

XXX

April 13, 2009

Engl 456 - British Novel

### Annotated Bibliography

Buckley, Jerome Hamilton. "Dickens, David and Pip." *Season of Youth: The Bildungsroman from Dickens to Golding*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974. 28-62.

After an initial exploration of the comparisons/contrasts of the protagonist in *David Copperfield* to the life of Dickens, Buckley concludes that by the time Dickens wrote *Great Expectations* (10 years later) his development of Pip reflected a drastically different protagonist from David, one that is closer to the author himself. Buckley then details an analysis of Pip with striking comparisons to Dickens' own life. This chapter shows the precision of Pip's character development: from his innocence and naiveté, driven from "Eden" by his great expectations; his corruption in the city where his hopes prove delusions; and the utter loss of material wealth and recovery of his integrity. Buckley gives great attention to the symbolic use of hands throughout the novel (Mrs. Joe, Estella, Magwitch, Biddy, Miss Havisham and Jaggers). Though Dickens was unaware of the bildungsroman, he incorporated the essential ingredients in both *David Copperfield* and *Great Expectations* but in opposite fashion. Pip is an orphan, travels to the city, is corrupted by money, is filled with shame and dedicated to improving himself which leads to pride. Buckley concludes with fascinating attention to the abiding sense of guilt that stems from the pledge of secrecy when Pip aided the criminal in his childhood. Because of this initial act, Pip becomes an accomplice and begins a career in which he ultimately finds himself "encompassed by all this taint of prison and crime." He argues that Orlick, as Pip's double, is the agent to carry out Pip's subconscious wishes and gives greater reason for Pip's experiences of guilt throughout the novel.

Feingold, Mordecai. "Philanthropy, Pomp, and Patronage: Historical Reflections upon the Endowment of Culture." *Daedalus* 16.1 (1987): 155-178.

Mordecai Feingold begins this article recognizing the few studies on the evolution of philanthropy. He claims that this issue defies moral categorization. His intent is to establish a non-partisan historical framework to view the phenomenon of philanthropy with a focus on the motives and ideologies. The distinction he gives is that philanthropy is charity, support of the less fortunate, while patronage is the support of high culture. Charity, he asserts, finds its foundation in the Bible based on both a fear of God and a societal duty. After the Reformation, a dramatic shift occurs in motive to the secular—the elimination of poverty and desire for societal reform. By the late 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, poverty was viewed as a disease in need of treatment by society. Benefaction was seen as bestowing greater good on the benefactor than on the beneficiary. Piety, based on indifference to the poor, became the mother of philanthropy. With the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the religion of humanity changes the motive once more to love, duty and justice. Philanthropy combines the religious and ethical worlds; patronage becomes a matter of choice rather than obligation. Feingold demonstrates that in scrutinizing motives in this discussion of

philanthropy and patronage, his goal is to credit human nature and the historical process with much complexity. He concludes that most critics agree that “any action resulting in the relief or happiness of another is meritorious, regardless of its motives.”

Harrison, Brian. “Philanthropy and the Victorians.” *Victorian Studies* 9.4 (1966): 353-374.

Brian Harrison gives a detailed analysis of Mr. David Owen’s recent study, *English Philanthropy 1660-1960*. While appreciating Owen’s attempt to stress the breadth of this topic, Harrison feels that he leaves many unanswered questions. One of Harrison’s criticisms is that Owen limits his study to those philanthropic organizations dealing directly with the relief and training of the poor. Excluding other societies/organizations creates a distortion by not discussing those charities involved in “social amelioration,” i.e. the temperance movement. He also criticizes Owen’s selectivity in that it prevents him from seeing the changes in the direction of charity. Harrison promises a much broader discussion of philanthropy. Harrison discusses the motives of Victorian philanthropists: “the hidden promptings within a man and the social situations without.” He cites examples of philanthropists who gave out of a strange mixture of guilt, compassion, and a myriad of psychological conditions that deserve investigation. Mr. Owen’s study reveals recurring patterns in the biographies of his philanthropists: childlessness, bachelorhood, leisure-class, boredom, invalidism and even recreation. Discussion of personality, family life, and the “unexpected qualities” characterizing philanthropists proves to be scattered and inconclusive, however. Yet, personal suffering often seems to be connected with philanthropy. Harrison asserts that philanthropy could be a means both of sharing and of forgetting suffering. As well, he includes the mutual help among the poor as a valid consideration of philanthropy.

Houston, Gail Turley. “‘Pip’ and ‘Property’: the Re (Production) of the Self in *Great Expectations*.” *Studies in the Novel* 24.1 (1992): 13-26.

This article focuses on how the two forces of production and reproduction influence the “making” of Pip in *Great Expectations*. In this second attempt by Dickens of a fictional autobiography, Houston argues that the hero and heroine are both “constructed”—made economically. Because of Pip’s lack of maternal nurture, his identity is largely shaped by economics. Thus he falls from the sphere of reproduction (female) into the realm of production (male) and is destined to become associated with property, one way or another. Pip essentially *becomes* property as much as inheriting it. Discussion follows regarding what it meant to be brought up “by hand” as contrasted with Herbert’s continual “looking about” for something—again the reproduction vs. production mode. Houston shows how Pip is vulnerable because he has fallen into the world of production and consumption; he is not born, he is made. This cannibalistic metaphor (in much of Dickens’s novels) is often seen whenever the protagonist is abandoned or betrayed by his mother. Thus, Pip learns either to consume or be consumed. The two extreme states of gluttony and starvation are seen as motives for Pip’s complicated, sometimes revengeful behavior. He is both innocent and guilty, victim and “wolf.” In the end, Houston asserts that it is Joe who has made him, or rather reproduced him, in that he acts as both nurse and mother to Pip. Houston has trouble with Dickens’s ending of this novel because Dickens affirms what he also reviles in a consumer society: the necessity for the powerless to underwrite the powerful.

Moynahan, Julian. "The Hero's Guilt: The Case of *Great Expectations*." *Essays in Criticism* 10 (1960): 60-79.

Moynahan begins this essay raising the issue of Pip's guilt of snobbery and ingratitude, making comparisons to murder in that they are both offenses against persons rather than property. This line of thinking then progresses to a study of the close association Pip develops with the "taint of criminality" throughout the novel, hinting that Pip as hero is somewhat entrapped by his association with guilt more than his actual behavior. Moynahan disagrees with the metaphysical readings of *Great Expectations* by G.R. Strange and Dorothy Van Ghent, that there is a universal guilt in the world of the novel. Instead, Moynahan shows that evidence is not clear for this interpretation. Instead, Moynahan suggests a strong comparison of Pip and Orlick as mirror images in their respective journeys of great expectations. In the confrontation at the lime-kiln the innocent figure (Pip) is made the accused and the guilty one the accuser. The question is raised, "Is Orlick merely projecting his own qualities on Pip or do Orlick's accusations give even a partial valid comment on Pip's actions?" The answer to this comes as Moynahan explores the fantasy element of *Great Expectations* which is borne out of a desire for power and a drive for mother-love. Moynahan concludes with a convincing argument showing that both Drummle and Orlick serve as instruments of vengeance with numerous analogies and linked resemblances belonging to Pip and to his ambitions.

Pecora, Vincent P. "Inheritances, Gifts, and Expectations." *Law and Literature* 20.2 (2008): 177-198.

Pecora uses *Great Expectations* and Marcel Mauss's research on gift exchange to argue the way we should think about about gifts and inheritances. He advocates that the state should not be barred from regulating inheritances (to a limited extent) through taxation, but it should also not be allowed to assume a parental role as the main distributor of legacies. He draws heavily from examples of Magwitch, Miss Havisham, and Pip to point out the complexities of being both an "heir and non-heir" of a gift. Though Pip is legally an orphan, he responds to his benefaction much the same way as the first son of a titled family (running up debts). Pecora then explores what he feels is Dickens's purpose in *Great Expectations*, the story of the "family romance" (Freud) whereby the "son, frustrated by his relationship (or lack thereof) with his actual parents, goes off in search of a parentage more in keeping with his fantasy vision of himself." He makes comparisons with Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* and Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*. Pecora makes observations in the shift that was occurring in the era of Dickens's *Great Expectations* in how inheritance was viewed. The issue of "testamentary freedom" is discussed, both pros and cons. He shows how Dickens both satirizes the distortions that inherited wealth produce as well as demonstrates that they are a positive part of social life. This apparently is no surprise in the Victorian novel. The whole idea of the "gift economy" is a common plot device that juxtaposes the legally wrongful (undeserving) with the legally rightful heirs. The chain of gift exchanges in *Great Expectations*, Pecora asserts, becomes the "glue of generosity" that holds together the social organism.