

I. Introduction

Charles Dickens is one of the most popular writers in the history of English literature. In his works, Dickens combines masterly story telling, humor, pathos and irony with sharp social criticism and acute observation of people and places both real and imaginary.

Dickens has written many novels, which are still remembered. Among them, *Pickwick Papers* (1837), *Oliver Twist*, *Nicholas Nickleby*, *The Old Curiosity Shop*, *Barnby Riddle*, *Martin Chuzzlewit*, *Dombey and Son*, *David Copperfield*, *Bleak House*, *Hard Times*, *Little Dorrit*, *A Tale Of Two Cities*, *The Great Expectations*, *Our Mutual Friend*, *Edwin Drood* etc are world famous books. Dickens was able to give completely new taste to the readers and he became a distinguished writer of his age. He began his writing with brief sketches of London characters he had come across in his hour of wandering about the city. He signed these sketches 'bozo' which was his nickname for his young brother derived from the child's mispronunciation of Moser.

Dickens, through his writings, spoke for millions. His novels did not occupy all his attention. He also edited magazines, produced plays and acted in them. He traveled extensively not only in England, but also in Europe and America. He delivered endless speeches, sponsoring charitable causes. Indeed, his energy was boundless.

Dickens has the double distinction of being the best story writer of his time and the most versatile and amusing creator of characters. His plots are well managed in terms of mystery and suspense. Of course, he would not be a Victorian if he did not colour his narrative heavily with morality and pathos. He almost invariably manages to dramatize these elements. Dickens's attitude towards crime, like that of most literary artists, was highly complex. Dickens was drawn to crime by the mere

fascination of ugly and perverse, by the opportunities it gives a writer for exploiting the sensations of mystery, suspense and terror and for throwing the cheerful elements into high relief. He was fond of showing the tragic retribution that follows crime and was particularly impressed by the thought of criminal as haunted by evil. In his novels, crime and villainy take their places among social phenomena as inevitable effects of evil in the social body. Mark Whyte Collins in introduction of *Bleak House*, explores this dimension of Dickens' novels in this manner: "*Bleak House* is smothered by a fog of justice, the convict's chain link the pages of *Great Expectations*, even *Pickwick Papers* reveals humanity degraded in he cells. There is scarcely a Dickens's novel outside the direct autobiography of *David Copperfield* in which one or more of the characters do not start, or end, their lives in compulsory confinement" (11). Mark White focuses on the inhumanity involved with the judiciary. He thinks that Dickens depicts how the confinement dehumanizes human beings.

About Dickens works, Phillip Collins, in *Public Reading of Dickens*, says that "He possessed an almost equal genius for rendering and for producing life like creations of human characters" (18). His heroes are life size heroes. In most of his novels, we begin with the hero in childhood and follow his personal adventures into the thick of a plot involving the popular romantic material of the day, kidnapping, murder, mob-justice, and other incidents of criminal life. In his later books, Dickens, however, gained the power of constructing elaborate plots, and of creating characters of heroic dignity and tragic intensity such as Sydney Cartoons in *A Tale of Two Cities* and Lady Dedlock in *Bleak House*.

Dickens is remembered not as a dramatic artist in the novel form, but as a showman of wonderful resources. He is the master of vast and fascinating stages,

crowded with farcical characters, with grotesque or terrible creatures, and with the touching forms of little children. In this connection, David Cecil, in *Earley Victorian novelist*, argues that “It is Dickens who explained how the poor workers of the factory had to live in the slum area, and how they had to maintain their lives on low wages, how their feelings were impressed” (2). Cecil perceives Dickens as a novelist of the oppressed and exploited people living in the slum areas.

Likewise, S.H. in introduction of *Pickwick Paper* claims, "Most of the Dickens qualities may be seen in the germ, his love of fun, his quickness to seize upon oddities of characters and behaviour, his incurable facetiousness, his readiness to expose social abuses, his scorn of humbug” (2). In *Oliver Twist* appears the lifelong preoccupation of Dickens with tragic sorrows and terrors of children which were to play so large a part in the *Old Curiosity Shop*, *Dombey and Son*, *David Copperfield*, *Little Dorrit*, and *Great Expectations*, together with his concern with crime and villainy, already anticipated in the interspersed tales of *Pickwick Papers*, which casts its gloom over *Oliver Twist*, *Martin Cuzzlewit*, *Bleak House*, *A Tale of Two Cities*, and *The Mystery of Edwin Drood*.

About his *Our Mutual Friend*, Salter E. Davies says that "His heroines like Agnes, Wickfield, are too good to be true, and that they remain on changed upon there pedestals throughout the whole of the stories in which they figure” (3). Davies thinks that Dickens’ characters are portrayed with too much exaggeration. He depicts these characters so virtuous that they sound rather unrealistic.

In *A Tale of Two Cities*, it is an entire system of legalized oppression that lies behind the picturesque horrors of French Revolution. Most obvious of Dickens' social intention was the satirical exposure of particular institutions that were held to blame for much of the vice and misery of the time. About oppression of Dickens' time,

George Cruikshank in an Introduction of *Oliver Twist* argues that "By the act of 1834 the old, the infirm, the insane, the diseased, unable to their own living, were a charge upon the community of a different kind from the able bodied unemployment or the sturdy beggar" (12).

In *Oliver Twist*, it is the inhumanity of the poor law, in *Nicholas Nickleby* that of schools in which poor children were abandoned to the greed of ignorant exploiters, in *Bleak House*, the withering effect on characters of the law's delays, in *Little Dorrit*, the red tape of civil service are conspicuous. The hard hearts of scheming men, who pursue their profit with ruthless disregard for the suffering of those they ruin, contribute much to the pathos of many novels like *Great Expectations*. Anthony F. Franco, in his article "Familial Relationships in Great Expectations", says "*Great Expectations* Allows us to experience glimpse of nineteenth century English family life as Dickens' most capably perceived (5)". Franco studies the Victorian family life in *Great Expectations*.

The art of Dickens has a great sense of humour. The chief instruments of this art being tears and laughter and above all the poignancy and flavour of their fusion, Dickens emerges as a prominent figure in the line of English humorists. As a humorist, Dickens is amenable to discipline, to a psychological duality, one side of his mind watching the other. Walter W. Crotch, in his essay "Charles Dickens Social Reformer", reinforces the similar idea. Crotch argues that The principal qualities of Dickens' novels are his irresistible humour, his surpassed descriptive power, and the astonishing vitality of his characterization (10).

Dickens has portrayed children as victims of society. *Oliver Twist*, Pip, Little Nell, Florence Dombey and David Copperfield stand out among such characters. These characters represent the complaint of the individual against the wrong done by

society and its institution. Dickens has himself known the lot of persecuted. At the root of his zeal for social reforms lies the memory of his own bitter childhood. In this connection, Philip Collins, in *Dickens, the Critical Heritage*, says "In nearly all his novels, there is an attack upon some legal or social living" (20). Obviously, Dickens despises legal system, which turns innocent people including children into criminals. He, therefore, attacks such unjustifiable legal system. Moreover, he raises his voice against the victimization of the children.

In *Great Expectations*, Dickens uses the thread of family to weave his history into an effective entertainment. The story focuses upon a central character, Pip who relates his adventures to the reader through Dickens' stylistic use of the first person point of view. About its theme, Edgar Johnson, in introduction of *Charles Dickens his Tragedy and Triumph*, says, "*Great Expectations* is novel of hope and heart break"(5).

In Dickens' novel *Great Expectations*, the plot depends on bloodlines and familial relationship. The central character like Miss Havisham would have a familial relationship with an adopted daughter, Estella. Similarly, Lawrence Stone, in *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England* says, "Estella's blood line is another instance of how Dickens is able to intertwine family relationship with plot in *Great Expectations*"(8).

In his novels, *David Copperfield* and *Bleak House*, female sexuality is deeply problematic, linked with prostitution in *David Copperfield* and with criminality in *Bleak House*. A discussion of Victorian theories about female nature illustrates how the cultural practice of reading the body as a sign informs *Bleak House*. Elizabeth Inman Laura in book *Gender and Body in Charles Dickens* argues:

Through its many grotesque female characters, *Little Dorrit* suggests anxieties about social and economic concerns specially instability in

the economy which is represented as a decrepit female body. In *Hard Times* and *A Tale of Two Cities*, class anxieties appear as gender anxieties, the possibility of class revolt in *Hard Times*” (3). Inman studies gender issues in Dickens’ novels.

Barry Stiltner, in *Ideological Fabrications*, says "Dickens is a novelist whose radical voice is constantly attempting to emerge amid such dialogism. This ideological tension, like the collision submerged tectonic plates, vibrates throughout Dickens’ novels” (4). Dickens' novels are so replete with ideological ruptures and contradictions that any political reading ultimately confronts a decentred terrain as it attempts an ideological taxonomy. As oppositional sites interact with the more conservative resonances in Dickens, an ideological destabilization occurs. That is an ideological flux, a mixture of vitriol and compromise permeate the novels.

The great characters Pickwick, Peck Sniff, Micweber, Jaggers, and William Dorrit etc are always remembered and in remembering them, Dickens is always remembered. They are always hyperbolic beings as Martin Coyle says in *Encyclopedia of Literature* “They vary from adroit professionalism to selfish importance from fanaticism to honorable limitation” (23). He has deep sympathy for the poor.

Humphrey House says in *The Dickens World*, “Dickens had tried to show that freedom is the greatest possession of man” (29). House argues that Dickens depicts freedom as the most important factor for the existence of human beings. David Daiches, in his *A Critical History of English Literature*, says:

Great Expectations explores, with more subtlety and more control than Dickens anywhere else displays, aspects of the relation between gentility and morality ... there is no other of his novels where the

characters and incidents are so perfectly subdued to the central moral vision (1057).

Daiches exposes Dickens' control over his writing in this novel. Moreover, Daiches thinks that this novel excavates various dimensions of the relationship between gentility and morality. In this novel, he has drawn his characters in such a manner that they all contribute to the moral vision Dickens wants to come up with.

In this manner, *Great Expectations* has been reviewed from different perspectives. The present study, however, aspires to analyze alienation prevailing in the capitalist society. Money works as the agent of this alienation. Money becomes all in all. People ignore each and every human value for the sake of money. Even the human relationship is commodified and reified. This is why people suffer from alienation in the capitalist society the way the characters like Pip do in *Great Expectations*. The Marxist discourses focused on alienation will form the theoretical tools for the analysis of the text.

II. Theoretical Tools

Alienation in the Capitalist Society

Marxism is a theory of determinacy of casual relations and consequences, and Marxists do not avoid or wish to avoid the fatal detour into the one way street of determinism. Richard's practical criticism and the new criticism limit themselves in their search for a text's meaning to the words on the page. Structuralism seeks to establish the structures that underlie narratives and that make meaning possible. Conspicuously absent is a serious interest in what many literary academicians would now consider very issue such as the historical situations and the politics of literary texts. To what extent are literary texts the products of the historical periods in which they were written? The world has gone through enormous socio – economic and political changes in the last millennium. Isn't it reasonable to expect those changes to turn up in our literature? And isn't it at least plausible to assume that those changes have some how affected the way we experience things? Can the human condition remain essentially the same? And what sort of view of the prevailing socio-economic and political condition do we find in a given text? Does it take an openly or more implicitly critical stance?

In Marxist criticism, social class relations function as central instruments of analysis. Hans Bertens, in his text *Literary Theory*, contemplates over Marxism in the following passage:

Marxism as an intellectual perspective still provides a wholesome counter balance to our propensity to see ourselves and the writers that we read as completely divorced from socio-economic circumstances. It also counter balances the related tendency to read the books and poems

we read as originating in an autonomous mental realm, as the free products of free and independent minds. (81)

Marxism's questioning of that freedom is now a good – less sensational than it was in the 1840s and 1850s when Karl Marx began to outline what is now called Marxist philosophy, although it is still controversial enough. He, in the foreword of his seminal text *Capital: Critique of Political Economy*, discusses the relationship between the consciousness and our existence:

The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. The Victorian upper class, if aware of this line of thought, would have been horrified, and certainly by the conclusion that followed: it is not the consciousness of man that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. (81)

The mode of production conditions the general process of social, political, and intellectual life. Marxism is about how the social circumstance determines much, if not all, of all people's life. The way we think and the way we experience the world around us are either wholly or largely conditioned by the way the economy is organized. Under a medieval feudal regime, people would have thought and felt different from the way we think and feel while living in this capitalist economy – that is, an economy in which goods are produced (the mode of production) by large concentrations of capital and then sold on a free, competitive market. The base of a society, the way its economy is organized, broadly speaking, determines its superstructure, everything that we might classify as belonging to the realm of cultures, again in a broad sense, education, law, but also religion, philosophy, political programs, and the arts. As Hans Bertens in *Literary theory* says:

If the way we experience reality and the way we think about it (our religions, political and philosophical views) are determined by the sort of economy we happen to live in, then clearly there is no such things as an unchanging human conditions. On the contrary, with for instants, the emergence of capitalism some centuries ago we may expect to find a new experience of reality and new views of the world. (81)

If the economic base indeed determines the cultural superstructure then writers will not have all that much freedom in their creative efforts. They will inevitably work within the framework dictated by the economic base and will have much in common with other writers – living and writing under the same economic dispensation. The classic statement of these crucial relationships is found in one of the theoretical ground – workings of what would become *Das Capital*. Tony Davies, in *Marxists Aesthetics*, writes:

In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation on which raises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. (143)

In Marxism, the mode of production conditions the social, political and intellectual life process. In general, with the change of economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations, a distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined

with the precision of natural science and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophical, i.e., ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. About society, in *Marxist Aesthetics* Tony Davies writes:

The economic structure of society is something to do with economics, rather than with the infinitely complex totality of human beings engaged in youth and age, labour and idleness, misery and happiness, in the social production their life. The definite relations indispensable and independent of their will are relations of class. (143)

Marx's thought is centered on the concept of an ongoing class struggle between those who owned property and those who owned nothing but whose work produced wealth. Karl Marx, in association with Friedrich Engels, invented radical but revolutionary economic, social and political theories in *Das Capital* and *The Communist Manifesto*. Marx formulated the most revolutionary and scientific theories in the time of tremendous socio-economic changes resulted from the scientific discoveries and establishment of large-scale production industries. His theories, in a very scientific way, disprove the bourgeois economic, social and political system establishing the philosophy of proletariat, the lowest stratum of society.

Marxism is a highly complex subject, and Marxist literary criticism is no less so. Marxism brought a significant change in bourgeois ideology. Marx expresses his dissatisfaction with the trend of the worldview the previous philosophers adopted in their works. As Marx himself clearly states, "Philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it" (qtd. in Selden, 24). He explains life and world from quite a different perspective. Taking into account the process of change as the inevitable process, his theory brought considerable change in the concept of art and literature as well.

Marxist criticism grounds its theory and practice on their discussion about base and superstructure, the Marxist philosophy. So, even if Marxism is basically a theory of social, economic, political and revolutionary activities, it does not leave art and literature untreated.

According to Marxist philosophy, base affects superstructure, and the change in base results in the automatic change in superstructure. To be more specific, the change in socio-economic relations brings the change in ideology, politics, religion, art and literature as well. So, basic characteristic of art and literature is determined by socio-economic factors. Before Marx people believed that their ideas, cultural life, legal systems and religions were the creations of human and divine reason, which should be regarded as the unquestioned guides to human life. But, Marxist philosophy reverses this formulation and argues that all ideological systems are the products of real socio-economic structure. Economic and social forces together constitute the base on which erects the superstructure– the politics, law, culture, ideology, religion, values, philosophy and art and literature. Thus, according to Marxists, base is primary and the superstructure is secondary. Marx himself states:

The mode of production in material life determines the social, political, and intellectual life processes in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determine their being, but on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness [...] with the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed [...] this consciousness must be explained rather from the contradictions of material life. (qtd. in Adams, 626)

The production of ideas, the production of consciousness, is directly interwoven with the material activity and the material intercourse of men. The basic ideas about the

Marxist literary criticism is best expressed in the works like *The Communist Manifesto* and *The German Ideology* written collaboratively by Marx and Engels. They believe that each economic structure e.g., feudalism, capitalism or socialism leads to its own type of social organization and production of its own literature, art, culture and religion. An ideology is no other than the product of the position and interest of a particular class. In any historical era, the dominant ideology embodies and serves to legitimize and perpetuate the interest of the dominant economic and social class of the time. Marx and Engels offer a very sensitive response to all kinds of difficulties, especially socio-economic, facing the humanity on the rise of industrial capitalism. For them, the working class, which emerges remarkably with the advent of capitalism, is the exploited class with both the desire and the ability to overthrow the bourgeoisie, the class of exploiters, and reorganize society in its own social interest. Marx and Engels interpret social and historical events to come up with a revolutionary outcome, while they comment on their own theories as “The reflection of proletarian struggle in the world of ideas” (qtd. in Cohen, 320).

Marxist philosophy of ‘dialectical materialism’ emerged in response to Hegelian philosophy of ‘dialectical idealism’, which argues that the matter is determined by consciousness. But, Marxist philosophy believes that the relation between base and superstructure is dialectical with the latter being determined by the former. Marx defines ‘ideology’ as a superstructure of which the concurrent socio-economic system is the ‘base.’ Engels describes ‘ideology’ as ‘a false consciousness’:

The governing ideology in the capitalistic socio-economic structure incorporates the interest of the dominant class, the bourgeoisie. All kinds of social and cultural institutions and practices including religion, morality, philosophy, politics, the legal systems as well as art

and literature are dominated and permeated by the ideology. Bourgeois ideology seems to be offering a natural and inevitable way of explaining and dealing with the world, but in fact, it has a hidden function of legitimizing and maintaining the position, power and economic interests of the ruling class. (qtd. in Cohen , 330)

Marxism treats literature as an expression of socio-economic life and judges it on the basis of how far it has fulfilled this function. Orthodox Marxist critics are of the opinion that the origin, development and success or failure of a literary work should be examined on the basis of its relation to socio-economic life of the contemporary society. Orthodox Marxist literary theory strongly insists that a work of literature should reflect the class relations and be committed to the cause of working class. A writer's success or failure should be judged on the basis of his works which exhibit his insight of the socio-economic situation of the era. Leon Trotsky says:

The poet can find material for his art only in his social environment and transmits the new impulses of life through his own artistic consciousness [...]. Art is always a social servant and historically utilitarian. (qtd. in Adams,794)

Marxist criticism, thus, examines how far a literary work carries the ability in altering human existence and leads it in the path of progress, prosperity and emancipation. It demands the authors to produce reality objectively with special attention to class divisions, the exploitation of the lower class by the upper. Marxism aims at revolutionizing the whole socio-economic life establishing a new political system led by proletariat. Literature, for Marxist critics, should be an auxiliary in spreading ideology of working class. So, literature, instead of rendering outward superficial appearance of reality, should explore the inner causes. Outward superficial

depiction of things, like that of naturalism and modernism, bracketing off all the contradictions can never lead to reality. Marxist literary criticism is thus very critical of the movement of 'art for art's sake', which treats a work of art as an autonomous entity. For Marxists, literature should have social as well as political implication. Marxist literary criticism denounces the modernist trend of writing as it concentrates on minute subjective picture of the world. For Marxists, writers should have profound understanding of wretched condition rather than subjective experience and aestheticism. Thus, literature, for Marxists, should revolutionize the conscience of the people of the working class to topple down the exploitative capitalistic society and to establish the society ruled by the majority class of the working people. They advocate the need of literature as a weapon to lead human society in the path of prosperity and progress.

Literature is unthinkable when attempted to treat it in isolation. So, it should be interpreted in socio-economic context. Marxist critics explain literature of any historical era as 'product' of the economic and ideological determinants specific to that era, not as work created in accordance with timeless artistic criteria. In his attempt to prioritize Marxist approach to literature over the formalist approach, Trotsky argues, "They (formalists) believe that in the beginning was the word. But we (Marxists) believe that in the beginning was the deed" (qtd. in Adams, 799). Marxist literary criticism, thus, analyses literature in terms of the historical conditions which produced it. It conceives the idea that the external reality is prior to ideas in the mind and that the material world is reflected in the mind of man and translated into forms of thought.

Marxist literary criticism incorporates not a single approach but approaches, thus accommodating variations within. So, there is no programmatic way of applying

Marxist ideas. Yet, Marxist critics will continue to discuss such issues as class struggle, commodification and alienation of labor and so on. Literature might be seen as opposing the ill effects of capitalism, and, of course, art is a part of society.

Capitalistic society lays its heavy blow on humanity and results in the destruction of human sentiments and feelings. It breaks the bond between man and man. The sense of self-interest heightens in the system of capitalism. We no longer enjoy family relation. An individual is important and all kinds of interests and relations are reduced to mere 'cash payment.' Therefore, the relation that exists among the people of capitalistic society is of give-and-take. Under capitalism, everything is bought and sold taking the form of commodity. The relation between people in society appears in the guise of relations between commodities. Marx views the commodity production as the production of goods not for personal use, but for sale, for exchange on the market. P. Nikitin argues in *Fundamentals of Political Economy* :

[...] in order to exploit the worker, the capitalist has to hire him, while the worker has to sell his labor power, while is now a commodity. The capitalist pays the worker a wage, with which the later buys his means of subsistence—commodities. Thus, the production relations between the worker and the capitalist are expressed not directly, but through commodities, and assume the character of commodity relations. (31)

So, personal worth changes into exchange value. All the ecstasies of human relation of ideal enthusiasm and of sentimentalism are turned to bitter egotistical and selfish calculation. All are professional. Physician, lawyer, priest, poet, scientist and all other people of occupation have been made 'wage laborers.' Marx, too, ponders over it in "communist Manifesto" in this way "The bourgeoisie has torn away the

family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation” (23). Therefore, success of possessing more and more wealth is given privilege. Love relation is considered an obstacle in success of life. The bourgeoisie substitutes naked, shameless, direct and brutal exploitation for the exploitation veiled by religious and political illusions.

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instrument of production. The innovative use of modern technological advancement in capitalist mode of production results in the increment of surplus value, which in turn increases the size of capital. Increasing productivity of labor is an important factor, which speeds up the accumulation of capital. It leads to the cheaper commodities, making it possible for the capitalist to cut the value of the commodity labor power, which means that with the same amount of variable capital a greater mass of live labor can be set in motion, so that more output and, consequently, more surplus value can be produced. But the rate at which workers are drawn into production becomes slower and slower, and lags behind the rate of the accumulation of capital, thus producing an ever-increasing section of workers, which find no employment for their labor. Unemployed population in capitalist society forms an industrial reserve army. The existence of reserve army of the unemployed is a desired thing in industrial capitalism, because the employed ones are compelled to work at low wages. He is also compelled to increase his working hour to sustain his living. P. Nikitin argues in *Fundamentals of Political Economy* :

A reserve army of labor in industry is essential to capitalism as a means of systematic pressure on the employed workers, it enables to capitalist to lower the wages under threat of dismissal, and to increase

the intensity of labor, i.e. to intensify the exploitation of the working class. (89)

Thus, the greater the accumulation of wealth by the bourgeoisies, the larger becomes the army of unemployed, the higher the degree of exploitation of the employed workers and worse the material position. So, the accumulation of capital and the deterioration of the position of the proletariat are seen to be two inseparable aspects of capitalistic society.

As the magnitude of capital increases and gigantic machines are introduced, colossal amount of things are produced. In other terms, industrial capitalism abides by constant revolutionization of production to meet its motives. To sustain and strengthen the existence of industrial capitalism, there needs a constantly expanding market for its products. As a result, the bourgeoisie expand its realm all over the world. As Marx says in "Communist Manifesto":

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of reactionaries, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old, established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilized nations, industries that no longer work with indigenous raw material, but martial, but [...]. (23)

So, the mechanism of industrial capitalism makes the world economy serve the interest of the bourgeoisie, thus compelling the working-class people to live the hellish life under the heightening exploitation. Marx further states, "It (bourgeoisie)

has agglomerated population, centralized means of production, and concentrated property in a few hands” (24).

Industrial capitalism is always regressive in terms of further development of the productive forces. Socialist relations of production differ radically from those of capitalism and other social formations based on private ownership of the means of production. The basis of socialist production relations is social ownership of the means of production. The matter of importance in the system of production relations is the way the workers are connected with the means of production. Under capitalism, the two are not connected at all, but oppose one another, since the means of production are the private property of the capitalists. Consequently, working people are tirelessly battling to abolish private ownership. P. Nikitin writes in *Fundamentals of Political Economy* :

The victory of socialism means that private ownership of the means of production has been replaced by social ownership of the means of production [...]. In this process, the exploiting classes are eliminated, exploitation of man is ended. Socialist revolution, whether it is achieved peacefully or non-peacefully, always means the radical breaking up of obsolete capitalist relations and the establishment of new, socialist relations. These transformations are carried out by the government of the working class in the interests of the whole of the people. (197)

Thus, Marxism explains socialism as an inevitable outcome of the heightening class struggle in industrial capitalism, which lays very destructive effects on whole humanity. Capitalist exploitation is not only economic exploitation but it is also the exploitation of man's right to an integrated life.

Lukcas and his followers stressed literature's reflection, conscious or unconscious, of the social reality surrounding it – not just a reflection of a flood realistic detail but a reflection of the essence of a society. Detriments to social wholeness reveal themselves in the literary work as aspects of capitalism the Marxists critic deals with content, for in content is to be found literature's importance in the movement of history. Terry Eagleton, like Althusser, in *Literary Theory* argues:

Criticism must break with its ideological pre-history and become a science. Texts do not reflect historical reality but rather work upon ideology to produce an effect of the real. The text may appear to be free in its relation to reality, but it is not free in its use of ideology.

(42)

Ideology doesn't refer to conscious political doctrines but to all those systems of representation which shape the individual's mental picture of lived experience. The meanings and perceptions produced in the text are a reworking of ideology's own working of reality. This means that text works on reality at two removes.

Eagleton goes on to deepen the theory by examining the complex layering of ideology from its most general pre-textual forms to the ideology of texts itself. He rejects Althusser's view that literature can distance itself from ideology. However, the literary result is not merely a reflection of other ideological discourses but a special production of ideology. For this reason, criticism is not concerned with just the laws of literary form or the theory of ideology but rather with the laws of production of ideological discourses as literature.

Eagleton surveys a sequence of novels from George Eliot to D.H. Lawrence in order to demonstrate the interrelations between ideology and literary forms. He argues

in *Literary Theory: An Introduction* “Nineteenth century bourgeois ideology blended a sterile utilitarianism with a series of organicist’s concepts of society” (43).

About dialectical criticism Jameson says in his essay "Ideology", “Dialectical criticism does not isolate individual literary work for analysis, an individual is always part of a larger structure or part of a historical situation” (45).

In reflection model of Marxism, literature is seen as reflecting a reality outside it. External reality is prior to ideas in the mind, and that the material world is reflected in the mind of man and translated into forms of thought. The Hungarian thinker Georg Lukacs is the best critic to practice this model. As he says in essay "Reflection Model", “A realistic work must reveal the underlying pattern of contradictions in a society or social order” (45).

His view is Marxist basically in its insistence on the material and historical nature of the structure of the society. He examines for instance Balzac’s novel *Les Paysans* and finds a significant form in the triangular configuration of three social classes landed aristocracy, bourgeoisie and peasantry. The conflict between these classes was the form of the society and it got reflected in the novel in the form of characters. Like Lukacs. Jameson argues in his essay "Ideology", “The concept of totality is of utmost importance. Without conception of social totality no socialist politics is possible” (189).

The most fully worked-out version of the reflection model in modern Marxists aesthetics is that of the Hungarian thinker Georg Lukacs. Lukacs did not see literature reflecting reality as a mirror reflects the objects placed in front of it. As he says:

Literature is knowledge of reality and knowledge is not a matter of making one to one correspondences between things in the world outside and ideas in the head. Reality is indeed out there before we

know it in our heads, but it has shape, dialectical totality where all the parts are in movement and contradiction. (Lukacs,171)

Lukcas focuses upon form which is different from Shklovsky. For him form is the aesthetic shape given to content. About form Lukcas says in “Reflection Model”, “It is one which reflects reality in the most objective way” (172). Lukcas considers the form of the early nineteenth century novel (Scott, Balzac, Tolstoy) or embodying knowledge of the contradiction, content of capitalist society as it develops. Lukcas could either demonstrate the grasp of the totality in a classic realist work or reject the unmediated totality of the non realist work, whether it was naturalist, symbolist or lyrical and subjective. But Marxists critic Theodor W. Adorno had complained of Lukacs’s dogmatism and tried to show how Lukacs was trapped within objective reality. Adorno criticizes Lukcas precisely because he transfers to the realm of art categories which refer to the relationship of consciousness to the actual world. Adorno says in *The Origin of Negative Dialectic*, “Art and reality stand at a distance from each other and that this distance gives the work of art a vantage point from which it can criticize actuality” (188).

For Adorno this critical distance comes from the fact that literature has its own formal laws. He doesn’t give two important indications of the kind of thing he means. Firstly, he talks of the procedures and techniques and as a fusion of subject and object. Adorno explains how the writer Lukacs castigates for their subjectivism in fact set themselves at a distance from reality, so that their work effectively criticizes it.

Proust and Joyce both use the interior monologue which in Lukacs’s view was a technique which placed an inflated emphasis on the thinking subject in the novel. Adorno, however, says in *The Origin of Negative Dialectic*:

The interior monologue, far from cutting the reality, can expose the way reality actually is. The separation from the world and the emphasis on subjectivity which comes from the interior monologue are a true picture of reality in its universal atomistic state, which alienation rules over men turning them into mere shadows of themselves. (177)

Like Lukacs, Adorno takes reality to be not the empirical world we see through our eyes or through the camera lens but the dialectical totality, a structure which can only be perceived by a process of thought linking things together and seeing how they effectively are like Lukacs too. Adorno emphasizes the alienated nature of reality in contemporary western society. The literary work does not give us a neatly –shaped reflection and a knowledge of reality but acts within reality to expose its contradictions. Adorno, in *The Origin of Negative Dialectic*, claims, “Art is the negative knowledge of the actual world” (160).

It is not sufficient to see how Proust and Joyce reproduce an alienated condition, but that one must also see how their work transcends this condition by placing the individual subject within a social totality that takes precedence over him. About Kafka and his works in *The Origin of Negative Dialectic* Adorno argues:

Kafka presents a kind of copy of an alienated or reified totality, as many of his critics have noted. But he also uses formal devices in his text, disruptions of conventional narrative time for instance, which show that this alienated reality has weak points and cracks in it. By both reproducing and exposing the reality, Kafka’s works give a negative knowledge of it, to negate it. (190)

Marxist criticism always insists upon the issue of class relations, and class struggle. Traditional Marxism then asserts that thought is subservient to and follows

the material conditions under which it develops. Its outlook is materialist, as opposed to the idealist perspective whose claim that matter is basically subservient to thought is one of the fundamental assumptions of modern western culture. We tend to assume that our thinking is free, unaffected by material circumstances. In our minds we can always be free. But Marxism rejects it. Minds are not free at all, they only think they are. As Hans Bertens, in *Literary Theory* argues:

Capitalism thrives on exploiting its labourers. Simply put, capitalists grow rich and shareholders do well because the labourers that work for them and actually produce goods get less – and often a good deal less – for their efforts than their labour is actually worth. (83)

Labourers have known this for a long time and have organized themselves in labour unions to get fairer deals. What they do not know however is how capitalism alienates them from themselves by seeing them in terms of production – as production units, as objects rather than human beings. Capitalism turns people into things, it reifies them. Negotiations about better wages, no matter how successful, do not affect that process. Marx saw it clearly at work in his nineteenth century environment. In *Literary Theory*, Hans Bertens reinforces:

Men whose grandfathers had still worked as cobblers, cabinet makers, yeoman farmers, and so on. In other words, as members of self supporting communities who dealt directly with clients and buyers performed mechanical task into factories where they were merely one link in a long chain. (83)

The process of reification is not limited to labourers. The capitalist mode of production generates a view of the world – focused on profit – in which ultimately all of us function as objects and become alienated from ourselves. About capitalism the

American Marxist critic Fredric Jameson says “We now all unknowingly suffer from a waning of affect – the loss of genuine emotion – because of the complete dominance of the capitalist model in our contemporary world” (qtd. in Don E. Wayne, 60).

Marxism, as an intellectual perspective, still provides a wholesome counter balance to our propensity to see ourselves and the writers that we read as completely divorced from socio – economic circumstances. As Marx says in essay "Politics of Class" “It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence but their social existence that determines their consciousness” (81).

We always have a certain margin of debates over issue such as freedom of action and thought. We are blind to our own conditions because of the effects what it calls ideology. Ideology is what causes us to misrepresent the world to ourselves. The socio economic base conditions the cultural superstructures. However, there are forces at work that prevents us from seeing this. Marxism rejects the liberal humanist’s idea – we are essentially free and can remain free as long as we can think. Ideology is not so much set of beliefs or assumptions that we are aware of, but it is that which makes us experience our life in a certain way and makes us believe that the ways of seeing ourselves and the world is natural. In doing so ideology distorts reality in one way or another and falsely presents as natural and harmonious what is artificial and contradictory – the class differences that we find under capitalism, for instance we are blind to our own conditions.

How is ideology able to hide authentic reality from us? One very influential answer was given in the 1960s by the French Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser. As he says in his essay Ideology, “Ideology distorts our view of our true conditions of existence. Ideology works through so called ideological state apparatuses which they may have their own subject to the ruling ideology” (18). It is clear that religion, law,

political system, the educational system in short, all the institutions through which we are socialized are influenced by ideology which is embedded in all sorts of material practices. While we believe that we are acting out of free will, we are in reality acted by the system. To clarify his idea, Althusser brings ideas from Jacques Lacan:

Aware of the deep lack – although we can not name it – and yearning for completion we turn to ideology, the more so since it constantly hails and interpellates us as concrete subjects – as if we are complete already. Ideology convinces us that we are whole and real, that we are the concrete subjects we want to be. (qtd. in Althusser, 60)

Ideology is seen as such a strong presence in the text of nineteenth century that we more or less have to break down its resistance to get a truer picture of the reality the text pretends to present. It is the ideology that is the real target of literary investigation, and aim in this particular case is not to show up the personal shortcomings, but the differences between the ideology and the real world. And the main purpose of Marxist criticism is to show issues of class and social exploitations and is especially attentive to the cultural mechanism and their literary versions – that keep people unaware of their exploited status.

A central question in Marxist approaches to literature concerns the reliability of literary text as social evidence. It addresses the politics of the world outside the text discussed by Tony Davies in *Marxist Aesthetics*: “If Charles Dickens’s *Great Expectations* and George Eliot’s *Middlemarch* are conditioned by the capitalist society of Victorian England what then are we going to find in these novels, a true picture of Victorian England, or an ideologically distorted reflection?” (90).

Commodity fetishism has become a specific problem of our age, the age of modern capitalism. In preceding forms of society this economic mystification arouse

principally with respect to money and interest bearing capital. Because of this situation a man's own activity, his own labour becomes something objective and independent of him, something that controls him by virtue of an autonomy alien to him. This text has drawn attention to the problem of alienation or more exactly to the closely related phenomenon of reification. As Lukacs argues, "The objectivism is unavoidable in human life – labour itself is an objectivization, it is only when social forms mutilate the essence of men that there arises the social relation of alienation" (Lukacs, 16).

To explain in detail about the alienation in the modernist literature, Lukacs brings Thomas Wolfe in his article "The Ideology of Modernism" in which he claims, "My view of the world is based on firm conviction that solitariness is by no means a rare condition, something peculiar to me or to a few specially solitary human beings, but the inescapable, central fact of human existence" (278). In modernist literature there is not for him an apparently not for his creator – any pre-existence reality beyond his own self, acting upon him or being acted upon by him. The hero himself is without personal history. He is thrown into the world – meaninglessly, unfathomably. He does not develop through contact with the world, he neither forms nor is informed by it. The only development in this literature is the gradual revelation of human conditions. Man is now what he has always been and always will be. A gifted writer however extreme his theoretical modernism, will in practice have to compromise with the demands of historicity and of social environment.

Modern subjectivism, taking these imagined possibilities for actual complexity of life, oscillates between melancholy and fascination. When the world declines to realize these possibilities, the melancholy becomes tinged with contempt. The question comes how far were those possibilities even concrete or real? Plainly they

existed only in the imagination of the subject, as dreams of they dreams. It is a hopeless undertaking to define the contours of individuality; left alone to come to grips with a man's actual fate, by means of potentiality is clear from the fact that it can not determine development – subjective mental status; however permanent or profound can not here be decisive. Rather, the development of personality is determined by inherited gifts and qualities by the factors, external or internal, which further or inhibit their growth. But in life potentiality, can of course, become reality, situations arise in which a man is confronted with a choice, and the act of choice a man's character may reveal itself – on a light that surprises even himself.

In advance, while still a subjective potentiality in the characters mind, there is no way of distinguishing it from the innumerable abstract potentialities in his mind. The subject, after taking his decision, may be conscious of his own motives. The concrete potentiality can not be isolated from the myriad abstract potentialities. Only actual decision reveals the distinction. The literature of realism, aiming at a truthful reflection of reality, must demonstrate both the concrete and abstract potentialities of human beings in extreme situations of this kind. If the human conditions man as a solitary being, in capable of meaningful relationships – is identified with reality itself, the distinction between abstract and concrete potentiality becomes null and void.

The negation of outward realities is not always demanded with theoretical rigueur. But it is present in almost all modernist literature. The major tendency in modernist literature is the attenuation of actuality. About modernist literature as George Lukacs says in " Ideology of Modernism":

In Kafka, the descriptive detail is of an extraordinary immediacy and authenticity. But Kafka's artistic ingenuity is really directed towards substituting his angst ridden vision of the world of objective reality.

The realistic detail is the expression of a ghostly unreality, of a nightmare world, whose function is to evoke angst – a similar attenuation of reality underlies – Joyce's stream of consciousness.

(282)

There is lack of human nature. Man is reduced to a sequence of unrelated experimental fragments; he is as inexplicable to others as to himself. The dissolution of personality, originality, the unconscious products of the identification of concrete and abstracts potentiality is elevated to a deliberate principle in light of consciousness.

A term is threadbare in the religion-socio-political intercourse for ages; alienation is a psyche of estrangement and loss in general. It is a condition in which an individual cannot realize all the potentials of his life, he feels outcast in terms of his relationship to society and his fellow men. This is different from what alienation is in religious and existentialist's terms. In this particular dissertation, the term alienation will be understood as a state of mystification or suffocation resulting from the molestation of an individual's labor power.

Work is the primary characteristic of human beings that defines his entity as distinguished from any other creature. It is his true essence and there he feels conscious of his existence. Production is the characteristic of his active 'species life' through and because of this production; nature appears as his works and his reality.

But when an unseen process forces him constantly relinquish his production to his master, he will be left contemplating himself in a world that he has created. The process in which he is being gradually impoverished rather subconsciously bewilders him. The basis of alienation under capitalism is the estrangement of the worker from the product of his labor and the

mystification of capital exploitation that tries to hide the real relation between wage, labor and capital. Out of this hidden exploitation of living beings and humans are degraded to the level of thing. These distorted, mystified (alienated) relations sink deep into human consciousness and are then regarded as something natural and inevitable. Such is the derivation of alienation: it exists in the product itself, and the capacity and desire for human to produce. When the true nature of worker and production is manipulated, and in this case denied, alienation is the natural response.

Capitalist system exists on objectification of labor and all sorts of human values into buyable and saleable items. In *Das Capital*, Marx dwells long on how alienated product of labor in the form of commodities dominant their own creators in 'Frankenstein fashion.' So, alienation has wider implication than mere mathematical appropriation of value from a worker. It is a resultant situation in humanity as a whole, especially as focused in this dissertation:

The history of mankind had a double aspect: it was a history of increasing control of man over nature, and at the same time it was a history of the increasing alienation of man. Alienation may be described as a condition in which men are dominated by forces of their own creation, which confront them as alien powers. (qtd. in Cohen ,95)

Alienation complex as an ill of modern society, which the reactionaries had ascribed to the increasing rationalization and specialization of the life process, Marx attributed to society and especially in relationship between a worker and owner of production, with regards to the exploitation of the

worker by the non-worker, i.e. capitalist. Alienation refers to the fact that man feels towards his productions, whether intellectual, material or artistic. Alienated labor leads to a world in which the real producer cannot recognize himself. Work, man's existential activity estranges him from both man and nature.

As long as he is a member of a capitalist society, man is an alienated being; he is not 'feeling at home' in this world. Because as said above, his product and his labor are estranged from him, the more a worker produces the less he can consume, and the more value he creates the more he devalues himself. All these consequences result from the fact that worker is related to the product of his labor as to an alien object. This phenomenon is as much social as it is psychological. The drive for a larger capital in terms of money values and with complete disregard for the real social requirements in terms of human values, turns all social relationships into economic relationships, that is, human relationships can only be consummated by way of economic relationships. Everything is for sale and all can be bought. The social compulsion to accumulate capital compels individuals to put their trust in money rather than in men. And as only the possession of money allows for social intercourse, social intercourse is for making money.

Every man is a means to another man to secure and improve his own economic position, no matter what his interests may be in extra-economic terms. Although a social being, he is so only outside society. He may find his social behavior both enjoyable and defensible, but actually he has no control over it and remains a helpless victim of circumstances.

Education as a force for resistance would make people aware of ideological manipulation and educate them for participatory democracy. By The epitome of evil leading to the condition of alienation is the property system. This economic root establishes the basis for the expropriation of the workers, both as a person and as a producer, and leads inevitably to the alienation of man from himself. That distorts the individual of his attributes and values, but they adjust themselves to the alienated life without being aware of this. This irony takes off from what was observed by Marx in “German Ideology”: “This consolidation of what we ourselves produce turns into an objective power above us, growing out of our control, thwarting our expectations, is one of the chief factors in historical development up to now” (23).

An individual works for existence but with no inspiration and emulation because he witnesses his labor value being drained by his enemy. He is expropriated of what he earns; that is responsible for general loss of human value.

The term is widely discussed in *Paris Manuscript* (1944) not extensively as a philosophical issue but as a social phenomenon of capitalism. In *Capital: Critic of Political Economy* Marx illustrates the process of reducing an individual into a mere working object, thus creating an alienated condition. As he says in: *Capital: Critique of Political Economy*:

Within the capitalist system all methods of raising the social productiveness of labor are brought about at the cost of the individual labor; all means for the development of production transform themselves into means of domination over, and

exploitation of, the producers. They mutilate laborer into a fragment of man, degrade him to the level of an appendage of a machine, destroy every remnant of charm in his work and turn it into a hated toil. They estrange from him the intellectual potentialities of the labor process in the same proportion as science is incorporated in it as an independent power. (30)

Man creates goods only by his labor. These goods are exchangeable. Their value is the average amount of social labor spent to produce them. Labor is alienated because the work has ceased to be a part of worker's nature and consequently he doesn't fulfill himself in his work but denies himself, has a feeling of misery rather than well-being, doesn't develop freely his mental and physical energies but is physically exhausted and mentally debased.

Capitalist structure of society contributed to the growth of alienation to the highest extent, worst in that sense. Here a man's alienation is more through going than that of a serf or a slave during feudal age. Slave sold his person, the serf sold part of his labor power, but a worker under capitalist system sells his entire labor power – physical and mental, too. During feudalism, workers and slaves were dependent but at least not divided.

The proletariat is bashed down into ruin, his mind and body broken on the wheel of woe. Modern times exemplify this; schizophrenia, suicides, school massacres, gangsterism, drug and food addiction, sexual deviance and sexual and physical abuse are all symptoms of a period of super alienation.

III. Textual Analysis

Money as an Agent of Alienation in *Great Expectations*

On the basis of the theoretical insights discussed in the previous chapter, Dickens' *Great Expectations* will be as scrupulously analyzed in the pages below.

The novel has been written in the first person narrative. The novel begins as the Pip, the narrator, starts telling us about his childhood days. It begins with giving the sense of loneliness of the speaker: "My father's family name being Pirrip and my Christian name Philip, my infant tongue could make of both names nothing longer or more explicit than Pip. So, I called myself Pip, and came to be called Pip" (1).

As compared with Dickens's earlier novels, *Great Expectations* has a well-knit and compact plot. The themes, which constantly recur in the novels of Dickens, are prisons and criminals, cruel and unjust institutions, helpless and unhappy children, greed for money and power. All these are to be found in *Great Expectations* and are woven into interlocking patterns with great subtlety and intensity. *Great Expectations* is the story of discovery of a man, who rises from an orphaned infancy to good fortune. He discovers that the basis of his prosperity is not what he thought it was and that a strange fate has loaded him with guilt. The success which Dickens achieves in the structure of this novel lies mainly in the fact that he never loses sight of the main story. All the major incidents in the story pertain to these principal figures. The novel has a gripping plot which is full of surprises and odd turns. The plot is resolved through the discovery of a series of unexpected relationships. The major structural feature of this novel is its division of into three distinct stages

of Pip's expectations. This is the end of the first stage of pip's expectations. Similarly, at the end of chapter 39 we read the words this is the end of the second stage of Pip's expectations.

The use of word 'stage' is significant. Dickens has employed theatrical methods in the main body of the narrative also. Another narrative method employed in the novel is the 'inset story', which was frequently used by some of the eighteenth century novelist. Dickens has invested each of the three stages of Pip's expectations with clear cut easily grasped temporal and spatial characteristics.

According to classical view, there are three classes in the society. One class is very rich, another very poor, and the third falls some where between the two. The average class is the best because in that condition of life, people are most ready to follow rational principle. But he, who has superfluous beauty, strength or wealth, finds it difficult to follow the rational principle. The person, who is very poor or very weak or very much disgraced, similarly finds it difficult to follow rational principles. This class does not know how to command and must be ruled like slave. Thus there is arising of a city which is not that of freeman but of masters and slaves.

In *Great Expectations*, Pip tells his story from the point of view of his adulthood looking back over the events, which have formed his character. This use of first person narration seems to create a strong sense of reality. *Great Expectations* tells the story of Phillip Pirrip, known as 'Pip', an orphan brought up by his bad-tempered sister and her warmhearted husband Joe Gargery, the village blacksmith. Pip contemplates over his childhood in the passage below:

I give Pirrip as my father's family name, on the authority of his tombstone and my sister Mrs. Joe Gargery, who married the black smith. As I never saw my father or my mother, and never saw any likeness of either of them, my first fancies regarding what they were unreasonably derived from their tombstone. (1)

These are the references about orphan boy, Pip, who never gets the love of his parents. He is introduced as small bundle of shivers, alone in the graveyard, and this is followed by the terrifying intrusion of the world of active violence and fear as the convict seizes him. We see the household at the forge, where he is made to feel guilty and ashamed of his very existence. At Christmas party, he is rebuked and bullied by his elders. Estella calls him coarse and common. The atmosphere of the first stage of Pip's expectations is predominantly that of depression, alienation, and isolation.

The orphan boy Pip lives with his sister, Mrs. Joe Gargery. His parents Philip Pirrip and Georgiana have already been buried in the Churchyard and Pip is familiar with their tombstones. The penny weakling is brought up by Joe Gargery. Whenever he gets a chance, Pip escapes into the churchyard on the marshes to take the air and amuse himself. Pip recollects his horrible childhood, "Hold your noise! Cried a terrible voice, as a man started up from among the graves at the sides of the church porch. Keep still, you little devil or I'll cut your throat!" (2).

The shivering boy is strictly warned that he will be roasted and eaten up if he speaks to anyone about this monster in the marshes and he is forced to bring food and file for him. He further recollects "You get me whittle. He.

tilted me again. You bring ‘em both to me.’ or I’ll have your heart and liver out” (3).

Joe Gargery, the village blacksmith, is one of the simplest and at the same time one of the most dignified of the minor characters in *Great Expectations*. His marital life is not a very happy one. Towards Pip he evinces a high degree of affection and very often tries to protect him from his vagaries and Pip remembers with gratitude all his kindness and care. But Mrs. Joe Gargery is wicked. Her tyranny over her orphan brother is so unimaginative that Joe felt obliged on several occasions to take the boy’s side against his sister. She is jealous of deep relationship between Joe and Pip as reflected in this extract:

My sister, Mrs. Joe throwing the door wide open, and finding an obstruction behind it, immediately divided the cause, and applied Ticks to its to further investigation. She concluded by throwing me- I often survived as a connubial missile- at Joe, who, glad to get hold of me on any terms, passed me on into the chimney and quietly fenced me up there with his great leg.

‘Where have you been you monkey? Said Mrs. Joe stamping her foot.’ You’ll drive me to the churchyard betwixt you, one of these days, and on a pr-r –recious pair you’d be without me! (8)

When Mrs. Gargery returns from the market rather late in the evening that day, she brings a piece of news for Pip. Pip is wanted by Miss Havisham, who lives in a house of town. She wants the boy to go to her house and play there. Miss Havisham is known to be an immensely rich and grim woman

leading a life of seclusion in a large dismal house. But Pip and Gargery both feel sad while parting from each other:

She wants this boy to go and play there. And of course he's going. I had of Miss Havisham up town- everybody for miles round had heard of Miss Havisham up town-as an immensely rich and grim lady who lived in a large and dismal house barricaded against robbers. I was going to play at Miss Havisham's and what on earth I was expected to play at. (52)

When it is the time to go, the mystified boy bids a tearful farewell to Joe and goes with Pumblechook who extends much kindness and loudly admonishes Pip to be grateful to his friends and benefactors. The boy has to work to entertain her. The boy is from village but Miss Havisham is a rich woman in the town. When he reaches Miss Havisham's house he finds complete difference between his house of village and her house. Pip has to play card with Estella a proud girl who stays at Miss Havisham's house for the entertainment of Miss Havisham. He is also provided wine. But what he has to do is not easy for him "We started for Miss Havisham's though I was not at all at my ease regarding the manner in which I should acquit myself under that lady's roof (55).

When they play, Estella treats Pip in a haughty manner. She, in the course of the play, mocks at him. Pip reflects on it in this manner:

Miss Havisham beckoned her to come close let me see you play card, with this boy. Is he a common labouring boy! What do you play boy! Asked Estella. What course hands he has! And what thick boots. I think she is very insulting thinks Pip. She laughed

contemptuously, pushed me out and locked the gate upon me.

(64)

Likewise, Estella mocks at him for calling the ‘knaves’ not ‘knaves’ but ‘jacks.’ She makes fun of his coarse hands. She ridicules him for wearing thick boots. Under Miss Havisham’s instructions, Pip is humiliated a lot. Estella behaves insolently with him as if he were a dog in disgrace. Pip is hurt and offended. It is with great difficulty that he holds his tears back. Seeing his misery, Estella merely laughs contemptuously. What Estella does is not because of her own will but because of the will of Miss Havisham. Both Pip and Estella are objectified by the upper class woman, Miss Havisham. They don’t act as per their will. What they do is out of Miss Havisham’s will. So, Pip feels too much humiliated and ashamed in capitalistic society. When Pip comes back from Miss Havisham’s house he lies to Miss Gargery when she asks about his visit to Miss Havisham’s house. When Miss Estella calls him a common boy, he wishes to be uncommon:

When I reached home, my sister was very curious to know all about Miss Havisham’s but I didn’t answer those questions at sufficient length. I wish my boots weren’t so thick nor my hands so coarse. The beautiful young lady at miss Havisham’s who was dreadfully proud, and that she had said I was common , and that I wished I was not common, and that the lies had been come of it somehow, though I didn’t know how. (70)

Though his sister is very curious to know all about Miss Havisham’s, he is in no mood to answer those questions. When Pip goes to bed that night, he lays awake for a long time thinking how Estella had treated him, and how common

she had thought him with his coarse hands and thick boots. Pip wants to be an uncommon person because Estella had treated him contemptuously for being so common. He thinks it as a memorable day because his thoughts are changed. So the town life here is represented by the upper classes and he wants to be uncommon. In other words, he, too, thinks that he must just like Miss Havisham and Estella to become someone special. In short, he is getting idolized. Pip wishes to get on in life and make him uncommon, “The felicitous idea occurred to me a morning or two later when I woke, that the best step I could take towards making myself uncommon was to get out Biddy everything she knew” (73).

Pip now goes to Biddy at the school maintained by Mr. Wopsole’s great aunt in order to add to his knowledge. A desire to improve himself and his mind has now taken possession of him. Miss Havisham calls all the relatives on her birthday. Pip reflects on it in the following words:

They somehow conveyed to me that they were all toadies and humbugs. As we were going with our candle along the dark passage, Estella stopped all of sudden, and asked me ‘Am I pretty?’ yes I think you are very pretty. She fired when she asked the last question, and she slapped my face with such force as she had when I answered it. (82)

The reference shows that it is the lady’s birthday and some of her poor relatives have gathered in her house and they lack courage to refer to what has brought there. Pip is humiliated many times by Estella. In the dark passage, Estella pauses for awhile to put some question to Pip concerning herself and to slap him on the face. At the time of card playing, he is disdained. Miss

Havisham tries to draw his attention to Estella's beauty and make him notice it by trying her jewels on Estella's breast and hair. Both her adopted daughter and Pip are objectified and reified at her hands. They don't have individuality in their life. Here, Pip is dominated by greed for money and by class consciousness. So are relatives. All those relatives are seekers for money; they all expect monetary advantages from Miss Havisham. They inwardly hate her.

Pip's visit to the manor house now becomes more and more frequent and in the course of eight or ten months, Pip and Miss Havisham become more familiar and even friendly. She sometimes makes kindly inquiries but seems not to be interested in Pip's affairs. Often she asks him whether Estella has grown prettier and when Pip admits that she has, Miss Havisham thinks that Pip enjoys Estella's beauty. Pip falls in love with Estella and the desire of Miss Havisham is to get enjoyment giving torture to Pip. She doesn't like to see happiness of pip.

What Estella does is the plan of Miss Havisham. Estella immediately rebuffs him, and, as a result, he begins to despise his lowly origins. Pip finds that Miss Havisham, on certain occasions, embraces Estella with great fondness advises her never to show any mercy on him as an admirer. So, he has to bear pain and frustration when he wants to get her love especially to become upper class person.

In Dickens's novels, he exposes a gulf between the world of love and world of money by making his characters speak very differently. His view of the world, is based upon a simple love for his fellow men, and this is brought out in the way he speaks a language other than that used by that inhabitants of the world of money. It shows that there is a tension between the world of love

represented by Joe and world of money represented by Miss Havisham and Estella. Between these two, Pip is in some way related to both. To Joe, this relationship is simple-he loves Pip dearly; to Miss Havisham, Pip is a matter of utility, who has earned a premium and now she has had enough of him. So, she is selling him off to another master.

Miss Havisham and Estella treat Pip only as an object, a point reinforced by the fact that they both see him, quite literally, from the same position:

Estella stood at the back of Miss Havisham's chair' their relationship to Pip and Joe signaled by the physical distance between them, is the relationship of master to servant. Miss Havisham,".for instant says a little latter," Gargery is your new master now. (130)

Pip is the object of a commercial transaction, and confronted by the world of money. Pip's simple love for Joe is replaced by shame. The tensions between Pip and Joe, on the one hand, and Pip, Estella and Miss Havisham, on the other hand, underpin the general tension in the novel. It is the pernicious effect of money upon people and their relationships, which destroys the simple love Pip previously had for Joe.

When Pip starts going to Miss Havisham's house to get love of Estella for the sake of money, he hates to work for Joe. As Pip reflects:

I was haunted by the fear that she would, sooner or later find me out with a black face and hands, doing the coarsest part of my work, and would exult over me and despise me. When we went into supper, the plea and the meal would have a more homely

look than ever, and I would feel more ashamed of home than ever in my own ungracious breast. (110)

Now when Pip has to work as a black smith's apprentice, he is ashamed of himself and of the house, where he is now to learn. This shame begins to weigh heavily upon his mind. He finds that he has to work against the grain. He feels that he is doing something degrading. What he is most afraid of is that Estella would see his black face and hands, doing the coarsest part of his work and that she will exult over him and despise him. The thought of Estella makes his work unbearable to him. Pip's feelings are taking him far beyond the boundaries of his social position. But there are no limits to human desire. Pip begins to look down upon the work of a blacksmith. His home, the work he has to do, the kind of meals he eats, all seem contemptible to him. He becomes a snob to become upper class man and for the sake of money. He tries to behave like an upper class man in order to get property of Miss Havisham. And it is possible only when he marries Estella.

When Miss Havisham makes Pip Joe's apprentice, she is effectively paying him off for his services to her. But Pip, because of a series of coincidences regarding Jaggers, has a secret belief that she will one day make it possible for him to become gentleman and marry Estella. That she has no such intention only serves to reinforce the mental pain that she is exerting upon Pip through Estella. But the effect of Estella upon Pip and the effect of his delusions about Miss Havisham's intentions make him increasingly dissatisfied with his life at the forge and with his lowly station as a blacksmith's apprentice. In the fourth year of this apprenticeship, Mr. Jaggers arrives from London, bringing news of Pip's great expectations:

‘My name,’ he said, ‘is Jagger; and I am lawyer in London. I am pretty well known. I have unusual business to transact with you, and I commerce by explaining that it is not of my originating. Now Joseph Gargery, I am the bearer of an offer to relieve you of this young fellow your apprentice. You would not object to cancel his indentures, as his request and for his good? Would you want nothing for so doing?’ ‘Lord for bid that I should want anything for not standing in Pip’s: said Joe, staring. (141)

It is decided that Pip should be ready to leave this place for London exactly after a week. Mr. Jaggers gives enough money to Pip for cloths and for the journey. But here the basic tension we can see in this passage is a simple one: love on the one side, money on the other. Joe is adamant that he will not stand in Pip’s way, and refuses to accept any money for releasing him from his apprenticeship. What is interesting is not so much the simple honesty with which Joe responds to the suggestion that Pip be made the subject of a commercial transaction, but rather the simple honesty with which Jaggers carries out his business. He may not like the system in which he works a point reinforced by the way in which he is constantly washing his hands with strong smelling soap, as if to wash himself clean of the corrupt world with which he deals but his work in it is carried out with scrupulous attention and devoted honesty. So, he is good chap in capitalistic world. He is out of touch of corrupted people like Miss Havisham in bourgeois society. So Joe and Jaggers paradoxically share in a fundamental honesty.

When Pip goes to London, Jaggers replaces Joe as the epitome of the type of society represented by money, just as Joe had previously been the

epitome of the world represented by simple love. In a sense, Joe and Jaggers function as unchanging symbols of the two worlds of love and money this idea- that Pip fails to understand the integrity of each character is given to us in a subtle form in the above passage. Watching the exchange between Joe and Jaggers, Pip is unsure how to interpret what he sees.

When Pip begins to go to London, Herbert starts visiting Miss Havisham. Herbert explains to Pip that he is distantly related to Miss Havisham and that he has gone to her house because she has sent for him to see if she can take fancy to him. If he succeeds in the test, she will make the necessary provision for him in the financial sense and he may have been given the hand of Estella in marriage. So he speaks in terms of becoming a capitalist one day; he speaks of making a fortune through the share business and through trade. Estella's decision to marry Drummle is obviously due to the fact that he is wealthy. And Pip has no relation with Miss Havisham and that she has only been adopted. Here not only is Pip influenced and corrupted by money but most of the characters are also corrupted by greed for money. They are crazy to earn and get money but the very money has become an agent of alienation in capitalistic society.

Pip goes to London to become a gentleman, where he develops the snobbery. He receives a letter from Biddy saying that Joe would be visiting him in London. When he receives the letter, he becomes sad:

I received this letter by post on Monday, morning, and therefore its appointment was for next day. If I could have kept him away by paying money, I certainly would have paid. My greatest

reassurance was that he was coming to Bernard's Inn, not to Hammersmith's way. (223)

Pip is somewhat perturbed by this news because he thinks that Joe's rustic manners will cause him much embarrassment. Though he is bound to the blacksmith by many ties, he isn't happy to meet his brother in law though they were close in his childhood. He looks forward to Joe's coming with considerable disturbance, some mortification and a keen sense of incongruity. If he could keep away Joe by paying money, he would certainly do. His greatest reassurance is that Joe will see him at Bernard's Inn and not at Hammersmith. Accordingly, when Joe goes to the manor house, Miss Havisham tells him to inform Pip that Estella has returned home and will be glad to see Pip. So Pip's snobbery is unpardonable because he doesn't like the activities and arrival of Joe which will prove Pip's rural background in world of capitalism. He hates Joe's arrival and behaviour thinking that it will show low status of his town life, which shows the bad effects of money on people's behaviour. Pip has tried to break all the friendly and close relationship with Joe.

Pip is now more than ever convinced that Miss Havisham is his patroness and he is to do all the shining deeds of the young knight of romance and marry the princess, when he is invited by Miss Havisham. He paints brilliant pictures of Miss Havisham's plans for him and decided to go to Satis House to see Estella and the well-meaning benefactress. Persuading him that it is unnecessary and inconvenient to stay at Joe's, he takes the afternoon coach. He decides not to stay with Joe but to take a room at the local inn called the Blue Boar. He thinks that, in his changed circumstances, it will not

look right for him to stay at the smith's place. He does not want Estella to think continuously of him as a common and ordinary fellow. He does not even call on Joe. Thus Pip has grown cold during his stay in the city and this is mainly because of his ambition to become upper-class man. In short, money has extinguished the best that is in him and perverted his mind. It is the bad effect of money observed in the materialistic society.

Pip is quite sure that Miss Havisham has summoned him to tell him of her intention to give Estella's hand to him. What matters to him at this time in his life is Estella, who has taken a strong possession of his heart and soul. He thinks that she has become a part of his 'innermost life' from which he can never escape. This is a deep spiritual confusion and abandonment, which engulfs him. He loves her to get property of Miss Havisham. Though she always humiliates him, he loves her. It shows Pip's struggle to become an upper class man. His recollection, too, is big evidence:

Truly it was impossible to dissociate her presence from all those wretched hankering after money and gentility that had disturbed my boyhood from all those ill-regulated aspirations that had first made me ashamed of home and Joe. It was impossible for me to separate her in the past or in the present from the innermost life of my life. (241)

As if to stress the extent to which Pip is subject to Estella's phantom-like nature, she is described in terms of 'vision', which materializes in the glowing fire lurks in the darkness of night and 'fleets away 'from the forge window. This is love of a type which is wholly destructive. It is love Pip expresses out of his hankerings for money and gentility, and this is indicative of conflict

between the individual and society at large. The personal turmoil Pip finds in his love for Estella, motivated by his desire for 'money and gentility' serves to mirror the conflicts in the individual's relationship to the outside world. So even in the love story of Pip and Estella, which reads on the surface much like any other Victorian love story, there is deep spiritual and emotional turmoil, which reflects the chaos and turmoil of society at large. Pip, therefore, is isolated from Joe and Estella. He doesn't like to stay at home because of bad behaviour of Mrs. Joe and desire of becoming the upper class man. He doesn't get love from the side of Estella. She gives mental torture instead of love. What he has to face is because of his ambition to become upper class man and greed for money.

When Pip comes to Miss Havisham's house again, he finds Estella very beautiful. Both Estella and Pip go out into the garden for a walk. Pip trembles in spirit and worships the very hem of her dress, but she is quite composed. As they walk Pip has an air of youthfulness and submission while the lady by his side has an air of completeness and superiority. Estella looks brighter and more beautiful than she was before and Pip is under strange enchantment. Miss Havisham draws her arm round Pip's neck and most passionately exhorts him to love Estella at all costs. Then in the same hurried passionate whisper, she recalls how she has loved. But Estella says to Pip that there is no softness, no sympathy, and no sentiment in her heart. But she doesn't tell it to Miss Havisham because she has to do what she orders. So both Estella and Pip are objectified and reified in world of capitalism. According to Miss Havisham, real love is blind devotion, unquestioning self-

humiliation and complete submission. She gives ideas for her own delight by inflicting torture not only on Pip but also on Estella.

Miss Havisham's exhortation to Pip to love Estella humbly and submissively does not come as a surprise because she wants that Estella should be the cause of as much torture for Pip as possible. This is only part of Miss Havisham's plan to wreak fury upon him. Pip's love for Estella is deep and intense. He is still under the delusion that Miss Havisham intends Estella to become his wife. He doesn't realize that Miss Havisham is arousing his hopes only to thwart them and in this way gratify her own vindictive feelings towards lower class people like Pip. On the one side, Miss Havisham asks Pip to love and, on the other side, she persuades Estella to take out his heart giving mental torture. So Estella rebuffs him many times, and it becomes a cause of alienation to Pip. It explored the capitalist world in which authenticity unity and harmony are systematically made impossible the way Pip and Herbert who give value upon money and they have no harmony in their life. Likewise, Pip and Estella are dominated by the ideologies of capitalism.

When Estella arrives in her furred traveling dress from London at the completion of her study, she seems more delicately beautiful and her manner more winsome than ever before. Without any displeasure, she tells Pip what he is to do and hands her purse to him. He grows slightly vehement in talking of the various poor relations of Miss Havisham who are besetting her with reports and insinuations to Pip's disadvantages. All the relations in capitalistic society are relations of money. Dickens attacks what seems to him the root cause of all contemporary evils namely money. Money is the great subject of his novels. Estella seems close to Pip. She is aware of the fact that she is

doing all this under the instruction of her guardian, Miss Havisham. She knows that what she has to do is not her own desire. They have become isolated. They are cut from family relationship. The individuality is lost forever. They are forced to recognize that not only are the objects of desire unattainable, but also that their desires are not even really their own. It is the Miss Havisham's desire that Pip should love and be abandoned by Estella. Though Estella is not interested towards his love, he suffers great restlessness and disquiet of mind and she is so inseparable from it all. Because of it, Herbert and Pip spend as much money as they can and seldom get their due. In capitalistic society, town life is represented by rich and upper class people and rural life is represented by poor people. Most of the evils are found in city life and all these evils are learnt by the common people like Pip and Herbert. They are victims of the upper class society. London, therefore, has been portrayed as a place enmeshed in immorality resulted out of lust for money.

Pip falls a vicious trap created by his own thirst for money. Pip has been living a fashionable and almost luxurious life in London:

So now as an infallible way of making little ease, I began to contract a quantity of debt we spent as much money as we could. We order something rather special for dinner, with a bottle of something similarly out of the common way. (282)

Pip develops lavish habits, with the result that he is spending more than the allowance. In Pip's company, Herbert, too, develops similar habits. As a result of these extravagant habits, both the young men get into debt. They have to keep up their social position as well. All these are resulted because of failure

of his dream and great expectation. But as he grows accustomed to his altered circumstances, his charm begins to wear thin and he ever becomes miserable. In and around him, he sees grown signs of degradation and moral ruin. He suffers great restlessness and disquiet of mind and Estella is so inseparable from at all, that he is at a loss to know or fix his own share in it. Both of them find themselves in debt because of their extravagant living. Occasionally they remind themselves that they are getting on badly, but they never have courage to take the foe by the throat. The city life is corrupted by the bad habit of drinking and spending much money which is influenced by the materialistic value in capitalistic society. They live with regrets and worries all the time.

The corrupting influence of money remains as long as Pip lives in London. The conflict between love and money is brought together in the character of Wemmick. Pip fails to understand the integrity of each character, “I thought Mr. Jaggers glanced at Joe, as if he considered him a fool for his disinterestedness. But I was bewildered between breathless curiosity and surprise, to be sure of it” (258).

Here, Pip is uncertain of what passes between the two men. The reason why he is uncertain is that he doesn't understand the nature of these two men; he fails to understand Jagger's integrity to the world of facts and money. Consequently, when he goes to London, he falls between the two worlds of Joe on the one hand, and Jaggers becomes a worthless snob, on the other hand. He cuts himself off from Joe and the love he can offer, but unlike Jaggers, he fails to understand the consequences of being a part of world of money; alienation from others, loneliness and lovelessness.

Though Pip has extravagant habit, he gets money regularly. Mr. Jaggers gives him a bank note of five hundred pounds and tells him that he will be getting the same amount of money every year. Mr. Jaggers says that it is still not possible for him to disclose to Pip the identity of Pip's benefactor. Pip, as a result, continues to be under the impression that the fountainhead of all this generous financial help remains as a mystery to Pip.

In comparison to the sort of honesty and integrity that is found in Jaggers, Miss Havisham's manipulation of Estella's character is clearly destructive. The following scene occurs at Sati's house where Pip has been asked to accompany Estella:

We were seated by the fire, just now described, and Miss Havisham still had Estella's arm drawn through her own. 'What!' said Miss Havisham Are you tired of me? "You should know said Estella, you stock and stone! Exclaimed Miss Havisham. I am what you have made me. Take all praise, take all the blames, take all the success, take all the failure, in short, and take me. (310)

The tension in this passage has to do with the conflict between the burning passion of Miss Havisham and the cold indifference of Estella. This is presented in such a way as to reverse the natural order of things. Estella, young, beautiful and attractive- attributes which we normally associate with the passion of youth-is standing near the fire and yet presents nothing but a cold, uncaring and unloving character; Miss Havisham, old and wizened like a witch, is paradoxically burning with passion. Estella is proud; she endures Miss Havisham's affection, she possesses perfect composure. But her self-

possessed indifference makes her almost cruel. Miss Havisham, on the other hand, craves Estella's contact with a 'fierce affections,' her eyes 'flash, she passionately strikes her stick upon the floor. The contradiction is that Estella can not feel the passion which is destroying Miss Havisham, because she has destroyed it in her. So there is a reversal of the natural order which draws attention to the destructive way in which Miss Havisham has manipulated Estella's character. The whole point of the passage is to reveal the extent of destruction of any normal capacity for love in Estella by Miss Havisham. What happens here to Miss Havisham is what happens to Pip in the novel as a whole Miss Havisham like Pip confuses wealth and love. She has given Estella everything that money can give: cloths, jewels, ability to break the heart of people like Pip. However, she has given her all this within the cold, isolated and distorting world of Satis house. In creating Estella, Miss Havisham has created a cold automation, incapable either of receiving or of giving love. Miss Havisham's spite turns love into hatred, and the natural order is destroyed. It shows how both Estella and Pip are reified at the hands of Miss Havisham.

Pip is twenty years of age now he has not yet heard a single word to enlighten him regarding the identity of his benefactor. But now he is clear that his real benefactor is Magwith, a real convict. This brutal criminal is the fountain head of his all source of income and isolation at the same time. When he knows that his real benefactor is the criminal Magwitch, he undergoes the experience of alienation:

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 for an hour or more, I remained too much stunned to think, and it was not until I began to think, that I began fully to know wrecked I was, and how the ship in which I remained too much stunned to think, and it was not until I began to think, that I began fully to know wrecked I was, and how the ship in which I had sailed was gone to pieces. (336)

Magwitch's role is that of a man who degrades pride and gives it a real cause and flitting. He is forced into the gross parody and ordeal of having to put up with Magwitch who has paid for Pip's developing a snobbish outlook. The convict, whose name was Magwitch, now discloses to Pip that his visitor was no other than the convict whom he had helped with food and fire in the churchyard many years before. He is alienated because of greed for money who thinks that his real benefactor is Miss Havisham who gives him money as his regular visit to her. So it causes an inward agony. It is no matter of joy for him to learn that he has been, and still is beneficiary of a criminal and convict. Money creates a system in which people will buy their possession of another person's life in recompense for the love they cannot have as they are alienated. In fact Pip's alienation is brought about by the system of money. Money, in this novel, is the principal system whereby relations between the individual self and society are established. In Dickens's work, as we see money is very often conceived and presented as a sort of language and this equation is not too surprising. Money like language is a system of signification in which the meaning value of individual units can exist only by virtue of the whole economic system which lies behind the imaginary fixation on the nature and origins of money.

Pip wants to be getting married with Estella for property of Miss Havisham and to be upper class man but when she is get married with Drummle, he undergoes in sense of alienation:

All done, all gone! So much was done and gone, that I when I went out at the gate, the light of day seemed of a darker color than when I went in for a while, I hid among some lanes and by-paths, and then struck off to walk all the way to London. I couldn't go back to the inn and see Drummle here. (370)

Pip has loved Estella for a long time and loves her dearly. Pip knows that there is no hope of his being able to get her as his wife as he is not as rich as Drummle is. Estella's reply to Pip's declaration of love is that she has always warned him not to expect any response from her. It leads him to pathetic condition. He thinks that there is nothing Pip can do so far as Estella is concerned. His earnest effort to stop this marriage fails completely. It makes him see that Estella is heartless and self-willed woman. She gets married with Drummer to become rich. So it is special greatness of this novel is that the greed for money and class consciousness have worked in a striking manner. Money is an agent of isolation because Pip is confused about natural affections and cut off from these nearest and most loyal to him because of the expectation of money. So Pip's love to Estella is judged in terms of money.

Pip falls very ill. He has high fever. He even loses consciousness and has fits of delirium. Pip has sense of isolation because of the way he has behaved towards Joe in London in his days of prosperity. Now Joe is taking care of him. Joe's attachment and sincerity towards him at this time of crisis creates a profound impression upon Pip. Pip realizes the extent of Joe's

devotion to him. But he is isolated because he no longer wants to be identified in the society where he has been living. All he knows in which world he has been living is false and doesn't want to be identified what he has been doing because he had treated Joe very much badly previously. He had not lived at home of Joe; he didn't like Joe's visit. Later on, when he knows that his debt is paid by Joe, he undergoes a sense of isolation. He is unsuccessful in every field. The characters like Pip, Estella, etc. are corrupted because of greed for money and ambition of being successful in the materialistic world. The overriding single subject of Dickens's novel is money, which stands for power, position and privilege. Money, however, as illustrated in the present analysis, works as a factor that leads one to alienation and reification.

IV. Conclusion

The nineteenth century was the great age of the English novels, which was the vehicle best equipped to present picture of life. Among Victorian novelists, Charles Dickens's novels are full of symbolic images and situations suggesting such notions as the desperate alienation of the individual, which is clearly portrayed in this novel, *Great Expectations*. The novel is full of nightmares symbols of loss, isolation and effects of greed on characters. The theme does remain central and power of the novel derives from the pitiless humor with which Dickens peruses his investigation of the hypocrisies, pretensions, corruptions, and distortions to which men are liable if they gear their ambitions wholly to the material aspects of a civilization in which prestige derives from monetary wealth or in some other ways surrender their personalities to an idol. Dickens has tried to express the effect of financial and social ambition on character Pip. Dickens has wanted to show how all the secret relationships illustrate something about the conflict between love and money. Money actually obscures the expression of love; this is one of the themes in the novel. In the other words, the thing which intervenes between characters in most of the relationships in the novel is money. What is particularly interesting, however, is that all the characters have need for love and for a relationship with another person, but this is consistently obscured by financial consideration in the capitalist society.

In such a situation characters become utilities: Estella is handed over Miss Havisham by Jaggers to save her mother from the gallows. Pip is bought off by Miss Havisham when she has finished toying with his emotions, and

made Joe's apprentice, even company's jilting of Miss Havisham is motivated by money. So most of the characters are deserted and isolated in materialistic society especially by Miss Havisham. Pip leaves Joe's natural love and simplicity in London, where he is snubbed by Estella, disdained by the Finches, and ultimately without love goes under sense of alienation in capitalistic society because of ambition to become upper class man and greed for money. Pip has no past, and hence no relationship to anything consequently not only does he possess nothing but he also has no status in world, because he is wholly isolated from it. He has no place anywhere, and is nobody. Much of the novel will have to do with Pip trying to become somebody, trying to discover who he is in capitalistic society. His view of the world is based upon a simple love for his fellowman, and this is brought out in the way he speaks a language other than that used by the inhabitants of the world of money. So there is tension between the world of love represented by Joe, and the world of money represented by Miss Havisham and Estella. The novel is full of tensions, these tensions all bear down upon Pip, whom each character regards differently: to Joe, the relationship is simple- he loves Pip dearly, to Miss Havisham, Pip is a utility who has earned a premium and now she has finished with him she is selling him off to another master. He is the subject of a commercial transaction, and confronted by the world of money represented by Miss Havisham. Pip's simple love for Joe is replaced by shame. It shows the pernicious effect of money upon people and relationships which destroy her love he can offer but unlike Jaggers, he fails to understand the consequences of being a part of the world of the money: alienation from others loneliness loveless ness in materialistic society. Miss Havisham

confuses wealth and love. She has given Estella everything that money can give, clothes jewels, the ability to break people's heart like Pip but she has given her all this within the cold, isolated and distorting world of Satis House. Characters are alone in the world and need the love and affection of others, but this must be freely given, not brought by money or forced out by threats in materialistic world. In his desire to find order in his life being upper class man, Pip readily acquiesces to the manipulation of his own life by Miss Havisham, whom he believes in his secret benefactress.

The novel has tried to prove that money creases system in which people will buy their possession of another person's life, in recompense for the love they can't have, because the result of not having love is alienation. The turmoil Pip finds in his love for Estella motivated by his desire for money and upper class man, serves to mirror the conflicts in the individual's relationship to the world of capitalism.

Pip is forced to recognize that not only are the objects of his desires unattainable, but also that his desires are not even really his own. Rather, he is acting out the desires of others or their desires are acting through him. It is Magwitch's desires that Pip should become a gentleman, and Miss Havisham's desire that he should love and be abandoned by Estella. Money in this novel is the principal system where by relations between the individual self and society are established. The economic world in which Pip tries to find respectability is of course a capitalistic one. The capitalistic world is a world of fluctuating value and unattained signifiers a world in which authenticity, unity and honesty are systematically made impossible. The novel seems unable to generate between the individual self and society are established. The

economic world in which Pip tries to find respectability is of course a capitalistic one. The capitalistic world is a world of fluctuating value and unattained signifiers a world in which authenticity, unity and honesty are systematically made impossible. The novel seems unable to generate any options other than the consolations of narcissism or the surrender to isolation and alienation. It is special greatness of this novel that the theme of greed for money and class consciousness has been worked out by Dickens in almost striking manner. At the same time, money works as the agent of alienation in world of capitalism because Pip is perverted in natural affections and cutoff from those nearest and most loyal to him by his expectation of money. Money has acted as a corrupting influence on human beings, in a materialistic society; people are too servile towards wealth, position, rank which has become cause of isolation in Pip's life. Society, people are too servile towards wealth, position, rank which has become cause of alienation in Pip's life. Herbert speaks in terms of becoming a capitalist one day. Estella's decision to marry is obviously due to the fact that he is wealthy. Pip has realized through his developing love for Magwitch that his pretensions to social rank, made on the basis of Magwitch's money served only to alienate him in capitalistic society.

Works Cited

- Adams, Hazard. "An Introduction". *A Critical Theory since Plato to Post Modernism*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1985.
- Adorno, Theodor & Walter Benjamin. *The Origin of Negative Dialectics*. New York: Free Press, 1977
- Althusser, Louis *Essay on Ideology*. London: Verso, 1984
- Bertens, Hans. *Literary Theory*. London: Longman, 1983.
- Cecil, David. *Early Victorian Novelists*. Ludhiana: Kalyani Pub., 1934.
- Cohen, Walter. "Marxist Criticism". *Redrawing the Boundaries*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt & Giles Gunn. New York: Modern Language Association Ptd. 1992.
- Collins, Mark White. "An Introduction". *Little Dorrit*. Ed. G.F. Maine. London: Collins Clear Ltd., 1857.
- Collins, Philip. *Dickens, The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1986.
- Collins, Philip. *Public Reading of Dickens*. London: Cassell, 1988.
- Coyle, Martin. *Encyclopedia of Literature & Criticism*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Crotch, Walter. "Charles Dickens, Social Reformer". *The Social Teachings of England's Great Novelist*. London: G. Bell & Sons Ltd., 1913.
- Daiches, David. *A Critical History of English Literature*. Vol. IV. New Delhi: Allied Publishers, 1996.
- Davies, E. Salter. *Our Mutual Friend*. London: Oxford University Press, 1812.
- Davies, Tony. "Marxist Aesthetics". *Literary Theory & Criticism*. Patricia Waugh. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

- Dickens, Charles. "An Introduction". *Pickwick Papers*. Ed. John Brown. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Dickens, Charles. *Great Expectations*. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Dickens, Charles. "An Introduction" *Oliver Twist*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. London: Longman, 1983
- Franco, F. Anthony. "Familial Relationships in Great Expectations". *The Dickensian*. New York: Vintage Book, 1982.
- Humphrey, House. *The Dickens World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.
- Johnson, Edgar. *Charles Dickens, His Tragedy & Triumph*. New York: Penguin Books, 1986.
- Laura, Elizabeth Inman. *Gender & Body in Charles Dickens*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Lukacs, Georg. "Reflection Model". *Historical Novel*. Ed. Lodan: Merlin, 1965.
- Lukacs, Georg. "The Ideology of Modernism". *History & Class Consciousness*. Ed. William Barker. London: Merlin Press, 1971.
- Lukacs, Georg. *History & Class Consciousness*. Ed. William Barker. London: Merlin Press, 1971.
- Marx, Karl & Fredrich Engles. *The German Ideology*. Ed. Fredrich Engles London: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Marx, Karl. "Communist Manifesto". *Creation of Knowledge*. Eds. Shreedhar Lohani, Rameshwor Adhikari, Abhinakaran Subedi. Kathmandu: Kantipur Offset Press, 1996.
- Marx, Karl. "Politics of Class". *Formalism & Marxism*. Ed. Tony Benned. London: Methuen, 1979.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: Critique of Political Economy*. Ed. Fredrich Engles. Vol. III.

London: Lawrence & Wishord, 1974.

Nikitin, P. *Fundamentals of Political Economy*. Mosco: Foreign Language Publishing

House, 1963.

Selden, Raman. *A Readers Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. New York:

Harvestor Wheatsheaf, 1985.

Stiltner, Barry. *Ideological Fabrications*. London: Macmillan, 1984.

Wayne, Don E. "New Historicism". *Literature and Critism: A New Century Guide*. Ed.

Kelsall et al. London: Routledge, 1990.