

The Metaphor of Robert Frost's "The Road Not Taken" in Charles Dickens's *Great Expectations*

Mohammed A. Rawashdeh *

Abstract

Charles Dickens's *Great Expectations* (1861) is usually read and even taught with the relationship between Pip and Estella at its center. This study shifts the focus to Pip and Joe relationship, viewing this relationship as another center for the novel. Unlike other studies that relegate Joe to the margin, this study presents him not only as another major character but also as Pip's double. Dickens employs Joe to enable Pip take the two roads when Pip's road diverges to the blacksmith's road and the gentleman's road and virtually enables Pip to know what the two roads have to offer him.

Before Joe replaces Pip on one of the two roads, Dickens carefully paves the way for this replacement. First, Dickens begins the novel with Pip, as a boy, suffering from identity problems, opening the door for different possible readings of Pip's identity. Second, he presents the young Pip and Joe as two characters who have much in common: have the same good nature and interests, tied to one another by real friendship, treated alike by Mrs. Joe. Equally important, Pip and Joe unite physically three times in the course of the novel to form one moving body when Joe carries Pip on three different occasions. The ending of the novel supports this new reading as Joe marries Biddy who once has been Pip's choice for a wife. Moreover, they name their first child Pip, an indication that he is strongly related to the original Pip who is now a gentleman.

When the persona in Robert Frost's famous poem "The Road Not Taken" says "Two roads diverged in a wood, and I— / I took the one less traveled by, / And that has made all the difference," he is fully aware that he is in a situation from which there is no turning back.¹ Therefore, he sighs for the unknown opportunities that the other road may have offered him. The deep regret he reveals springs from the feeling that the other road might have been better, or more fruitful, inferring that the one he chose was unsatisfactory. What he is sure about, however, is that the road taken profoundly altered his entire life.

Pondering over what we might have missed, or even avoided, on a path that was a possible option is a curiosity that tantalizes our minds, particularly when we, in retrospect, try to evaluate our achievements along the road we chose to

follow. In Dickens's *Great Expectations* (1861), this curiosity is satisfied. The reader is given the opportunity to observe both of two possible outcomes to the plot when Pip, the hero, is given the chance to explore two completely varying roads. This study argues that Pip and Joe are intended to be viewed as one persona split into two characters, a literary tactic employed by Dickens to enable Pip to pursue both options: the road of the blacksmith and the road of the gentleman. By undoing the traditional construct of *Great Expectations* (1861)—Pip's relentless endeavors to become a gentleman to win Estella's love—Pip's decision to go to London to live the life of a gentleman leaving both the forge and Biddy to Joe becomes the turning point that brings into play the metaphor of Frost's two roads, however, with a fundamental difference between Pip and Frost's persona, that the former, through his double (Joe), would be able to simultaneously explore the two roads.

It is essential to point out that Dickens uses the early chapters of the novel to carefully establish the similitude between Pip and Joe, before the opportunity to proceed down a new road is presented to Pip. Once the roads diverge, Joe, as Pip's proxy, continues his journey on the familiar road, the features of which are not difficult to anticipate, leaving Pip free to travel down the second, somewhat mysterious road, whereas Joe the blacksmith, who forms a sharp contrast to Pip the gentleman, takes on the role of Pip's double, continuing on Pip's road, illustrating to the reader what Pip's future life might have been like if he had never been imbued with dreams of becoming a gentleman and subsequently been provided with the means of becoming such.

But the question that poses itself here is: what is the basis for such a reading? On the one hand, from a "deconstructive" point of view, a text is not a rigid construction; rather, it is a weak one so much so that we can "deconstruct" it in a way that would yield a meaning that even contradicts the former one. It is true that Jacques Derrida, in his discussion of writing, points out that writing is always preceded by "a meaning" created within and maintained by the "logos," but this "linear writing," which governs the "interpretation of signs," as he states, has never been in full control of the meaning.² That is to say, no one can claim that a certain text has one single meaning. What Derrida suggests explains why we find ourselves prone to see in texts meanings other than the traditional ones and sometimes construct meanings that even clash with or oppose the meanings suggested by others. Ross Murfin calls this desire to read a literary work against the grain "the deconstructive itch," pointing out that, according to deconstructors, "texts" do have the capacity "to support seemingly irreconcilable positions."³ It is from this assumption that this reading of the novel (which, contrary to the norm, marginalizes Estella and gives Joe a pivotal role in the novel) claims its validity.

On the other hand, there is something of a consensus among critics that *Great Expectations* (1861), written during the latter stage of Dickens's literary career, differs from his earlier novels, which were marked by the striking realism. The novel is not realistic in the traditional sense of the term because several episodes in it can be labeled as melodramatic and some, rather, as picaresque or, even, burlesque than realistic.⁴ In addition to its lack of "true" realism, a further distinguishing factor is identified by Anny Sadrin who highlights the idea that it is not a "topical novel."⁵ That is to say, Dickens's earlier novels focus on particular topics such as political, economic, and social issues whereas *Great Expectations* (1861) does not; the novel has its own peculiarity. Sadrin also describes the novel as "fundamentally ambiguous."⁶ Its ambiguity, however, reflects Dickens's new interests, and Dickens certainly intended the novel to appear as such to serve these new interests. Michael Wheeler and Harold Bloom are more specific about the change in Dickens's narrative pattern. The former says that Dickens's later novels "indicate a deepening interest in the psychology of the individual rather than the condition of the society," and the latter holds that *Great Expectations* (1861) "enters the abyss of Pip's inner self."⁷ Wheeler attributes this change to the influence of Wilkie Collins, the young novelist who was a master of this type of writing and with whom Dickens became intimate friends. It is worth mentioning that Wheeler maintains that Dickens's last novels displayed "the destabilizing of individual identity."⁸

From this perspective, identity arises as one of the serious issues that the novel attempts to tackle. Jeremy Tambling places "the creation of identities" at the heart of the novel, and Gail Houston asserts that the novel revolves around "the hero's search for identity."⁹ But, what is identity? Philosophers from the time of Plato to our present time have been trying to unravel the constitutive criteria of identity. Pillars of modern philosophy like Locke, Hume, Hegel, Marx, and Freud had their contributions in this regard, but each one approached the question of identity from a different perspective. Nevertheless, a comprehensive and precise definition of the concept remains a goal that is still yet far from being achieved; such a definition is unattainable simply because identity has its constituents in our genes, psyche, culture, race, and, even, citizenship. However, people who lead smooth natural lives do not concern themselves with identity, but the question of identity becomes an agonizing concern to individuals who experience identity crisis i.e. who live with vague or vulnerable identity, or, in Steph Lawler's terms, who "are not quit sure who they are."¹⁰

“Who am I?” is the question that troubles Pip from his childhood as he finds himself unable to utter his name and unable to create convenient and supporting images of his parents, whom he does not remember. His very name (Pip) is the result of his childish inability to pronounce his name (Philip Pirrip) correctly. Adopting this name (Pip) might be the first cause for his identity crisis since he loses, by abandoning his real name, one important constituent of the personal identity—the name given to him by his parents. Moreover, the utterance “pip,” as a signifier, indicates something small and insignificant, a connotation that surely would not help in achieving a satisfactory identity as Pip grows up. It is worth noting here that upon acquiring the identity of the gentleman in London, Pip accepts Herbert’s suggestion to assume a name, Handel, that suits the new identity. The second cause that contributes to the vagueness of his personal identity, as a child, is the death of his parents while he is too young to remember them. A person usually draws a large portion of his self-identity his knowledge of his parentage and his history with his parents, the history which becomes the memory of that person. Memory, as Harold Noonan states, is “crucial to personal identity.”¹¹ Pip, obviously, had no memory of his parents since they died when he was too young to remember them, but could only create vague images of them in his childish mind. To his bad luck, the images he creates (based on the style of lettering used on their tombstones and being miscomprehended by Pip) contribute to creating disturbing images about his parents and virtually adding to the fragility of his identity. A third cause can be found in the treatment Pip receives from his sister as he grows up in her household. What confuses Pip and causes him to be unsure of his identity is the constant haranguing and abuse, both physical and verbal, that Mrs. Joe doles out to him. Although he is essentially a good child, his sister’s insistence that he is thoroughly unworthy and bad leads him to doubt himself. He only ever feels somewhat comfortable with his own identity when he is in the presence of Joe. This feeling of uncertainty leads Pip, at different points in the novel, to see himself in others and sometimes in imaginary literary characters that he becomes familiar with, like seeing himself capable of absorbing all diabolical aspects of George Lillo’s character, Barnwell.¹² Pip’s vivid imagination makes him susceptible to such episodes; Gwin Watkins underscores these disturbances in his character, describing the outcome as “alienation from self” and “identity loss.”¹³

The idea that Pip’s struggle with his identity is the pivotal point of the novel serves to bolster the major premise of this study. That premise being that Pip and Joe are actually one personality, split into two characters with two different identities as a literary ploy which enables Pip to explore the two roads, one as himself and the other in the guise of Joe, the blacksmith. The metaphor of the

two roads offers itself as a manifestation of the new meaning of the novel or vice versa, that the new meaning is created through, in Jacques Derrida's terms, the "metaphorical mediation," which in itself is a signifying process.¹⁴ According to Derrida, metaphor emerges when the "signified" stops to have that "immediate" and "mediated" relationship with the "logos." In other words, the metaphorical meaning is born when the "signified" is freed from the "logos" and simultaneously the metaphorical medium presents itself as a substitute in that relationship.¹⁵

Thus, the complexity of the plot opens the doors wide for different readings of Pip's identity, one of which is that Pip and Joe are one character, or that Joe is Pip's double. This "doubleness" emerges profoundly and fits smoothly in the suggested metaphor of the two roads in the novel. It is significant to remark that employing metaphor as a device to link the different dramatic episodes is not new to Dickens's narrative technique. Wheeler observes that Dickens in the 1860s revealed "fascination with the mysteries of identity— especially the split personality and doubles."¹⁶ Doris Alexander points out (in a chapter subtitled 'On How Two Personalities Amalgamate to Form One Character') that Mrs. Micawber, in *David Copperfield*, and Mrs. Nickleby, in *Nicholas Nickleby*, when combined together, represent the personality of Dickens's mother.¹⁷ In this case, we have a real character whose traits have been divided between two fictitious ones. But ultimately, it is one character that split into two characters. On another level, Graham Smith views the encounter between the "traveler" and the small boy, in *The Uncommercial Traveller*, as a meeting between the "traveler" and "his younger self."¹⁸ It is as if the "traveler" had a double in his boyhood, and Dickens decided to hold this double in animation until the "traveler" grows up and returns to encounter himself, the self of an earlier time period. Julian Moynahan in "The Hero's Guilt: The Case of *Great Expectations*" refers to Miss Van Ghent's "metaphoric connection between Magwitch and Pip" in the sense that Magwitch represents Pip's criminal acts if snobbery is to be viewed as a crime.¹⁹ Displacing Ghent's suggestion as inaccurate, Moynahan replaces Magwitch with Orlick "to define Pip's implicit participation in the acts of violence with which the novel abounds."²⁰ Other critics, Daniel Pollack-Pelzner observes, "have discerned parallels between Pip and the character Wopsle portrays."²¹ The notion here is that "doubleness," is embedded in the novel and could be seen from different perspectives, depending on the way the text unfolds itself to the reader.

Usually, *Great Expectations* (1861) is taught in classrooms with Pip and Estella at its center. Besides, Pip's character, Estella's character, and the

relationship between the two, receive in-depth scrutiny and analysis from critics and commentators.²² Pip's relationship with Joe is only referred to in passing and is far from ever being considered as one of the focal points of the novel. Joe is, apparently, one of the least seriously considered characters in the novel. Robert Golding and James Crowley reduce Joe to a sort of standard of morality, depicting him as a passive character with no role to play in developing the plot of the novel.²³ Surprisingly, Sadrin does not even include Joe in her list of characters who, as she puts it, "play an important part... in the life of the hero" even though the list includes such minor characters as Pumblechook, Orlick, Wopsle, and Trabb's boy.²⁴ Houston seems to be the only one who holds that Joe plays a significant role in the novel. Although she does not dwell on the point, she remarks, in her essay "Pip and 'Property,'" that Joe is one of those who "made" or "reproduced" Pip.²⁵ Hence, Joe should receive his due share of attention and his importance in the novel shall be underscored. We can examine the structure of the novel and divide it into three parts corresponding tidily in terms of the relationship between Pip and Joe: the part in which Dickens establishes Pip and Joe as one character, the part that prepares the ground for their separation, and finally, the part in which each one takes his separate road.

To solidify the ground of the premise of the study and before returning to Pip and his identity crisis, it is essential to show how Dickens establishes the "doubleness" of Pip's and Joe's characters. The process is a multi-dimensional one; it encompasses what Pip and Joe have in common, the way people view and treat them, and their tendency to remain physically close to each other. Dickens introduces Pip and Joe to the reader as simple, illiterate, and kind-hearted friends.²⁶ To solace Pip in times of distress, Joe would tell him that he had suffered a lot during childhood at the hands of his father, just as Pip now suffers at the hands of Mrs. Joe, and when Pip becomes Joe's apprenticed boy, Joe tells him about the days when he himself had once been an apprentice. Such episodes are meant to show that Pip's childhood seems to mirror that of Joe's. Furthermore, Mrs. Joe treats Joe and Pip as if they are of the same age. She, with her "hard and heavy hand," is as harsh on Joe as she is on Pip.²⁷ She would also put the same amount as well as type of food for each of them, not paying attention to the fact that Joe is an adult who works at a physically demanding job and Pip is just a little boy. Moreover, Mrs. Joe and Pumblechook would frequently discuss Pip's future in his presence without consulting him about this matter. Pip does not seem surprised that he, as a young boy, is never consulted; however, he does remark upon the way in which Joe is equally disregarded, noting that "In these discussions, Joe bore no part."²⁸ Dickens once again gives Pip and Joe a shared denominator.

Pip and Joe like also to be physically close to one another, something in which Pip seem to find enhancement for his vulnerable identity. Pip's visit to the Three Jolly Bargemen to call Joe shows how Pip likes to stay physically close to Joe, for he excuses himself to Mr. Wopsle, who has already made him space to sit, and prefers to sit beside Joe, the one with whom he feels secure and comfortable.²⁹ In different incidents, we find that Joe and Pip maintain even a sort of physical connection. When the stranger hands Pip the shilling, Pip thanks the man while "holding tight to Joe," and in the chase of the two convicts, while holding one of the torches in one hand, Joe holds Pip's hand in the other.³⁰ This physical attachment is most prominent on three separate occasions during the course of the novel when, on each occasion, the two become one moving body. The first is in the beginning of the chase of the convicts when "Joe took [Pip] on his back," and they plunged into the marshes as one body.³¹ The second and the third are associated with their tour in London during Pip's recuperation. Joe bears the adult, but still weak, Pip from his room to the carriage.³² Joe carries the adult Pip for a second time, when they get back from the tour, "across the court and up the stairs."³³ Crowley rightfully describes the incident as a "moment of intense communion with Joe."³⁴ These occasional symbolic instances of fusion of their two bodies stand as salient signs that Pip and Joe are one personality (with one identity) split between two characters. Pip confirms this unity as he expresses his feeling towards the enterprise that Jaggers has carried for him. He says that he "was lost in the mazes of [his] future fortunes, and could not retrace the by-paths [he and Joe] had trodden together."³⁵ This declaration emphasizes the unity of character and identity between Pip and Joe before the appearance of Jaggers. Thus, this "doubleness" is very well established before Pip's visit to Satis house and the aim is to see Joe thenceforth as Pip on the first road, giving Pip the opportunity to take the other one.

The second phase (preparing the ground for their separation) starts with Pip's growing self-consciousness: his awareness that he is uneducated and his desire to improve himself, a fact which inevitably leads to the mental separation of the two characters. This growing self-consciousness, manifested in his relentless efforts to acquire education, is his first step towards forming a satisfactory identity and simultaneously marks his mental separation from Joe. A year after the chase of the two convicts, Pip manages to write a few lines (as a letter to Joe) in broken English. This is the occasion when Pip finds out that Joe is illiterate.³⁶ For the first time, Pip views himself as different from, or rather, superior to Joe. This feeling of superiority is evident in the language he uses to describe that incident: "I leaned over Joe, and, with the aid of my forefinger, read the whole letter."³⁷ G. L. Brook remarks that Dickens "paid a good deal of

attention to the choice of appropriate language for his characters.”³⁸ This appropriate language essentially includes the character’s word choice. Moreover, Herald Nelson, in his discussion of the narrator’s language and rhetoric in Dickens, points out that “the narrator’s language may show a rise or fall in spirits.”³⁹ The language Pip uses to describe that incident shows an obvious rise in his spirits, and it is indicative of his consciousness of his new identity, one that is different from that of Joe’s.

Significantly enough, that same evening, Pip is told that he is to go and play at Miss Havisham’s house on the next day, the visit that, par excellence, is considered the first turning point in his life. As a result of that visit, Pip, on the one hand, becomes aware of the fact that social identity is as important as personal identity. From the abuse and humiliation he suffers from at Satis house, he realizes that he belongs to a class (the proletariat, in Marxism) that is being held by the Class of Estella (the bourgeoisie) as inferior and worthless. It is the class conflict that emerged, as Georg Lukacs remarks, with the increasing power of capitalism. “In Marxism the division of society into classes,” Lukacs explains, “is determined by position within the process of production.”⁴⁰ Pip, at this point, seems to realize this fact very well, and thereupon, as Crowley puts it, “begins to renounce—even resent his humble beginnings.”⁴¹ During his visit to Satis house, Pip, under the impact of Estella’s strong contempt, becomes convinced to believe that he is “backward” and “ignorant,” compared to the society of Estella and Miss Havisham. For the first time, he feels ashamed of his social identity, that being a “labouring-boy” is a humiliating thing, and that having “coarse” hands and “thick” boots is something demeaning. According to him, even his terminology turns to be a source of shame, simply because Estella says, with disdain, that he uses the term “Jacks” instead of “knaves.”⁴² We understand that this term was learned from Joe, for he says, “but I wish you hadn’t taught me to call knaves at cards, Jacks.”⁴³ What is astonishing is that, on that particular occasion, Pip identifies himself through Joe; he “wished Joe had been rather more genteelly brought up, and then [he himself] should have been so too.”⁴⁴ He believes that he and Joe share one identity, or, he inevitably has to dog Joe’s footsteps. Being relatively physically small for his age and Joe very large, Pip seems to see himself as though looking through a magnifying glass when he looks at Joe, like Swift’s Gulliver when he, in Brobdingnag, observes the faults of the human race magnified in the gigantic people there. His disappointment in his own humble life grows accordingly, and his ignorance as a child looks so much worse when reflected in Joe, an adult. For Pip, the things that Estella found fault with in him are magnified in Joe. Pip is aware of the impact of that visit on him; he admits that “a strange thing happened to [his] fancy” in that place.⁴⁵ That “strange thing” is nothing other than his contempt of his identity as

a member of the proletariat and his desire to be a member of the bourgeoisie, a feeling that sparks what could be called the emotional separation between the two, Pip and Joe.

The emotional separation between the two is made clear when Joe, in his long lecture on happiness and contentment, could not help Pip restore his old satisfaction in his social identity. Joe's speech proves to be of no substantial help to Pip who, after he leaves Joe and gets up to his room, starts to slight and judge negatively the class he belongs to, represented in the cottage he lives in, the people he is related to, and the lifestyle they lead. The impact of his following visits to Satis house augments his identity crisis, for these visits gradually alienate him from his people in general and from Joe, his soul mate, in particular.

The embarrassment incurred by Joe on Pip by his awkward behavior during their visit to Miss Havisham makes Pip more certain about his feeling toward his social identity and widens the gap between the two once-intimate companions as well. After that visit, he comes to the conclusion that he "should never like Joe's trade," even though he admits that he "had liked it once," but as he notes, "once was not now," revealing fundamental change in his attitude and plans.⁴⁶ Pip seems to attribute Joe's awkwardness and ignorance to his social identity, and following in Joe's footsteps would necessarily transform him into another Joe—a clumsy, ignorant blacksmith. In her article "Meditating on the Low: A Darwinian Reading of *Great Expectations*", Goldie Morgentaler views Joe as the "natural" and Pip as representative of "the evolution of the human species away from its primitive origins."⁴⁷ Morgentaler's Darwinian reading of the two characters reveals that Pip and Joe, at a certain stage, are one entity, a point that supports the notion of "doubleness" suggested in this study. From her Darwinian viewpoint, Pip begins the novel in the same category as Joe, "the natural", but his decision to strive to become a gentleman sets him on the path of evolution to a higher state. Our reading of the novel replaces "entity" by "identity," i.e., they start with one social identity and start to separate, first psychologically, as Pip grows up and becomes more resentful of his social identity. What confirms this alienation is that Pip never reveals this feeling to Joe, on the ground that he wants to save Joe the harm of such a disclosure. Surprisingly, he does not find any difficulty in revealing his dissatisfaction with his social identity to Bidley.⁴⁸

After Pip becomes officially apprenticed to Joe, what binds them together are the physical, material things (the cottage and the forge), not the mutual interests and common worries. The thing that Pip once waited for impatiently (to be apprenticed to Joe) becomes a heavy burden on him, or rather a nightmare, a

source of shame and embarrassment. As Joe's apprentice, Pip now sees his life stretched out before him, unswerving, dull and humiliating. There seems to be no choice but to marry Bidley (since the tutoring lessons and her knowledge of his career made them close to one another) and to be a blacksmith for the rest of his life. Knowing what road he has to take in life or what social identity he is destined to, Pip is overwhelmed with despair and gloom. According to him, knowing this road, or being entrapped in this social identity, is like a thick curtain that dimmed his happiness, the thickest curtain in his entire life, as he describes it.⁴⁹

As the hope of a second road is not yet on the horizon, Pip is perplexed. He does not know what to do, but he knows for sure that he does not want to take the road that he sees "stretched out straight before [him]."⁵⁰ This road or identity, according to him, delineates a dim picture of his future life. Pip describes that road as "straight" to indicate that nothing is unknown or hidden to be discovered on it; it foretells a low, monotonous life of an ignorant, dirty blacksmith. The idea of performing dirty, manual labor torments Pip immensely; he is horrified by the notion that Estella "would, sooner or later, find him out, with a black face and hands." His feeling of alienation increases as he grows more contemptuous of his identity— "more ashamed of home."⁵¹

His misery is compounded by his inability to advance with his personal identity, for he comes to the realization that the knowledge Bidley has imparted to him is meager and not satisfactory. His dissatisfaction with his personal identity reaches its peak, however, when he learns, in one of his visits to Miss Havisham, that Estella, being from the bourgeoisie, is abroad to be educated "for a lady." The news about Estella's education fuels his desire to become a gentleman, to acquire a new social identity, although at this stage he does not know how to achieve his aim. In the midst of his despondency, a new road, the very road that will lead him to obtain the identity he aspires to, looms sudden and imminent; Jaggers comes and unexpectedly announces that Pip is to "be immediately removed from his present sphere of life [social class]... and be brought up as a gentleman."⁵² In other words, he is to be given a new social identity, one through which he would see himself eligible for the love of Estella.

As a result of Jaggers' visit, a fork suddenly opens up before Pip on the road which had threatened to be "straight" for eternity. Finding himself, totally unexpectedly, standing at this fork, Pip appraises the two roads now open to him. The first appears to him as a miserable one, with the exception that it has Bidley on it, whereas the second, hazy and difficult as it may seem, has Estella on it. His infatuation with Estella, although he knows full well that she is dangerous, leads him to choose the second road. Like Frost's persona, he

chooses the less trodden road, thinking it to be the better one. On Estella's road, Pip is not even told the name of his benefactor; Jaggers admonishes him, with his authoritative voice, "the name of the person who is your liberal benefactor remains a profound secret, until the person chooses to reveal it."⁵³

Pip's decision to assume a new social identity (taking Estella's road) marks the beginning of the third phase, in which Pip and Joe separate physically. In this phase, Pip the gentleman intrudes upon the reader's awareness as an opposite binary of Joe who is left in the village to continue the road they had started together.

The circumstances in which Pip departs to London assert that the scene has been brilliantly prepared so that Joe continues to play Pip's role in the village in a very smooth and convincing way. On the one hand, because she has been mortally injured by Orlick, Joe's wife has been bedridden, at least, for a few months. To all practical purposes, Joe ceases to be her husband. On the other hand, Biddy starts to get closer to Joe as she nurses Mrs. Joe on a daily basis and steps into her shoes as housekeeper for Joe and Pip. More importantly, Pip alienates himself from Biddy who has been set up early in the novel as his "potential wife."⁵⁴ He actually indirectly gives her to Joe when he says to her, a few days before his departure to London, "you will not omit any opportunity of helping Joe."⁵⁵ Pip, as he explains, means educating Joe and improving "his manners", but actually, he asks for the kind of help that he himself had received from her and had resulted in their forging a close relationship.

The plot of the novel makes it obvious that before the divergence of the road, Pip and Joe are one character on one road, but after the divergence, they have to separate. Pip's desire to keep his new clothes at Mr. Pumblechook's house (out of the village) and not to put them on in the village until the morning of his departure serves the premise that Pip in his new identity cannot be with Joe on the same road, even though seemingly he does that "to avoid observation in the village."⁵⁶ Pip is to leave the village at five o'clock in the morning and "had told Joe that [he] wished to walk away all alone" i.e. not be accompanied by Joe.⁵⁷ The prominent point here is that Pip, dressed in his gentleman's outfit, cannot walk side by side with Joe, the blacksmith, on the same road. Symbolically, the physical and psychological split of Pip and Joe is complete at this point. Pip sets out on his new road alone, leaving Joe to continue on the old, established road in lieu of Pip. The latter tries to conceal his real reason for declining to walk with Joe to catch the coach, even to himself. The reason is, of course, Pip's wish to avoid the embarrassment of being seen with Joe due to "the contrast" there would be between the two of them.

What is peculiar about this is that Pip would appear in his new identity, as a gentleman. That is to say, he would be on the other road, and Joe could not be with him on that road, for Joe is to continue the journey they have started together. Of course, the apparent justification for not allowing Joe to accompany him to the station is that Pip, as a gentleman, is ashamed of walking with Joe, the common man. But this justification remains prisoner to Pip's heart and is meant to serve the traditional interpretation of the novel. The traditional interpretation of the novel is served by viewing this incident simply as indicative of Pip's pride and snobbishness due to his new-found circumstances. I suggest that Pip's refusal to have Joe walk him to the coach has greater significance as being the definitive moment in which the two characters each take on their new singular role.

Pip tries to make light of the separation, telling the reader, "I whistled and made nothing of going." Despite his feeling of being "so ready" to leave Joe and his social class in its entirety, the actual event is not as easy as he would have us believe. On reaching the edge of the village, Pip is overcome with emotion, relating that "with a strong heave and sob I broke into tears," and when he lays his hand on the fingerpost and says, "Good-by, O my dear, dear friend!" the friend in question is Joe.⁵⁸ In the event, his separation from Joe is painful and emotional, as if it were a metaphoric surgical operation to separate two conjoined bodies. Joe also feels the intensity of the separation, although he, like Pip, tries to conceal his emotions. This painful separation is meant by Dickens to emphasize that the relationship or bond between Pip and Joe has been so strong and that Pip and Joe are separating for ever.

What is interesting is that in the period after Jaggers' visit, Pip starts to view Joe and Biddy as a team from which he is excluded. His unease with the situation is clear as he says that he "became quite gloomy" as Joe and Biddy "became more at their cheerful ease."⁵⁹ He feels envious of Joe and Biddy, particularly when they seem ready to get along without him and become quickly accustomed to the notion of his departure. Joe's and even Biddy's intentions in hiding their true feelings are noble—they wish to relieve Pip of any guilt and to facilitate his leaving for Pip's sake. Pip misreads Joe's and Biddy's apparent lack of regret at his leaving.

Pip meanwhile is fully aware that he and Joe are on two totally different roads. Joe, however, is still his friend. The road already diverged and each of them has to be alone on his road. In other words, the split in the identity entails a split in the character, Joe, the member of the proletariat, in the village taking the road that Pip once viewed as his, and Pip, the member of the bourgeoisie now, in London taking the road that branched unexpectedly from it. The death of Mrs.

Joe is a plot necessity so that Joe could marry Bidley, the young woman who once was Pip's prospective wife. Joe remains in the village, the hard working, contented blacksmith.

In spite of the fact that Pip finds London, in Hobsbaum's terms, "ugly, crooked, narrow, dirty," he lives in it assuming a new social identity.⁶⁰ That is to say, he leads in London what he believes to be the life of a gentleman: a life of idleness, clubs, and parties; a life of social competitions and affectations. But the toll of this new identity turns out to be a high one: financial problems and excruciating emotional trauma. He loses Estella, his money, and his benefactor; furthermore, he has many enemies, feels lonely and insecure. "His idea of gentility," as Sadrin remarks, "is henceforth tainted and contaminated."⁶¹ He discovers his naïveté in his former understanding of social identity and happiness. Pip certainly regrets taking that road and consequently decides to return to the first road—his former identity and humble social class. His plan meanwhile is to marry Bidley after he declares his regret for leaving her and even to resume his career in Joe's forge if it pleases her. It seems that, perhaps unconsciously, he held this notion in reserve, for he feels jealous when he learns from Bidley, in his visit to the village upon his sister's death, that Orlick is still interested in her. As Stanley Friedman discerns, the "vague something" that Pip harbors while in London turns out to be no less than "a plan to marry Bidley."⁶² To his surprise, this time, he arrives in the village on Joe and Bidley's wedding day. Seeing, as a reality, that Joe has replaced him in his relationship with Bidley, he realizes that he and Joe could not be on the village road together. It is the same conclusion that Joe reaches in his first visit to Pip in London when he says to Pip "You and me is not two figures to be in London."⁶³ Martin Meisel points out something close to this when he says that "Pip is not permitted to go back to Bidley any more than to Joe." Meisel's conclusion, however, hinges on the notion that the past is inaccessible, and therefore Pip "can neither regain nor remake any stage of [it]."⁶⁴ Houston describes the occasion on which Pip finds out that Bidley and Joe have got married as a "surprising scene" and that Dickens in so doing "denies" Pip Bidley.⁶⁵ Houston's disapproval springs from her insistence on one central meaning for the novel. Had Dickens given Pip a second chance with Bidley, he would have slipped into the grotesque and debilitated the plot's complexity which provides a marvelous potential for multiple readings.

In his second visit to the village, Pip finds out that little Pip has been born to Joe and Bidley. The birth of a baby boy to Bidley, carrying the name Pip, stands as a clear sign that through Joe, Pip was able to see what he himself could have achieved on the road he chose not to take. Of course, this reading of the episode should not clash with the other reading which views the birth of little Pip as a

recovery of Pip's "lost innocence through a redemptory second birth."⁶⁶ Tambling interprets Pip's wish to be given little Pip as a sort of recidivism on Pip's part.⁶⁷ But our reading of Joe, as Pip's double, allows us to understand why Pip feels that he somehow has his share in little Pip. Bidley indirectly acknowledges Pip's share in little Pip when she puts her hand into Pip's hand, after she has put her girl's little hand to her lips.

The return of Pip to his road and his union with Estella, as Jerome Meckier holds, augments the union of Joe and Bidley.⁶⁸ It emphasizes that Pip cannot be the "old chap" once again. In her Darwinian reading of the novel, Morgentaler views Pip the gentleman as an evolutionary transformation of Pip the coarse boy and thereby infers that the finality that the novel insists on is that "Pip can never go home again."⁶⁹ But my reading of the story suggests that Pip can never go home again because he left Joe, his double, on that road to explore it for him and so he cannot be with his double on the same road.

Thus, unlike Frost, through Joe, Dickens satisfies the curiosity of his reader as well as his character when he enables Pip to explore the two roads that diverge in his life journey. Frost's persona sighs, and Pip might sigh as well, but not like Frost's persona because he is unable to know what good things he might have missed on the road not taken, rather, because he does see by his own eyes the good things he has missed, as he watches Joe living happily with Bidley, Pip's woman on his road not taken, whereas he himself is perplexed and forlorn on Estella's road. With regard to Pip and his identity, we can connect Pip's whole narrative to his identity. When one writes a narrative that embodies his "memories, understandings, experiences and interpretations," Lawler argues, he virtually engages "in processes of *producing* an identity."⁷⁰ Taking into account that what Pip has been attempting through out his life is no more than producing a satisfactory identity, writing his life story becomes one of identity constitutive elements he makes use of to achieve that goal since the gentleman identity turns to be a disappointment and going back to the blacksmith identity is not feasible at this point in his life. Pip might have failed to produce the identity he seeks in the life of the gentleman; but he certainly succeeds in producing a distinct identity through his narrative.

استعارة روبرت فروست "الطريق غير المسلك" في رواية تشارلز ديكنز *الامال الكبيرة*

محمد الرواشده، قسم اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها، جامعة اليرموك، إربد، الأردن.

ملخص

في العادة تُقرأ وتُدْرَس رواية *الامال الكبيرة* (Great Expectations) 1861 للكاتب الإنجليزي تشارلز دكنز (Charles Dickens) على أنها تتمحور حول العلاقة بين بب (Pip) واستيلا (Estella)، حيث يسعى بب (Pip) الفقير سعياً حثيثاً للوصول إلى مكانة اجتماعية يصبح معها أهلاً لأن تقع استيلا (Estella) في حبه فيتمكن من تحقيق حلمه بالزواج منها.

تقدم هذه الدراسة قراءة مختلفة للرواية حيث تبرز محوراً آخر لا يقل أهمية عن المحور المعهود للرواية يتضمن هذا المحور بالعلاقة بين بب (Pip) وجو (Joe). في ضوء القراءة الجديدة تصبح شخصية جو (Joe) التي لا تلقى في الغالب اهتماماً من النقاد تكافئ في أهميتها شخصية استيلا (Estella) حيث تبين الدراسة بأن شخصية جو (Joe) في مرحلة معينة من أحداث الرواية تصبح امتداداً لشخصية بب (Pip) فيكمل جو (Joe) عن بب (Pip) طريق حياة الحداد كي يتمكن بب (Pip) من أخذ طريق حياة "الجنّتلان" الذي فُتح له من حيث لا يدري. كما تبين الدراسة بأن الكاتب يقوم بتأسيس وبناء نقاط الالتقاء بين الشخصيتين، بب (Pip) وجو (Joe)، منذ البداية كي يهيء القارئ للدور الهام الذي سيلعبه جو (Joe) عندما يجد بب (Pip) نفسه على مفترق طريقين، وبهذه الطريقة فقط يتمكن بب (Pip) من أخذ الطريقين في نفس الوقت وبالتالي من معرفة ما يخبئه له القدر عليهما. وبهذه القراءة تكون هذه الدراسة قد أعطت بعداً آخر يعمل جنباً إلى جنب مع القراءة التقليدية للرواية للوصول إلى فهم أعمق لما تحويه من معان ودرجة أعلى من التذوق لخصائصها الفنية.

* The paper was received on Aug. 11, 2009 and accepted for publication on Oct. 24, 2010.

Notes

- 1 *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. ed. Nina Baym. Vol. D, 6th edition. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2003.
- 2 Jacques Derrida. *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Spivak. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976. p. 86.
- 3 Ross C. Murfin. "What is Deconstruction". *Case Studies in Contemporary Criticism: Great Expectations*. Series editor: Ross C. Murfin. New York: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- 4 The novel, nevertheless, can be viewed as being realistic from Bertolt Brecht's concept of realism, that realism is in the work's "function," not in its "form" or "content." Jeremy Hawthorn. *Studying the Novel: An Introduction*. 3rd edition. London: Arnold, 1997. p.77. Goldie Morgentaler equates *Great Expectations* with a fairy tale, expressing the view that it is "essentially a Cinderella story in which the fairy godmother turns out to be a convict." Goldie Morgentaler. "Meditating on the Low: A Darwinian Reading of *Great Expectations*." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn 1998, Vol. 38 Issue 4, pp. 707-715. Literary Reference Center. Online: EBSCO: <http://search.ebscohost.com>. 3 Oct. 2008. p. 712.
- 5 Anny Sadrin. *Great Expectations*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1988. p.47.
- 6 Anny Sadrin. *Great Expectations*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1988. p.116. In this regard, Graham Smith attributes this change to "a waning of interest in the 1860s," on Dickens' part, because of what he terms "sloth" in reform. Graham Smith. "Suppressing Narratives: Childhood and Empire in *The Uncommercial Traveller* and *Great Expectations*". *Dickens and the Children of Empire*. ed. Wendy S. Jacobson. New York: Palgrave Publishers, Ltd., 2000. p. 46.
- 7 Michael Wheeler. *English Fiction of the Victorian Period 1830-1890*. 2nd edition. Longman Literature in English Series. London and New York: Longman, 1994. p. 102. Bloom also says, "David Coperfield, despite its autobiographical elements, would not refute Henry James's judgment that Dickens 'has added nothing to our understanding of human character.' *Great Expectations*, because it enters the abyss of Pip's inner self, does refute James." Harold Bloom. "Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: *Great Expectations*." Infobase Publishing, 2000, p. 1-2, essay last updated 2005. Literary Reference Center. Online: EBSCO: <http://search.ebscohost.com>. Norman Page also states that "the novel as a whole is profoundly serious" in spite of the existence of some comic characters and episodes. Norman Page. *A Dickens Companion*. Hong Kong: The Macmillan Press Ltd. 1984. p.215.
- 8 Michael Wheeler. *English Fiction of the Victorian Period 1830-1890*. 2nd edition. Longman Literature in English Series. London and New York: Longman, 1994. p. 111.
- 9 Jeremy Tambling. *Dickens, Violence and the Modern State: Dreams of the Scaffold*. London and New York: Macmillan Press Ltd., and St. Martin's Press Inc., 1995. p.30. Gail T. Houston. *Consuming Fictions: Gender, Class, and Hunger in*

- Dickens's Novels*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994. p.162.
- 10 Steph Lawler. *Identity: Sociological Perspectives*. Cambridge: Polity press, 2008. p. 1.
- 11 Harold W. Noonan. *Personal Identity*. London: Routledge, 1989. p.11.
- 12 Charles Dickens. *Great Expectations*. ed. Janice Carlisle. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1996. p. 123.
- 13 Gwen Watkins. *Dickens in Search of Himself*. Hong Kong: Macmillan Press, 1987. p. 7.
- 14 Jacques Derrida. *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Spivak. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976. p. 15.
- 15 Ibid. p. 86.
- 16 Michael Wheeler. *English Fiction of the Victorian Period 1830-1890*. 2 ed. Longman Literature in English Series. London and New York: Longman, 1994. p. 111. Elizabeth Emrath, in her discussion of Dickens' narrative medium, also maintains that the "Shakespearean Amplified Metaphor" is Dickens' "version" of the devices used by Victorian novelists. Elizabeth D. Ermarth. *The English Novel in History: 1840 – 1895*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. p. 36. Doubtless, simply as metaphor, is not strange to Dickens' mentality; Herald Nelson mentions "Theatricality," "intensity," and "hallucination" as some of the expressions critics use to describe Dickens' extraordinary capacity for imagination. Herald S. Nelson. *Charles Dickens*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1981. pp. 32, 33.
- 17 Doris Alexander. *Creating Characters with Charles Dickens*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991. pp. 99-102.
- 18 Graham Smith. "Suppressing Narratives: Childhood and Empire in *The Uncommercial Traveller* and *Great Expectations*". *Dickens and the Children of Empire*. ed. Wendy S. Jacobson. New York: Palgrave Publishers, Ltd., 2000. p. 49.
- 19 Julian Moynahan. "The Hero's Guilt: The Case of *Great Expectations*". *Dickens: Hard Times, Great Expectations, and Our Mutual Friend, A Casebook*. Ed. Norman Page. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1979. (Original source: *Essays in Criticism*, Vol.15, 1965, pp. 60-79.) p. 106.
- 20 Ibid. p. 107.
- 21 Daniel Pollack-Pelzner. "Dickens's Hamlet Burlesque." *Dickens Quarterly*. Vol. 24, No. 2, June 2007. p.103
- 22 Jerome Meckier in his defense of the novel's second ending, reemphasizes "that *Great Expectations* is Estella's story, too, not just Pip's." Jerome Meckier. "Charles Dickens's *Great Expectations*: A Defense of the Second Ending." Harold Bloom, ed. "Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: *Great Expectations*"; 2000, pp. 167-195. Essay last updated: 03-14-2005. Literary

- Reference Center. Online: EBSCO: <http://search.ebscohost.com>. 3 Oct. 2008. (Original source: *Studies in the Novel*, Spring 1993, Vol. 25, Issue 1). p. 171. Stanley Friedman devotes a whole study— “Estella’s Parentage and Pip’s Persistence”— to the Pip/Estella relationship. Gail Houston, in “Pip’ and ‘Property,’” describes Estella as the “astonishing Dickensian heroine,” pointing out that she is one of the important characters who play a key role in “making” Pip, for she suggests that Pip is “not born”, but “made.” Gail T. Houston. “‘Pip’ and ‘property’: The (Re)Production of the Self in *Great Expectations*”. *Studies in the Novel*, Spring 1992, Vol. 24, Issue 1, pp. 13-25. Essay last updated: 08-12-2002. Literary Reference Center. Online EBSCO: <http://search.ebscohost.com>. 3 Oct. 2008. p.15. 18.
- 23 According to the Golding, Joe enables us to measure “Pip’s progress through life.” Robert Golding. *Idiolects in Dickens: The Major Techniques and Chronological Development*. Hong Kong: The Macmillan Press Ltd. 1985. p.177. Crowley holds that from Pip’s relationship with Joe we know Pip’s “capacity to love others.” James P. Crowley. “Pip’s Spiritual Exercise: The Meditative Mode in Dickens’ *Great Expectations*.” *Renascence*; Winter 1994, Vol. 46 Issue 2, pp. 133-143. Essay last updated: 06-09-1995. Literary Reference Center. Online: EBSCO: <http://search.ebscohost.com>. 3 Oct. 2008. p.139.
- 24 Anny Sadrin. *Great Expectations*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1988. p. 198. Linda Raphael finds Miss Havisham significant enough to devote a whole essay — “A Re-Vision of Miss Havisham: Her Expectations and Our Responses”—to show “her significance in the novel.” Linda Raphael. “A Re-Vision of Miss Havisham: Her Expectations and Our Responses.” *Studies in the Novel*. Winter 1989, Vol. 21 Issue 4, pp. 400-413. Essay last updated: 08-08-2002. Literary Reference Center. Online: EBSCO: <http://search.ebscohost.com>. 3 Oct. 2008. p. 401. However, this negligence of the function of Joe in the novel seems to stem from Dickens himself. In a letter to Forster; Dickens describes Joe as “a good natured-foolish man. Quoted in Norman Page’s *A Dickens Companion*. Hong Kong: The Macmillan Press Ltd. 1984. p. 215. But as Norman Page explains, Dickens’ description of Joe “is a very incomplete account of Joe Gargery’s role in the story.” p.216.
- 25 Gail T. Houston. “‘Pip’ and ‘property’: The (Re)Production of the Self in *Great Expectations*.” *Studies in the Novel*, Spring 1992, Vol. 24, Issue 1, pp. 13-25. Essay last updated: 08-12-2002. Literary Reference Center. Online: EBSCO: <http://search.ebscohost.com>.: 3 Oct. 2008. p. 22.
- 26 One of the first pieces of information imparted to us about Pip is the fact that, unable to read what is written on his parents’ tombstones, he has created images of them based on “The shape of the letters”, not from whatever information these letters could convey to him. Joe, likewise, can neither read nor write. This fact is carefully placed in the reader’s mind by Dickens’ choice of language for Joe. On Sunday Joe is compelled to present a comical character, described by Pip as being “like a scarecrow.” Pip, likewise, looks pitiful in his best attire, which are “like a kind of Reformatory,” tight and restrictive of any movement of Pip’s “limbs.” Early in the

novel, the reader is told that Pip and Joe are friends. "Pip, old chap" is Joe's way of addressing Pip and Pip's favorite words because they make him feel the warmth of Joe's love for him. Joe also consciously uses "old chap" just before Pip's departure to London to reassure him that he is confident that the latter won't forget their friendship.

- 27 Charles Dickens. *Great Expectations*. ed. Janice Carlisle. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1996 p.28.
- 28 Ibid. p.105.
- 29 Ibid. p. 86.
- 30 Ibid. p. 89.
- 31 Ibid. p. 5.
- 32 Ibid. p. 424. Pip says, "Joe wrapped me up, took me in his arms, carried me down to it, and put me in."
- 33 Ibid. p. 425.
- 34 Ibid. p. 139.
- 35 Ibid. p. 144.
- 36 Ibid. p. 61. Pip comments on that incident saying, "I derived from this, that Joe's education, like Steam, was yet in its infancy."
- 37 Ibid. p. 60.
- 38 G. L. Brook. *The Language of Dickens*. London: Andre Deutsch, 1970. p. 168.
- 39 Herald S. Nelson. *Charles Dickens*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1981. p. 96.
- 40 Georg Lukacs. "Class Consciousness". *Identities: Race, Class, Gender, and Nationality*. eds. Linda Martin Alcoff and Eduardo Mendieta. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2003. pp 115, 109.
- 41 James P. Crowley. "Pip's Spiritual Exercise: The Meditative Mode in Dickens' *Great Expectations*." *Renascence*; Winter 1994, Vol. 46 Issue 2, pp. 133-143. Essay last updated: 06-09-1995. Literary Reference Center. Online: EBSCO: <http://search.ebscohost.com>. 3 Oct. 2008. p. 135.
- 42 Charles Dickens. *Great Expectations*. ed. Janice Carlisle. New York: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1996. p. 73.
- 43 Ibid. p. 82.
- 44 Ibid. p. 75.
- 45 Ibid. p. 77.
- 46 Ibid. p. 113.
- 47 Goldie Morgentaler. "Meditating on the Low: A Darwinian Reading of *Great Expectations*." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn 1998, Vol. 38 Issue 4, pp. 707-715. Literary Reference Center. Online: EBSCO: <http://search.ebscohost.com>. 3 Oct. 2008. p. 719.

- 48 He says to Bidly, "I am disgusted with my calling and with my life" p. 132
- 49 On that occasion, he says, "Never has that curtain dropped so heavy and blank, as when my way in life lay stretched out straight before me through the newly entered road of apprenticeship to Joe" p. 114.
- 50 Charles Dickens. *Great Expectations*. ed. Janice Carlisle. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1996, p. 114.
- 51 Ibid. p. 115.
- 52 Ibid. p. 141.
- 53 Ibid p. 141.
- 54 Gail T. Houston. "'Pip' and 'property': The (Re)Production of the Self in *Great Expectations*". *Studies in the Novel*, Spring 1992, Vol. 24, Issue 1, pp. 13-25. Essay last updated: 08-12-2002. Literary Reference Center. Online: EBSCO: <http://search.ebscohost.com>. 3 Oct. 2008. p. 14.
- 55 Charles Dickens. *Great Expectations*. Ed. Janice Carlisle. New York: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1996. p. 150.
- 56 Ibid. p. 155
- 57 Ibid. p. 159
- 58 Ibid. p. 160
- 59 Ibid. p. 146
- 60 Philip Hobsbaum. *A Reader's Guide to Charles Dickens*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1977. p. 226.
- 61 Anny Sadrin. *Great Expectations*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1988. p. 72.
- 62 Stanley Friedman. "Estella's Parentage and Pip's Persistence: The Outcome of *Great Expectations*." *Studies in the Novel*, Winter 1987, Vol. 19, Issue 4, pp. 410-421. Essay last updated: 08-08-2002. Literary Reference Center. Online: EBSCO: <http://search.ebscohost.com>. 3 Oct. 2009. p. 412.
- 63 Dickens, Charles. *Great Expectations*. ed. Janice Carlisle. New York: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1996. p. 215
- 64 Martin Meisel. "The Problem of the Novel's Ending". *Dickens: Hard Times, Great Expectations, and Our Mutual Friend, A Casebook*. Ed. Norman Page. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1979. (Original source: "The Ending of *Great Expectations*", *Essays in Criticism*, Vol.10, 1960, pp. 326-31). P. 127.
- 65 Gail T. Houston. "'Pip' and 'property': The (Re)Production of the Self in *Great Expectations*". *Studies in the Novel*, Spring 1992, Vol. 24, Issue 1, pp. 13-25. Essay last updated: 08-12-2002. Literary Reference Center. Online: EBSCO: <http://search.ebscohost.com>. 3 Oct. 2008. p. 14.
- 66 Martin Meisel. "The Problem of the Novel's Ending". *Dickens: Hard Times, Great Expectations, and Our Mutual Friend, A Casebook*. Ed. Norman Page. London: The

- Macmillan Press Ltd., 1979. (Original source: "The Ending of *Great Expectations*", *Essays in Criticism*, Vol.10, 1960, pp. 326-31). P. 126.
- 67 Jeremy Tambling. "*Dickens, Violence and the Modern State: Dreams of the Scaffold*." London and New York: Macmillan Press Ltd., and St. Martin's Press Inc., 1995. P. 37. He says, "As the recidivist, he wishes to be given Bidley's child."
- 68 Jerome Meckier. "Charles Dickens's *Great Expectations*: A Defense of the Second Ending." Harold Bloom, ed. "Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: *Great Expectations*"; 2000, pp. 167-195. Essay last updated: 03 -14 -2005. Literary Reference Center. Online: EBSCO: [http:// search.ebscohost.com](http://search.ebscohost.com). 3 Oct. 2008. (Original source: *Studies in the Novel*, Spring 1993, Vol. 25, Issue 1). P. 173.
- 69 Goldie Morgentaler. "Meditating on the Low: A Darwinian Reading of *Great Expectations*." *Studies in English Literature*, Autumn 1998, Vol. 38 Issue 4, pp. 707-715. Literary Reference Center. Online: EBSCO: <http://search.ebscohost.com>. 3 Oct. 2008. p. 719.
- 70 Steph Lawler. *Identity: Sociological Perspectives*. Malden: Polity Press, 2008, p11.