehumanized to the extent that he finally sees pigeons as “portable property.” In this context, it is noteworthy that tumblers are no ordinary pigeons but specifically developed, precious birds which “fanciers” valued highly in the mid-Victorian period. Pigeon-fanciers of the day gathered, for instance, in the “London Pigeon Clubs,” as Darwin has shown in his illustrious book. To be strict, there were two kinds of tumbler: “the short-faced tumbler” and “the common tumbler,” both of them artificially developed to acquire “the singular and strictly inherited habit of flying at a great height in a compact flock, and tumbling in the air head over heels” (Darwin 82). On this basis, one might say that the “tumblers” which Wemmick desired to possess were a commodity having a specific “use-value” and monetary worth. Of course, unlike Merdle, he is not an arch-villain of capitalist society; nevertheless, he commits himself to the so-called capitalist system in which what is of crucial importance are money, wealth, capital and “portable

property.” Tumblers are more or less of great value; and value is, according to Marx, “human labor in abstract”: “Value . . . transforms every product of labour into a social hieroglyphic” (Marx *Capital* Vol. 1: 166). As Wemmick regards pigeons as valuables, he is an economic man whose slogan may be, “Remember always money, sir!” This unscrupulous capitalist motto is mainly addressed to Pip; but the hero fails to become a sagacious capitalist; instead, it turns out that Pip is, as Smith points out, “the antihero of man’s deluded involvement with money in capitalist society” (Smith 191).

Money appears before the young Pip as the ravager of freedom and the demolisher of his love for Estella. As a child, Pip is invited by Miss Havisham about once a week to play with the princess-like Estella; they play at cards, for instance. But the aim of Miss Havisham’s invitation to Pip is to revenge herself upon men in general, and so Pip is made a sacrifice. Pretty Estella is designed to “break his heart” (ch.8, 60). Sure enough, as blueprinted by Miss Havisham, Pip becomes infatuated by Estella more and more in spite of her insulting manner towards him. After a series of such delightful but miserable relations with Estella, the time comes when Pip should be apprenticed to Joe. Inwardly, Pip does not want to be bound by “indentures” because his anxious dream is to be a gentleman in order to marry Estella. Upon hearing that Pip’s apprenticeship is forthcoming, Miss Havisham invites not only Pip but Joe to hand the latter “five-and-twenty guineas” as a “premium,” and says, “Good-by, Pip!” This farewell greeting sounds so distressing that Pip instantly asks her, “Am I to come again, Miss Havisham?” (ch. 13, 102). This question gives her a good occasion to say: “No. Gargery is your master now. Gargery! One word!” (ch. 13, 102). In this way, Miss Havisham cuts the thread spun between Pip and Estella, after recognizing that Pip is helplessly in love with Estella.

This day was bad for Pip in two ways; first, on that very day, he knew he was no longer a child, but an adult, who had to work for his master, Joe. Pip is put into the so-called master and servant relationship. He is not allowed to play with Estella any more, but must struggle to earn money in the matter-of-fact society. Secondly, Pip’s Eros is checked, or shattered in front of the goddess-like beauty, Estella. However much he is abused by Estella, Pip adores her all the more. Nonetheless, from the time when Pip is bound as an apprentice to Joe, he is not able to see or talk with Estella, the only object of his adoration and love. Pip’s estrangement from Estella is therefore due to two

adult persons. Miss Havisham prohibits him from coming to Satis House, and Joe, though with no malice, by means of the “indentures,” makes Pip his apprentice. Worse still, Pip has to admit that he belongs to the working class, not the middle class, much less the landed class (the class of Miss Havisham). Pip as the first person narrator remembers the incident with bitterness:

Finally, I remember that when I got into my little bedroom I was truly wretched, and had a strong conviction on me that I should never like Joe’s trade. I had liked it once, but once was not now.

(ch. 13, 106)

Pip is, so to speak, “castrated” by Miss Havisham and Joe, who close the door leading to Estella. To borrow Freud’s term, Pip is under the influence of “censorship” imposed by adults who “repress” the child’s sexual desire;²⁷ Pip’s erotic desire directed towards the *femme fatale* Estella must be checked because he comes to the stage of adolescence. Given that the Freudian complex relationship between desire and repression, it seems significant that just when Pip’s Eros is aroused, his desire is checked. In this relation, it deserves special attention that money plays an important role in splitting the Pip-Estella relation asunder. In the final analysis, it is the money — “five-and-twenty guineas” — that overpowers Pip. Indeed, as Marx says, money is “the almighty being” (*Manuscripts* 136). Pip succumbs to the almighty money whose absolute power is epitomized by two adults: Miss Havisham, the godmother, and Joe, the father figure.

V: Money

Money in realist novels more or less determines the lives and fortunes of characters. From the mid-eighteenth century onwards, novels have been largely concerned with “real” people living in capitalist society. Money is more plainly referred to in realist novels than preceding literary genres like romances.²⁸ This is true not only of novels but also of such novelistic prints as Hogarth’s. His famous engravings known as *Marriage A-la-mode* (1745) show that marriage is a mercenary business dealing in terms of rank and wealth.²⁹ In Plate 1 (fig. 5)³⁰ of the *Marriage* prints, the young couple on the eve of their marriage turn away from each other in disgust, whereas their parents — the son’s father is “Earl Squander” without money, and the daughter’s is a merchant without class — are settling the marriage contract. The financial difficulty of the Earl is indicated by the lean usurer standing



fig. 5 Hogarth, *Marriage A-la-mode*, plate 2 (1745)

near the table, who hands the Earl the paid-up “Mortgage.” As the many coins and banknotes laid on the table show, the daughter’s father pays the debt for the Earl, which is probably more than a few thousand pounds. The parents are in pursuit of their own mutual profits, heedless of their children’s feeling. Hogarth’s print reveals that a marriage arranged by parents is based on the “cash nexus,” the embodiment of which is the detailed representation of money on the table.

In the novels of the eighteenth century as well, the fact that marriage is a contract between families is repeatedly shown; notably, the tragedy of *Clarissa Harlow* is partly caused by her family’s patriarchal greed for wealth. We notice that in Hogarth’s *Marriage* print many coins and banknotes are drawn to signify that marriage is nothing more than an exchange of money. Similarly, many references to money are found in *Clarissa* in connection with marriages; for instance, Lovelace’s “proposal” explains how much money *Clarissa* gains if she consents to the marriage:

“In the first place, madam, I offer to settle upon, by way of

jointure, your whole estate. And moreover to vest in trustees such a part of mine in Lancashire as shall procure a clear four hundred pounds a year, to be paid to your sole and separate use, quarterly.

“My own estate is a clear £2000 *per annum*. Lord M. proposes to give me possession either of that which he has in Lancashire . . . or that we call The Lawn in Hertfordshire . . . I shall choose a clear £1000 *per annum*. (Letter 186, 596-97)

Like Hogarth, Richardson presents money in a realistic fashion. Money in such specific sums indicates again that marriage is a dealing with money, from Lovelace’s point of view; at least, he believes in the sovereign power of money, by which woman is, whoever she is, overpowered.

Similarly, in Jane Austen’s novels, characters are concerned with love, marriage, and money. In *Northanger Abbey*, which is a burlesque of contemporary Gothic romance like *Udolpho*, Catherine Morland the anti-heroine of the novel comes to know that Mrs. Tilney was given “twenty thousand pounds, and five hundred to buy wedding-clothes” when she married (ch. 9, 87). Moreover, the question of money comes to the fore as regards Catherine’s marriage with Henry. Henry’s father, General Tilney at first thinks, misled by John Thorpe, that Catherine is a wealthy lady as possessed of “ten or fifteen thousand pounds” (ch. 30, 241); and this is why he invites her to his manor (Northanger Abbey), but on discovering his misunderstanding he turns her out of his house. However, to Catherine’s relief, Eleanor’s marriage with a “man of fortune and consequence” makes the father so relieved that General Tilney consents to his son’s marriage with Catherine, who eventually turns out to have “three thousand pounds” (ch. 30, 247). Wealth, as presented in specific numbers like Lovelace’s “£2000 *per annum*” or Catherine’s “three thousand,” plays an important role in one’s marriage. It is therefore no wonder that Emma, after facing an unexpected proposal by Elton, rejects him, reflecting that he, a mere vicar, is very impudent to intend to marry “Miss Woodhouse of Hartfield, the heiress of *thirty thousand pounds*” (*Emma*, ch. 16, 154, my italics). Emma thinks that Elton had better “try for Miss Somebody else with twenty, or ten” (*Emma*, ch. 16, 154). For Emma, Elton was out of the question because “in fortune and consequence she was greatly his superior” (*Emma*, ch. 16, 154).

References to money are thus indispensable when novelistic characters — hero, heroine and parent — are concerned with marriage. In Dickens, however, the circumstances attending money are a little dif-

ferent, for money in Dickensian novels is dealt with in the light of purely capitalistic aspects, rather than from matrimonial viewpoints. In capitalist society, Pip is idiosyncratic because he, like Timon of Shakespeare, seems to hate money. In this respect, Pumblechook, who is a merchant of “the corn and seed trade,” is contrasted with Pip. One of Pumblechook’s distinctive traits is his preference for arithmetical figures; he is so fond of doing accounts that he constantly asks Pip simple questions of reckoning. What follows is one of those questions: “First . . . Forty-three pence?” (ch. 9, 66). The right answer is three shillings and seven pence. Pip probably knows the answer, but thanks to his repulsion from Pumblechook, he is about to offer a wrong answer on purpose: “Four Hundred Pound.” On second thoughts, however, Pip dodges the correct answer by being “about eight pence off” (ch. 9, 67). Delighted at Pip’s wrong answer, Pumblechook commences a lecture on reckoning:

Mr. Pumblechook then put me through my pence-table from “twelve pence makes one shilling,” up to “forty pence make three and fourpence,” and then triumphantly demanded, as if he had done for me, “*Now!* How much is forty-three pence?” To which I replied, after a long interval of reflection, “I don’t know.”

(ch. 9, 67)

Pip knows the right answer, but he persists in saying, “I don’t know” because, I think, his fanciful nature goes against the grain when he is aware that he is bound by capitalist realism. Numbers, as mentioned earlier in discussing Malthusian statistics, can represent hard reality. In the case of Pip, he is forced to confront more particularized figures — “forty-three pence” — than Lovelace’s “£2000 *per annum*,” Catherine’s “three thousand,” and Emma’s “thirty thousand pounds.” Pip is fond of “fancy” and so he dislikes numbers and money. Pip is, as it were, an anti-capitalist, but his tragedy is that he is encircled by hard capitalists like Pumblechook. Pumblechook reappearing in chapter 19 asks Pip condescendingly for “More Capital” on hearing that Pip has come into his great expectations. Pumblechook tries to insinuate himself into Pip’s favor with his humble words and gestures. Pumblechook ventures to say that there is “an opportunity for a great amalgamation and monopoly of the corn and seed trade” (ch. 19, 155). But as he needs “More Capital” in order to realize his monopoly, he proposes that Pip should be a “sleeping partner” (ch. 19, 155). Although Pip manages to avoid his involvement with Pumblechook, the latter overshadows Pip as a cunning, greedy capitalist.

Pip's repulsion towards money and his dislike of numbers become all the more apparent when Magwitch (alias Provis) reappears in the novel. Magwitch, the transported convict, returns to England in secret in order to see Pip the gentleman, to whom Magwitch's wealth has been sent from Australia. Curiously enough, Magwitch's ambition is to make a gentleman. Pip is then chosen, since he once gave Magwitch a "file" and "wittles." Magwitch is, however, wrong in that he thinks money can turn anyone into a gentleman; Pip is by no means born with a silver spoon in his mouth; he is a mere village boy brought up at the home of a blacksmith. Moreover, since Magwitch's desire to make a gentleman is superimposed on Pip, he is turned into Magwitch's *alter ego*. For this reason, Pip is annoyed by the uncanny feeling of criminality through much of the novel despite the fact that he does not commit any criminal acts.³¹

It is also worth remembering that from the outset Magwitch functions as a ghost or apparition; in the opening scene of the novel, when Pip is in deep reverie at the churchyard where he fancies how the dead relatives were, he is abruptly aroused by a wild figure who "*started up from among the graves* at the side of the church porch" ferociously crying "Hold your noise!" (ch. 1. 4, my italics). Magwitch is presented as a corpse dancer in a *danse macabre*, who resurrects from the grave (or Hell) to this world in the form of a skeleton. When Pip was ordered by Magwitch to bring him a file and food, he was taken aback at dark vision in which the convict is metamorphosed into "the pirate"; Pip felt Magwitch looked "as if he were the pirate come to life" (ch. 1, 7). In the scene of his first encounter with Magwitch, Pip's gruesome images, such as the savage convict, darkening marshes, graves, gibbet with chains, are so starkly evoked that a frightening vision of death is assigned to Magwitch and Pip at the very beginning of the novel.

After a long absence, Magwitch as a "great dancer" in a *danse macabre* starts up again from the bottom of the world — namely, Australia —, to Pip's great confusion and displeasure. But Magwitch in fact reappears before Pip so that despite his good intentions he may wreak havoc on his protégé. On the night when Pip again comes across Magwitch after a long interval, the weather is intolerably bad. A sort of apocalyptic vision is brought forth:

When the rain came with it and dashed against the windows, I thought, raising my eyes to them as they rocked, that I might have fancied myself in a storm-beaten lighthouse. Occasionally, the smoke came rolling down the chimney as though it could not bear

to go out into such a night. . . .”

(ch. 39, 313)

In the description of the storm, one might be surprised to find the narrative is serio-comic; the narrator is serious in that he brings London an Apocalypse; yet, on the other hand, the narrating Pip-Dickens is jocular and comical; Dickensian humorous personification is functioning with reference to “the smoke” that, like a human being, comes down the chimney as if to say, “I don’t want to go out on such a hellish, stormy night.” In the passage quoted, the smoke is not a man but a ghost or “spirit.” It is to be noted that the “Spirit of Smoke” is not similar to Miss Havisham’s ghost, because ghostly figures are in general characterized by the power of floating or hovering in the air. The spirit of smoke, however, comes down, instead of going up. This suggests that circumstances around Pip have changed; from now on, he must confront what is called monetary reality.

Monetary realism is closely linked with Magwitch the benefactor. What is remarkable about Magwitch is that he is a paradoxical figure, since, on the one hand, he is a ghost from the underworld, on the other he is in possession of “real” money. On the stormy night, Pip hears footsteps coming up from the bottom of the stair. He listens more carefully to perceive that someone is stumbling in the dark. He wonders who might be below:

“There is some one down there, is there not?” I called out, looking down.

“Yes,” said *a voice from the darkness beneath*.

“What floor do you want?”

“The top. Mr. Pip.”

“That is my name — There is nothing the matter?”

“Nothing the matter,” returned the voice. And the man came on.

I stood with my lamp held out over the stair-rail, and he came slowly within its light. It was shaded lamp, to shine upon a book, and its circle of light was very contracted; so that *he was in it for a mere instant, and then out of it*. In the instant, I had seen a face that was strange to me, looking up with an incomprehensible air of being touched and pleased by the sight of me.

(ch. 39, 314, my italics)

In this scene of encounter in the dark, it is obvious Magwitch is made shadowy to underline his ghost-like attributes. He is here without substantial body, for he is a mere “voice from the darkness beneath,” and besides, he momentarily appears in a faint light; but then he disappears all of a sudden; he is as fleeting as a ghost might be. He comes from

the bottom of the staircase, like the dead from the grave to take hold of Pip to whom Magwitch feels a fatherly affection; yet Pip cannot understand at all who the man is before him. To Pip, the situation becomes all the more embarrassing because the man looks “touched and pleased by the sight” of him. The truth is that this ghostly man is the real benefactor of his “great expectations” although Pip is alienated from the fact. This is why Magwitch has to tell that it is he who has made Pip the gentleman. In what follows, Magwitch discloses the truth little by little referring specifically to two small signs:

“Could I make a guess, I wonder,” said the Convict, “at your income since you come of age! As to the first figure now. *Five?*”

With my heart beating like a heavy hammer of disordered action, I rose out of my chair, and stood with my hand upon the back of it, looking wildly at him.

“Concerning a guardian,” he went on. “There ought to have been some guardian. . . . As to the first letter of that lawyer’s name now. Would it be *J!*”

All the truth of my position came flashing on me; and its disappointments, dangers, disgraces, consequences of all kinds, rushed in. . . .
(ch. 39, 318-19; my italics)

In the quotation, metonymy is significant in relation to monetary realism. Magwitch calls attention to the letter “Five” which is in fact the first figure of Pip’s annual income: five hundred pounds. The first revelation sends a chill over Pip so that he feels his heart beating violently. The next word touches upon the first letter of the lawyer’s name: “J” of Jaggers. These two small figures, as Freud puts it, are the mere “dregs of world of phenomena,” but, the dregs, as Freud argues, contain deep significance.³² In fact, it is these small signs that communicate the painful truth to Pip. One could say that the small letters — “Five” and “J” — help shape the machinery that sets the “monetary realism” in motion. This capitalist realism embodied by money is opposed to antirealism which gives birth to fanciful objects like ghosts; in contrast, monetary realism, once put in motion, drives Pip, the seer of visions, to the world of money and capital that rejects playfulness and childishness.

It is important, however, to remember that capitalist realism is not necessarily incompatible with “play” elements, for, as shown by such economic terms as “speculation,” capitalism has an aspect of play in which everyone vies for victory. Historically speaking, it is well-known that in the mid nineteenth century, there occurred the “railway

mania.” In Britain, the railway — since the opening of the Liverpool-Manchester line — had appealed to a wide range of investors from George Hudson, the “Railway King” to ordinary citizens such as shopkeepers, clerks and widowers; all of them were carried away with the prospect of unlimited profits from the railway industry. As Altick points out, the railway mania dominated *Punch*’s pages, in which the boom was presented as an extraordinary burst of speculation turning anyone into a small capitalist.³³

The stock market in the Victorian era had been providing people with an opportunity to become a greedy shareholder. In this connection, it is convincing that Huizinga correlates the prize in games with price in economy; the words, prize and price, have the same root etymologically (*Homo Ludens* 51), so it is clear that the capitalist economy comes to have a play element; investment can be seen as gambling in the market. Capital paves the way for economic risk in quest of a mercenary prize. However, Pip is intentionally remote from capital as it would make him fully aware of monetary reality. Monetary realism is first and foremost ruled by the detailed descriptions of numbers (or signs) that Pip detests. His antagonism for numbers is, as I noted earlier, manifested in his refusal to solve a simple question of accounting. In this sense, number as a sign in monetary economy is placed in sharp contrast with the novel’s fairy-tale elements with the ghost occupying the center. After half way through the novel, money rather than the ghost plays an important role in making Pip face hard financial reality.

Pip pretends to be indifferent to minutely specific money and numbers; and by doing this, whether conscious or not, he distorts the exactness of monetary numbers in order to undermine an overwhelming economic reality. Undoubtedly Pip is irrational and childish in that he does not wish to be faced with such a reality; his childishness is antithetical to rationalism as exemplified in mathematical rigidity. This binary opposition between economic reality and Pip’s irrational disbelief in economy mirrors a familiar Dickensian dichotomy between fact and fancy. To play in earnest, as Huizinga has argued, “we must be more than merely rational beings” (*Homo Ludens* 4), and Pip is an irrational being full of fanciful nonsense. Pip’s irrational antagonism to money is well illustrated by his casual attitude toward his debt that keeps on increasing almost day by day on account of his wasteful expenditure. Pip’s bad pecuniary habits begin with, for example, his “election” into a club called “The Finches of the Grove”

in which the members of the club “spent their money foolishly. . .” (ch. 34, 273). Pip becomes stuck in heavy debt because he spends beyond his income. In short, Pip is another Micawber, whose advice to David is too famous but, I think, worth quoting: “. . . Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure nineteen six, result happiness. Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure twenty pounds ought and six, result misery. . .” (*David Copperfield*, ch. 12, 170). Pip like Micawber feels that his fortune turns out to be an outright misery, and for this reason, Pip creates for himself a fiction wherein the rigid framework of money and numbers is destroyed so that money is made unstable and wavering.

A fiction about money is fabricated when he realizes his debts and Herbert’s are so enormous that it is by no means possible to overlook them. On one day when Pip proposes to Herbert that they should examine how much they owe, they work on a “Memorandum of Pip’s debts” and a “Memorandum of Herbert’s debts” separately. In the process, Pip says to Herbert, who complains that he has lost some bills, “Then, Herbert, estimate; *estimate it in round numbers*, and put it down” (ch. 34, 276, my italics). Pip knows that estimating is a useful method to distort monetary reality. At this point, it is symbolic that they find their bills scattered about here and there in the room; the disorder of the bills reflects the confused situation of their economy.

Each of us would then refer to a confused heap of papers at his side, which had been thrown into drawers, worn into holes in pockets, half-burnt in lighting candles, stuck for weeks into the looking-glass, and otherwise damaged. . . . I sometimes found it difficult to distinguish between this edifying proceeding and actually paying the money. In point of meritorious character, *the two things seemed about equal*. (ch. 34, 276, my italics)

Pip is so confused that he is unable to distinguish writing down the debt from paying it; that is, in Pip’s mind, registering his debts is equivalent to their payment. His pecuniary manipulation transforms the amount of money into something less exact; money is made vague as “round numbers”: “. . . supposing Herbert’s debt to be one hundred and sixty-four pounds four-and-twopence, I would say, ‘Leave a margin, and put them down at two hundred’” (ch. 34, 277). Once Pip casts a spell over the money, it turns into just two hundred. In monetary realism, by contrast, spells no longer work effectively; instead, capitalist reality overpowers Pip’s frail fiction; Pip and Herbert “ran into new debt immediately, to the full extent of the margin” (ch. 34, 277).

Given *Great Expectations* is a “novel,” Pip’s strategy about money which aims to destroy its exactness is all but exceptional, since realist fictions, in general, as Ian Watt once put it, overemphasize their involvement with detailed numbers to suggest that the story is not fictitious but real.³⁴ Hence in the eighteenth century, Defoe and Richardson, to name two, had been concerned with a meticulous factuality in numbers. The reader of those authors knows, for instance, that Robinson Crusoe was born on September 30, and that on his birthday he was shipwrecked on the coast of a deserted island in the Caribbean Sea where he was to live for “eight and twenty years, two months, and 19 days,” and thereafter he “left the island, the nineteenth of December” in the year 1686 (*Robinson Crusoe* 274). Similarly, we know that Clarissa was born on July 24, and that she died at six thirty in the evening on September 7 at the age of twenty. Numbers in novels are useful to register novels’ historicality. Likewise, realist fictions are fond of money; to be more exact, in realist novels, it is a great necessity to dwell upon every figure of money, as seen in Herbert’s supposed debt: “one hundred and sixty-four pounds four-and-twopence.” Pip, however, does not make much of numbers; on the contrary, he seems to ridicule the rigidity and fixedness that those novelistic numbers are likely to suggest. Nonetheless, Pip’s fiction about money discloses its inability to rule over realism and capitalism; Pip’s debts increase more and more, making him insolvent. Although Joe as *deus ex machina* rescues Pip at the very moment when he is being arrested for debt, Pip is obviously undermined by his monstrous capital. Even when Joe comes to rescue Pip, the omnipotence of money is brought into the open as Pip’s debt is shown, significantly, in detail: “Hundred and twenty-three pound, fifteen, six. . .” (ch. 57, 462).

Pip is not the only person who is faced with the harsh reality of money and capital; Estella too experiences the violent fluctuations of the economy after her marriage with Drummle. It is mentioned that she had even been on the brink of the bankruptcy. She reappears in the novel after a considerable absence to meet Pip in the premises of Satis House. Pip, now “an old bachelor,” revisits the place to find that every building has gone; only the ground and “the wall of the old garden” (ch. 59, 482) are left. Estella, the owner of the Satis House estate, is deprived of properties such as the house and brewery. Pip and Estella are now standing, as it were, in the solitude of primeval nature; nature around them is both Eden-like and “Paradise Lost”-like. On the ground “some of the old ivy had struck root anew” and over-

head, Pip sees that “the stars were shining beyond the mist, and the moon was coming. . .” (ch. 59, 482). Green plants and the heavenly bodies thus evoke a romantic image. As Frye notes, the “wood-world” has been providing literature with the settings for dream visions in which lovers are united; in the romantic wood-world, “enchantment,” “illusion,” and “random desire” have been brought into focus (*Frye on Shakespeare* 44-47). Pip and Estella happen to meet again in this romantic wood-world that seems to stimulate their mutual “random desire.” Significantly, Estella says to Pip, “I have often thought of you” (ch. 59, 484), while Pip, aroused by the sight of Estella, says to himself: “The freshness of her beauty was indeed gone, but its indescribable majesty and its indescribable charm remained” (ch. 59, 483). In fact, she is still a *femme fatale* to Pip, who is spellbound by her “indescribable charm” as soon as he glimpses her.

Finally both Pip and Estella are brought face to face in the wood-world romance atmosphere; moreover, stars and the moon overhead appear to cast their astrological influence over the two. It is often the case that star motifs are related to the fortune of lovers as in Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*. In the drama, the young couple of tragic destiny are described as “star cross’d lovers” (Prologue. 6). Whereas in *Hamlet*, there are such astrological allusions as “stars with trains of fire” (1. 1. 117) and “Disasters in the sun” (1. 1. 118).³⁵ In Dickens too, in the opening of *David Copperfield* there is an unmistakable echo of astrology; when David was given birth to “on Friday, at twelve o’clock at night,” his nurse and some “sage women” claimed “first, that I was destined to be unlucky in life; and secondly, that I was privileged to see ghosts and spirits” (ch.1, 11). Then, is David similar to Pip in that he is destined to “see ghosts and spirits”? Anyway, it is clear that in the garden of Satis House the romantic image is amplified by astrological allusions. Pip is indeed both romantic and spellbound. However, it is revealed that Estella, unlike Pip, does not look at nature or even at Pip.

What matters, as regards Estella, is that in this “Paradise Lost”-like garden, she eagerly speaks of her properties as though she were a “landed gentleman” whose best means is land:

“The ground belongs to me. It is the only possession I have not relinquished. Everything else has gone from me, little by little, but I have kept this. It was the subject of the only determined resistance I made in all the wretched years.” (ch. 59, 483)

Although she has lost the buildings of Satis House and brewery, she insists that she still holds the land. In the end she comes back to the retained land with a view to rebuilding Satis House, the brewery and the garden. Almost a half of her dream is coming true, as her answer attests to Pip's question: "Is it to be built on?" (ch. 59, 483). She answers to Pip: "At last it is. I came here to take leave of it before its change. . . ." (ch. 59, 483). Estella returns to Satis House not merely as a landed person, but as the modern factory owner of a brewery; that is, she reappears as a Victorian entrepreneur who aims to invest capital and oneself in an industrial enterprise in pursuit of money; it is natural for her that she should take up the brewery business since, as Herbert once told Pip, Miss Havisham's father, Mr. Havisham "was a country gentleman . . . and was a brewer," who was "very rich and proud" (ch.22, 180). Mr. Havisham, seeing his son was a "prodigal," disinherited him, so that Miss Havisham became the heiress of the family. Estella as the adopted daughter of Miss Havisham is now the successor to the family, who must protect the Satis House estate. Estella is now standing on her own ground, to start afresh as a Victorian entrepreneur.³⁶ Pip cannot abide by this capitalist rule, but Estella well understands the capitalist ethic; her words, "I have kept this," testifies that she is, as it were, a capitalist heroine.

If the novel is split into two worlds, the one is occupied by such capitalists and realists as Pumblechook, Wemmick, and somewhat dubiously Estella, while Pip the dreamer and anti-realist is a solitary inhabitant of the other, alienated and alone. One can argue that Pip is a definite disclaimer of capital, since he deserts his home, severing the bond of his apprenticeship to Joe, and besides, he rejects the "great expectations" brought to him by the transported convict. What's more, as an "Idle Apprentice,"³⁷ he spends money like water taking advantage of his fiction about his wealth. In sum, Pip transforms everything economic, monetary, and capitalistic into the fanciful. He eventually finds himself alone, estranged from everything and everybody he either loves or dislikes. Estella becomes a hard capitalist Victorian, whereas Pip is a failed gentleman, who has lost all capital, being deprived of his divine but material "Princess" Estella.³⁸

Notes

¹ In discussing *Great Expectations*, Gallagher draws attention to the boundary between life and death “which was remarkably controversial in the nineteenth century” especially in the discourse of medicine. She argues that the problematic discourse on the boundary of life and death gave birth to numerous “spectral projections” like, for example, Magwitch and Miss Havisham. The ghost in *Hamlet* overshadows the novel, for Pip like Hamlet is assigned to avenge his father figure, Magwitch. Pip is driven by his painful class struggle to become a gentleman; and this wish is shared by Magwitch. See Gallagher and Greenblatt, *Practicing New Historicism* 163-210. Meanwhile Susan Walsh in reading *Great Expectations* notices the metaphorical correspondences between medical discourse and economy in the mid-Victorian period; she argues that commercial crises or a disordered economy, such as the 1840s’ railway crisis and the Depression of 1858, were expressed by use of “medical language,” more specifically, those crises were represented as the aged, “climacteric” female body. Miss Havisham is a victim of this maltreatment. The linkage of a bad economy with a disordered female body was so prevalent in the mid-century that artist for *Punch* carried time and again what may be called gendered cartoons in which, by implication, old women are related to financial crises. Susan Walsh 73-98.

² At the end of the eighteenth century, Dr. James Curry claimed that he found an essential difference between “*Absolute and Apparent Death*,” but Gallagher points out that “there was in fact very little consensus about the essential difference.” *Practicing New Historicism* 195.

³ Soon after attending Dr. John Elliotson’s demonstrations of mesmerism at London University, Dickens discovered he had the ability to mesmerize people; in fact, he regularly practiced this new therapeutic science upon his family and friends. Dickens tried mesmerism for the first time on his wife during his trip to America in 1842; Catherine was magnetized “into hysterics” and then into a “mesmeric trance” when Dickens made hand passes about his wife’s head for several minutes. Kaplan 182-83.

⁴ As to Gothic tradition in Victorian fiction, see also Wiesenfarth’s study, in which he discusses the development of Gothic fiction from the eighteenth century onward. He maintains that in the old Gothic novel the question is “who your parents are,” but that in the new Gothic the question is turned into “who you are.” *Great Expectations* is, he argues, a new Gothic fiction in the form of a *Bildungsroman* that incorporates a mystery story. Wiesenfarth 16, 83-100.

⁵ Doody insists that if the novel is defined as a fiction in prose of a certain length, its origin traces far away back to ancient Egypt or the age of Augustus. According to her argument, what Ian Watt described as the English novel is the product of what she calls the “new Realism”; she contends that the advent of the new genre is to be found in Charlotte Lennox’s *The Female Quixote* (1752). Doody 288.

⁶ With reference to Rabelais, Auerbach comments on the revolutionary mode of Rabelais’s “super-realistic” *mimesis*. In Rabelais, triumphant earthly life is revealed with “the freedom of vision, feeling, and thought” and thereby supplies the reader with a “wealth of phenomena.” Dickens’s vision of the ghost seems to have an affinity with this Rabelaisian representation of the world “in utter confu-

sion.” In the Dickensian type of description, superficial reality and the internal reality of one’s more or less mad psychology are confused. Bakhtin recognizes the Renaissance folk culture tradition in the “grand style” of realistic novelists like “Stendhal, Balzac, Hugo, and Dickens.” See Auerbach 276 and *Rabelais* 52.

⁷ This poem gives us a supreme example of metaphor, beginning with the following lines:

Tiger, tiger, burning bright
In the forests of the night,
What immortal hand or eye
Could frame thy fearful symmetry? (“The Tiger” 1-4)

⁸ By analyzing two types of aphasia Jakobson discovers two aspects of literary language; in the mode of realism, novels are bound by metonymy — especially synecdoche —, whereas in poetry, notably of Romanticism, metaphor is predominant. Hence the realistic novelist “is fond of synecdochic details,” and, in contrast, the “principle of similarity underlines poetry.” In metonymy, the principle of contiguity is working, while in metaphor that of similarity functions. Jakobson 69-96. Following the metaphor and metonymy formulation thus proposed by Jakobson, Lodge observes that in *Bleak House* many metaphors are felt to prevail so that the novel marks a “shift from a metonymic to a metaphoric mode of writing.” Lodge 101-02.

⁹ See Miller, “The Fiction of Realism” 124. Concerning Dickens’s complex use of figures, Dorothy Van Ghent pays attention to Dickens’s peculiar use of metaphor and metonymy; in Dickensian tropes, lifeless objects become humans, whereas humans lifeless objects. Van Ghent, “The Dickens World: A View from Todgers’s” 419-20. Moreover, it should be remembered that not only literature but science is sometimes overtly metaphorical, because scientific descriptions cannot help being dependent on language which is more often than not figurative. In the case of Darwin, for instance, it was inevitable for him to personify “Mother Nature” however criticized for his dependence on metaphors. See Beer 69.

¹⁰ Malthus in the second edition of his *Population Essay* introduced the new category known as “moral restraint,” which meant that during the period of the delay of marriage man was expected to abstain from “irregular” conduct — namely, sexual intercourse in brothels. See Malthus (Cambridge) 23; Cambridge edition uses the second edition of 1803, while Penguin edition makes use of the first edition published in 1798.

¹¹ Chadwick and Nassau Senior were the two main characters of the Royal Commission for the Poor Laws set up in 1832. See Briggs 275.

¹² To promote various social reforms such as the Poor Laws or the Reform Bills, many Royal Commissions were established in the 1830s, consequently by 1849, “more than 100 Royal Commissions had been set up.” Mid-Victorian England was therefore “an age of Blue Books, the reports of the Commissions,” some of them being “best sellers.” See Briggs 275.

¹³ The Inn Scene of the play (3. 148-78) is a parody of *Don Quixote*. Asked by the innkeeper if he has any money, Don Quixote replies that “he did not have so much as a single real, because he had never read in histories of knights errant that any of them had ever carried money” (Part I, ch. 3, 29). On the other hand, Rafe

is required by the landlord of the Bell Inn to pay “twelve shillings”:

HOST. Thou valiant Knight of the Burning Pestle, give ear to me: there
is twelve shillings to pay, and as I am a true knight, I will not bate a
penny. (3. 158-60)

Surprisingly, seeing his apprentice in jeopardy, Rafe’s master (“Citizen”) pays the money despite the fact that he, together with his wife, is a spectator at the play. The introduction of money with specific numbers is designed to criticize the convention of romance which is basically free from money. For the relationship between *The Knight* and *Don Quixote*, see Hattaway xviii.

¹⁴ As opposed to the official feast, carnival is a spectacular festival which celebrates temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established orders. In carnival all are only temporarily rendered equal; the site of carnival is the open “marketplace” where “laughter” transcends gloomy seriousness. As Rabelais’s world is full of images of the flesh and belly, Bakhtin calls this type of description “grotesque realism.” Bakhtin explains it as follows:

The essential principle of grotesque realism is degradation, that is, the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract; it is a transfer to the material level, to the sphere of earth and body in their indissoluble unity.

(*Rabelais* 19)

¹⁵ For Van Ghent’s argument about Dickens’s personifications and the “pathetic fallacy,” see note no. 9.

¹⁶ A child’s lie is perhaps closely linked with a child’s nonsensical play with words in the forms of rhymes, alliterations, refrains, and the like; in discussing the relationship between jokes and pleasure, Freud argues that child’s nonsensical word games are the reflection of his withdrawal from “the pressure of critical reason.” However, education in general suppresses child’s “nonsense” in favor of “logical thinking,” and for this reason, in children, especially in boys, “the rebellion against the compulsion of logic and reality is deep-going and long-lasting.” Freud’s observation is remarkable in that it explains Pip’s predilection for nonsense: “. . . the characteristic tendency of *boys to do absurd or silly things* seems to me to be directly derived from the *pleasure in nonsense*” (*Jokes* 175, my italics).

¹⁷ Bakhtin points out that “grotesque realism” is accompanied by a downward movement, like “Pantagruel’s descent into hell.” *Rabelais* 370, see also note no. 14.

¹⁸ Dick’s anxiety may be translated into his fear of the oppressive father. Freud’s accounts of Hans’s “castration complex” and “Oedipus complex” in the father-son relationship is relevant enough to explain Dick’s anxiety about King Charles’s head — a familiar symbol of the phallus. As Freud points out, Hans’s anxiety about horses is equivalent to his fear of, and antipathy to his father, who loves his mother and has a big “widdler.” See “Little Hans.”

¹⁹ See Panofsky 19 and figure 9. It is certain that Dickens was well versed in the subject of the *danse macabre*, as Slater points out; as early as 1841 he had bought *The Dance of Death* containing Holbein’s wood engravings, and in his “A Small Star in the East” (1868) the narrator remembers the Dance of Death on seeing the impoverished lives of the poor around Ratcliff.

²⁰ Valverde de Hamusco's *Historia de la composicion del cuerco humano* (1556) carries this print. See the cover illustration of Porter, *Benefit*.

²¹ See Paulson, *Hogarth* Vol. III, figure 6 (British Museum).

²² See *Victorian Punch*, ed. Koike, Vol. 2, figure 1-64, and Matsumura 138-39.

²³ The tradition of the Newgate novel or the Newgate school of fiction was forged by, among others, writers such as Bulwer-Lytton and Ainsworth. This genre is connected with sensation novels of the 1860s, because of its overt interests in crime. For a comprehensive study of the Newgate novels, see Hollingsworth and Hojo. As to related genres such as the Newgate Calendar, broadsheets and the "penny dreadful," see Mayhew 213-39, Altick, *Studies in Scarlet* 70-72, Altick, *Punch* 236, and Altick, *Deadly Encounters* 6-7.

²⁴ Philip Collins explains that this scene in *Barnaby Rudge* is shaped through Dickens's witnessing the execution of Courvoisier in July 1840 — the Courvoisier case was one of the most famous murders of the century. Later, in 1846, Dickens complains in a letter to the *Daily News* of the appalling bestiality of the crowd as regards the Courvoisier hanging; a great many people made a merry-making of the execution. As to Dickens's attitude toward public execution, see Collins 224-26, Edgar Johnson 177, 352.

²⁵ Foucault argues that disciplinary power was formed around the beginning of the nineteenth century; this power carries out "the great confinement on the one hand; correct training on the other." The locations where a panoptical gaze is alert are the prison, asylum, penitentiary, reformatory, school and hospital. Above all, the panopticon prison is the most typical: "The Panopticon is a marvelous machine which . . . produces homogenous effects of power." See Foucault 195-228. Tambling discusses the power relationships within *Great Expectations* in the light of Foucault's subject of disciplinary technology. Tambling 11-31.

²⁶ This passage is quoted in Smith, 63.

²⁷ Censorship is a figure of speech whereby Freud meant the functions of dream-work in which desire, or the Unconscious is disguised and repressed, because evil libidinal desire is always checked even in our dreams by the "guardian of sleep." In other words, censorship brings about "dream-distortion." *Interpretation of Dreams* 168-81.

²⁸ Frye defines romance as a "quest" in which the ageless hero and heroine experience "a sequence of minor adventures leading up to a major or climactic adventure." In romance, characters are wholly emancipated from the laws of nature, which keeps them evergreen. As regards the relation between romance and the novel, both Bakhtin and Frye have a common notion that the novel has been developed as a parody of other preceding, canonical genres such as epic or romance; probably one of the finest examples of novelistic parody would be *Don Quixote*, in which the conventionality of chivalric romance is exposed. From a historical perspective, Lucács considers *Don Quixote* as a work produced "at the beginning of the time when the Christian God began to forsake the world." Armstrong correlates the rise of the English novel with conduct books in the eighteenth century; they taught women to be "domestic." Similarly, Gallagher notices the problematic relationship between the ideology of domesticity and that of social paternalism in the novels of the nineteenth century. See *Anatomy* 186-87, 306, *Dialogic Imagination* 6-11, Lucács 103, Armstrong, and *Industrial Reformation* 113-84.

²⁹ Lawrence Stone argues that in the eighteenth century decision-making power was transferred to the future spouses themselves, and that “companionate marriages” instead of arranged ones had their effect in society. Lawrence Stone 219-20. Paulson also points out that “the *Spectator* habitually argued that marriage can only be based on love.” Paulson, *Hogarth* Vol. II, 214. One might say that companionate marriage was an ideal, and that it was in vogue from the eighteenth century onward.

³⁰ See Paulson, *Hogarth* Vol. II, figure 91 (British Museum).

³¹ This is not to deny Julian Moynahan’s claim that Orlick is Pip’s *alter ego* or “shadow.” Pip’s repressed desire is indeed transferred to the bestial Orlick. Van Ghent, though, focuses on Pip’s affinity with Magwitch, stating “Magwitch, from a metaphysical point of view, is not outside Pip but inside him.” See Moynahan 60-79 and *The English Novel* 165.

³² Freud, referring to “a slip of the tongue,” says that an error of this kind often signifies the repressed desire. Freud compares the work of a psychoanalyst to that of a detective who is supposed not to expect that the murderer left “his photograph behind at the place of the crime, with his address attached,” hence, he maintains: “So do not let us under-estimate small indications.” *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* 52-53.

³³ See Altick, *Punch* 455, More 90, Briggs 296, Hobsbawm 109-119, and Koike, *Eikoku Tetsudo Monogatari* 45-58.

³⁴ In Watt’s classic view, the English novel is concerned with individual experience that requires particularity of description, especially of time and place. The realist novel is therefore “under an obligation to satisfy its reader with such details . . . which are presented through a more largely referential use of language than is common in other literary forms.” Watt 35.

³⁵ As Tillyard explains, in Elizabethan literature, there was a wealth of reference to the stars. He notes, however, that the power of the astrological doctrine was rather restricted, and that people thought their wills were basically their own. Tillyard 65.

³⁶ Poovey discusses the relationship between commerce and virtue, linking *Our Mutual Friend* with the English economy of the 1850s and 60s, when capital came to the fore because limited liability legislations — such as the Limited Liability Act of 1855, the Joint Stock Companies Act of 1856 and the Companies Act of 1862 — were passed so as to reduce risks to the shareholder. These legislations provided “unscrupulous individuals” with speculative opportunities to invest more freely than before. Greed for capital pervading the period caused the hitherto unprecedented speculative boom, which set the stage for “the dramatic triumphs and the tragic collapses” that Victorian novelists often envisaged. Poovey argues that *Our Mutual Friend* betrays paradoxical interactions between speculation and morality. See Poovey 156-57. In my view, *Great Expectations* enacts a hunger for more capital; the prevalence of company floatations of the period can be seen through such characters as Pumblechook, Herbert, and probably Estella.

³⁷ In reading *Great Expectations*, Eiichi Hara discusses a “self-destroying” movement in which mutually opposing stories of various kinds are superimposed upon Pip by other characters; stories of the Prodigal Son, Lillo’s George Barnwell, the penitent Idle Apprentice, the fairy-tale prince, and so forth strike against each other, so that Pip in fine finds himself alienated from such stories as “he himself

can never be the author of.” Hara 593-614.

³⁸ Though the question of the novel’s ending has been a classic problem that many critics have commented upon, it seems fairly certain that the altered close as it stands does not necessarily show a happy ending of great promise nor rebirth of Pip, but instead, the couple’s future is darkly overshadowed by, in a symbolical way, the somewhat evil stars and moon looming over the mist, and also realistically, by the hard materialist, Estella, who is not, I believe, romantic at all however much Pip the frustrated lover is romantic. The original brief ending where Estella in Piccadilly wishes to shake hands with Pip and to kiss “little Pip” is revised following Bulwer-Lytton’s advice. For the controversies over the ending of the novel, see, for instance, Forster Vol. II, 289, Miller, *Dickens* 270-78, Rosenberg 87-115, and Gilmour 445-47.

Works Cited

- Altick, Richard. *Victorian Studies in Scarlet*. New York: Norton, 1970.
- . *Deadly Encounters: Two Victorian Sensations*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1986.
- . *Punch: The Lively Youth of a British Institution 1841-1851*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1997.
- Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 87.
- Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Trans. Willard Trask. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1953.
- Austen, Jane. *Northanger Abbey*. Ed. Anne Ehrenpreis. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.
- . *Emma*. Ed. Ronald Blythe. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and his World*. Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.
- . *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.
- Beaumont, Francis. *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. Ed. Michael Hattaway. London: A & C Black, 1969.
- Beer, Gillian. *Darwin’s Plots: Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot and Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. London: Ark, 1983.
- Blake, William. *The Poems of William Blake*. Ed. W. H. Stevenson. Harlow: Longman, 1971.
- Briggs, Asa. *The Age of Improvement 1783-1867*. London: Longman, 1959.
- Carroll, Lewis. *Alice in Wonderland*. Ed. Donald Gray. New York: Norton, 1992.
- Cervantes, Saavedra. *Don Quixote (Part I)*. Trans. John Rutherford. London: Penguin, 2002.
- Chadwick, Edwin. *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of Great Britain*. Ed. M. W. Flinn. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1965.
- Collins, Wilkie. *The Woman in White*. Ed. Julian Symons. London: Penguin, 1974.
- Collins, Philip. *Dickens and Crime* Third Edition. London: Macmillan, 1994.

- Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species*. Ed. J. W. Burrow. London: Penguin, 1968.
- Defoe, Daniel. *Robinson Crusoe*. Ed. Angus Ross. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965.
- Dickens, Charles. *Oliver Twist*. Ed. Steven Connor. London: Dent, 1994.
- . *Old Curiosity Shop*. Ed. Angus Easson. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.
- . *Barnaby Rudge*. Ed. Gordon Spence. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.
- . *David Copperfield*. Ed. Jeremy Tambling. London: Penguin, 1996.
- . *Hard Times*. Ed. David Craig. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969.
- . *Bleak House*. Ed. Andrew Sanders. London: Dent, 1994.
- . *Little Dorrit*. Ed. John Holloway. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967.
- . *Great Expectations*. Ed. Robin Gilmour. London: Dent, 1994.
- . *Great Expectations*. Ed. Charlotte Mitchell. London: Penguin, 1996.
- . *Our Mutual Friend*. Ed. Adrian Pool. London: Penguin, 1997.
- Doody, Margaret Anne. *The True Story of the Novel*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1997.
- Eliot, George. *Silas Marner*. Ed. Q. D. Leavis. London: Penguin, 1967.
- . *Essays of George Eliot*. Ed. Thomas Pinney. London: Routledge, 1963.
- Flew, Antony. "Introduction." *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. Ed. Anthony Flew. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.
- Flinn, M. W. "Introduction." *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of Great Britain*. Ed. M. W. Flinn. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1965. 1-73.
- Forster, John. *The Life of Charles Dickens* Vols. I and II. London: Dent, 1966, 1969.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison*. Trans. Allan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis: The Penguin Freud Library* Vol. 1. Trans. James Strachey. London: Penguin, 1973.
- . *The Interpretation of Dreams: The Penguin Freud Library* Vol. 4. Trans. James Strachey. London: Penguin, 1973.
- . *Jokes and their Relations to the Unconscious: The Penguin Freud Library* Vol. 6. Trans. James Strachey. London: Penguin, 1973.
- . "Analysis of a Phobia in a Five-Year-Old Boy ('Little Hans')." *Case Histories I: The Penguin Freud Library* Vol. 8. Trans. Alix and James Strachey. London: Penguin, 1977.
- Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.
- . *Northrop Frye on Shakespeare*. Ed. Robert Sandler. New Haven: Yale UP, 1986.
- Gallagher, Catherine. *The Industrial Reformation of English Fiction: Social Discourse and Narrative Form 1832-1867*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1985.
- , and Stephen Greenblatt. *Practicing New Historicism*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2000.
- Ghent, Dorothy Van. "The Dickens World: A View from Todgers's." *Sewanee Review* 58 (1950): 419-38.
- . *The English Novel: Form and Function*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1953.

- Gilmour, Robin. "Appendix: The Two Endings." *Great Expectations*. London: Dent, 1994. 445-47.
- Hara, Eiichi. "Stories Absent and Present in *Great Expectations*." *ELH* 59 (1986): 593-614.
- Hattaway, Michael. "Introduction." *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. Ed. Michael Hattaway. London: A & C Black, 1969. ix-xix.
- Herbert, Christopher. "Filthy Lucre: Victorian Ideas of Money." *Victorian Studies* 44 (2002): 185-213.
- Hobsbawn, E. J. *Industry and Empire*. London: Penguin, 1990.
- Hojo, Fumio. *Newgate Novel*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1981.
- Hollingsworth, Keith. *The Newgate Novel 1830-1847: Bulwer, Ainsworth, Dickens, and Thackeray*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1963.
- Huizinga, Johan. *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.
- . *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*. Trans. R. J. Payton and U. Mammitzsch. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.
- Jakobson, Roman. *Fundamentals of Language* Second Edition. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.
- Johnson, Edgar. *Charles Dickens: His Tragedy and Triumph*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986.
- Kaplan, Fred. *Dickens and Mesmerism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975.
- Koike, Shigeru. *Eikoku Tetsudo Monogatari* (The Story of Railways in Britain). Tokyo: Shobunsha, 1979.
- . *Victorian Punch* Vol. 2. Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobo, 1995.
- Lodge, David. *The Modes of Modern Writing*. London: Edward Arnold, 1977.
- Lucács, Georg. *The Theory of the Novel*. Trans. Anna Bostock. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT P, 1971.
- Malthus, Thomas. *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. Ed. Anthony Flew. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.
- . *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. Ed. Donald Winch. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Marx, Karl. *Capital* Vol. 1. Trans. Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin, 1976.
- . *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*. Trans. Martin Milligan. New York: Prometheus Books, 1988.
- Matsumura, Masaie. *Punch Sobyoshu* (Collections of *Punch*'s Prints). Tokyo: Iwanami, 1994.
- Mayhew, Henry. *London Labour and the London Poor* Vol. I. New York: Dover, 1968.
- Milbank, Alison. *Daughters of the House: Modes of the Gothic in Victorian Fiction*. London: Macmillan, 1992.
- Miller, Hillis. *Charles Dickens: The World of His Novels*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1958.
- . "The Fiction of Realism: *Sketches by Boz*, *Oliver Twist*, and Cruikshank's Illustrations." *Dickens Centennial Essays*. Ed. Ada Nisbet and Blake Nevius. Berkeley: U of California P, 1971. 85-153.
- More, Charles. *The Industrial Age: Economy and Society in Britain 1750-1985*. London: Longman, 1989.
- Moynahan, Julian. "The Hero's Guilt: The Case of *Great Expectations*." *Essays*

- in *Criticism* 10 (1960): 60-79.
- Panofsky, Erwin. *The Life and Art of Albrecht Dürer*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1955.
- Paulson, Ronald. *Hogarth's Graphic Works* (Third Edition). London: The Print Room, 1989.
- . *Hogarth Volume II: High and Low, 1732-1750*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1992.
- . *Hogarth Volume III: Art and Politics, 1750-1764*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1993.
- Porter, Roy. *London: A Social History*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1995.
- . ed. *Cambridge Illustrated History of Medicine*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- . *The Greatest Benefit to Mankind*. London: Harper Collins, 1997.
- Poovey, Mary. *Making a Social Body British Cultural Formations, 1830-1864*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995.
- Radcliffe, Ann. *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. Ed. Bonamy Dobrée. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1966.
- Richardson, Samuel. *Clarissa or the History of a Young Lady*. Ed. Angus Ross. London: Penguin, 1985.
- Rosenberg, Edgar. "Last Words on *Great Expectations*." *Dickens Studies Annual* IX (1981): 87-115.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Ed. G. Black Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974.
- Slater, Michael, and John Drew, eds. *Dickens' Journalism: 'The Uncommercial Traveller' and Other Papers 1859-70*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2000.
- Smith, Grahame. *Dickens, Money, and Society*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: U of California P, 1968.
- Sterne, Laurence. *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy*. Ed. Graham Petrie. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967.
- Stone, Harry. *Dickens and the Invisible World: Fairy Tales, Fantasy, and Novel-Making*. London: Macmillan, 1979.
- Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977.
- Tambling, Jeremy. "Prison-bound: Dickens and Foucault." *Essays in Criticism* 36 (1986): 11-31.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. London: Pimlico, 1998.
- Walpole, Horace. *The Castle of Otranto. Three Gothic Novels*. Ed. Peter Fairclough. London: Penguin, 1968.
- Walsh, Susan. "Bodies of Capital: *Great Expectations* and the Climacteric Economy." *Victorian Studies* 37 (1993): 73-98.
- Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1957.
- Wiesenfarth, Joseph. *Gothic Manners and the Classic English Novel*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1988.