

I: Introduction

Historical and Political Background of the Novel

Before we analyze this text, *Oliver Twist*, it is necessary to shed light in the historical background in which Charles Dickens wrote this novel. Charles Dickens was not doubt influenced by the event around him in the 19th century Victorian England.

Industrial revolution first came to England. It brought a great political and economic change in the early Victorian England. Before industrialization, the rural feudals held the political power of the country. There was the human relationship between feudals and farmers. British people were accustomed to strong feeling of brotherhood, sense of responsibility and honesty among themselves. After industrialization there came political reconstruction putting all kinds of previously recognized human relationship the feudal, patriarchal and idyllic to end. The middle class emerged to power. In the 19th century Victorian age there came democratic reforms and freedom of individuals which profited a few middle class people. They invested money to factory. They became industrialists and economically prosperous equal to the British aristocracy. The human relationship arose between industrialists and working class people. Due to the reform act of 1830 they got the right to vote that previously disenfranchised the middle class citizens.

With the industrial revolution the middle class advanced not only financially but also full political power. The parliament itself was quickly conquered. The middle class people were prosperous whereas the working class people were miserable. They now began to live in a terrible poverty.

The Social Background

Industrial revolution brought a great social change in the 19th century. Before industrialization there was not class consciousness although there was the human relationship between feudals and farmers. But after industrialization the class consciousness developed in society. Social class divisions arose between capitalists and workers. The capitalists who invested the private money to the factory were a few middle class people. They became prosperous whereas the workers had to work for the meager wages. They were very poor. They lived in rooms without windows and lack of proper food and proper sanitation. The middle class people in the society lived in the comfortable rooms an proper care and sanitation. Liberality in economic policy of the government gave tremendous prosperity to the industrialists whereas millions of people were socially dislocated and economically destituted. The situation of having no law that determined the rate of wage, working hours and other benefits to the labourers caused extreme misery to the workers who were inhumanely exploited and brutalized. The women and children were given works fully unsuited to their age and sex. They had to work for 14-19 hours with very short break for the lunch. The only thing they had to sell was their labour.

The unequal distribution of wealth contributed to a dramatic gap between capitalists entrepreneurs the "haves" of society and the working class-the "haves not". In 1846, the British statesman Benjaman Disralei (1804-1881) described England under the rule of Queen Victoria I (1819-1901) as two nations: the nation of the poor and the nation of the rich. He further says:

Two nations between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy; who are as ignorant of each other's habits, thoughts and feelings, as if there were dwellers in different zones, or inhabitants of different

planets; who are formed by a different breeding are fed by a different food, are ordered by different manners and are not governed by the same laws the nation of the rich and the poor. (186)

The industrial revolution brought great effects in Victorian society. It brought rapid urbanization and deterioration of rural England, population growth; massive poverty, growing class tensions and pressures towards political and social reforms. Agriculture itself was changed into the business spirit. Charles Darwin's theory of evolution brought a social unrest; it shook the earlier religious beliefs in the 19th century Victorian period.

The Victorian writers dealt with the current social, economic and intellectual problems of the period. In the late 1800's they also analyzed the loss of faith in traditional values. The Victorian writers like Charles Dickens, Carlyle, Ruskin and Arnold criticized the Victorian society through their literary works. Carlyle attacked the greed and hypocrisy he saw in society in *Sartor Resartus* (1833-1834).

Charles Dickens and His Time

By the time Charles Dickens was born in 1812, there, in England, working class people were in miserable condition although there was the material prosperity, progress and the prosperous condition of the middle class people. Because of the riots of the working class people the government made laws. It was poor law amendment of 1834. But their condition did not improve. It was at the height of criticism. Various contemporary newspapers 'the times' has been campaigning against it. Regarding the contemporary reaction on the effects of poor law 1834, Lowe writes:

— the Benthamities saw it as an ideal reform and it was popular with the majority of rate payers. However in every other respect the act abused the most bitter criticism both from the working class who

suffered hardship from it and from the humanitarians who thought it cruel and cold blooded. Most of the newspapers were severely critical and there was a flood of pamphlets and petitions as well as hostile demonstrations and attacks on the work houses and Guardians.

(Lowe7)

The work houses did not provide any means for social or economic betterment in Dicken's time. It became the vehicles of exploitation for the hypocritical petty workhouse masters over the poor. Dickens held strong views on the reformed workhouses, and they went clean against the views expressed by the enlightened opinion of his day. That enlightened opinion was, in fact, the main cause of the misery of those people unfortunate enough to be separated from their families under the new rule. Charles Dickens wrote *Oliver Twist* in 1837 to criticize the harsh effect of the poor laws amendment act 1834. It has further highlighted various activities, mass poverty, lack of sanitation, public display of death penalty. In the poor law of 1834 there was a parish beadle to take care of the poor in the work houses. Mr. Bumble was a parish beadle in Dickens' *Oliver Twist*. Workhouses were made as a relief for the poor but it was not true to the poor. The workhouse masters voiced for the charity whereas the poor were starved to death. Workhouse masters were hypocritical to their duty. Charles Dickens was a great humanitarian and his humanity appealed him to check the appalling situation. His literary works are to be used as weapons in his war against all social ills. In *Oliver Twist* he challenged the workhouse system. With regard to the novel Robert Garland writes:

Dickens began writing *Oliver Twist* three years after a new system of administering relief to the poor was set up the poor law Amendment Act 1834. The first seven chapters of the novel take place in and

around a workhouse established under the new system. Its management and organization are described with journalists' eyes for vivid detail and in those chapters. Dickens is protesting against what he saw as the inhumanity and injustice of the new system. (8)

Dickens was a lifelong champion of the poor. He himself suffered the harsh abuse visited upon the poor by the English Legal System. In England, in the 1830s, the poor truly had no voice, political and economic. In *Oliver Twist* Dickens presents the everyday existence of the lowest members of English society. He went far beyond the experiences of the workhouse, extending his depiction of poverty to London's squalid streets dark ale houses and thieves' dens. He gave voice to those who had no voice establishing politics and literature with his social commentary. As regards to Dickens literary works and his time G.D. Klingopulos says:

Carlyle and Dickens dominate the first half of Victorian reign and their work helps one to discern the centers of interaction between literature and society in the period. One chief concern in their work is the description and analysis of the condition of England. Another is the examination of prevailing economic doctrines concerning poverty, population and the scope of public responsibility. (26)

Dickens writes current political and social issue of his time. *Oliver Twist* deals with current political social issue of the Victorians society.

The Autobiographical Note

Charles Dickens wrote *Oliver Twist* not only by historical situation of poor oppressed people but also by an autobiographical event. When Charles Dickens was 12 years old his father was in debt financially. From 9th February 1824, Dickens, at the suggestion of James Lamert, was sent to work in Warren's blacking warehouse, 30

hunger for stairs and for a mere salary of six shilling a week. The humiliating experience of this period was so profound that it always remained fresh in his heart. It made him an injured artist a life long advocate for the cause of poor especially children. When he became a writer he made it for his target. Apparently, Dickens never forgot the day when a more senior boy in the warehouse took it upon himself to instruct in how to do his work. The more senior boy was Bob Fagin. Dickens' residual resentment of him reached a fevered pitch in the characterization of the villain Fagin in *Oliver Twist*. In regard to the autobiographical element in *Oliver Twist*, Steven Marcus says:

The experience of *Oliver Twist* without doubt, reflects Dickens' memory of that traumatic experience in his childhood the blacking episode and the neglect that suffered at the hands of his parents. We know that the circumstances of his father having been imprisoned the breaking up of his family, the agony of being left alone and forgotten, the rough companionship of the boys at the blacking factory had excited in him an extreme feeling of humiliation and degradation. (44)

All the scenes of workhouse, his bad companies in the workhouse and the harsh company of Noah Claypole, and the misery Oliver faces directly reflect to the childhood of Dickens himself. Marcus takes the autobiographical sketch of Dickens to trace the similarity of the events in his life and in his novels. He wrote in his autobiography.

These lines gives us really pathetic sight occurred in life of a poor, who is not able to join school but has been joined to work in blacking factory. He is easily hurt and bodily weak and spiritually delicate. All these characteristics are reflected in the major character Oliver.

Oliver Twist – Critical Review

The first publication of Dickens' *Oliver Twist* was in a serial form in the magazine entitled *Bentley's miscellany* from February 1839 and was issued in a book form before the end of the year although the serial publication ran until March 1839. It was published under his pen name 'Boz'.

Though Dickens published only few short stories before *Oliver Twist* and could not get much fame, the serial form of the novel brought him greater success and recognition to the world of literature. The novel contains fifty-three chapters. Each chapter includes a major event that occurred in the life of a poor orphan from his low birth to his strongman hood. Charles Dickens is the great Victorian writer. He is praised as well as criticized by various critics.

Angus Wilson argues that *Oliver Twist* is "one of Dickens' best known novels, perhaps more than any other it has a combination of sensationalism and sentiment that fixes it as one of the masterpieces of popular art" (qtd in *Oliver* 27). This statement enforces that the novel is sensational and sentimental.

"The novel is basically about the exploitation of a child; he saw only hypocrisy in his high-minded aloof reformism. He also finds the political issue in the novel so he writes that the conflict between these intellectual reformers and Dickens is a clash of classic type that frequently arises in English political life. (17)

E M Forster, in his *aspect of novel*, describes the characters of Dickens' novel as 'flat' characters. Forsters' flat characters are those which are called 'humorous' in the seventeenth century and which are sometimes called 'types' and sometimes caricatures'. In fact, they are constructed round a single idea or quality though some have criticized his characters as flat, for others they are caricatures. Commenting the characters

Somerset Maugham writes: "Dickens' general method of creating character was to exaggerate the traits, peculiarities, foibles of his models and to put into the mouth of each one same phrase or string of phrases, which stamped his quintessence on the reader's mind "(61). Regarding *Oliver Twist*, G.K. Chesterton writes:

The fable of *Oliver Twist* is one of the focal points of the nineteenth century literary culture. In a large figurative sense it reported a society which while still fixed in traditional attitudes. In fact the novel does not give any new ideas of the author but obviously presents the current social problem. (53)

To J. Hillis Miller, the novel is about "money, money, money and what money can make of life" (14) Here, Miller finds the novel dealing only with money but in reality the novel is more than this. Regarding the plot of the novel, Arnold Kettle writes:

"The good characters are by and large too good and the bad too bad. If the centre of interest of the novel were indeed the plot then the conventional assessment of a Dickens novel – a poor story enlivened by magnificent though irrelevant characters would be fair enough (121)."

He also has similar idea to Harry Kaste. Both of them opine that Dickens has used many characters in *Oliver Twist*. It is called Dickensian style. Many critics have accepted *Oliver Twist* as a novel of social issue. In their observation the novel presents the social phenomenon of the Victorian society, G.K. Chesterton writes:

Dickens stands first as a defiant monument of what happens when a great literary genius has a literary taste asking to that of the community for the kinship was deep and spiritual. Dickens was not like our ordinary demagogues and journalists Dickens did not write what the

people wanted. Dicken wanted what the people wanted. Dickens never talked down to the people. He talked up to the people. (40)

In his view, Dickens did not write what people wanted but wrote the social truth. He always remained on the side of people and revolted against social injustices through his writing.

In an account of *Oliver Twist*, Mrs. Margaret Oliphant expresses that Dickens as a novelist and critic was clearly the class writer, one of the advocates of the poor (22). Similarly, Kettle opines "The core of the novel and what gives it value, is its consideration of the plight of the poor. Its pattern is the contrasted relation of two worlds (121).

Oliver Twist and *Nicholas Nickleby* continue to show the imaginative fertility that had brought about Dickens' early triumph of the two novels, *Oliver Twist* is the most consistently effective as an attack on social injustice. Though Dickens had imaginative ability to write his idea, his attack on social injustice made his novels more real and more effective. *Oliver Twist* trends to be real as it attacks on the social injustice of his time. The institutions, which Dickens attacks the workhouses in *Oliver Twist* or the Yorkshire schools in *Nicholos Nickleby* are easily recognizable. (Shelston 90-93)

Not only in these two novels, but also in his *Bleak House* and *Little Dorrit*, he has taken institutions a metaphors for social malaise. In '*Our Mutual Friend*', he has attacked the economic system engaging it not on the grounds of theory, but in term of its effect on human behaviour Kathleen Tillorson gives a closer look in the genesis of *Oliver Twist*.

For *Olivers'* origin Dickens change a different level of reality, and presented the persistence of the 'principle of good', but he also has said that Dickens has

sometimes been criticized for confusing conditions under the old and new poor law, except the prominence of the beadle. He was only reflecting conditions themselves confused, for the process of implementation was necessarily gradual. When he was writing early in 1837, hundreds of parishes were still untouched by the act and not yet combined into unions (9). Obviously, Dickens has presented the contemporary social problem.

Earnest A Baker is of the opinion that Dickens' object was to tell the truth, to show how crime is bred and that vice systematically pursued does not yield the delights gaily asserted by the romancer. In 1867, he still resolutely affirms, "it is empathetically God's truth. But having adopted the framework of a novel with a trademark of a plot he could not help bringing in much that was not exactly God's truth. Oliver's childhood in the workhouse and his far-echoing request for 'more' may be condoned in a tract upon the poor law" (179). He talks about the issue of the poor law. Dickens speaks against inhumanity.

Observing the *Oliver Twist* David Daiches writes:

Oliver Twist is the first of Dickens' novels to concentrate on specific social ills but as always with Dickens, the force of the indictment falls most heavily on the individuals who administer the attacked institution rather than on the institution as such *Oliver Twist*, bandied between workhouse on the one hand, and benevolent protection on the other, with a third sinister alternative of forcible adoption into one of criminal gangs of London, exists not so much to be saved as to illustrate the different kinds of environment into which innocence may fall.(1053)

Charles Dickens writes about social abuses of the Victorian period. He attacks injustice and inhumanity of the Victorian society. He is a moralist, humanitarian and social reformer. He is the advocate of the poor and oppressed people.

Dickens' Life and Works

Charles Dickens was born on February 7th 1812 in Portsea, England. His parents were middle class but they suffered financially as a result of living beyond their means. His father, John Dickens was a spendthrift clerk in the Navy pay office. He had an unsettled childhood as John Dickens was constantly shifted from one naval base to another. With John Dickens' transfer, the family shifted to London before he was three. In 1817, he was again transferred to Chatham, Kent and the family settled at two ordnance Terrace.

Dickens was a voracious reader from his childhood. In Chatham his earliest passion for reading awoke with his mother's stimulation and the young Dickens read the works of Fielding, Smollet, Goldsmith and Defoe enthusiastically. He also became interested in exotic stories and read *Arabian Nights* with a child's curiosity.

Toward the end of 1822, after five years, John Dickens was transferred to London again and the family settled at 16 Bayham Street, in Camden Town. John Dickens, a financially irresponsible man, was not only unable to save a penny for future but fell into debt.

The school education for Dickens became an unaffordable privilege out of their reach and he was instantly withdrawn from the school and came to join the family in London. Mrs. Dickens' attempt to run a boarding school for girls to see the financial troubles turned to complete failure. In such harsh situation, at the age of twelve from 9th February 1824, Dickens, at the suggestion of James Lamert, was sent to work in Warren's blacking warehouse. Shortly afterwards on 24th February 1824

John Dickens was arrested for debt and imprisoned in the Marshalsea debtor's prison situated in the high street, south work, London. Mrs. Dickens and the children, except Charles and his elder sister Fanny, followed him in the prison as it was the custom of the time.

A timely legacy of 450 following the death of his mother rescued John Dickens from the Marshalsea on 28 May 1824 and brought the separated family together again. He resumed his work at the Navy pay office. Although Charles Dickens spent the miserable life in Warren's blacking factory. It left permanent and profound affect on Dickens imagination and attitude towards the lower class people. He quarreled with Lamert withdrew Charles from the factory and delivered him to Wellington House Academy run by William Jones, where he remained until March 1827.

In the spring of 1827, Charles Dickens, a youth of fifteen, worked as a low clerk later as a journalist. His experience as a journalist kept him in close contact with the darkening social conditions of the industrial revolution and he grew disillusioned with the attempts of law makers to alleviate those conditions. A collection of semi-fictional sketches entitled *sketches by Boz* earned him recognition as a writer. Dickens became famous and began to make money from his writing when he published his first novel, *'the pickwick papers'* which serialized in 1836 and published in book form the following years.

In 1837, the first installment of *Oliver Twist* appeared in the magazine *Bentley's Miscellany* which Dickens was then editing. Even at this early date some critics accused Dickens of writing too quickly and too prolifically, since he was paid by the word for his serialized novels. Yet the passion behind *Oliver Twist* animated in part by Dickens own childhood experiences and in part by his outrage at the living

conditions of the poor that he had witnessed as a journalist touched his contemporary readers greatly successful, the novel was a thinly veiled protest against the poor law of 1834 which dictated that all public charity must be chanted through workhouses.

In 1836, Dickens married Catherine Hogarth but after twenty years of marriage and ten children fell in love with Ellen Ternan, an actress many years his junior. Soon after Dickens and his wife separated ending a long series of marital difficulties. Dickens remained a prolific writer to the end of his life and his novels among them *Great Expectation*, *a tale of two cities*, *A Christmas Carol*, *David Copperfield*, *Hard times* and *Bleak house* continued to earn critical and popular acclaim. He died of a stroke in 1870, at the age of 58, leaving the *Mystery of Edwin prood* unfinished.

II: New Historicism

New Historicism is a new mode of literary study that was propounded in the early 1980s. Its proponents oppose to the *formalism* that they attribute both the *New Criticism* and to the critical *deconstruction* that followed it. In place of dealing with a text in isolation from its historical context new historicists attend primarily to the historical and cultural conditions of its production, its meanings, its effects, and also of its later critical interpretations and evaluations. This is not simply a return to an earlier kind of literary scholarship, for the views and practices of the new historicists differ markedly from those of former scholars who had adverted to social and intellectual history as a "background" against which to set a work of literature as an independent entity, or had viewed literature as a "reflection" of the worldview characteristic of a period. Instead, new historicists conceive of literary text as "situated" within the institutions, social practices, and discourses that constitute the overall culture of a particular time and place, and with which the literary text interacts as both a product and producer of cultural energies and codes.

Louis Montrose described the new historicism as "a reciprocal concern with the historicity of texts and the textuality of history (68)." That is, history is conceived not to be a set of fixed, objective facts but, like the literature with which it interacts, a text which itself needs to be interpreted. Any text, on the other hand, is conceived as a discourse which, although it may seem to present, or reflect, an external reality, in fact consists of what are called representations – that is, verbal formations which are the "ideological products" or "cultural constructs" of the historical conditions specific to an era. New historicists often claim also that these cultural and ideological representations in texts serve mainly to reproduce, confirm, and propagate the power-structures of domination and subordination which characterize a given society.

Stephen Greenblatt inaugurated the currency of the label "new historicism" in his Introduction to a special issue of *Genre*, Vol. 15 (1982). He prefers, however to call his own critical enterprise cultural poetics, in order to highlight his concern with literature and the arts as integral with other social practices that, in their complex interactions, make up the general culture of an era, Greenblatt's essay entitled "Invisible Bullets" in *Shakespearean Negotiations* (1988) serves to exemplify the interpretive procedures of a leading exponent of this mode of criticism. Greenblatt begins by reading a selection from Thomas Harriot's *A Brief and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia*, written in 1588, as a representative discourse of the English colonizers of America which, without its author's awareness, serves to confirm "the Machiavellian hypothesis of the origin of princely power in force and fraud," but nonetheless draws its "audience irresistibly toward the celebration of that power." Greenblatt also asserts that Harriot tests the English power structure that he attests by recording in his Report the counter-voices of the American Indians who are being appropriated and oppressed by that power. Greenblatt then identifies parallel modes of power-discourse and counter discourse in the dialogues in Shakespeare's *Tempest* between Prospero the imperialist appropriator and Caliban the expropriated native of his island, and goes on to find similar discursive configurations in the texts of Shakespeare's *Henry IV, 1 and 2* and *Henry V*.

The works of Michel Foucault and Louis Althusser are the key influence on new historicism. According to them, human 'experience' is shaped by social institutions and specifically by ideological discourses. They conceived ideology as actively constituted through social struggle. Althusser abandons the orthodox interpretation of ideology as "false consciousness". His theory places ideology within the material institutions (political, judicial, educational, religious and so on). He

conceives ideology as a body of discursive practice which sustains individuals in their places as subjects. Foucault also emphasized that discourses are always rooted in social institutions. He shows that social and political power work through discourse. He says that power relations in any given era in a society constitute the concepts, oppositions and hierarchy of its discourses. As such, truth and knowledge are determined by the society in any given era. There are no 'absolute' truths, not even permanently 'authentic' truth and knowledge in the world. Truth and meaning depend upon politico-historical contexts. Borrowing the basic idea of power from Nietzsche, he explains that our language activities themselves depend on our 'will to power'. We cannot possess truly 'objective knowledge of history because even historical writing is entangled in cultural 'tropes' or symbols! besides being biased due to the subjectivity of those who write it and the limitations of its creation. Discourses are produced within the real world of power and struggle and they are means to gain, maintain or subvert the existing power systems. Truth depends on who creates and maintains history, or who has the power to create and perpetuate what is taken as truth. For instance, both the colonizer and colonized create their own kinds of truth, but they create the opposite truths. So, there are no absolutely true or absolutely false discourses of any kind; there are only more powerful and less powerful ones. Powerful discourses determine and dominate the mode of thought and other discourses.

For new historicists, history is not a homogeneous and stable pattern of facts and events which can be used as the "background" to the literature of an era, or which literature can be said simply to reflect, or which can be adverted to (as in early Marxist criticism) as the "material" conditions that, in a unilateral way, determine the particularities of a literary text. In contrast to such views, a literary text is said by new

historicists to be "embedded" in its contest, and in a constant interaction and interchange with other components inside the network of institutions, beliefs and cultural power-relations, practices, and products that, in their ensemble, constitute what we call history. New historicists commonly regard even the conceptual "boundaries" by which we currently discriminate between literature and non-literary texts to be a construct of post-Renaissance ideological formations. They continue to make use of such discriminations, but only for tactical convenience in conducting critical discussion, and stress that one must view all such boundaries as entirely permeable to interchanges of diverse elements and forces. Favored terms for such interchanges whether among the modes of discourse within a single literary text, or among diverse kinds of texts, or between a text and its institutional cultural context – are "negotiation," "commerce," "exchange," "transaction," and "circulation." Such metaphors are intended not only to denote the two-way, oscillatory relationships among literary and other components of a culture, but also to indicate, by their obvious origin in the monetary discourse of the marketplace, the degree to which the operations and values of modern consumer capitalism saturate literary and aesthetic, as well as all other social institutions and relations. As Stephen Greenblatt has expressed such a view, the "negotiation" that results in the production and circulation of work of art involves a "mutually profitable exchange" – including "a return normally measured in pleasure and interest" – in which "the society's dominant currencies, money and prestige, are invariably involved." ("Toward a Poetics of Culture," in *The New Historicism*, ed. H. Aram Veveser, 1989.)

New historicists acknowledge that they themselves, like all authors, are "subjectivities" that have been shaped and informed by the circumstances and discourses specific to their era, hence that their own critical writings in great part

construct, rather than discover ready-made, the textual meanings they describe and the literary and cultural histories they narrate.

New Historians believe that they themselves, like all authors, are "subjectives" that have been shaped by the circumstances and discourses specific to their era. Hence, their own critical writings construct the textual meanings they describe and the literary and cultural histories they narrate. They also believe that the course of history between the past and the present is not coherent, but exhibits discontinuities, breaks and ruptures. By doing so, they hope to 'distance' and 'estrangle' an earlier text. These historians focus on the power configurations – especially in the aspects of class, gender, race and ethnicity – that prevails in their present culture.

Foucault' Power

Foucault's major concern is his stress on the productive nature of power that turns a negative conception upside down and attribute the production of concepts, ideas and the structures of institutions to the circulation and exercise of power in its modern forms. This notion is that power is all pervasive also deserves equal weight. He forcefully expresses these points in *discipline and punish* as he says "we must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms, it excludes; it 'represses' it 'censors', it 'abstracts' it 'masks' it 'conceals'. In fact power produces, it produces reality, it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth" (194).

Power, according to him is a creative sources for positive value, is practiced hegemonially. It is not hierarchical flowing from top to bottom and is not used vertically to dominate the other'. Foucault's power does not adhere to the repressive hypothesis that see power functioning in the form of chain which localizes it in a few hands. Power, for him is not just the ruthless domination of the weak by the stronger.

This idea is akin to Nietzsche who says that power is not to be 'had' at all. In *History of Sexuality* (Vol. One), Foucault writes about the all pervasive nature of power:

Power is everywhere: not because it embraces everything but because it comes from everywhere. [...] power comes from below; that is there is no binary and all-encompassing opposition between ruler and ruled at the root of power relations, and serving as a general matrix-no such duality extending from the top down and reacting on more and more limited groups to the very depths of the social body. (9834)

From this it becomes clear that Foucault's main project was to turn the negative conception of power upside down. (By 'negative conception' we mean the vertical and hierarchical notion of power). In doing this, he owed more to Nietzsche than to Karl Marx who, like Foucault, saw history in terms of power but defined power as something to be wielded by somebody upon the 'other'. On the contrary, Foucault saw power not simply as a repressive force or tool of conspiracy but as a complex of forces that produce what happens in a society. It is not wielded by somebody because he himself is caught and empowered by certain discourses and practices that constitute power.

Foucault says that the subject is always placed in a net like organization power, knowledge and representation. It becomes something around which power circulates and produces its effects. Power marks an individual and imposes the law on him but it is knowledge that makes its possible. That is to say that power's attempt to subject an individual becomes successful with the help of knowledge. To subject an individual means to compel someone else to be under control or dependent and to tie a conscience or self knowledge of his own identity. Discourse of discipline positions

an individual writing certain limits the individual thinks, speaks and tries to act accordingly. The knowledge of himself and that of other objects therefore can't escape the boundary set the discourses. And because the knowledge prescribed by discourses is what determines power relations an individual is subjected to identified according to this demarcation.

A subject can not but be submissive to a discipline which being aided by a institution becomes the foundation of knowledge and Truth. Because discipline is what Paul Bove calls , "an accumulative, co-operative project for the production of knowledge, the exercise of power and the creation of careers" (qtd in spannos 32). Such a project, therefore, always produces knowledge irrespective of truth or falsity, and support the techniques of power. Foucault's observations about the regulatory mechanisms of knowledge and their assistance to the techniques of power are expressed in his hypothesis about dominant knowledge systems that are the products of the disciplines. He sees such a system "as double repression: in terms of those whom it excluded from the process and in terms of the model and the standard (the bars) it imposes on those receiving this knowledge" (Discipline and punish 219). In this way, the subject can't but live in the network of power, knowledge and the techniques of power, all of which produce and revolve around the subject. The subjects, because of already being components of the power structure, can't get rid of the subjectivity imposed on them but only try to alter prevailing power relations.

Foucault's concern with the productivity of power, as his notion that power is all pervasive, also deserves equal weight. Power, seen in this light is not wielded by somebody because he himself is caught and empowered by certain discourses and practices that constitute power.

Foucault's radical thesis on power is not to devalue and discredit the truth or science in general but to question the historical conditions necessary for the emergence of such truths. For this purpose he demonstrates the historicity of different disciplines and the concepts of objects related to such disciplines along with power relations and their strategies.

In developing this new idea of power, Foucault is less concerned with power as an entity or process than with an interrogation of the material conditions which promote specific power relations. He calls this project of evaluating one's own historical epoch or present an 'Ontology' of the present. Writing on this idea of Foucault, McHoul and Grace say "An ontology of the present would aspire to unearth the particular historical conditions which produced the types of scientific truth peculiar to our society" (60). From this it becomes clear that, these two critics see, as we do, Foucault setting himself apart from all other contemporary social theorists. This is because of his is not the status of the truths but on the conditions necessary for the production of such truths

Foucault, thus, challenging the conditions of the production of certain truths which, for him, are but the effects of power, deviates in his concept of power and truth from his contemporary thinkers. He doesn't say that power is evil in itself, rather his idea of power is related to productivity. By the seems to suggest in his latter works, that productive power limits an individual and subjects him to certain conditions. This subjection of an individual is possible with the help of 'techniques of power that are aided by truth/knowledge. But the subject can resist his position and conditions that are set for him by the ideological framework of the discourse.

Foucault's Discourse

For critical discourse theorists such as Foucault, the term 'discourse' refers not to language or social interaction but to relatively well-bounded areas of social knowledge. Foucault thinks of discourse in terms of bodies of knowledge. His use of the concept moves it away something to do with language and closer towards the concept of discipline. Discipline, for Foucault, has two senses: one, it refers to scholarly disciplines such as science, medicine, psychiatry and so on and two, it refers to disciplinary institutions such as prison, school, hospital and so on. We can, therefore, clearly establish Foucault's idea of discourse as the historical relationship between scholarly disciplines and institutions of social control.

For Foucault, the whole rationalization of a society is a 'myth'. A society, according to him, should be analyzed as a 'process' in several fields, each of which shares the "fundamental experience of society: madness, illness, death, crime, sexuality and so forth" ('Subject and Power' 329). And all of these human phenomena are the units of knowledge (i.e. discourses). And the discourses of all of such phenomena have their own vocabulary, concepts and rules, the knowledge of which constitutes power and serves as the dominant ideology of society.

Foucauldian concept of discourse may be seen to have a number of components which are fairly identifiable: objects (the things any discourse studies or produces); operations (methods or ways treating the objects), concepts (the terms which constitute the unique language of discourse) and theoretical options (those different assumptions and theories on the basis of which discourses are formulated). With the help of all these components a discourse produces effects and is itself produced. But all of these components are subject to change. This implies that

discourse is always in a process of formulation, correlation and transformation, which takes place after a certain epoch.

This concept of discourse is obviously very different from the Anglo-American conceptions that connect the term discourse only to language or to social interaction. It is so because for critical theorists like Foucault discourse refers to well bounded areas of social knowledge. And this social knowledge is reflected in discourse.

This is a shift in the concept of discourse. It is technical accomplishment in terms of linguistics or social interaction towards the 'howness' of the statement made and 'whatness' of the conditions of their production. Foucault clarifies this idea in his book, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* while referring back to his historical analyses in *The Order of Things*. Though Foucault Lamerts his own failure to specify the term, he relates a discourse not to what it states but to what particular circumstances in which it states something:

Instead of gradually, reducing the rather of fluctuating meaning of the word 'discourse', I believe that I have in fact added to its meanings; treating it sometimes as the general domain of all statements sometimes as an individualizable group of statements and sometimes as a regulated practice that accounts for a certain number of statements.

(80)

Now the question that arises is the statement a unit of discourse? Does a statement have properties similar to proposition, sentence and speech act? The answer to both questions, in a way, is 'no'. A statement is not a unit of discourse in the way proposition, sentence and speech acts are, because it may lack the logicity of a proposition, ordered structure of a sentence, and the 'facility condition' of a speech

act. but a statement can sometimes be a unit of discourse because it is what Foucault describes in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* "a function that cuts across a domain of possible structures and possible unities, and which reveals them with concrete contents in time and space of statement" (87).

This concept of statement hints at one of Foucault's important thesis regarding discourse. He takes statements as components of discursive formations which are primarily functional. He denied the one to one correspondence of forms and function of linguistic units as argued by the Speech Act Theory. So, 'facility conditions' of propositions, sentences and speech acts may not work for Foucauldian discourse.

When Foucault is interpreted on the basis of his idea of discourse, he doesn't appear to be interested in logical analysis of propositions or formal linguistic system. His concept of discourse encompasses the material conditions associated with time and space. For Foucault, the statements or the *Functional* units of discourse, don't represent the state of affairs but they do things and bring about effects rather than merely produce speech acts.

According to him, these material conditions are related to the 'archive' which is not a stable system of stating form that have certain functions but is a historical flux, which can be defined as "the general system of the formation and transformation of statements" (Foucault, *Archaeology* 130). Archive therefore is concerned to historical conditions of difference. And it is in this archive that discourses produce their effects and are themselves produced. Foucault also connects the material conditions that constraints that enable production of discourse with the archive, which is "a much more mobile and fluid term than the relatively fixed concept of episteme"

Because Foucault is a philosopher of 'discontinuity' his study doesn't see the development of different discourses in the linear 'episteme' running up to the present.

Though his main concept regarding discourse is best expressed in his book *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, his other works like *The Order of Things*, *The History of Sexuality, Discipline and Punish* and *Madness and Civilization* also touch upon the issue of discourse. In all of these books Foucault refuses to accept the linearity of the development of discourses. All of these books attempt to clarify how disciplinary institutions create and develop discourses in different fields of human knowledge. *The History of Sexuality* (Vol. I), for example, deals with how the discourse called sexuality is developed for 'sex' and reveals how the discourse of 'sex' changes over different times. *Madness and Civilization*, on the other hand, is concerned with the discourse of psychiatry (i.e. madness) and shows how this discourse is defined by clinical institutions like the hospital. In the same way criminology is studied in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*.

Discourses themselves are not absolutely true, there always lies gap between practice and statements of discourse.

Having discussed material conditions that enable and constrain the production of discourses, it is now essential to study the representational nature of discourse. Though discourses represent the specific cultural circumstances under which lie the power structures and the relations of power, they don't represent the 'real'. So, to simplify this argument, we can say that the discourse, while trying to establish the 'Truth' always hovers between the 'real' and (mis) representation. Commenting on this Foucauldian idea McHoul and Grace write that "Discourse is not just a form of representation; it is a *material condition* (or set of conditions) which enables and constrains the socially productive 'imagination'. These conditions can therefore be referred to as 'discourses' or 'discursive formations of possibility" (34).

The idea therefore is, if discourses don't represent 'the real', Foucault doesn't believe and distinguish between the best or the metadiscourse and the minor or the marginal discourse. He, in his interview to Alessandro Fontana and Pasquale Pasquino said, his principal interest was to study how 'effects of truth are produced within discourses which in themselves are neither true nor false' (qtd. in Adams 1134).

How then is truth determined (or at least supposed to have been determined by discourses if no discourse, represents the 'real'? It is such discourses that enable institutions of different disciplines to wield power with which the criteria of truth is established. Who is allowed to speak with authority, what is free to be thought, written and spoken and what constraints are to be taken into account, are all determined by statements of discourse. Individuals, so, living in certain discursive formations have to follow the truth looming around them. They can't think or, speak without obeying the unspoken 'archive' of rules and constraints, which is but the construct of disciplinary institutions. If they do so, they must risk being condemned to 'madness' or 'crime', for discourses always are said to have been reserving, what Foucault calls, "an exhaustive ordering of the world". It is, he goes on to say, "as though methods, concepts, types of analysis and finally men themselves had all been displaced at the behest of a fundamental network defining the implicit and inevitable unity of knowledge" (*The order* 75-76).

One of the facets of Foucauldian discourse is how individuals are made 'subjects' by the discourse. The simple thesis that Foucault is not interested in discourse as language, implies that he must be interested in discourse as thought-the intention of men who have formulated them. But, in turning away from discourse as a system of language to discourse as thought, Foucault clearly says there is no reason to

suppose that these rules and criteria are someone's personal thoughts. In his view, discourse can be a theoretical framework for manifestation of ideology of any society. And by this logic, a discourse never allows freedom to an individual. He is always guided by the rules of this discursive formation and their effects. Foucault, in his paper 'Politics and the Study of Discourse' suggests, "Seek in the discourse, not its laws of construction as do the structural methods, but its conditions of existence [...]. Refer the discourse not to the thought, to the mind or to the subject which might have given rise to it, but to the practical field in which it is deployed" (15).

This makes it clear that instead of being a means through which a human subject accomplishes something, discourse places him in certain position. The subject is supposed to speak, think or write from the place specifically set for him. It is because discourses are the product of discursive conditions (i.e rules and criteria) that specify the position of subjects who can now identify themselves as 'patients' 'doctors' 'perverts' 'criminals' etc.

The Foucauldian concept of discourse may remain vague if not compared with Edward Said's concept of Orientalism as a discourse and Antonio Gramsci's hegemony. Though Foucault is said to have not taken any political issues in his writing, it is here in his early essay 'George Canguilhem: Philosopher of error' that he explicitly equates European knowledge and the mirage of western rationality with the "economic domination and political hegemony of colonialism" (54). Seen through this statement alone, Foucault seems to be sharing affinities with both Said and Gramsci who respectively talk about textual colonialism (i.e. Orientalism) and the *willful* consent to be ruled' i.e. hegemony as the effects of European discourses. But Foucault's concept of discourse is not exactly akin to these two theorists. The point can be established with reference to Said who writes on 'how' of Orientalism:

'Continued investment made Orientalism, as a system of knowledge about the orient, an accepted grid for filtering through the orient into western consciousness' (6).

The above statement clearly hints at the three major difference between Saidian and Foucauldian discourses. Firstly, Said takes discourse as a 'continued' phenomenon with which Foucault, the philosopher of discontinuity as a 'continued' phenomenon with which Foucault, the philosopher of discontinuity, obviously disagrees. Secondly, Said takes the European knowledge about the orient as tainted that comes after being filtered through a 'grid'. This is similar to Foucault's notion, for he also doesn't believe in 'real' representation. But, for Said there exists the 'real orient' which should be sought outside the discourses of Orientalism neglecting its 'tainted' representation. In this way Said (mis) interprets Foucault. Thirdly, Said examines the west-east relationship as that of power and domination for which Orientalism functions as knowledge and imperialism as power. But for Foucault, the power relationship results from differences in discourses that are involved in discursive practices.

Foucault, however, seems to have some commonalities with Antonio Gramsci, who defines hegemony as the 'willful consent to be ruled' and doesn't examine power-relationship in it in terms of domination. People belonging to certain discourses, according Gramsci, may have that consent' to be ruled whereas the superior discourse (not metadiscourse) may try to rule with the help of the truth it establishes. Foucault also agrees that discursive practices result from the differences in discourses, which are intricately woven with power that helps a discourse be a governing and an ordering medium in society. Finding an intersection between Gramsci and Foucault would be easy with reference to Raman Selden who says, "The discursive Practices

have no universal validity but are historically dominant ways of controlling and preserving social relations of exploitations (106)".

In this way, moving away from the idea of discourse as a system of language to define it as thought. Foucault challenges the formalistic trend of seeing subject as the source of knowledge: the human mind receives impressions of the objects and puts them into 'transparent' words. Foucault sees discourse as the product of 'archive' of the material conditions. He sees discourse as inseparable from power because every discourse according to him, becomes the ordering medium of the institution it belongs to. Although discourse is neither true nor false, it attempts to represent the 'real' and forms limits and constraints for its subjects. It does so with the help of certain dichotomies related to normality or abnormality. For example, the discourses define madness, criminality, and sexual abnormality and so on in relation to sanity, justice and sexual normality. And "such discursive formations massively determine and constrain the forms of knowledge" (Selden 106). All human subjects, therefore, are positioned by discourses or knowledge of different fields and of themselves. So, to view discourse, as a pure form of knowledge would be a flawed approach, for no discourse could escape from the network in which power politics governs all other components. To talk about the development of any discipline (e.g. science) for the advantage of the human subject, therefore is nothing but an illusion for a subject who but is always imprinted and conditioned by the discursive practices of his society.

III: The Political Reconstruction of Human Relationship in Dickens' Oliver

Twist

Power of politics and subjection in the workhouse

Industrial revolution brought a great political and economic change in the early Victorian England. Before industrialization in England, the rural feudals held the political power of the country. There was the human relationship between feudals and farmers. British people were accustomed to strong feeling of brotherhood, sense of responsibility and honesty among themselves. But after industrialization the political reconstruction came in England. The middle class emerged to power. They invested money to factory. They became industrialists. They economically became prosperous. There came the human relationship between industrialists and working class people.

Due to the reform act of 1830 they got the right to vote. With the industrial revolution the middle class advanced not only financially but also full political power. The parliament itself was quickly conquered; and all kinds of previously recognized human relationship the feudal, patriarchal and the idyllic were put to end.

The middle class were prosperous whereas the working class were miserable. The poor, orphans, the sick, the old and the unemployed were in miserable condition. Because of the riots of the working class, the government made the laws of 1834 as a relief. It was criticized by the newspapers, humanitarians. Charles Dickens made confrontation by literary text, *Oliver Twist* in 1837. Despite the attack, the poor law of 1834 remained in force.

In *Oliver Twist* Dickens focuses on the social ills of the 19th century. He makes confrontation the workhouse system. Workhouses were made for the poor people as a relief but in the name of giving charity people in power try to represent

inhumanity by creating the truth. This idea is close to Foucault's radical thesis that highlights "the essential link between power relations and their capacity to produce the truths we live by (Mc Houli and Grace 58). A relief for the poor in the workhouse is the projection of power in the domain of the discursive practice for Dickens.

The novel opens with the workhouse scene. A child who was later named as Oliver Twist was born from an unidentified and unmarried woman who died as soon as the child was delivered. He was raised in the workhouse for 10 years. He was born in the workhouse and was named Oliver Twist by Mr. Bumble, the master of the workhouse. After 9 months of his birth he was transferred to the branches of workhouse where there Mrs. Mann was the superintendent of the workhouse. The workhouse where Oliver Twist was sent was Dickens writes:

Where twenty or thirty other juvenile offenders against the poor laws rolled about the floor all day without the inconvenience of too much food or too much clothing under the parental superintendence of an elderly female who received the culprits at and for the consideration of seven pence half penny per small head per week. (27)

In general charitable institutions only reproduced the awful conditions in which the poor would live anyway. As Dickens put it, the poor choose between "being starved by a gradual process in the house or by a quick one out of it. Dickens is concerned with the poor people. His story demonstrates the hypocrisy of the petty middle class bureaucrats who treats a small child cruelly while voicing their belief in the Christian virtue of giving charity to the less fortunate. The workhouses were not really for a relief for the poor but they were the way of oppressive others by creating humanity and inhumanity dichotomy.

Besides questioning the basic relationship between historical actuality and fiction, Charles Dickens confront this dichotomy to arrive an idea of what he considers the human assistance to the poor people. In fact Mrs. Mann and Mr. Bumble, the officials of the workhouse, were cruel and inhumane. They exercise power in others in the workhouse in the name of giving charity. As regards this Dickens writes:

Seven pence half penny's worth per week is a good round diet for a child; a great deal may be got for seven pence half penny, quite penny to overload its stomach and make it uncomfortable. The elderly female was a woman of wisdom and experience; she knew what was food for children and she had a very accurate perception of what was food for herself. So she appropriated the greater parts of the weekly stipend to her own use and consigned the rising parochial generation to even shorter allowance than was originally provided for them. (27)

Mrs. Mann took major parts of stipend that meant for children for her own use. The poor were being starved to death. But she, in the name of giving charity exercise her power for material wealth. Oliver Twist and other poor were treated badly in the workhouse. Oliver Twist spent 9 years in the Mrs. Mann's workhouse. He was later transferred to the workhouse where he was born first. Mr. Bumble, the workhouse master, voiced the moral virtue of giving charity to the poor. But he did not fulfill his responsibility. He behaved without compassion towards the paupers under his care. There is the result of disparities between appearance and reality in character sketch. When Oliver Twist asked for more gruel MR. Bumble decided to send him as an apprentice in a five pound. Luckily, he was saved from being an apprentice. He was sent to Mr. Sowerberry house. From there he ran away to London and Oliver's power

of knowledge understand the powerful person when Mr. Bumble wear hat and coat with cane. Dickens writes: "As Mr. Bumble spoke, he raised his cane to the bill above him, and gave three distinct raps upon the words "Five pounds" which were printed there on in Roman capitals of gigantic size (49)."

Workhouse is the projection of power in the domain of the discursive practice for Dickens. Dickens, with his power of knowledge, comments the workhouse system. He writes:

The members of this board were very sage, deep, philosophical men, and when they came to turn their attention to the workhouse, they found out at once, what ordinary folks would never have discovered the poor people like it! It was a regular place of public entertainment for the poor classes; a tavern where there was nothing to pay a public breakfast, dinner, tea and supper all the year round, a brick a mortar, Elysium, where it way all play and no work. (34)

Foucault says that every epoch of human society is governed by diverse discourse each of which corresponds to a particular area of human knowledge. Because human knowledge encompassed various fields a society has many discourses. Foucault's more radical theses is that such discourses contradict each other and as a result there is no harmony and oneness in the society. This is because in a discourse lies a kind of power which produces the effects and is itself produced out of the network of representation and truth. Power, for Foucault is all pervasive and resides in every domain of society. Dickens circulates his power in the discourse of the society. There come contradiction at each other. While involving in the discourse power is exercised.

Dickens is the advocate of the poor and oppressed people. He voiced from the side of the marginalized people. The poor people were the marginalized people in

England. They were deprived of the government achievement. For new historicism the voice of marginalized people takes as a promotion where as traditional historians neglect it.

In *Oliver Twist*, the voice of asking for more is the collective voice of the marginalized poor orphan children. Through the figure of Oliver Twist, an orphan, Dickens demonstrate the voice of marginalized children. He writes:

'Please, Sir I want some more'.

The master was a fat, healthy man; but he turned very pale. He gazed in stupefied astonishment on the small rebel for some seconds and then clung for support to the copper. The assistants were paralyzed with wonders, the boys with fear

"What!" said the master at length in a faint voice.

"Please, Sir," replied Oliver, "I want some more." (36)

Oliver's asking for more has become a fictional myth. It presents the eternal problem of the right of the weak against the strong. It has never come perfection it has always beginnings. Arnold Kettle says, when Oliver asks for more, "issues are stake which make the world of Jane Austen tremble." "We care, we are involved not because it is Oliver and we are close to Oliver, but because every starved orphan in the world and indeed everyone who is poor and oppressed and hungry is involved and the master of the workhouses is not anyone in particular but every agent of an oppressive system everywhere (117). "

Oliver's asking for more is the power struggle against the oppressor not to overthrow it but to have rights to food and existence. The relation between the strong and the weak is the power relations. It never comes perfection. As regards this Arnold Kettle writes:

What we do remember is that vision of the underworld of the first eleven chapters, the horrors of Fagin, the fate of Mr. Bumble, the trial of the Artful Dodger, the murder of Nancy, the end of Sikes. What engages our sympathy is not Oliver's feeling for the mother he never saw, but his struggle against his oppressors of which the famous gruel scene is indeed a central and adequate symbol. (177)

For new historicist, text is the interpretation of history. The text and historical situation are equally important for the interplay of discourse. The history is the matter of interpretation not facts where as traditional historians say that history is linear, objective and fact.

Oliver Twist is the fictional 19th century culture Dickens history does not more in a linear fashion. For him it has multiple beginnings and descants. Power of Dickens' knowledge confronts the workhouse system where *Oliver Twist* survived for 9-10 years. In the name of giving Charity, the officials of the workhouse exercise power in the poor. This is Dickens' confrontation to the superficial tendency of officials to giving charity. And such tendency Dickens says, is on the soul nothing but an exercise of power that sublimates the creativity and potentiality of an individual by making him tread on what the 'society' thinks is the right path. His idea power also incorporates the subjection of an individual and his resistance that easily corresponds. In *Oliver Twist*, in the workhouse, politics of power is delivered in the name of giving charity.

Discourse on Criminality and Justice

How criminality appears in the 19th century Victorian industrial society? Charles Dickens put criminality into discourse. While putting into discourse he uses power. For Dickens criminality is born in the industrial society by the poor laws of the

state that banned the poor for begging. It is the construct of the society that compels Oliver Twist to join the criminality although he does not like it from his conscience.

In the 19th century Victorian England, due to the industrialization, there arose economic disparities between the middle class and the working class. The middle class came to power politically and economically whereas the working class people lived in a state of terrible poverty. It is the power projection of upper and middle class people upon the poor that made the poor ban for begging. It was not possible to survive from begging so the poor were compelled to join the criminal world whereas the work house also meant a slow starved to death.

Oliver Twist, a poor and orphan person, runs away from the power and oppression of the workhouse comes to London city. Oliver's trip to London parallels the migration of the poor to the Urban centers of England during the industrial revolution. His hungry, exhausted condition is a result of the laws forbidding begging and it leaves him vulnerable enough to accept the questionable charity of band of thieves. Dickens clearly blames the crimes committed by the poor on the people who passed the draconian poor laws. In order to survive Oliver Twist accepts the aid of Fagin's band. Oliver's stay with Fagin's band represents the first truly domestic experience in his life. Paupers have to choose between the harsh condition of the workhouses and the harsh conditions of the streets. Because begging is a punishable offence those who stay outside the workhouse are often forced to turn to crime in order to survive. The poor are thus reduced to a public existence as criminal's corpses, and "idle, lazy paupers living on state charity. The state chooses to recognize their existence only when they commit crimes, die or enter the workhouses.

In urban areas, because of the poverty, Fagin, Bill Sikes, Nancy, Charley Bates and Artful Dodger became criminals for existence. The poor who could not earn

enough for living became thieves. We can see many scenes of poverty in Fagin's den. The author describes his poor residence in this way, "Oliver's grouping his way with one hand and having the other firmly grasped by this companion ascended with much difficulty the dark and broken stairs" (87). Here in these lines the author is describing the passage and stairs to the room of Fagin. The house is dirty and dark so that Oliver can not walk easily. It is a dark cell. This is symbolic to the dark aspects of life of Fagin and also the dark aspects of the Victorian civilization. The author takes the food and the residence of Fagin as other examples of his poverty. He writes thus: "The walls and ceiling of the room were perfectly black with age and dirt. There was a deal table before the fire, upon which were a candle, stuck in a ginger, beer bottle and a place" (87). Thus Fagin has been living a poor life. He lives in an old and dirty house. There is no good furniture and there is neither electric light nor a good lamp but a candle stuck in ginger beer bottle. The food he has prepared is just a loaf and with butter and no more. In this respect, the famous critic fielding writes: "It is fundamentally optimistic in arguing that crime is caused by circumstance. We know that even Fagin's corruption is caused by man" (21). Here if we examine the pieces of text and the comment of Fielding, we see that every incident of the Victorian society is equally responsible to make Fagin a thief. Nancy, a female pauper, joins the criminal group of Fagin in order to survive. She struggles to live in the streets of the London city being a prostitute. Dickens' description of her manner as "remarkably free and agreeable," combined with her position as a young, unmarried female pauper, strongly implies that she is prostitute, a profession for which Dickens' Victorian readers would have felt little sympathy. In his preface to the 1841 edition of the novel, Dickens confirms this implication, writing that "the boys are pickpockets and the girl

is a prostitute. Nancy's prostitution is the counter culture against the Victorian moralistic society.

Fagin gives Oliver training to pick up pockets for some days. Then, one day he sends Oliver with Dodger and Charlie Bates to steal goods. When Dodger picks up a pocket Oliver remains seeing it: "He plunge his hand into the old gentleman's pocket and draw what was Oliver's horror and alarm as he stood few paces off, looking on from thence a handkerchief! To see him and the to Charlie Bates and finally to behold them, both, running away round the corner at full speed! (60)".

When Dodger picks up a pocket-handkerchief from the pocket of an old gentleman, who is very busy in reading before a bookstall. When Dodger and Charlie Bates run off picking the pocket, Oliver can't decide what to do and what not to. Then he also runs off and ht police capture him. Thus, the society changes an innocent child into a thief.

The Victorian society suffered from thieves and pickpockets. They had strong disgust for thieves. When these pickpockets ran away after stealing the handkerchief all the people whoever heard the word "Thief", ran after them leaving their shops and stalls, for example:

Stop thief! Stop thief! There is magic in the sound. The tradesman leaves his counter, and the car man his wagon; the butcher throws down his tray; the baker his basket; the milkman his pail, the errand-boy his parcels; the schoolboy his marbles; the paviour his pick axe; the child his battledore. Away the run, pell-mell, helter-skelter, splash-dash: tearing, yelling, screaming, knocking down the passengers as they turn the corners, rousing up the dogs, and astonishing the fowls: and streets squares, and courts, re-echo with the sound. (60-61)

In this scene, we see that, all the people whoever hear the word 'Thief', run off leaving their works and the stations. It shows that the thieves must have troubled people so much. It is, in fact, a hazardous result of the so-called industrial revolution of England.

Dickens is also a humanitarian novelist. His works always give voice for humanity. He tries to plead mainly for social reformation. After the publication of the two immediately succeeding novels *Nicholas Nickleby* and *Old Curiosity Shop*, Dickens becomes a sort of professor in humanitarianism and the publication of *Oliver Twist* makes him more humanitarian.

Moreover, whether we study his *The Old Curiosity Shop*, *Dombey and Son*, *David Copperfield*, *Bleak House*, *Hard Times*, *A Tale of Two Cities*, *Great Expectations*, or *Oliver Twist*, he seems pleading for upbringing the poor by reforming the society and humanizing the human beings. For, this he takes the events from his society as it is. Therefore, he often seems not having much bothered about the unity of plot and character but certainly having clear and definite ideas. In his novels, he presents many characters young and adult, male and female, and rich and poor. In the same way, he goes on writing until he is able to put his ideas clear before the readers. Accordingly, there are many characters in *Oliver Twist* also. It is indeed a very long novel containing fifty-four chapters. Though the story is very long and deals with many chapters, yet there is a flow of his opinion from the beginning to the end of the novel.

Dickens has depicted both minor and major criminal activities in *Oliver Twist*. The boys' pick pocketing Mr. Bronlow and Bill Sikes and his gangs' attempt house breaking are two obvious criminal activities that directly affect the central character *Oliver Twist*. However, the criminal theme reaches its climax in Bill Sikes' murdering

Nancy. Oliver' domestic relationship with Fagin and his gang contributes to the novel's argument that the environment in which one is raised is a greater determining factor on one's character than biological nature. The need for companionship, Dickens suggests drive people to accept whichever community accepts them in return. Oliver reacts with shock horror at the idea of stealing and robbery. It is the result of goodness and morality.

Oliver Twist explores different varieties of justice that served by the English court system; spiritual or godly justice and with site's crime personal justice or the torment of conscience. Justice for Sikes's foulest and most cruel" of crimes is served almost instantly by the horrific mental torture. He can not escape from Nancy's blood. It is the psychological punishment to sikes. Finally he kills himself. Fagin hangs in gallows. Bumble is disgraced and monk dies in prison. In *Oliver Twist* all the evil characters are punished appropriate and Oliver Twist, Brownlow, Mrs mailie, good character live a happy life.

Dickens had seen many executions with his own eyes and experienced the feeling of horror and pity aroused by such cruel actions. In Dickens' time death penalty was carried out in public. Dicken's power of understanding detested such spectacles and through his works campaigned for abolition of death penalty itself at first and than for at least removing the scaffold from the public view. He never believed that the spectacle of such brutality could have any positive impact on mankind and at the same time he disproved the contemporary general belief that such terrible spectacle of capital punishment could help not to reduce the criminal activities. Dickens, through the discourse, confronts the death penalty given by the state. He joined the other abolitionists against it and wrote a series of four long letters

to the daily news advocating the entire abolition of death penalty. He has described the negative impact of it eloquently with deep psychological insight.

Dickens depicts Fagin as an object of pity mingled with disgust; however, the crowd gathered in his final trial is entirely unsympathetic, hollow and indifferent to the seriousness of the situation "some of the people were eating and some fanning themselves with handkerchiefs ..." (Dickens 469). On the final day a huge mass of people gather to witness the execution carried out. Dickens describes the hideous crowd contemptuously. A great multitude of people had already assembled; the windows were filled with people, smoking and playing cards to beguile the time; the crowd were pushing, quarreling, joking" (Dickens 476) Dickens hates the crowd and the scaffold- "One dark cluster of objects in the centre of all – the black stage, the crossbeam the rope and all the hidings apparatus of death." (Dickens 476)

Fagin stays in the confinement. During his confinement his discourse goes ups and downs. His conscience tortures himself. Dickens exploration of the psychological state of Fagin during the last few days shows this deep psychological insight. Fagin is fully deranged and is half conscious. His fear of approaching death is nerve racking and emotionally appeals for sympathy:

It was not until the night of this last awful day that a withering sense of his helpless desperate state come in its full intensity upon his lighted soul; not that he had ever held any defined or positive hope of mercy, but that he had never been able to consider more than the dim probability of dying soon. He had sat there, awake but dreaming. Now he started up every minute and with gasping mouth and burning skin hurried to and fro in such a paroxysm of fear and wrath that even they

used to such sights – recoiled from him with horror. He grew so terrible, at last in all the tortures of his evil conscience. (Dickens 472)

Here Dickens shows the psychological insight upon Fagin.

Discourse on Power

Dickens examines the different kinds of power and its projection of dominance in 19th century Victorian society. Dickens, with the treatment of governmental institutions on *Oliver Twist* sheds light on how Victorian government can exercise its power on poor and innocent people. When *Oliver Twist* is brought to Fang in charge of pick pocketing Mr. Brownlow, Fang the police magistrate, circulates his power and suppresses *Oliver Twist*. His power projection makes *Oliver* guilty though *Oliver's* conscience is innocent and pure. Dickens, with the police magistrate's behaviour on *Oliver Twist*, sheds light on how a judicial institution of the government can exercise its power on poor and innocent like *Oliver Twist* and also on how an individual is subjected to certain norms and values after he is deprived of freedom of thought, speech action and justice.

For new historicists literary text is the interpretation of history. Here Dickens puts the Victorian history into discursive formation. Dickens confronts the magistracy system and shows that it is not trustworthy. Instead of maintaining peace and providing security to the society; giving justice to the innocent and proper punishment to the guilty the agents of government as Fang hegemonies over the innocent and the poor. For Dickens it is the dominant power over the poor. Fang's utter negligence and harshness even to the minor offenders seem disgusting. *Oliver Twist* is entirely innocent. But Fang, the police magistrate, exercised his power and made him guilty and declared to be punished for three months with hard labour. This is the result of disparity between appearance and reality. If the case was not followed by an honest

witness he would have suffered the imprisonment. Dickens thus exposing the incompetence of judicial system points the urgent need to bring reformation. Dicken's *Oliver Twist* focuses on fact with fiction. He wants them to be exposed and brought to the public's knowledge Mr. Browlow is a middle class virtuous man rescue of Oliver Twist. His idea of power understands that Oliver Twist is innocent. He makes confrontation towards the case of Oliver Twist. The bookseller who is the real witness in pick pocketing tells Mr. Fang that other two are the thieves not Oliver Twist. The man said:

I saw three boys, two others and the prisoner here, loitering on the opposite side of the way when this gentleman was reading. The robbery was committed by another boy. I saw it alone, and I saw that this boy was perfectly amazed and stupefied by it." Having by this recovered a little breath, the worthy book. Stall keeper proceeded to relate, in a more coherent manner, the exact circumstances of the robbery. (Dickens 108)

The witness of bookseller could be possible to release Oliver Twist. Dickens uses Oliver Twist's situation to criticize the institutions toward the poor in 1830 England.

Oliver's inability to speak at his trial, caused by his exhaustion and sickness, metaphorically suggests the lower class lack of political power and ability to voice its own concern in a public forum. In 1830's England, the right to vote was based on wealth, so the poor had no say with respect to the law. Upper classes project their own conception of the poor upon them to the points of blithely redefining poor people's identities with no regard for the truth. Oliver even can not say his name due to exhaustion and terror so a court officer gives him the false name of "Tom white". By the name "Oliver Twist" is in fact no more authentic, as Mr. Bumble invents this

name when Oliver is born. Oliver's identity has been determined by other more powerful people throughout his life. This is the hegemony over the poor Oliver Twist. Dickens put Victorian society into the interpretation discourse is made with power so that there is not oneness in society.

After release Oliver Twist lives in Brownlow's house. He feels there as if he lived in another world full of happiness and good care. His idea of power experiences the three different worlds. For him, the world of workhouse and the criminal directed towards the power and oppression but the world of Brownlow's house, for him becomes to save individuals norms and values. He has left behind the poverty and ugliness, the brutality and violence, power and oppression of the workhouse and the criminal world. It was the power and oppression of the government that created criminal world because the government banned the poor for begging. In order to survive the poor involved in the crime. In order to survive, Oliver Twist accepts the aid of Fagin band.

In the criminal world, there are different kinds of power. The power of the government is that criminals are punished bitterly after arresting. So criminals are terrified by the government. Among the criminals Fagin is superior to others. He exercises his power on others. Fagin's power of knowledge keeps all the members of the groups into his command. Bill sikes confronts him. Fagin and Bill Sikes are in the power struggles whereas Charley Bates, Artful Dodger and Nancy accept Fagin. They are in power relation at each other.

In the pick pocketing event Artful Dodger and Charley Bates return without Oliver Twist. In the fear of disclosing the matter by Oliver Twist and government's power and oppression Fagin exercised his power to send them in search of Oliver Twist. Nancy's visiting to the prison in search of Oliver Twist wearing the middle

class dress shows that the middle class were powerful at the Victorian society which stands for high culture whereas working class people stands for low culture.

Oliver Twist's staying at Brownlow's house wearing new middle class dress is in contrast to his staying at Fagin's den. He experiences both high culture and low. It is the power that Fagin and Bill Sikes circulate Oliver Twist. He is compelled to take part in pick pocketing and burglary although his will to power does not like it. In the burglary Bill Sikes threatens Oliver not to make any hesitation. For Dickens criminal world is created by the country's circumstance he confronts the government, law and workhouse system. Dickens tries to defend the poor for being criminal from the character of Oliver Twist. Oliver's idea of power tries to save from that work and run away. Oliver Twist says, "Oh! For God's sake let me go!" cried Oliver; "Let me run away and die in the fields./ I will never come near London; never, never! Oh! pray have mercy on me and do not make me steal. For the love of the bright Angels the rest in Heaven, have mercy upon me!" (Dickens 205)

Power and oppression was projected on Oliver Twist to involve the burglary.

London apprentices and wages labourers directed at the symbolic institutions of power and oppression. The world of workhouse and world of the crime directed at power and oppression upon Oliver Twist. The workhouse master, Mr. Bumble circulated power on Oliver Twist, other poor in the workhouse. He reported the gentleman in a white coat when Oliver Twist asked for more food. The man in white coat says that he will be hung. It is the dominant power of the strong upon weak.

Economic Disparities in Oliver Twist

Oliver Twist brings forth the acute misery of the town poor people. Industrial Revolution had driven thousands of people to destitution. People were starving and dying from hunger, cold and sickness caused especially from various contagious

diseases. The middle class people were advanced economically and politically. The government was liberal to middle class people. The economic power of the middle class people became so harsh that it towered over all human values, the sense of humanity brotherhood and duty. All human relationships were concentrated into money relations and wealth became the only object everyone desired to obtain. There was economic disparity between capitalists and workers. The social and economic life of the whole nation underwent a great change. Pauperism fell as a curse on the life of English people.

Dickens shows deep and genuine sympathy with the misery of the lower class people. Though he is not able to put forth any proper solution to the situation he displays the touching picture of the crisis in the life of urban poor people. It is not only painful but equally faithful to reality. Rising sympathy on the wretched plight of working class, he points the need of immediate reformation. In *Oliver Twist* he has pictured unspeakable misery of a family crushed into starvation.

New historicists support the poor into literary discussion. It is the interpretation of poverty which was seen in 1830s England for Charles Dickens.

Being apprenticed to a parochial undertaker Mr. Sowerberry, Oliver visits a bereaved family with his master. On their way to the house, they pass through the most crowded part of the town inhabited by the poorest class of people. The following description shows how complete and utterly degrading poverty could be in Victorian England.

The houses on either side were high and large, but very old, and tenanted by people of the poorest class: as their neglected appearance would have sufficiently denoted, without the concurrent testimony

afforded by the squalid cooks of the few men and women who, with folded arms and bodies half doubled, occasionally skulked along. . . . some houses which had become insecure from age and decay, were prevented from falling into the streets by huge beams of wood reared against the walls and the firmly planted in the road; but even these crazy dens seemed to have been selected as the nightly haunts of some houseless wretches, . . . the kennel was stagnant and filthy, the very rats, which here and there lay putrefying its rottenness were hideous and famine. (38)

With the placement of Dickens in the Victorian literary scene, we can see mainly two themes, in his novels. Firstly his novels shed light on the current political, and social issues of the Victorian society. Secondly, he presents the wretched condition of the poor in society. In this novel '*Oliver Twist*' Dickens confronts the way realities are constructed by the historical bases, and examines the Victorian institutions in the society with its pretended intention to give the poor charity, justices, peace and security on the surface they pretend to provide charity and justice but in the soul there lives the power hungry among the upper class people.

Dicken's text dominant trope in 19th century discourse about the relation between texts and readers

It is the author Dickens who is swayed by his own text and this nicely illustrates a dominant trope in nineteenth century discourse about the relation between texts and readers. *Oliver Twist*, a novel in which all the underworld characters (Fagin, Sikes and Nancy as well as Oliver himself) unexpectedly demonstrate some ability at reading. In the library of Oliver's kindly bourgeois rescuer Mr. Brownlow there are substantial collection of books promising that you shall read them if you behave well.

Mr. Brownlow collects books and reads. He also sends Oliver's a book to return to the book sellers. It is a cultural education that makes the relation between texts and readers. Oliver Twist becomes the reader when Fagin gives Oliver a book. Fagin aims directly instill into Oliver's soul "the poison which he hoped would black it and change its forever. His plan is to entrap Oliver into a criminal lifestyle under the guidance of the evil genius of the clever old Jew; an attempt is made to prepare Oliver for a life of crime and sin. The Jew intelligently employs all kinds' methods to trap him. He recommends for Oliver a course of imitation advising him to make 'models' of Charley Bates and Artful Dodger. Fagin also considers him a suitable object of study. He spends a night in telling stories of the criminal exploits of his own childhood, which are mixed up with so much that was droll and curious that Oliver could not help laughing heartily and showing that he was amused in spite of all his better feelings. Fagin gives Oliver a book to read.

It was a history of the lives of and trials of great criminals, and the pages were soiled and thumbed with use. Here he read a dreadful crimes that made the blood run cold, of secret murders that had been committed by the lonely wayside; of bodies hidden from the eye of man in depicts and wells; which would not keep them down, deep as they were , but had yielded them up at last, after many years and so maddened the murders with the sight that in their horror they had confessed their built and yelled for the gibbet to end their agony.

(Dickens 188)

There is certainly an echo of Foucault's "song of crime" here as Oliver imagines a form of direct criminal address. Oliver reacts with horror and prayers to the criminal

biographies he is forced to read and remains of preference of the life represented by the law – abiding Mr. Brownlow and his substantial library.

IV: Conclusion

Dicken's *Oliver Twist* is a lively portrait of the 19th century Victorian England. He has successfully presented the vivid picture of the Victorian society and social phenomena. For the new historicists literary text is the interpretation of history. Charles Dickens brings the Victorian society into the discursive formation. He has made confrontation towards the social abuses of Victorian harsh institution. For the new historicists the rationalization of society is myth. It is interpreted differently. *Oliver Twist* is a socio – historical document presented in artistic form.

Due to the industrial revolution political reconstruction came in the 19th century Victorian England by putting all the earlier human relationship, feudals, partriarchal to end. The middle class came to power politically and economically. The upper and middle class people became prosperous where as the poor working class people lived in a terrible poverty. There was the economic disparity brought by the industrial revolution. Though there were practices of reforms, the hegemony of the institution suppressed the poor.

Dickens was a great critic of social abuses, he was a great reformist. Dickens made confrontation towards the court, governmental institutions, and workhouse system. The institutions in the Victorian society were directed towards power and oppression. The work house institutions which voiced for the charity to the poor suppressed all the poor and innocent.

The upper and middle class people projected the power to dominate the poor by creating different truths. The poverty was the main problem of the Victorian society. Middle class people were rich and prosperous whereas that working class people were in wretched condition. Charles Dickens attacked social ills and voiced for the poor and oppressed people. The new historicists support the marginalized people

whereas other old historians neglect. The poor, the exploited and the criminals who are the marginalized people are taken into discussion in *Oliver Twist* by Charles Dickens. The construct of the society brought criminality, unemployment, population growth and prostitution in the Victorian society. The poor people were hegemonized by the middle class and banned them for begging. There were alternatives that either to stay in the harsh condition of the workhouses or stay in the harsh condition of the street so criminality grew as the construct of the society. The wages labourer and apprentices directed towards the institutions of the power and oppression. Charles Dickens discloses the bitter reality of the court.

Charles Dickens is a humanist. His sympathy towards the appalling situation of the poor working class people is the sympathy of the humanist. Dickens, who as a humanist neither explores the real internal causes of the socio economic crisis in the life of his poor working class characters nor does puts forward any permanent solution to them. Instead of heightening power struggle and leading the society toward revolution Dickens makes only confrontation towards the corrupt institution, system of exploitation and social injustice. He highlights the marginalized people, the poor, the exploited and the criminals. He knows the economic of the Victorian society. He never encourages the poor working class people to struggle against the oppressors. *Oliver Twist* asking for more gruel struggle for the existence. He hates the unequal distribution of wealth. He does not search for the means to solve problems. He only exposes and confronts the abuses of the contemporary social and political life and Lamerts for the pre-industrialized society of brotherhood, love and harmony *Oliver Twist* contains Dickens liberal anxiety and his desire for past complacency. He Lamerts over the loss of spiritual value. There was a strong force striving supported the efforts of reformers to rectify social phenomenon and as well as the operation of

government. By 1800, there was a severe punishment even for minor crimes. In this regard Hary Kaste says that in 1800 there were the hundred crimes, many of them obviously minor were punishable by death (7). Such capital punishment was too cheap in England. Therefore, Dickens, in the novel makes the issues of the same harsh rule when the gentleman in whitecoat says that the boy will be hung when Mr. Bumble reported that Oliver's asking for more food. Gradually the harsh rule of death punishment was checked by 1837 of fifteen crimes was punishable by execution. In 1833 there came the beginning of regulation over the employment of children in factories. The hours of labour and working condition for children and women were controlled. The poor laws of 1834 made all the able – bodied paupers reside in a workhouse. However, the system was sharply censured and the increased prevalence of crime has been attributed to it. Dickens made the poor law of 1834 a remarkable target of denunciation in his *Oliver Twist*.

In *Oliver Twist* among many destitute only Oliver and Rose are benefited from domestic charity and personal benevolence. All the other characters, workhouse children and other paupers continually suffer or become criminals. Moreover these two characters on whom Dickens lavish goodness and charity donot actually belong to working class. Rose is already adopted by Mrs. Maylie Oliver suffers during his childhood mainly because of his identity being kept secretly for the sake of obtaining his property. The other working class characters who belong to it by birth rarely possess any goodness. Noah claypole, Toby Crackit, Artful Dodger are some of such characters who are fully degraded by vice. Fundamental goodness in *Oliver Twist* clearly seems to have been contributed by his gentle birth. For Dickens, goodness becomes an inherited character which remains sparkling despite being engulfed by all pervasive evil power.

Thus, *Oliver Twist* presents the picture of the feature of 1830 English society. Charles Dickens bitterly attacks the defects of existing institution: government, the law, education, penal system and mercilessly exposes the injustice and wretchedness inflicted by them.

Work Cited

- Adams, Hazard, ed. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Forthworth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992.
- Allen, Walter. "The Early Victorians." *The English Novel, A Short Critical History*. London: Penguin, 1958.
- Cecil, David. *Early Victorian Novelists*. Ludhiana: Kalyani Publisers, 1987.
- Chesterton, G.K. *Appreciation and Criticism of the Works of Charles Dickens*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1911.
- Churchill, R.C. "The Genius of Charles Dickens." *The New Pelican Guide to English Literature*. Vol. VI. Ed. Boris Ford, London: Penguin, 1982.
- Collin, Philip. *Dickens: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1986.
- Compton-Rickett, Arthur. *A History of English Literature*. New Delhi: Universal Book Stall, 1990.
- Daiches, David. *A Critical History of English Literature*. Vol. IV. New Delhi: Allied Publishers, 1979.
- Diaches, David. *A Critical History of English Literature*. Vol. IV. Delhi: Allied Publishers Ltd., 1991.
- Dickens, Charles. *Oliver Twist*. New Delhi: UBS Publishers' Distributors Ltd., 1995.
- Dickens, Charles. *Oliver Twist*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Faubion, James D., ed. *Power: Essential Works of Foucault*. Trans. Robert Hurley, et al. New York: The New York Press, 2000.
- Fielding, K.J. *Studying Charles Dickens*. England: York Press, 1986.
- Ford, Boris, ed. *From Dickens to Hardy*. London: Longman, 1982.

- Foucault, Michel. "Nietzsche, genealogy, history" *The Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rabinow. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984. 76-100.
- ... , George Canguilhem: Philosopher of Error. *Ideology and Councsciousness* n.p: n.p, 1980. 53-54.
- ... , Subject and Power. *Power: Essential Works of Foucault*. Trans. Robert Hurley, et al. Ed. James D. Faubion. New York: The New York Press, 2000. 326-348.
- ... , *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987.
- ... , *History of Sexuality*. Trans. Robert Hurley. Vol. 1. New York: Pantheon, 1978. 3 Vols. 1978-86.
- ... , *The Archeology of Knowledge*. Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- ... , *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Routledge, 1970.
- Garland, Robert. *For Oliver Twist*. England: Longman Group Limited, 1985.
- Grenblatt, Stephen J. Introduction. *The Forms of Power and the Power of Forms in the Renaissance*. Spec. issue of *Genre* 15.1-2 (1982): 3-6.
- ... , Invisible Bullets: Renaissance Authority and Its Subversion," Dollimore and Sinfield, *Political Shakespeare* 18-47.
- Gupto, Arun. "Foucault and his Analysis of History". *Healing Thoughts on Teacher Theory*. Kathmandu: New Hira Books Enterprises, 2004. 113-120.
- Guy, Williams. *Introduction to Oliver Twist*. Madras: Macmillan, 1983.
- Jefferson, Anna and David Robey. *Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction*. London: Batsford, 1987.
- Kaste, Harry. *Dickens' Oliver Twist*. New Delhi: Kalyani Publishers, 1991.

- Kettle, Arnold. *An Introduction to the English Novel*. Vol. 1. New Delhi: Universal Book Stall, 1991.
- Lowe, Norman. *Mastering Modern British History*, London: Longman, 1991.
- McHoul, Alec and Wendy Grace. *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject* New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- Miller, J. Hillis. Presidential Address 1986. The Triumph of Theory, the Resistance to Reading and the Question of the Material Base. *PMLA* 102 (1987): 281-91.
- Montrose, Louis. "Eliza, Queene of Shepheardes' and the Pastoral of Power." *English Literary Renaissance* 10 (1980): 153-82.
- ... , "Renaissance Literary Studies and the Subject of History." *English Literary Renaissance* 16 (1996): 5-12.
- Price, Martin, ed. *Dickens: A collection of Critical Essays*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall, 1980.
- Said, Edward, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. 3rd ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991.
- Selden, Raman. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. 2nd ed. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, n.d.
- Spanos, W.V. *The Appolonian Investment of Modern Humanist Education*. Cultural Critique. Vol. 1. n.p:n.p, 1986, 7-72.