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Abstracts

This thesis is an examination of the double motif used by Charles Dickens in *A Tale of Two Cities*, *Great Expectations*, and *Our Mutual Friend*. There is a subtle shift that takes place in these last completed works, from a double motif which is used to prescribe individual behaviour along the lines of domestic or Christian ideology, to one which examines the social and psychological consequences of the individual’s submission to such ideological imperatives. In fine, Dickens begins to distance himself from the stock, physical double he had inherited, turning instead to a double that finds its causes and ramifications firmly located in both the social and psychological spheres. This increasing complexity of the double motif is indicative of Dickens’ gradually more sophisticated, less stereotypical view of the relationship between the individual and society than that suggested by his famous caricatures or his previous works.

Cette thèse étudie le motif du double tel qu’utilisé par Charles Dickens dans ses trois dernières œuvres complétées, soit *A Tale of Two Cities*, *Great Expectations* et *Our Mutual Friend*. Ces œuvres laissent transparaître le changement subtil où le double, servant à prime abord à prescrire un comportement d’idéologie chrétienne ou domestique, tend ensuite à évaluer les conséquences d’une soumission à de tels comportements. Plus particulièrement, Dickens tente de s’éloigner du double standardisé et physique utilisé jusque là, pour se tourner plutôt vers un double qui prend source dans une sphère tant sociale que psychologique. Cette complexité croissante du motif du double laisse entrevoir, de la part de Dickens, une perspective plus sophistiquée, moins stéréotypique des relations entre l’individu et la société, en comparaison de ce que suggèrent les caricatures de ses œuvres précédentes.
Introduction

As evinced by the number and variety of doubles that inhabit his works, Charles Dickens was fascinated with the double as a literary motif. In *The Old Curiosity Shop* (published 1840-41), Little Nell’s grandfather is wholly possessed by a compulsive portion of his own psyche during his nocturnal gambling exploits. In *The Haunted Man and the Ghost’s Bargain* (1848), Redlaw is shadowed by his Evil Genius, his double incarnate. In *David Copperfield* (1849-50), David encounters doubles in the characters of Uriah Heep and James Steerforth, who enact his repressed desires. And in *Bleak House* (1853), Esther Summerson discovers a double in the person of Lady Dedlock, her estranged mother.

Nowhere is Dickens’ fascination with the double more apparent than in his final completed novels, *A Tale of Two Cities* (1859), *Great Expectations* (1860-61), and *Our Mutual Friend* (1865-65). A remarkable number of doubles make their appearance in these works. In *A Tale of Two Cities*, we find many instances of doubling, including Sydney Carton and Charles Darnay, Lucie Manette and Madame Defarge, and Miss Pross and Jarvis Lorry. In *Great Expectations*, Pip is surrounded by doubles in the persons of Orlick, Herbert, Drummle, and Estella; as well, key characters, such as Magwitch and Miss Havisham or Jaggers and Wemmick, are compared through the mechanism of doubling. And in *Our Mutual Friend*, Bradley Headstone finds doubles in the persons of Eugene Wrayburn and Rogue Riderhood, Riah is obliged to assume another persona by his parsimonious employer, and John Harmon fabricates disguised doubles of himself in order to ascertain the true nature of other characters.
Dickens' particular interest in the double is not only manifested by the sheer number of times the motif appears in these latter works, but also by the variety of types of doubling. In *A Tale of Two Cities*, we find external doubles, or those not confined to one character's psyche; the most prominent instance of this type is the doubling between Sydney Carton and Charles Darnay. There are also cases of internal, or self-doubling, in the novel: Doctor Manette is a schizophrenic, sometimes regressing to his Bastille identity, "One Hundred and Five, North Tower" (73); Jarvis Lorry and Jerry Cruncher both present public sphere personas that are markedly different from their domestic, more genuine, selves. In *Great Expectations*, Orlick, Herbert, and Drummle function as "ontogenetic" (Gillman 446) doubles, whose actions represent alternatives, for Pip; through their actions, Pip experiences much vicariously, yet does not suffer the consequences of transgression (as does Orlick). Pip also has a double of projection, or a part of his psyche invested in another entity, in the person of Estella: in Jungian terms, she represents the anima, or female component of his unconscious, to Pip's animus. As well, those otherwise most disparate of characters, Magwitch and Miss Havisham, find themselves doubled by virtue of their similar victimizations at the hands of the confidence man, Compeyson; theirs is a doubling based on occult connections, for there is no explicit comparison made between them. In *Our Mutual Friend*, Bradley Headstone is locked in class conflict with Eugene Wrayburn for the love of Lizzie Hexam. This conflict invokes Rogue Riderhood, Headstone's lower class, external double, who literally and symbolically drags the would-be school master down to his lower class origins. Fascination Fledgeby's servant, Riah, is a case of internal doubling similar to
that found in Lorry, Cruncher, Jaggers, and Wemmick in the earlier novels. And finally, because of the thespian ease with which he assumes several distinct identities (including Julius Handford, John Rokesmith or Boffin’s ‘Secretary,’ and Rogue Riderhood’s ‘Captain’), John Harmon is rendered an instance of self-doubling similar to that of Charles Darnay-D’Aulnais-Evrémonde before him.

As implied by these similarities, Dickens’ use of the double in these final three completed works evinces a degree of working-through and experimenting with the motif. The primary aim of this thesis is to examine such similarities between the doubled characters that inhabit Dickens’ final works, and to draw some conclusions regarding Dickens’ goal in repeating and developing certain types of doubles. In doing so, we will see the Byronic hero type of *A Tale of Two Cities* (Sydney Carton) further developed and more realistically portrayed in *Our Mutual Friend* (in the character of Eugene Wrayburn); the dichotomy between the public and private selves, as seen in Jarvis Lorry and Jerry Cruncher, reiterated in Jaggers, and radically intensified in the two Wemmicks; shades of Orlick’s socially produced ferocity and rage (which seem to be exacerbated by his double, Pip) reiterated in Bradley Headstone; and Pip’s immersion in the Thames, producing a ‘new’ Pip who realizes Joe’s moral worth, repeated in Eugene Wrayburn’s symbolic baptism at the hands of Headstone, and his eventual rejection of the societal dictates that warn against marriage beneath one’s socioeconomic station.

This brief catalogue of Dickensian doubles begs the question of what, exactly, is meant by the term, ‘the double.’ While the generic term might well seem to be unambiguous, various critics suggest it has seen such frequent and diverse usage that it is
now equivocal. In “The Double as Incomplete Self: Toward a Definition of Doppelgänger,” Clifford Hallam comments, “the terms ‘Doppelgänger,’ ‘Double,’ ‘alter-ego,’ and so forth, without further clarification or restriction, are virtually meaningless as a critical tool” (18). In the Dictionary of Literary Themes and Motifs, Jeffrey Berman states, “the myriad of interchangeable names attests to its [the double’s] literary popularity and vagueness: double, Doppelgänger, secret self, second self, opposing self, alter ego, shadow, mirror image, split personality, dual personality, multiple personality” (963). And in “Concepts of the Double,” Albert Guerard explains:

The word double is embarrassingly vague, as used in literary criticism. It need not imply autoscopic hallucination [seeing oneself] or even close physical resemblance. . . . Characters who seem occultly connected in the author’s imagination (and such connection may take many forms) may also be referred to as doubles. A minor character may reenact a major character’s traumatic experience, if only because the author could not leave the trauma alone. A strong feeling of sympathetic identification may lead to a sense of doubleness, an immobilizing recognition of the self one might have been. (3)

Though they apply to the double in general, Guerard’s comments are particularly relevant to the double in Dickens’ later works, for the more significant instances often do not bear the standard indicators of doubleness, such as physical likeness, propinquity, similar names, same gender, and so forth.

In generic terms ‘the double’ refers to a link of parallelism or antithesis (or both)
between two or more not necessarily human entities (e.g., Gogol's *The Nose* and *The Overcoat* contain a personified nose and overcoat, respectively, each of which functions as a double for the protagonist). This link might be dual or multiple. It might occur by multiplication or division; if by multiplication, two or more distinct characters of the same physical, moral or psychological type participate in the doubling; if by division, one personality is fractured into component parts, each of which is represented by a distinct character. The double might be manifest or latent; if manifest (usually indicated by physical resemblance), characters who do not comprise the double are aware of it; if latent, knowledge of the double is restricted to the reader, the narrator, and possibly the doubled character. Thus far, we have restricted our delineation of the double to its external manifestations. It might also be manifested internally, within one entity. If so, the internal double, much like its external counterpart, might be comprised of dual or multiple personas. It might also occur by multiplication or division. Moreover, the internal double might be subjective or objective: in the case of the former, only the doubled character is aware of his condition; in the latter case, other distinct characters are aware of the doubling. Of course, there are exceptional instances of doubling to be considered. Dostoyevsky's *The Double* and Poe's "William Wilson" both contain doubles that are equivocal in nature: the reader is unable to identify them conclusively as subjective or objective, much less internal or external.

As to the characteristics and typology of the Dickensian double, we could do worse than observe that it is hardly less multiple than its generic counterpart. Perhaps the most thorough taxonomy of the Dickensian double to date is that devised by Steve Kahn.
in his dissertation. *A Psychoanalytic Study of the Theme of the Double in Some of the Works of Charles Dickens*. Kahn lists four types of doubles in Dickens: the autoscopic double, or the “manifest mirror image of the self” (21); the double of projection, or “the character who seems a discrete objectification of another character’s unconscious drives . . . [who] acts out the repressed wishes of the id . . .” (24); the decomposed double, which occurs when character traits “are given discrete individual existence . . . [thus creating] a constellation of doubles” (22); and the superego double, where “the imperious voice of the ego ideal and conscience is objectified as a double, through the mechanisms of decomposition and projection” (22). Applying Kahn’s typology to Dickensian doubles, we find Sydney Carton and Charles Darnay comprise an autoscopic double; James Steerforth functions as David Copperfield’s double of projection; Orlick, Herbert, and Drummle form a decomposed double in conjunction with Pip; and Mortimer Lightwood often acts as Eugene Wrayburn’s superego double. Curiously, even though he adopts a psychoanalytic approach, Kahn omits the internal doubling of multiple personality or schizophrenia, evident in the cases of Doctor Manette, and to a lesser extent in Wemmick and John Harmon. Moreover, Kahn’s psychoanalytic approach renders him blind to other, non-psychoanalytic types of doubling in Dickens. The motif often hinges on subtle parallels or antitheses between characters of different socioeconomic milieus, who never meet and have no physical, psychological or moral similarities. Magwitch and Miss Havisham comprise a double of this type. Notwithstanding these blind spots, Kahn’s taxonomy is a valuable starting point in any examination of the Dickensian double. It will be used here as a contributing basis for an examination of the motif in Dickens’ later
works.

Various theories have been posited regarding the necessary and sufficient socioeconomic and psychological conditions that foster the use of the double as a literary motif. Dickens' use of the motif is firmly located in nineteenth-century industrial England,\(^1\) with its succession of socioeconomic changes generated by the steam engine and a host of subsidiary technological innovations. Among these socioeconomic changes were the rapidly expanding division of labour, and the increase in the amount and value of private property, caused by profits being funnelled into the pockets of the capitalist who exploited the common labourer. According to Jeremy Hawthorn in *Multiple Personality and the Disintegration of Literary Character*, the conditions which reinforced this division also fostered the development of the phenomenon known as multiple personality. In order to maintain his sanity when faced with the ideological (if not physical) violence inflicted upon him, the appalling living and working conditions, and the daily rigours associated with mere subsistence, the average worker would acquire the ability to think of himself in the abstract, removed from the trials of quotidian life.

In order not to limit his argument to the working class, Hawthorn raises the

---

\(^1\) This is not to suggest that the double originated in the socioeconomic milieu of the Industrial Revolution in England. Its source, as discussed by Clifford Hallam in "The Double as Incomplete Self: Toward a Definition of Doppelgänger," is actually the German Romantic movement of the eighteenth century:

The German word [doppelgänger], which literally means "double-goer," was brought into the language and, simultaneously, into the literary tradition—as a term only—by the novelist Jean Paul (Richter), who in 1796 defined the word in a one sentence footnote: "So heissen Leute, die sich selbst sehen"—"So people who see themselves are called." (5)
distinctively middle class phenomenon of literacy. Because it promoted self-awareness through self-objectification and self-analysis, literacy enabled the middle class subject to conceptualize split or multiple personality; the conditions which foster multiple personality were thus created for the middle class. Hawthorn’s argument regarding multiple personality applies, pari passu, to the use of the double as a literary motif. That is, before one can conceptualize the double as a literary motif, the phenomenon of split or multiple personality must be part and parcel of social discourse and consciousness; it must be understood, if not experienced, by both the producer and consumer of the text.

Socioeconomic divisions caused by technological change were not the only impetus behind multiple personality and the use of the double as a literary motif. In The Double and the Other: Identity as Ideology in Post-Romantic Fiction, Paul Coates suggests the increased interaction with other races during this epoch contributed to the use of this motif: “The Double can be said to crystallise under the concurrence of two conditions: when other people begin to be viewed as akin to ourselves; and when the self is projected into a space hitherto defined as other” (32). Driven by heightened demands for raw resources, trading partners, and luxury goods, the expansion of British colonialism saw interaction with other races greatly increase. Despite instances of

1 The middle class, with its will to promulgate its increasingly dominant ideology and its need to make use of its growing leisure time, was largely responsible for putting literacy in vogue. As education gradually became available to, and even mandatory for, working class children, literacy would become a factor for the ‘masses’ as well: “as of 1841, two-thirds of English bridegrooms and half of English brides could sign their names rather than an X on the marriage register” (Arnstein 6). Innovations such as lending libraries and serial publication brought down the price of books, and effectively expanded the reading public.
extreme violence (e.g., the Sepoy Mutiny in 1857 and the Boer War, 1899-1902), this interaction promoted the decay of the borders that had previously segregated races. Borders which had ensured that the British self could never be remotely compared to the foreign other. Increased emigration further increased interaction with other races. Horrendous living and working conditions, scarce alimentary resources, and an explosion in population, all contributed to a massive exodus of British citizens to the colonies. These immigrants would continue to see themselves as English, Irish, Scottish or Welsh, even though their children would be born and raised in the colonies (this trend is still with us today). The possibility of perceiving oneself as both British self and colonial other was thereby established. We can perceive the roots of calling the signifiers ‘self’ and ‘other’ into question, revealing these distinctions to be arbitrary.

Given the socioeconomic conditions that fostered the use of the double as a literary motif, Dickens’ extensive use of it comes as little surprise. As Coates comments, “stories that deal explicitly with the Double seem in the main to be written by authors who are suspended between languages and cultures” (2). Coates’ comment can be applied to Dickens, because of the latter’s peculiar position between classes. Except for the famous stint in the blacking warehouse at Hungerford Stairs in 1823 (during which he certainly came into regular contact with members of the working class). his upbringing

---

3 In Britain Yesterday and Today: 1830 to the Present. Walter Arnstein gives the following figures: “the population of England, Wales, and Scotland in 1831 to be 16,161,183—more than twice what it had been seventy years earlier . . . By 1851 the population . . . had swelled to 20,816,351” (18). While these figures suggest a significant stress on the socioeconomic infrastructure, Arnstein posits the pronounced shift in population towards the urban centres as the real culprit in producing human misery.
was that of a lower middle class boy. He had a rudimentary education: aside from his
time at the blacking warehouse, he was not obliged to work in order to sustain himself;
and, for the most part he did not have to worry about getting enough to eat or having a
roof over his head. As is well known, his writing and publishing endeavours prompted a
meteoric rise on the social register during his adult life. In constant demand for public
speaking engagements, and hobnobbing with the rich, Dickens lived a life positioned well
above his boyhood on the social scale. No doubt, he had ample opportunity for observing
and living the life of the upper class, just as, during his time at the blacking warehouse. he
could have done the working class. He also, no doubt, discovered that a person was not
to be judged wholly according to the putative qualities of class. The use of the double
motif in his works evinces this fact, for Dickens often uses “contrasting ‘pairs’
[comprised of members of the same class] in order to disturb the incuriosity, the
blindness, of class judgement” (Lucas 15) that he had witnessed and was party to himself.

This “incuriosity” and willful “blindness” is the result of the ascendent middle
class ideology. One of the central concerns of Dickens’ works is the critique of this
ideology. 4 His focus is typically the confrontation between the individual subject and the

4

In A Preface to Dickens, Allan Grant comments, “For all his continuous popularity, there
was no more radical and often bitter critic of his own time. His spirit opposed the major
tendencies of both evangelical puritanism and utilitarian calculation which between them
colourised Victorian society” (x). Grant’s word choice is strategic, for Dickens was
indeed radically opposed to evangelism and utilitarianism. However, perhaps more than
any other author’s, Dickens’ work was hugely influential in reifying domestic and
Christian ideology. In this thesis I am espousing neither the liberal modernist stance on
the novel as a subversive genre, nor the New Historian position on the genre as entirely
subsumed and informed by culture. Rather, I am attempting to adhere to a via media,
acknowledging both the novel’s (and, pari passu, Dickens’ works) subversive and
prevailing ideology, with its monologic dictates. This ideology is manifested in his works in the form of corrupt, anachronistic institutions (the Court of Chancery in *Bleak House* and the Marshalsea prison in *Little Dorrit*), classist attitudes (the equating of poverty with criminality, as seen in *Oliver Twist* and *Great Expectations*), and education (seen in its most utilitarian form in *Hard Times*). These manifestations are what Louis Althusser labels “ideological state apparatuses” (239). Collectively, they seek out and extirpate transgressive conduct on the part of the individual; in so doing, they inculcate the individual in accordance with the dictates of the prevailing ideology, so that the “concrete subject” (Althusser 245) or model, conformist citizen is produced. Ideology is strictly egalitarian in its incessant interpolation of the individual. All men, regardless of their position within the power structure, are irresistibly reduced to mere instruments in its service. Perhaps better than any other author of his day, Dickens understood this process. He was also cognizant of the fact that the double functions as a particularly apt literary motif for revealing the ideology which plays such a ubiquitous role in the formation of the individual. The double afforded him the opportunity to compare and contrast physically, morally, or psychologically similar or antithetical characters from different conformist elements.

In his essay, “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses,” Althusser introduces this term in order to designate those manifestations of state power and repression that are more subtle than the police, the military or the judiciary system. Ideological state apparatuses include religion, education, the ‘ideal’ family unit, the judiciary and political systems, the media, and so forth. Through these and other instruments of power, the state is able influence the behaviour of its citizens in order to promote and perpetuate its own interests.
professions, classes, genders, and races, in order to highlight subtle differences in individual psyche and development. The effects of the prevailing ideology’s state apparatuses, its subtle ways and means of interpolating the individual, were thus brought into relief. David Copperfield’s doubling with Uriah Heep and James Steerforth is an example of doubling that functions to reveal ideology: David is the middle class ‘norm.’ against which the lower class Heep and the upper class Steerforth are contrasted. Even though both the naive and the narrating David turn a blind eye to the obvious oppression of the humble Heep and the moral crimes committed by the charismatic Steerforth, these injustices are too manifest for the reader to gloss over in a similar manner. The effect of this disjunction is to underline the middle class’s will to upper class freedom, a longing inculcated in David by the severe oppression he experienced at the hands of Murdstone and later Creakle.

Given the socioeconomic causes and implications that play such an important role in the use of the double, it is surprising to find that the majority of studies of the motif employ a psychoanalytic methodology. Otto Rank’s *The Double: A Psychoanalytic Study*, Robert Rogers’ *A Psychoanalytic Study of the Double in Literature*, C.F. Keppler’s *The Literature of the Second Self*, and Karl Miller’s *Doubles: Studies in Literary History*, are some of the works that do so. If the suggestion that the socioeconomic and ideological conditions of nineteenth-century England fostered the use of the double is accurate, if the double is not merely a product of individual psychology projected into the
social domain (but is produced by a symbiotic relationship between the two domains\textsuperscript{6}), and if we believe Dickens subscribed to these notions, we cannot limit ourselves to a psychoanalytic methodology when examining the causes and implications of the motif.

It is the secondary aim of this thesis, then, to demonstrate the importance of the prevailing socioeconomic conditions to the use of the double motif in general, and thus the interdependence of the social and the psychological domains in Dickens’ use of the double, specifically. In order to do so, a Marxist approach will be adopted alongside the psychoanalytic methodology used in the majority of studies of the double. As it is used here, the term “Marxist” refers to an awareness of the social discourse, tensions, and conflicts that produce the divided subject, and thus the conditions in which the double motif might flourish. Implicit in this ‘awareness’ is Georg Lukács’s theory of reality being reflected in the novel: “the novel . . . revealed or ought to reveal underlying patterns in the social order and provide a sense of the wholeness of existence with all its inherent contradictions, tensions, and conflicts” (Cuddon 528). The term “psychoanalytic” is used here in its Freudian variant, with its inductive tendency to project the schisms and tensions among the id, ego, and superego into the realm of the social, a projection which engenders possibilities for the use of the double. Using such disparate, even antithetical, methodologies might well seem problematic: Marxist critical theory subscribes to the

\textsuperscript{6} In \textit{Multiple Personality and the Disintegration of Literary Character}, Jeremy Hawthorn comments: “[S]ocial tensions, divisions between individuals, become internalized and result in divisions within individuals. And these internalized conflicts can then, in their turn, be projected back into society by means of contradictory forms of behaviour” (135-36).
notion that the individual is always interpolated by his social milieu, becoming nothing more than the subject of the prevailing ideology; Freudian theory, on the other hand, posits the social milieu as a product and reflection of individual psychology. When examining Dickens’ use of the double motif, neither critical approach on its own adequately encompasses all the causes and implications of doubling, regardless of the specific type of doubling being examined. As will be demonstrated in this thesis, Dickens’ use of the double finds its causes and implications in both the social milieu and individual psychology; it is rarely, if ever, restricted to one domain or the other.
Discussion

*A Tale of Two Cities* is a novel replete with instances of doubling. Those instances are immediately suggested by the “two cities” noun phrase of the title: London and Paris function as a metonymic representation of the manifold similarities between the two nations, England and France. Several characters effectively double themselves by assuming multiple names and identities: the present “Marquis St Evrémonde” (268), an emigrant in France, is known as Charles Darnay, the French language tutor, in England (the latter name is derived from ‘D’Aulnais’, his mother’s maiden name); the French “Doctor of Beauvais” (218) is known as “One Hundred and Five, North Tower” (73) when incarcerated in the Bastille, “the shoemaker” (70) after a lengthy imprisonment, and Doctor Manette on the English side of the Channel; and John Barsad, one of the false witnesses against Charles Darnay, poses at various times as several different spies in the employ of the English government, the French monarchy, and the foundling Republic: he will finally be revealed to be Miss Pross’s estranged brother, Solomon. Two other characters double themselves by assuming different identities in the public and private spheres: Jeremy Cruncher, a courier for Tellson’s by day, becomes a “resurrection man” by night; and Mr. Lorry, the self-professed “man of business” while conducting the business of Tellson’s Bank, reveals himself to have strong sentimental feelings (especially for the Manettes) in the private sphere, which he cannot allow to conflict with his business acumen. There are even familial doubles: Charles’ wife and daughter are both named Lucie; his uncle and father are twins.

In order to develop and portray these doubles, Dickens takes a great deal of care in
evoking his setting and drawing a number of analogies, thereby establishing the necessary and sufficient conditions for the numerous doubles we will encounter in this novel. In the famous first chapter, "The Period," he deals simultaneously with significant spatial and temporal parallels: the spatial parallel is that between London and Paris; the temporal parallel, that between the late eighteenth century of the novel's setting and the mid-Victorian period of its publication. Dickens was pragmatic in situating his story as he did, as it allowed him to espouse subversive actions in the cause of social change, without disturbing the sentiments or complacency of his socially stable and economically secure, predominantly middle class readership. Even though he had taken care to distance potential violence from his readership, Dickens knew that the novel's didactic force depended on a certain degree of empathy between the reader and the characters in the novel. Such empathy could only be achieved through debunking the temporal and national differences established by the dominant middle class ideology. By convincing the reader that his late eighteenth-century predecessor was not so different from himself, nor for that matter, was the average French citizen. The dilemma--how to maintain the distancing effect necessary for sales while promoting the potentially subversive aims of the social problem novel--is resolved in the first chapter.

To commence the first chapter, the Dickensian narrator addresses the temporal gap between the events depicted in the novel and its publication by stating: "the period was so far like the present period, that some of its noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or for evil, in the superlative degree of comparison only" (35). By collapsing the differences between contemporary and late eighteenth-century England, not
to mention France, this narrator peremptorily denies any middle class claims of socioeconomic progress. The need for social change through personal evolution (the didactic moral of the novel) is thereby projected into the milieu of the contemporary reader, without threatening that reader with class violence.

A lengthier comparison is drawn between the England and France of the 1780s and '90s. The two countries are laden with an effete, parasitical aristocracy, embodied by the reigning monarchs, George III and Louis XVI. Both are overrun by a litany of petty and serious crimes, the punishments for which are marked by extreme violence. England has its highway robbers and prison riots; France has “such humane achievements as sentencing a youth to have his hands cut off, his tongue torn out with pincers, and his body burned alive, because he had not kneeled down in the rain to do honour to a dirty procession of monks which passed within his view, at a distance of some fifty or sixty yards” (36). Neither nation can accuse the other of having a monopoly on violence, be it institutionalized or otherwise; neither can claim moral superiority. Thus, we find the first chapter has effectively undercut any claims a middle-class readership could make to temporal or national differences. Yet there is still a comfortable distancing effect at work, allowing the mid-Victorian reader to empathize with many of the characters of the book, while remaining safe from the more socially subversive, threatening elements depicted.

---

7 When they read of these events, Dickens’ nineteenth-century readership surely recalled the ‘Peterloo’ massacre of 1819, where turnkeys fired their weapons at unarmed prisoners.
The paradigmatic comparison of England and France is sustained and expanded beyond the bounds of the first chapter. There are instances of close ties both in the public sphere (Tellson's is a bank that is both English and French) and the familial domain (Lucie is the progeny of an English mother and a French father). As seen in the confrontation between Miss Pross and Madame Defarge, similar levels of patriotic fervour are displayed by people on both sides of the channel. There is also a series of elaborate comparisons drawn between the two countries in the chapters depicting Darnay's trials (bk. 2, ch. 2-4; bk. 3, ch. 6, 9-11), the first in England and the latter two in France.

The selection of the judiciary process as the vehicle for drawing parallels between the two countries is astute, for the dominant ideology of a society is readily discernable in the social customs that inform and surround court proceedings. Before the English trial, we are treated to one of Dickens' famous ironic invectives against a corrupt anachronistic English institution:

... the Old Bailey was famous as a kind of deadly inn-yard, from which pale travellers set out continually, in carts and coaches, on a violent passage into the other world: traversing some two miles and a half of public street and road [cf. the journey to the guillotine in Paris], and shaming few good citizens, if any . . . . It was famous, too, for the pillory, a wise old institution, that inflicted a punishment of which no one could foresee the extent; also, for the whipping-post, another dear old institution, very humanising and softening to behold in action; also, for extensive
transactions in blood-money, another fragment of ancestral wisdom, systematically leading to the most frightful mercenary crimes that could be committed under Heaven. (90-91)

Like the Court of Chancery in *Bleak House* or the Marshalsea prison of *Little Dorrit*, the old Bailey is an institution, an Althusserian ideological state apparatus, that simultaneously evinces the predominant ideology as it irresistibly interpellates individuals, coercing them to become subject to its informing, ubiquitous ideology.

English society, here, is no better than its French counterpart, in its practice of making a public spectacle of human misery. Paradoxically, the informing ideologies of both societies commit covert acts of oppression against the very spectators of such horrific deeds: by following the crowd and succumbing to the curiosity, the ghoulish delight in viewing human suffering, each person relinquishes his or her claim to individuality, becoming nothing more than a component of the mob.

The mob mentality manifested in these court scenes is yet another telling comparison between the two nations. In giving us the mob's supposed motivation, Dickens evokes the issue of patriotism, and the various misdeeds committed by people of both nationalities under its rubric. It appears that patriotism is the motivating factor for the participants and witnesses of both the French and English trials: John Barsad and Roger Cly have denounced Charles supposedly *pro patria*, just as citizens of the fledgling Republic denounce many of their former leaders, and are drawn to witness the trial of the already convicted and vivisected 'traitor.' It quickly becomes apparent, though, that feelings of patriotism have little to do with the proceedings in either country. Through
cross-examination, Barsad and Cly are revealed to have pecuniary motives: rather than paying him the money they owe, they would have Damay executed. Madame Defarge, that paradigm of Revolutionary fury, is supposedly seeking justice against the French aristocracy for the litany of wrongs committed against her millions of wretched fellow citizens; her will to justice, however, is actually a drive for revenge against the aristocracy as a whole, and the Evrémonde brothers specifically, for the rape and murders committed against her family members. Even though self-centred, the motives of these characters are noble in comparison to those of their fellow citizens, who are motivated simply by the ‘pleasure’ of witnessing scenes of human misery, especially that which is experienced in extenso. At the English trial Jerry enquires what case is being heard; his interlocutor gleefully elaborates the punishment: “[H]e’ll be drawn on a hurdle to be half hanged, and then he’ll be taken down and sliced before his own face, and then his inside will be taken out and burnt while he looks on, and then his head will be chopped off, and then he’ll be cut into quarters” (91). The narrator precludes any hypocritical suggestion that such public displays are used as a hortatory device by observing the entertainment value they had for most people: “the people then paid to see the play at the Old Bailey, just as they paid to see the play in Bedlam” (91). Later, he comments on the very people who pay to witness such scenes, and their true motivation for doing so:
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In Britain Yesterday and Today: 1830 to the Present. Walter Arnstein comments: “use of the pillory and public flogging of civilians had ended in the 1820s, and the flogging of soldiers in peacetime was formally abolished in 1868. During that same year the last public hanging took place at Tyburn. Thus ended one of the traditional, if dubious, sources of public amusement and edification” (88).
The sort of interest with which this man [viz. Charles Darnay] was stared and breathed at, was not a sort that elevated humanity. Had he stood in peril of a less horrible sentence—had there been a chance of any one of its savage details being spared—by just so much would he have lost in his fascination. The form that was to be doomed to be so shamefully mangled, was the sight; the immortal creature that was to be so butchered and torn asunder, yielded the sensation. Whatever gloss the various spectators put upon the interest, according to their several arts and powers of self-deceit, the interest was, at the root of it, Ogreish. . . . The accused . . . [was] being mentally, hanged, beheaded, and quartered, by everybody there. (93)

As we discover, these comments apply not only to the English, but to the French as well. For their part, the French participants in Charles’ first trial in that country have similarly homicidal proclivities. After his acquittal, “tears were shed as freely as blood at another time . . . the very same people, carried by another current, would have rushed at him with the very same intensity, to rend him to pieces and strew him over the streets” (314). It appears, then, that the violence introduced in chapter one, that seemed there to be limited to criminals and the justice systems, infects the whole of society in both nations. The two nations, thus the two cities of the title, are not only similar in terms of providing the setting for the novel, they are also alike in terms of corruption, moral decay, and tremendously destructive violence.

In the London-Paris analogy we see Dickens make use of a controlling motif in
order to establish a series of parallels. These parallels are not doubles, *per se*; yet they do foster the conditions favourable to doubling, giving the reader mechanical indicators (in the form of explicit comparisons and contrasts) of doubling. We have delineated the use of this motif at some length because, as we shall see, the use of a controlling motif to establish the conditions for doubling is a strategy Dickens employs frequently. Another such controlling motif in *A Tale of Two Cities* is the conflict between Eros, or the life drive, and Thanatos, or the death drive.9 This motif acts as an organizing mechanism for various entities and characters, grouping some on the side of Eros and others on the side of Thanatos, producing binary oppositions in the process.

The novel commences with two of the leading avatars of Thanatos, or the death drive: “the woodman, Fate” (36), who will cut timber in the woods of France and Norway in order to slowly assemble the guillotines used in the Revolution, and “the Farmer. Death” (36), who will provide the carts that will transport condemned prisoners from the place of incarceration to the place of execution. In their drive to mass destruction, these

9

In *Civilization and its Discontents*, Freud defines the binary opposition between Eros and Thanatos:

... besides the instinct to preserve living substance and to join it into ever larger units, there must exist another, contrary instinct seeking to dissolve those units and to bring them back to their primaeval, inorganic state. That is to say, as well as Eros there was an instinct of death [Thanatos]... a portion of the instinct is diverted towards the external world and comes to light as an instinct of aggressiveness and destructiveness. In this way the instinct itself could be pressed into the service of Eros, in that the organism was destroying some other thing, whether animate or inanimate, instead of destroying its own self. Conversely, any restriction of this aggressiveness directed outwards would be bound to increase the self destruction, which is in any case proceeding. (55-56)
mythic figures are joined by the women of Saint Antoine (Madame Defarge and the "Vengeance," in particular), slowly but surely knitting the fate of their victims in much the same manner as their classical precursors\(^\text{10}\); the Revolutionary mob, which kills or venerates, according to its whim, and then dances the Carmagnole in celebration; and that lone figure of terror, the guillotine, whose shadow casts an ominous shadow over the lives of all the inhabitants of the novel.

Against these votaries of death is ranged a similar gallery of figures representing Eros. Lucie Manette’s influence and positive energy is often construed metaphorically as a type of weaving used to promote and enhance life, thus as antithetical to the knitting of condemnation and death performed by Madame Defarge, the Vengeance, and the women of Saint Antoine. In her father’s case, “She was the golden thread that united him to a Past beyond his misery, and to a Present beyond his misery” (110). She is no less influential with her husband and daughter, “ever busily winding the golden thread that bound them all together, weaving the service of her happy influence through the tissue of all their lives, making it predominate nowhere” (240). Doctor Manette, with his Hippocratic oath, his attempts to save the young victims of the Evrémonde brothers so many years ago, and his philanthropy towards prisoners of the Republic, is also

\(^{10}\) The similarity between the women of Saint Antoine and the classical Fates is striking: Portrayed in art or poetry as stern old women or as sombre maidens, the goddesses were always thought of as weavers. Clotho, the Spinner, spun the thread of life; Lachesis, the Dispenser of Lots, decided its span and assigned to each person his or her destiny; and Atropos, the Inexorable, carried the dreaded shears that cut the thread of life at the proper time. The decisions of the Fates could not be altered, even by the gods. (cited from “Fates,” Microsoft Encarta ’95—see works cited)
unequivocally identified with Eros. We see Manette, in his defence of Charles against the trumped-up charges of the Revolutionary court, as the champion of Eros and the individual, confronting the rampant destructiveness of the mob. There is even a man amongst the ranks of the Eros forces who is capable of raising the dead. When we first encounter Jarvis Lorry, he is dreaming of conversations with a ‘dead’ person. “on his way to dig some one [Doctor Manette] out of a grave” (46). Lorry’s phenomenal powers are suggested by the enigmatic message, “RECALLED TO LIFE” (41). which Jerry Cruncher must return to Tellson’s; this suggestion is confirmed when he succeeds, with Lucie’s help, in facilitating Doctor Manette’s re-entry into the world from his Bastille grave. In this role, Lorry stands in opposition to the Evrémonde brothers who first had the Doctor incarcerated.

Although it forms some interesting thematic and symbolic parallels, serving to establish favourable conditions for the double motif, the Eros-Thanatos conflict serves as a somewhat mechanical means of indicating the moral standing of various characters, but says little about the socioeconomic and psychological state of those characters. A more traditional type of doubling that focuses more upon these issues is that which is generically termed the split self. This type of doubling occurs in two circumstances: when a character is obliged to assume radically different, even antithetical, traits in the public sphere, as opposed to those normally possessed in private; or when the character experiences a severe trauma. There is an instance of doubling caused by the public-private dichotomy in the first chapter: “the highwayman in the dark was a City tradesman in the light, and, being recognized and challenged by his fellow-tradesman whom he
stopped in his character of ‘the Captain,’ gallantly shot him through the head and rode away” (36). We see a similar split in the personality of Jerry Cruncher, a courier for Tellson’s by day, and “Resurrection-man” (193) or exhumer of freshly interred bodies by night. This “honest tradesman” (183) has a split personality for reasons similar to those of the highwayman: both liminal figures lead a double life out of economic necessity: both assume another identity because their second calling is socially unacceptable, even outlawed. The flouting of societal taboos take its toll on the individual, both in social and psychological terms: once he is discovered, or even suspected, of having perpetrated some illicit act, the individual is promptly anathematized, marginalized, and thus rendered unable to earn a living (as we see in Magwitch’s case. if the individual is not already de facto a criminal, he will now be obliged to become one). Fortunately for him, Jerry will reject his nocturnal calling when he witnesses the mass destruction of human life wreaked by the Revolutionary mob.

Jarvis Lorry is another instance of a split self rendered necessary by the public-private dichotomy. His is a split caused by an internal conflict between his reason and his emotions: Lorry’s business acumen, his constant efforts to maintain a good standing with his employer, often conflicts with his personal feelings, especially where the Manettes are concerned. Sometimes, as when Doctor Manette reverts to his “One Hundred and Five, North Tower” persona, Lorry’s feelings predominate, and he puts aside his duties at Tellson’s; at other times, as when Lucie and Doctor Manette appear at Tellson’s in Paris pursuing Charles, his feelings are ruthlessly suppressed in favour of his business acumen and loyalty to his employer:
One of the first considerations which arose in the business mind of Mr Lorry when business hour came round, was this:—that he had no right to imperil Tellson’s by sheltering the wife of an emigrant prisoner under the Bank roof. His own possessions, safety, life, he would have hazarded for Lucie and her child, without a moment’s demur: but the great trust he held was not his own, and as to that business charge he was a strict man of business. (293)

Lorry is not just a man of better feelings masquerading as a man of business. He is genuinely torn between two great loyalties—that which he feels for the Manettes, his long-time friends, and that which he possesses for Tellson’s, his life-long employer. Although he maintains less strict a dichotomy than Wemmick of Great Expectations, Lorry manages to keep distinct his business or public life and loyalties from his private ones.

Remarkably, he also manages to maintain his own psychological integrity while doing so.

Doctor Manette does not fare as well. When we first meet him isolated in a miserable garret kept by Ernest Defarge, he is known as “the shoemaker” (70) because of his habit of whiling away the time in prison making young women’s shoes. Elspeth Buitenhus suggests Manette’s act of making shoes is a means of dealing with the trauma of solitary incarceration and the loss of his wife: “the sexual associations of shoes are well-known . . . . the compulsive need to keep making young ladies’ walking shoes most certainly suggests some kind of compensation for the sudden separation from his [Manette’s] wife, especially when he tells us that the mould for these shoes is imprinted on his own hand” (27). Ironically, Manette’s pathetic attempt to deal with his trauma will only result in another loss—his own extra-Bastille identity.
some connection with the outside world and his young wife, in particular) has been lost for Manette, at least consciously. Manette also has little or no conscious knowledge of his own real world identity as "the Doctor of Beauvais" (218). Lucie's melodramatic entrance into her father's prison existence is the catalyst to recall him to his life outside and before prison. Her physical appearance, particularly her likeness to his young wife, serves to 'resurrect' a series of recollections in the prisoner's benumbed mind. Amongst these recollections, Manette speaks of the mind-body splitting that enabled him to cope with a Bastille prisoner's hopeless and utterly inane existence:

He took her [Lucie's] hair into his hand again, and looked closely at it. 'It is the same. How can it be! When was it! How was it!' . . . 'She had laid her head on my shoulder, that night when I was summoned out--she had a fear of my going, though I had none--and when I was brought to the North Tower they found these upon my sleeve. "You will leave them? They can never help me to escape in the body, though they may in the spirit."' (75)

Manette has so successfully performed this mind-body split, that, when discovered in the depths of the Bastille, he is a mere shoe-making automaton. In psychoanalytic terms, Manette has become a schizophrenic, with one of his personalities seemingly lost: the eminent Doctor of Beauvais is subsumed beneath the pathetic shoe maker. The former personality predominates before and after incarceration in the Bastille; the latter gains ascendancy in order to cope with the psychological stress of solitary confinement while in prison. During the course of the novel, Manette does not
have control over which predominates, as poignantly illustrated in the “Nine Days” chapter (bk. 2, ch. 18). The disassociation between these two personalities is demarcated by a transition period that Manette is unable to recollect:

My mind is a blank, for some time--I cannot even say what time--when I employed myself, in my captivity, in making shoes, to the time when I found myself living in London with my dear daughter here. She had become familiar to me, when a gracious God restored my faculties; but I am quite unable even to say how she had become familiar. I have no remembrance of the process. (103)

Manette’s deposition is notable for its passive voice: phrases such as “I found myself,” “she had become familiar to me,” and “God restored my faculties” serve to reinforce his inability to control which personality predominates at any given time. His Bastille personality has acted, in the absence of his other, pre- and post-Bastille self, to restore Manette to life, liberty, and psychological well-being. Once the former has achieved its goal--self-annihilation--the Doctor of Beauvais personality assumes its ascendancy and promptly forgets the painstaking, arduous process of recovery.

Unfortunately for the Doctor, his shoe-making personality is not so easily suppressed; it resumes its domination shortly after his daughter’s marriage to Charles Darnay, the man the Doctor learns is the son and nephew of the aristocratic brothers responsible for his lengthy incarceration. After nine days at his shoe-making bench, plying this pathetic occupation, and with little or no response to various stimuli, the Doctor suddenly reappears. Lorry and Pross are understandably at their wits’ end, and
seek an advisor. Paradoxically, Lorry will seek the medical opinion of the only qualified advisor available—the Doctor himself:

I am a mere man of business, and unfit to cope with such intricate and difficult matters. I do not possess the kind of information necessary; I do not possess the kind of intelligence; I want guiding. There is no man in this world on whom I could so rely for right guidance, as on you. Tell me, how does this relapse come about? Is there danger of another? Could a repetition of it be prevented? How should a repetition of it be treated? How does it come about at all? What can I do for my friend? No man can ever have been more desirous in his heart to serve a friend, than I am to serve mine... (230)

Lorry’s easily discerned pretense of seeking advise for a ‘friend’ is his only recourse, given the circumstances. The Doctor quickly grasps the fact that his advice is sought regarding a matter intimately concerning himself, or more correctly, his other self. The pretension is gradually dropped during the course of their consultation, until, in what is a rare scene of psychological complexity in this novel, the Doctor is left explaining the thoughts of this close ‘friend’:

... it is very hard to explain, consistently, the innermost workings of this poor man’s mind. He once yearned so frightfully for that occupation, and it was so welcome when it came; no doubt it relieved his pain so much. by substituting the perplexity of the fingers for the perplexity of the brain, and by substituting, as he became more practised, the ingenuity of the hands.
for the ingenuity of the mental torture: that he has never been able to bear the thought of putting it quite out of his reach. Even now, when I believe he is more hopeful of himself than he has ever been, and even speaks of himself [italics mine] with a kind of confidence, the idea that he might need that old employment, and not find it, gives him a sudden sense of terror, like that which one may fancy strikes to the heart of a lost child.

(234)

In this third-person narrative of himself, Manette gives us a privileged glimpse of the split personality objectifying, observing, and analysing its other self: the Doctor personality is acting in its objective, clinical capacity as the analyser; his shoe-making counterpart, revealing its innermost apprehensions and fears, acts the part of analysand. The only problem, from a Freudian psychological perspective, is the solution to the Doctor’s neurosis. Supposedly, Lorry’s and Pross’s surreptitious removal of the shoe-making apparatus, the physical manifestation of the Doctor’s neurosis, will remove the means, and therefore the will, to repetition-compulsion. The Doctor’s nervous breakdown in response to Charles’ conviction and death sentence at the hands of the revolutionary ‘justice’ system is evidence enough to demonstrate the inadequacy of this solution.

Nevertheless, the Doctor’s case of split personality is more psychologically developed than the case of either Lorry or Cruncher. That is not to say that the Doctor’s case is exclusively psychological. We must not lose sight of the fact that the Doctor’s neurosis is ultimately attributable to the social domain (specifically, the incarceration that causes his split personality is an attempt to maintain upper class hegemony on the part of
the Evrémonde brothers), just as the split personalities of Lorry and Cruncher are also attributable to the social domain, specifically the public-private dichotomy. Examining these doubles as a group, we see that Dickens is working through possibilities in order to create a double that is fully integrated in both the psychological and social domains.

The Sydney Carton-Charles Darnay double approaches this ideal. Whereas Doctor Manette is a manifestation of two personalities within one body, Sydney Carton and Charles Darnay (the Marquis St Evrémonde) share one personality between them: in Freudian terms, Carton represents the libidinal id, Darnay the selfless superego. Steve Kahn refers to this type of double as the double of “projection,” where one “character who seems a discrete objectification of another character’s unconscious drives . . . acts out the repressed wishes of the id . . .” (24). Limiting ourselves to an exclusively psychological explication of the Carton-Darnay double would be reductive. Their external doubling, like the internal doubles of Jerry Cruncher, Jarvis Lorry, and Doctor Manette, has social causes and ramifications just as it does psychological. Taking a page from Freud’s *Totem and Taboo*, Elspeth Buitenhus states in her dissertation, *Fractions of a Man: Doubles in Victorian Fiction*:

What we have, then, in the Carton/Darnay double is Dickens’ extended metaphor for the emergence of Victorian man. He must define and then reject that side of himself which threatens to dissipate for personal gratification the energies that should be directed towards the benefit of society as a whole. (20)

The Carton-Darnay double functions along two registers. Psychologically, the two
distinct characters represent facets of one hypothetical psyche. Socially, this double
represents the trajectory of the individual who is gradually and successfully inured in the
domestic ideology of the Victorian middle class (with its dictate of subordinating
individual drives to the needs of the family and larger community as a whole).

Despite his aristocratic genealogy, Darnay is already inured in that ideology. The
testimony given by Lucie and her father at his trial amply evinces that the “well-grown
and well-looking” (92), “self-possessed” (93), Darnay is sympathetic and philanthropic to
a fault. He represents the individual subject who subordinates his own desires, goals,
even well being, to society: because he refuses to contribute to and perpetuate the
oppression of the surrounding villagers, he abandons his ancestral estate and adopts a
properly middle class work ethic, making a living in London “with great perseverance
and untiring industry” (160); before wooing Lucie, he shows his “self-denial” (163) by
approaching Doctor Manette in order to ascertain if she is already engaged, and to avoid
an awkward, embarrassed refusal on her part; upon receiving the plea for help from his
family’s loyal servant, Gabelle, he immediately departs for France with the idealistic, if
naive, notion of saving the hapless servant from the bloodthirsty mob.

For his part, “the careless and slovenly, if not debauched” (104) Carton is the
paradigm of self-indulgence. As suggested by the amount of alcohol he imbibes with
little or no effect during the late night legal strategy sessions with Stryver, his nocturnal
debauchery is habitual. This debauchery is eclipsed only by his licentiousness. As
Elspeth Buitenhus suggests, Carton’s comment, “that’s a fair young lady [referring to
Lucie] to hand to a coach in the dark” (114), is nothing short of lewd.
These two morally antithetical characters comprise what is generally referred to as an ‘autoscopic’ double, where an uncanny physical resemblance is due to providence rather than propinquity. The possibility of doubling between Carton and Darnay is first evoked at the latter’s English trial, where they are described by Jerry Cruncher as “so like each other in feature, so unlike each other in manner--standing side by side, both reflected in the glass above them” (108). As when Pip mistakes Herbert Pocket’s face through a window as an image of himself, this mirror-image is suggestive of doubling. Later, Carton comments on Darnay at his trial: “I thought he was a rather handsome fellow, and I thought I should have been much the same sort of fellow, if I had had any luck” (118). This statement not only underlines the doubleness of the Carton-Darnay relationship, it also emphasizes an essential feature of that relationship: the doubling between the two is “one of opposites which are essentially the same” (Morgentaler 261). Jerry’s observation is particularly insightful: for what is so striking about these two men standing side-by-side, is not their physical resemblance, but the incongruity of that resemblance when accompanied by such dissimilar mannerisms (as is typical in Dickens, mannerisms are indicative of moral conduct).

The antithetical twinship of the Carton-Darnay relationship is nowhere made more manifest than in the subtle nuances of their neuroses. As we have witnessed, Charles is selfless to a fault. It is only when the letter from Gabelle arrives, however, that we begin to see what affects and motivates this mysterious man. At this point in the tale, Charles is at Tellson’s attempting to convince Mr. Lorry not to go to Paris for fear of personal harm. During the course of their conversation, Charles makes the curious remark. “I wish I were
going myself” (265). Without questioning him on why he wishes to go, Lorry immediately takes his junior to task for such hypocrisy (telling Lorry not to go, while wishing he was going himself), alluding to his wife and daughter as responsibilities that should keep him in London. Despite Lorry’s objection, it becomes increasingly evident that Charles is experiencing no small degree of malaise: the narrator notes that there is “a latent uneasiness in his mind, which had already made Charles Darnay restless, and which still kept him so” (267); as he opens the fateful letter, he is “very ill at ease with himself” (270). This letter, with its pleading “for the love of Heaven, of justice, of generosity, of the honour of your noble name” (270), appeals to Charles’ sense of honour, integrity, loyalty, and noblesse oblige. It also serves to awaken his highly developed sense of guilt:

The latent uneasiness in Darnay’s mind was roused to vigorous life by this letter. The peril of an old servant and a good one, whose only crime was fidelity to himself and his family, stared him so reproachfully in the face . . . .

He knew very well . . . he had acted imperfectly. He knew very well, that in his love for Lucie, his renunciation of his social place, though by no means new to his own mind, had been hurried and incomplete. He knew that he ought to have systematically worked it out and supervised it, and that he had meant to do it, and that it had never been done. (271)

Here, we see Charles racked by guilt at the very thought of self-indulgence. In “Charles Darnay and Revolutionary Identity,” Edwin Eigner suggests that the real source of Darnay’s guilt is his inability to fulfill his mother’s last wish, “to have mercy and to
redress” (154) the wrongs perpetrated by his uncle and father. Specifically, Charles was to seek to redress his progenitors’ infamous conduct towards a certain peasant girl and her family, which left only one sister (Madame Defarge) living, and the Doctor of Beauvais living death in life, permanently incarcerated in the Bastille. In order to expiate the egregious conduct of the Evrémonde brothers, Charles was to have bestowed his mother’s jewels on this surviving peasant girl. Charles is unconsciously aware that even this gesture, were it to be performed, would fall well short of true expiation (as witnessed by his uncle’s earlier paltry payment for the peasant boy killed by his speeding carriage in bk. 1, ch. 7); it would only devalue the lives of the peasant girl’s family, by commodifying their existence as so many ounces of gold, diamonds, jewels, and so forth. Furthermore, it would do nothing to redress the wrong suffered by the Doctor of Beauvais. Charles’ sense of guilt is inextricably intertwined with his feelings towards his nefarious uncle. This man has usurped Charles’ birthright by appropriating the title of Marquis upon his brother’s (Charles’ father’s) death. During the time of the tale, he continues to besmirch the family name with such deeds as brazenly running down peasant children as if they were dogs or livestock, and, in true Machiavellian fashion, seeking une lettre de cachée in order to incarcerate permanently the only visible threat to his life and estates—his nephew (bk. 2; ch. 7). The conversation we witness between these two (bk 1; ch. 9) sheds more light on the source of Charles’ highly developed sense of guilt. This guilt is evinced by a several Freudian slips on Charles’ part. First, he enquires. “Can I separate my father’s twin-brother, joint inheritor, and next successor, from himself?” (154): in doing so, he reveals that inheritance, and that which his uncle has appropriated
from him, is not far from his uppermost thoughts. Charles then proceeds to renounce the family estate, which has not yet devolved to him. After which, he suggests that it might do so “to-morrow” (155), knowing full-well that his uncle’s death is a precondition.

These slips express Charles’ longing for the death of his uncle, a man whom he equates with his father, in order that he, Saint Charles, might restore the family name and redress past wrongdoings. In other words, Charles’ will to justice involves a sine qua non—parricide. In oedipal terms, he has truly lived up to his name. Evrémonde (a corruption of the French tout le monde, ‘everyone’): he has unconsciously wished for, and obtained, the demise of his father and uncle; he has transferred the guilt of these progenitors onto himself; and he now finds himself powerless to expiate that guilt.

Sydney Carton has his variant of neurosis as well. At first, he seems only too bored with everything and everyone around him: his manner is “careless” and “insolent” (108); his life is that of a wastrel gentleman, subjected to a perpetual, self-inimical cycle of nocturnal dissipation and subsequent convalescence. Given his flippant manner and brilliant stratagems in the courtroom, we are led to assume that Carton is a case of frustrated or bored genius. We gradually find, however, that his ennui is not merely the product of boredom (if it were, he would be Eugene Wrayburn in another tale): he displays a good deal of self-loathing as well. During a meal taken after Darnay’s English trial, the inebriated Carton confides to his double that he has grown weary of “this terrestrial scheme”; he says, “the greatest desire I have. is to forget that I belong to it” (114). Surveying himself in a mirror shortly after the meal, he asks.

Do you particularly like the man? . . . why should you particularly
like a man who resembles you? There is nothing in you to like; you know that. Ah, confound you! What a change you have made in yourself! A good reason for taking to a man, that he shows you what you have fallen away from, and what you might have been! Change places with him, and would you have been looked at by those blue eyes [Lucie`s] as he was?

Come on, and have it out in plain words! You hate the fellow. (116)

These are the words of a person racked by frustrated desire and unfulfilled, but tremendous, ambition. Carton`s profound self-loathing is, here, readily transferred to Darnay because he reminds him of what he could have been. had he not wasted his time drinking and carousing, had he directed his efforts more to his own aid and advancement, rather than living off the scraps tossed to him from Stryver`s practice: as suggested by the chapter title, “The Jackal” (bk. 2, ch. 5) Carton plays the Jackal to Stryver`s Lion.

As with his double of better deportment, Carton`s hamartia seems to be his perverse, self-inimical penchant for helping others before, or instead of, helping himself: in school he often did exercises for other boys, to the neglect of his own; in practising law, he dissipates his own brilliant energy, determining strategy for the largely incompetent, self-important Stryver, thus squandering (presumably many) opportunities for taking on cases and making a name for himself. If any doubts linger in the mind of the reader as to Sydney`s potential moral worth, the narrator dispels them:

Waste forces within him, and a desert all around. this man stood still on his way across a silent terrace, and saw for a moment, lying in the wilderness before him, a mirage of honourable ambition, self-denial, and
perseverance. . . A moment, and it was gone. Climbing to a high chamber in a well of houses, he threw himself down in his clothes on a neglected bed, and its pillow was wet with wasted tears.

Sadly, sadly, the sun rose; it rose upon no sadder sight than the man of good abilities and good emotions, incapable of their directed exercise, incapable of his own help and his own happiness, sensible of the blight on him, and resigning himself to let it eat him away. (121-22)

The word “blight” in the final sentence is significant. Elspeth Buitenhus notes that this word appears in the conversation when Carton, “The Fellow of No Delicacy” (bk. 2: ch. 13), reveals his true feelings towards Lucie Manette. Commenting on any hypothetical relationship between her and himself, Carton says: it “would bring you to misery, bring you to sorrow and repentance, blight you, disgrace you, pull you down with him. I know very well that you can have no tenderness for me; I ask for none; I am thankful that it cannot be” (180). Carton’s foreclosure of any possibility of a relationship between them precludes any emotional response on Lucie’s part. Yet, it seems they both take for granted that that response, if given, would surely have been rejection. In short, his sense of wasted possibility, both his and Lucie’s awareness of some inhibiting condition, and their comprehension of the word “blight” as signifier for that condition, all indicate, as Buitenhus posits, that Carton has a sexually transmitted disease, probably syphilis. Little wonder he is glad to sacrifice himself for the man he wishes to be, and the woman he wishes could return his love.

This ‘selfless’ act of sacrifice contains the moral and social message of A Tale of
Two Cities: change for the better, be it personal or social, is preferably effected through individual evolution rather than social revolution. Sydney has evolved from a profligate, dissolute wastrel to become a selfless, Christian martyr figure, paving the way for the “far, far better” (404) society he supposedly envisions. He has given his own life in order to save his rival, the man he envies. He has done so for a higher ideal than any he has envisioned before: for the sake of the woman he loves and in order to preserve the web of loving familial relationships that surrounds her. Moreover, Carton’s act of self-sacrifice, evidence of the individual’s ability to bring about positive social change through personal evolution, provides a viable, desirable alternative to the mass destruction caused by social revolution. In fine, Carton realizes, if even on a small scale, Darnay’s megalomaniacal dream of controlling the Revolution.

The novel’s moral conclusion has its psychological complications, foremost of which is Carton’s will to suicide or euthanasia, depending on the severity of his disease. Whilst we, as readers, appreciate the Christian paradigm of self-sacrifice for others (and our appreciation speaks volumes about the Christian bias of our culture), our consciousness cannot help but raise questions concerning the true motivation behind Carton’s otherwise selfless deed. Is his self-sacrifice merely the Hamlet-esque means of shuffling off “this mortal coil”? As Otto Rank suggests in The Double: A Psychoanalytic Study, “we [often] have the strange paradox of the suicide who voluntarily seeks death in order to free himself of the intolerable thanatophobia [fear of uncertain death]” (78). Or is Carton’s act merely a means of perpetuating his own existence ad infinitum, through the child who will supposedly bear his name? His final vision—and we must always bear
in mind that this vision is a supposition on the part of the narrator--is dominated by Sydney, the younger:

I see that child who lay upon her bosom and who bore my name. a man winning his way up in that path of life which once was mine. I see him winning it so well, that my name is made illustrious there by the light of his. I see the blots I threw upon it, faded away. I see him, foremost of just judges and honoured men, bringing a boy of my name. with a forehead that I know and golden hair. to this place--then fair to look upon. with not a trace of this day’s disfigurement--and I hear him tell the child my story.

with a tender and a faltering voice. (404)

Otto Rank has noted the egoism that is involved in such a vision: “The thought of death is rendered supportable by assuring oneself of a second life. after this one. as a double” (85).

In fine. Carton’s supposed vision of a child that will bear his name is nothing more than a paradoxical desire for immortality through death. Carton’s egocentrism. here. surely equals Darnay’s megalomania elsewhere.

It does not matter that we never gain a privileged glimpse of what will actually occur in the Darnay/Evrémonde family. The point of Carton’s sacrifice. despite its probable neurotic causes. is that he. an individual. has managed to change the course of events (specifically. Darnay’s death sentence) dictated by the social upheaval of the Revolution. through personal evolution. The intersection of the psychological and the social domains in this work is now manifest. We see how social dictates cause dangerous repression in the individual. and how that repression redounds upon the social world in
the form of tremendously destructive energy. In the Carton-Darnay double, Dickens has
given us an alternative to repression that necessarily finds its catharsis in destruction:
instead, repression can be dissipated through good deeds and Christian self-sacrifice. The
overt Christian morality is somewhat overdone. Nevertheless, the Carton-Darnay double
interests us here because, with its causes and ramifications located in both the
psychological and social domains, it is paradigmatic of later Dickensian doubles.

In making the transition from *A Tale of Two Cities* to *Great Expectations*, we
move from a novel that emphasizes the interdependence of social praxis and individual
action, to one that posits the individual subject as a product of social conditioning. The
importance of this shift cannot be overstated: it has a profound impact on the work as a
whole, from its setting, to its characterizations, to what concerns us here, the use of the
double motif. With this new focus on the individual subject comes a double motif that is
more introspective, more reflective of and concerned with individual psychology as a
product of social conditioning. Focusing on the individual subject might well seem to
undermine Dickens’ endeavours to abolish arbitrary class distinctions. However, this
focus supports such an agenda, weaving a complex web of affinities between individuals
who would normally be segregated by class distinctions, thereby exposing those
distinctions to be artificial.

Dickens forms affinities between diverse characters in *Great Expectations* through
the mechanism of doubling. Three instances of doubling pertain to this discussion: Pip’s
doubling with Orlick, Herbert, and Drummle; the internal doubling of Wemmick and
Jaggers; and Magwitch’s doubling with Miss Havisham. Each of these doublings is
significant for its social and psychological causes and ramifications. Pip’s doubles represent possibilities for himself projected into other social or professional classes: as well, they represent external manifestations of components of his own psyche. Wemmick and Jaggers, like Lorry and Cruncher of A Tale of Two Cities, are remarkable for their ability to divorce their public, working lives from their private existence in such similar, yet distinctive ways. Both are so successful in this endeavour that they each become, for all intents and purposes, two different people; each possesses what C.F. Keppler calls a “second self.” Finally, Abel Magwitch and Miss Havisham comprise a double that comes as close as any to being what Gillman and Patten term ‘typically Dickensian’:

That the characters are related is a perception others must come to by going beyond dissimilarities of feature or social station to underlying convergences of moral or psychological situation. Similarities must be discovered behind apparent differences; but those similarities never eradicate entirely the line that separates one person from another. (445)

Magwitch and Havisham share no physical resemblance or propinquity between them. They never encounter one another, they inhabit vastly different socioeconomic spheres, and they are not of the same gender, yet there are a number of striking psychological, moral, and ultimately, social congruencies between these two characters. As we shall see, these doubles differ from those of A Tale of Two Cities in their increased focus on the individual’s psyche.

As Great Expectations is a bildungsroman focusing on the development of Pip, it is not surprising that he is at the centre of many of the doublings in the novel. In “Mirror-
Images in *Great Expectations,* Karl Wentersdorf emphasizes Pip’s involvement in a recurring pattern of physical and psychological doubles:

In place of Marlowe’s Faustus, with a good angel and an evil angel at each shoulder symbolizing the warring elements in the protagonist’s heart and soul, we find Pip mirrored in sets of “right” and “wrong” twins who embody diametrically opposed aspects of his character at various stages of his development. (205)

These antithetical doubles include Dolge Orlick and Herbert Pocket, Bentley Drummle and Startop, and Pepper and Trabb’s boy. Each set of characters, in conjunction with Pip, comprises a decomposed double, where Pip’s doubles represents moral, psychological, and social polarities for him. This type of doubling, “expressing the spectrum of possibilities for the [doubled] character” (Gillman 444), is not a new strategy for Dickens. In *David Copperfield,* Uriah Heep and James Steerforth function in relation to David in much the same way as Orlick and Drummle function in relation to Pip: at either end of the spectrum of social possibilities attainable for the protagonist, doppelgängers enact his unconscious urges, allowing him to experience vicariously the tragic consequences of allowing one’s libidinal drives free reign. This is an especially effective means of characterization for Pip because he contains such polarized elements within his own psyche; as Herbert comments, he is “a good fellow, with impetuosity and hesitation, boldness and diffidence, action and dreaming, curiously mixed in him” (269). Here, we will examine three of Pip’s doppelgängers, who represent a cross section of the social possibilities available to him, and who reflect much of his psychological state, whilst...
providing didactic examples for him.

Pip’s working class double, Dolge Orlick, is a primal version of Uriah Heep. He functions as the id to Pip’s ego, making thinly veiled sexual advances towards Biddy. brutally enacting Pip’s unconscious revenge wishes against his abusive sister and the self-important Pumblechook, and attempting to annihilate Pip (an act configured in Freudian psychology as the id’s struggle to overthrow the ego) just when he is about to effect the altruistic deed of aiding and abetting Magwitch’s escape from England and proscribed death. Pip’s aversion, even hostility, towards Orlick masks a certain ambivalence: at once, Pip hates Orlick for his brutality and vulgarity, yet he identifies with Orlick’s primal instincts, realizing subconsciously, that they are just as much a part of his own psyche.

This recognition is apparent in the assault on Mrs. Joe and its aftermath. The same night that Orlick brutally attacks Mrs. Joe, Pip is subjected to Wopsle’s rendition of “the affecting tragedy of George Barnwell” (144), a little-known drama about a wretch who robs and murders his uncle. Both Wopsle and Pumblechook sadistically use this performance to provide a didactic example of what Pip will surely become, if he persists in his wicked ways; Pip, of course, feels “as if it were a well-known fact that I contemplated murdering a near relation” (145). The weapon used in the attack is fittingly symbolic: in Pip’s mind, the filed leg-iron that once restricted Magwitch’s movements links the deed to Pip’s former guilty act (the stealing of the food and file for Magwitch). When Orlick confronts Pip immediately before attempting to murder him, he admits the attack, but lays the ultimate blame at Pip’s door:
I tell you it was your doing—I tell you it was done through you . . . . I come upon her from behind, as I come upon you to-night. I giv’ it her! I left her for dead, and if there had been a limekiln as nigh her as there is now nigh you, she shouldn’t have come to life again. But it warn’t Old Orlick as did it; it was you. You was favoured, and he was bullied and beat. . . . Now you pays for it. You done it; now you pays for it. (437)

Orlick has a point. Although it is clearly condemned as criminal on all sides, his deed possesses a modicum of justice, for he was physically abused at Mrs. Joe’s instigation. And even though Pip renounces the substance of the deed, the spirit is another matter, for he was physically and mentally abused under the guise of being brought up “by hand” (39).

Orlick’s act, in other words, is Pip’s desire. A comment from Freud’s Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement Between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics pertains to Pip:

An obsessional neurotic may be weighed down by a sense of guilt that would be appropriate in a mass-murderer, while in fact, from his childhood onwards, he has behaved to his fellow-men as the most considerate and scrupulous member of society. Nevertheless, his sense of guilt has a justification: it is founded on the intense and frequent death-wishes against his fellows which are unconsciously at work in him. It has a justification if what we take into account are unconscious thoughts and not intentional deeds. (87)
Pip is just such an "obsessional neurotic." He allows Orlick to enact his socially unacceptable, libidinal and violent urges (later, Orlick will attack and rob the self-important Pumblechook), standing by 'innocently' vicariously experience the joy of transgression without facing or paying the penalties. Pip repays Orlick for his services by having Miss Havisham's lawyer, Jaggers, unceremoniously dismiss him from her service. This act is every bit as malicious as Orlick's attempted murders, especially in view of Magwitch’s life story (which demonstrates that adverse socioeconomic conditions are conducive to 'criminal' behaviour): it is an act that might well leave Orlick destitute, with no other means than criminal acts to support himself. The difference between Orlick’s attempted murders and Pip’s vengeful acts of dismissal (he also has Trabb’s boy sacked) is that the former is ‘honest’ about his deeds; for his part, Pip refuses to take responsibility for his cowardly acts, stealing out of town before having to face the objects of his petty vengeance.

Orlick’s moral antithesis is Herbert. Whereas Orlick provides a negative example for Pip, Herbert functions as a positive example of industry and perseverance, wedded to realistic expectations. Wentersdorf points out the two are obvious opposites, both in mannerisms and physiognomy:

Orlick is a broad-shouldered, loose-limbed, brutish fellow of great strength. Herbert is tall, of slender build, and gentlemanly in appearance.

... Orlick is ill-favoured and sullen, swarthy, and with ragged hair;
Herbert is pale and light-haired. ... Orlick is lethargic in temperament.
slow in his movements. ... Herbert is agile and energetic. ... The one is
hostile, treacherous, and threatening . . . . The other is frank, patient, and scrupulously fair. (209)

Repeatedly, we find Herbert is characterized by his education and refinement, moral uprightness, and physical frailty; Orlick by his ignorance, moral wickedness, and physical power. The educational, moral, and physical differences between Herbert and Orlick are markers of class: education, polished deportment, fine clothes, and physical frailty representing the middle class and above; ignorance, crudeness of manner, filth, and physical brutality being markers of the working class and below. Pip, with his aspirations to become ‘respectable’ through dress and deportment, and his past mired in Joe’s smithy and the world of the marshes, partakes of both classes.

Pip’s first encounter with his middle class double takes place at Satis House. After ensuring that Pip is not a prowler, Herbert, with the air of a seasoned pugilist, challenges him to a fight. This contest is symbolic on two levels. On one level, it serves as an example of how Pip’s attempts to rise in station only result in reconfirming his origins (just as when he hires a rowing coach in order to better Drummle and Startop, the man suggests Pip has “the arm of a blacksmith” {218}; or when he returns home in ostentatious apparel, Trabb’s boy mocks him with his parodic “don’t know ya” {267}). Once this blacksmith’s apprentice overcomes his feelings of intimidation, he takes a sadistic pleasure in pummelling this “young gentleman in a grey suit” (120), as if Herbert were personally responsible for Pip’s coarseness in the eyes of Estella: “I am sorry to record that the more I hit him, the harder I hit him” (120). After the battle is done, though, Pip’s feelings of empowerment are quickly replaced by feelings of regret, even
I felt but a gloomy satisfaction in my victory. Indeed, I go so far as to hope that I regarded myself while dressing, as a species of savage young wolf or other wild beast. . . . [W]ithout having any definite idea of the penalties I had incurred, it was clear to me that village boys could not go stalking about the country, ravaging the houses of gentlefolks and pitching into the studious youth of England . . . (120-21)

Pip realizes that he has only succeeded in reconfirming himself as part of the lower, bestial and savage order of Orlick, rather than raising himself to Herbert’s sophisticated plane of existence. He has taken the first step in realizing crass materialism and affected manners do not necessarily make a gentleman.

On another level, this battle is a representation of Pip’s struggle against his better half. As evinced by Herbert and Pip’s first conversation in London. Herbert understands Estella’s character, and how and why Miss Havisham is raising her: “that girl’s hard and haughty and capricious to the last degree, and has been brought up by Miss Havisham to wreak revenge on all the male sex” (200). At the time of the fight. Herbert’s isolation and Miss Havisham’s sudden demands for Pip’s visits indicate that Herbert has already come to his conclusions and has refused to be exploited as an animated doll for Estella to develop and practice her wiles upon. Having asked Pip, “Who let you in?” (119) and “Who gave you leave to prowl about?” (119), and finding that Pip’s being at Satis House is sanctioned, even encouraged, by “Miss Estella,” Herbert challenges Pip to a fight almost as a matter of course. Herbert, however, is not attempting to hurt Pip (his
awareness of the rules and conventions of fighting, as well as his dexterous warm-up.

indicate he could do so, if he wished). Rather, he has discerned that Pip is his
replacement, that this innocent country youth will be ruthlessly exploited for the sake of
Estella’s inculcation. His challenge, then, assumes two functions: it is both a means of
resistance against Miss Havisham’s crass exploitation and a means of warning off Pip.

The function of this combative encounter is paradigmatic of Herbert’s and Pip’s
relationship. Despite his unremarkable appearance and circumstances, Herbert functions
as a quasi guardian angel for Pip, protecting him either from himself (that is, Pip’s worse
instincts) or from external threats. Herbert is instrumental in determining Pip’s response
to Magwitch’s sudden appearance (his immediate concern is for Magwitch’s safety), for
rescuing Pip from certain annihilation at the hands of Orlick, and for establishing Pip in a
remunerative occupation once Magwitch’s assets are seized and thus lost to Pip.

Unconsciously, Herbert is also the cause of Pip’s one good deed (paying for Herbert’s
partnership). Furthermore, Pip will come to realize, through Herbert, that his perception
of the world around him is often coloured by his own unconscious: “I often wondered
how I had conceived that old idea of his [Herbert’s] inaptitude, until I was one day
enlightened by the reflection, that perhaps the inaptitude had never been in him at all, but
had been in me” (489). In short, this unassuming, diligent, loyal friend provides an
example of moral conduct and psychological prudence that Pip eventually does well to
emulate. Pip wishes he had obtained the lucrative partnership and the girl of his dreams
for himself, not realizing that Herbert’s success is due as much to his realistic
expectations as to Pip’s *deus ex machina* manoeuvre of purchasing his friend a
partnership.

Although Pip never quite achieves Herbert’s moral stature, he is a better person for his experience. He has moved, slowly but surely, towards moral maturity. Markers of this trajectory include his public acceptance of Magwitch as a fellow human being (not a felon to be shunned), his willingness to forgive Miss Havisham her all-too-pitiable faults (despite the psychological toll her schemes have taken on himself, Estella, and others), and, most importantly, his recognition of Joe’s tremendous moral stature. By the conclusion of the tale Pip attains a moral awareness roughly equivalent to that which Herbert had already attained as of their first encounter at Satis House.

Bentley Drummle is Pip’s upper class double. This “idle, proud, niggardly, reserved, and suspicious” (225) composite of Orlick’s brutality and Steerforth’s social status will enter into open competition with Pip, as well as a multitude of other suitors, for Estella’s hand in marriage. We gain a glimpse of the substance of this competition at the Blue Boar Inn. Bentley and Pip meet at this establishment by chance, the former going out for a horse ride and dining with Estella, the latter going to Satis House in order to convince Estella not to marry such a brute. Clearly, each knows what the other is about. During the course of their conversation, they engage in such a juvenile exchange of insults and one-upmanship, jostling one another away from the warmest spot in front of the fire (a scene that foreshadows the fireside confrontation between Bradley Headstone and Eugene Wrayburn later), that we can hardly distinguish between the two fine young examples of British breeding and education, despite their class differences. The moral message of the scene is that, in their star-struck adoration of Estella, all men
are reduced to the equality of petty squabbling.

Estella, being beautiful, well-educated, and wealthy, is a valuable ‘catch’ on the marriage market (and certainly Drummle views her as much the same sort of object as his well-bred horse, his fashionable clothing, his pocket-watch, etc.). It is well understood by all Estella’s would-be suitors, including Pip and Drummle, that possession of her will bestow her traits upon her ‘possessor.’ Using Pip’s tactic of dogged perseverance, Drummle manages to woo and eventually win Estella, at once realizing Pip’s class aspirations and enacting his libidinal desires as Orlick did before him. Drummle’s victory, however, is Pyrrhic: his relationship with Estella, based on crass materialism, is an emotional failure. Once again, Pip’s ostensible enemy is revealed to be his benefactor by providing an example of what might have happened had he (Pip) successfully courted Estella.

We see, then, in each of Pip’s doubles, social and psychological possibilities which, thanks to Magwitch’s money and Herbert’s example, he is free to embrace or reject. In his vilification of Orlick, Pip rejects his working class background (much like Magwitch, Orlick is the criminal product of his socioeconomic circumstances); in his vilification of Drummle, he rejects the self-centredness, vulgarity, and brutality born of upper class overindulgence; and in his valorization of Herbert, he embraces the middle class virtues of industry and self-reliance (virtues that Joe, too, possesses). In psychological terms, Orlick and Drummle enact Pip’s primal and libidinal urges, suffering the social consequences in Pip’s stead; Herbert provides the example of contented, psychologically healthy existence through setting and achieving modest,
realistic expectations. After various trials and tribulations (mostly the former), Pip chooses to embrace Herbert's example, both on a socioeconomic and psychological level, thus embracing the middle class ideology promoted by *Great Expectations* as a whole.

One specific facet of this ideology—the private-public dichotomy—is brought into focus with another important doubling in the book: that of Wemmick and Jaggers. Each of these two characters embodies the private-public dichotomy in a similar manner to Jeremy Cruncher and Jarvis Lorry of *A Tale of Two Cities*. Just as the two agents of the banking profession are divided either by conflicting drives (such as emotional and business ties in the case of Lorry), or by economic necessity (as in the case of Cruncher), each representative of the legal profession actively cultivates a business persona which, in public, supplants his private self. This act of deceit is effected in order to maintain a formidable business reputation as a legal practitioners, to instill fear and awe in their clients and their adversaries. It is a social act that has its effects in terms of individual psychology.

Because Pip visits his Walworth home with greater frequency, the reader gains more insight into the private side of Wemmick than of Jaggers. As Angus Calder comments, the dichotomy between Wemmick's private self and his public, business persona is pronounced:

Wemmick is two people in one—'the wrong twin' and the right one. He is the gentle handyman at his home in Walworth and the tight-lipped plotter of Little Britain: the devoted son of an Aged Parent and the devoted worshipper of the Golden Calf of "portable property". His life may be
seen as a prophetic parody of the divided existence of present-day
commuters who, after a day at the office working for the firm, 'relax' by
working whole-heartedly at improving their own homes. (Calder 26)

When Pip first encounters Wemmick, he finds him to be "a dry man" (195), who only has
a "mechanical appearance of smiling" (196), who is so standoffish as to not be in the
habit of shaking hands as a form of greeting or bidding goodbye, and whose Little Britain
*modus operandi* is characterized by the materialistic dictum, "get hold of portable
property" (224). This behaviour is a matter of form for Wemmick. The first indication of
anything below this dry facade comes during an otherwise trivial conversation between
Pip and Wemmick. After Pip comments on the inscrutability of Jaggers' manner in
dealing with him at his Little Britain office, Wemmick observes (referring to Jaggers' mannerism), "it's not personal; it's professional: only professional" (221). The
importance of this observation lies not in recognition of Jaggers' duplicity, but in
Wemmick's awareness of the necessity of maintaining separate identities in the public
and private spheres: it also reveals that Wemmick possesses some ability to empathize
with Pip, as well as a willingness to reassure him. In short, despite all appearances to the
contrary, Wemmick possesses feelings below his dry, business appearance.

This intimation of Wemmick's internal doubling, his strict demarcation of the
public and private spheres, is corroborated on several occasions. When Pip visits
Wemmick in his Walworth home, he is found tenderly caring for his "aged parent" (230).
cleverly devising all sorts of domestic contrivances (including the visual door knocker
devised for the convenience of his deaf father, and a miniature cannon used to announce
nine o’clock daily), and stealing his arm around Miss Skiffin’s waist. These eccentric, harmless acts demonstrate all the warmth and humanity of the Walworth Wemmick that is lacking in his Little Britain counterpart. When Pip asks Wemmick if Jaggers “admires” his Walworth home, Wemmick voices his policy of maintaining a strict separation between his two modes of existence: “the office is one thing, and private life is another. When I go to the office, I leave the Castle behind me, and when I come into the Castle, I leave the office behind me. If it’s not in any way disagreeable to you, you’ll oblige me by doing the same. I don’t wish it professionally spoken about” (231). And when dining with Jaggers, Pip remarks that Wemmick is “as dry and distant to me as if there were twin Wemmicks and this was the wrong one... he was the wrong twin all the time, and only externally like the Wemmick of Walworth” (401, 404). Wemmick’s suppression of his Walworth persona is a result of his wish to cultivate a certain impression not only with his clients, but also with his employer, Jaggers. That is, Wemmick’s assumption of a dry, business-like facade is also a ruse for the sake of maintaining Jaggers’ good opinion. Much like Jarvis Lorry, Wemmick is willing to put himself through a great deal of suppression in order to maintain that good opinion, as well as the respect and awe of his clients. In Wemmick’s case, though, we sense the ruse has gone too far, and the Little Britain Wemmick has become a separate person from his Walworth counterpart.

Interestingly enough, Jaggers too, subjects himself to suppression. He does so because of previous indiscretions committed by himself. Some time before meeting Pip, Jaggers had convinced a client accused of a particularly violent murder to give up custody
of her young child to "an eccentric rich lady" (424) in order to fulfill the wishes of his rich client, and in order that the child not fall victim to its socioeconomic circumstances and become a criminal. Once exculpated through Jaggers' acumen, this client came to live with him as his housekeeper because she was traumatized and unable to support herself. He allowed her to do so with no hope of remuneration, despite his knowledge of her unequivocal guilt. The female homicide of this narrative is Molly, his servant and Estella's mother; the "eccentric rich lady," Miss Havisham; and the child given up for adoption, Estella.

Considering his calling and his Little Britain persona, Jaggers' acts are curiously duplicitous: on one hand, he defends and exculpates a woman he knows to be both de jure and de facto criminal, for the sake of his own legal reputation; on the other, he does what he can to help the woman's innocent child, and even harbours the woman when she cannot cope. Jaggers is a strange case of professional aspirations conflicting with moral conduct and personal emotions. His philanthropic acts betray his cognisance of society's complicity in criminality. The socioeconomic conditions that oblige so many unfortunate people to resort to 'criminal' acts as their only means of survival are allowed, even encouraged, to continue, as poignantly displayed by Magwitch's life story. Knowing this, and realizing (one suspects) that he makes his own living from prosecuting so many victims of circumstance, Jaggers acts as he does. In doing so, he reveals himself, like Jarvis Lorry, to be more than his overbearing, inscrutable, Little Britain persona would lead us to believe. Knowing the world he inhabits, knowing the awe his clients and the general criminal populace must hold for him in order to maintain his professional status.
Jaggers does everything necessary to maintain that mystique, including not disseminating any incriminating narratives concerning himself, and not allowing his private persona to make its appearance in public. During the course of the novel, he exposes himself only once by revealing his story to Pip and Wemmick; it is enough to reveal the extent of the repression to which he subjects himself.

Unlike the internal doubling of Wemmick and Jaggers, the Abel Magwitch-Miss Havisham pair is an instance of external doubling. Like the Carton-Darnay double of A Tale of Two Cities, the causes and effects of this double are located in both the social and psychological domains; it depends, however, less upon an external signifier such as autoscopy than does the Carton-Darnay double. Magwitch and Havisham, two liminal figures who never meet, who inhabit antithetical social spheres of existence.\textsuperscript{12} and who seem such polar opposites, share an obsessive drive to reek revenge upon society.

This drive has been engendered by the unscrupulous exploits of the confidence man, Compeyson. Magwitch’s ire is a class affair: the product of a lifetime of inequity climaxing in an instance (we are certain, among many) of manifest injustice: he is tried and convicted as an intractable criminal simply because he looks the type, with his ragged clothing, unkempt hair, and less than ideal hygiene; his partner in crime, Compeyson, is exonerated because he does not look the type, even though he is the mastermind behind

\textsuperscript{12} Michal Ginsburg, in his “Dickens and the Uncanny: Repression and Displacement in Great Expectations,” comments: “The world of Miss Havisham is for Pip the world of fairy tales and fantasy as opposed to reality. . . . The world of Magwitch, on the other hand, is the world of what in the nineteenth-century novel was regarded as “reality”--the world of squalor and need, of destructive passions and crime” (116).
their joint ventures. To make matters worse, Compeyson bears false witness against Magwitch in order to secure leniency for himself. Havisham’s ire differs in kind, but not degree. Hers is a monstrous rage born of cruel abuse at the hands of, and directed at, the male gender as a whole. Small wonder: for Compeyson, in concert with her prodigal, estranged half-brother, has contrived at wooing her; he has proposed marriage and jilted her; then he has sadistically informed her that all was done in order to bilk her of her wealth. She is left with little self-esteem, if any, into the bargain.

Another parallel between Magwitch and Havisham is that they both seem to belong to the unearthly or primordial realms. Magwitch is engaged in a Promethean struggle against the social dictates and laws of society, which would first foist a life of criminality upon him, then brand him a criminal, and finally demand his death or lifelong proscription for retribution. When Pip first encounters him, the convict stubbornly rises from the graves in which society would rather he were interred (among them are the graves of Pip’s family, suggesting the archetypal return of the dead father). This half-man, half-apparition, looks to Pip “as if he were eluding the hands of the dead people, stretching up cautiously out of their graves, to get a twist upon his ankle and pull him in” (38), as a “pirate come to life, and come down [from the gibbet on the marshes], and going back to hook himself up again” (39). Havisham, too, seems unaccustomed or unwilling to inhabit the land of the living. She is variously described by Pip as “some ghastly wax work” (87), a “skeleton” (87), “corpse-like” (90), and vampiric, “as if the admission of the natural light of day would have struck her to dust” (90). On two occasions (94, 413) Pip even envisions Miss Havisham pendant from a beam, as if having
just committed suicide by hanging (surely, an image reminiscent of Magwitch’s supposed suspension from the gibbet). Pip’s intuition proves unerring. Havisham is bent on living her life *in extenso*, even wishing for death; she does everything she can, including stopping clocks and preventing any natural light from entering her domicile, to exclude all signs of life from her own, perpetually suspended existence.

Magwitch and Havisham both exploit Pip, using him as an instrument of revenge on society. In Miss Havisham’s case, Pip is first used as a living, breathing doll, which can be used to inculcate Estella in the ways and means of tormenting men. Upon receiving notice of his mysterious expectations, Pip becomes a convenient means of sadistically arousing resentment and contempt in Havisham’s sycophantic relatives (who, with the exception of Matthew Pocket, believe he has supplanted them in her affections and in her will), and jealousy in Estella’s would-be lovers. Even in Magwitch’s seemingly altruistic actions, Pip is an object of exploitation: he serves as a nothing more than a mannequin which will be provided with all the material accoutrements and education that accord with Magwitch’s ideal ‘gentleman.’ Through typically Dickensian exemplars of a true gentleman (viz. Joe, Herbert and Matthew Pocket, and Wemmick), Pip gradually realizes that crass materialism is self-inimical. Magwitch, however, never learns this lesson. Commenting on the social aspersions heaped upon him in Australia, Magwitch says,

> ... it was a recompense to me ... to know in secret that I was making a gentleman. The blood horses of them colonists might fling up the dust over me as I was walking; what do I say? I says to myself, “I’m making a
better gentleman nor ever you’ll be!” When one of ’em says to another, 
“He was a convict, a few years ago, and is a ignorant common fellow now.
for all he’s lucky,” what do I say? I says to myself. “If I ain’t a gentleman.
nor yet ain’t got no learning, I’m owner of such. All on you owns stock
and land; which on you owns a brought-up London gentleman?” (339)
The implicit comparison between Pip and the “blood horses” of the colonists is
appropriate. Pip is no better than some sort of livestock or investment used to augment
its owner’s prestige. Magwitch’s revenge tactic is simple: against all odds, he will
succeed in making (and owning) a better gentleman than any of those who have scoffed at
him, stigmatizing him as wholly a criminal. In a materialistic sense, the product of
Magwitch’s altruism is no different than the product of Havisham’s more explicit
exploitation: both the gentleman, Pip, and the lady, Estella, are rendered mere material
possessions that confer status upon their possessors.

Interestingly, Magwitch and Havisham both function in loco parentis to both Pip
and Estella. Both will do much, materially, pedagogically, and psychologically, to
inculcate in Pip his middle class way of life; and both are closely related to Estella
(Magwitch is her biological father, Havisham her adopted mother). The implications of
these connections are far reaching: irrespective of particular socioeconomic milieu,
everyone is related in terms of basic humanity. Furthermore, everyone is complicit in
exploitation and criminality. Magwitch and Havisham, in particular, are each examples
of individuals who have been the victims of oppression and exploitation themselves
becoming exploitive of others. As in A Tale of Two Cities, in Great Expectations we see
the interdependence of the psychological and social realms. The difference in the latter novel is that Dickens takes care to show us more of the psychological causes and effects. the pain and the suffering involved in this interdependence, just as he reveals more of the intricacies of class relations.

*Our Mutual Friend* is a novel that maintains this more introspective focus. The outmoded institution or social ill inherent in the social problem novel is still present (here, it is the corrupting influence of money). However, Dickens' concern is clearly focused on the effect such a corrupting influence has on the individual rather than on society as a whole. Part and parcel of this focus on the individual is a new style of Dickensian characterization: no longer is Dickens content to let external physical traits or mannerisms indicate the moral conduct or psychological well-being of his characters. In fact, we see in such examples as the Lammles, the Veneerings, and John Harmon that these external indicators are often at odds with internal states of being.

Like its predecessors, *Our Mutual Friend* contains a variety of types of doubles, ranging from external doubles formed by moral or socioeconomic parallels or antitheses, to internal doubles produced by adherence or resistance to social dictates. For the most part, these doubles serve one of two purposes: either they emphasize a condition of social and moral decay that pervades society, or they highlight the effects of prevailing socioeconomic conditions and societal dictates on individual psychology. This latter purpose, especially, marks Dickens' use of the double in *Our Mutual Friend* as differing from his previous uses of the motif not in kind, but in degree. Robin Gilmour suggests *Our Mutual Friend* is a novel "about the mysteries of the human personality, about
surfaces and depths, and about deception and disguise—psychological concerns which threaten to pull away from the sociological subject” (105). Gilmour’s comments are particularly relevant to Dickens’ use of the double in this novel because the most significant doubles, the Wrayburn-Headstone and the Riderhood-Headstone pairings, reveal the effects of social dictates on the individual with more psychological verisimilitude than previously witnessed in Dickens’ works. This is not to detract from the portrayal of Sydney Carton and Charles Darnay, or Magwitch and Miss Havisham: Dickens simply succeeds in delving further into Headstone’s psyche, in better exposing the neurosis engendered by societal dictates, than he does in previous characters.

Similar to *A Tale of Two Cities*, *Our Mutual Friend* commences with characters being compared along the lines of controlling motifs. Specifically, Gaffer Hexam, Pleasant Riderhood, and Bradley Headstone are doubles under the rubric of “Birds of Prey” (bk. 2, ch. 12). These three are analogous in their predatory instincts vis-à-vis other human beings. Gaffer, in his quest for dead bodies in the Thames, is described as “a roused bird of prey” (45); Pleasant, with her pawn shop and boarding house, “had it in the blood, or had been trained to regard seamen, within certain limits, as her prey” (406); and Bradley, who pursues Eugene night and day in a fruitless attempt to discover Lizzie Hexam’s whereabouts, is described as a “passion-wasted nightbird with respectable feathers, the worst nightbird of all” (618). These three characters are symptomatic of a society where even the most intimate human relations (as we see in the case of the Lammles) have been reduced to an economy of exploitation. Gaffer, Pleasant, and Bradley are echoed in a host of other characters who make their living exploiting or
hunting their fellow human beings: Silas Wegg attempts to extort half their wealth and more from the Boffins. Fascination Fledgeby purchases promissory notes in order to extort grossly inflated interest rates from their signatories, and the Lammles prey on whomever they can (including the naive Georgiana Podsnap) in order to live on ‘nothing a year.’ Gaffer, Pleasant, and Bradley are thus not extraordinary in a society crowded with predatory ‘birds.’

Whereas the predatory birds motif invites comparison and contrast, another motif—immersion in the Thames—serves as a mechanism overtly indicating and substantiating instances of doubling. Like the Harmon dust mounds, the Thames is richly symbolic. It is the source of life: Rogue Riderhood, Lizzie and Gaffer Hexam earn their living from it. It poses the threat of death: George Radfoot, Gaffer Hexam, Rogue Riderhood, and Bradley Headstone are all found dead in the river during the course of the novel (the latter two locked arm-in-arm, reinforcing their doubling); John Harmon barely escapes the river as Julius Handford (a double of his old, pre-baptismal self). It also offers the possibility of rebirth: Bradley Headstone emerges as a school master where he entered the water as a bargeman; Eugene Wrayburn struggles from the depths of the river, emerging a true Dickensian gentleman (a conversion similar to that of Harmon before him), willing to disregard the societal dictates concerning class differences and marry Lizzie Hexam for love. The implicit comparisons and contrasts between the characters who are subject to the whims of the river is substantiated in a vision Mortimer Lightwood has after searching for Gaffer Hexam through the night (bk. 1, ch. 13) only to find the “bird of prey” dead in the river:
Mortimer Lightwood sat before the blazing fire. conscious of drinking brandy and water then and there in his sleep, and yet at one and the same time drinking burnt sherry at the Six Jolly Fellowships, and lying under the boat on the river shore, and sitting in the boat that Riderhood rowed, and listening to the lecture recently concluded, and having to dine in the Temple with an unknown man, who described himself as M.R.F. Eugene Gaffer Harmon . . . (224)

The unknown man’s compound name is significant: it is a conflation of the names of three characters who are immersed in the river during the course of the novel.

Mortimer’s vision suggests the levelling effect of the river’s influence, as if those who have been immersed in its primordial waters share a preternatural experience that simultaneously strips them of individuality and sets them apart from other mortals.

Aside from those doubles ranged under the rubric of controlling motifs, Our Mutual Friend contains internal doubles resulting from social pressure in the form of societal dictates, taboos or laws, as does A Tale of Two Cities and Great Expectations.

Riah bears the same type of multiple personality born of the public-private dichotomy we have witnessed in Jarvis Lorry, Jerry Cruncher, Wemmick, and Jaggers. In public, he is perceived as a shrewd, ruthless financier, the incarnation of the money-lending Jew; in

Riah’s public persona is similar to Dickens’ previous racist portrayals of Jews, specifically Fagin of Oliver Twist. Riah’s portrayal is Dickens’ apology for such portrayals. Note 2 to bk. 2, ch. 5 of the Penguin edition of Our Mutual Friend is explanatory: “. . . Mrs Eliza Davis attacked Dickens for the representation of Jewish people in Fagin in Oliver Twist. Dickens replied on 10 July 1863 and made further amends by introducing Riah into Our Mutual Friend. Mrs Davis wrote to thank him and
private, we find he is a generous, kindly man, possessing “a gentleness monstrously in contrast with the character he had given him” (487) and little monetary wealth. The “he” of this quote refers to Fascination Fledgeby, Riah’s employer, as well as the true owner and guiding influence behind Pubsey and Company. By obliging Riah to pose as the owner of Pubsey and Company, to play the part of the money-lending jew, Fledgeby is able to conceal his complicity in causing the miseries of others—a situation which he enjoys immensely. Riah does not share his employer’s enthusiasm. In fact, he serves his employer only out of a sense of familial duty (Fledgeby’s father had aided Riah in a time of need), not for any personal gain. It takes the exposure of Fledgeby as the de facto director of Pubsey and Company, as well as the perspicaciousness of Jenny Wren, to bring Riah’s double nature to light, to expose his putative identity as an assumed persona at odds with his true character. Riah differs from his predecessors, Lorry, Cruncher, Wemmick, and Jaggers, only in that he does not assume a public persona of his own accord. The fact that Fledgeby obliges him to do so reinforces the racial and social implications of this double.

Another internal doubling that results from social pressure is that experienced by John Harmon. At first sight, Harmon’s affectation of various personas seems a mechanical plot device (albeit, an essential device, as evinced by Boffin’s reference to Rokesmith as “Our Mutual Friend” {157}), a mechanism from comedy adapted to the darker, more sombre tone and mood of Our Mutual Friend. His actions, however, serve a higher thematic purpose. Specifically, his acts of imposture are used to evoke issues of later presented him with a Hebrew and English bible . . .” (904).
identity, the ways and means in which society thwarts the best efforts of the individual in forging his own identity.

We first encounter this chameleon-like character as the subject of an interesting narrative, “the man from somewhere” (bk. 1, ch. 2), told by Mortimer Lightwood during a markedly insipid Veneering social gathering. This forum is appropriate because it emphasizes in no uncertain terms that identity is often, if not exclusively, public property, having little to do with the actual person. Mortimer’s account details the successive anathematization of Harmon’s mother and sister at the hands of his cruel father, his expulsion at the age of fourteen upon attempting to defend his sister, his emigration to South Africa and subsequent establishment as a vintner there, and finally, his return to England some fourteen years later in order to accede to his now-dead father’s estate. Given the materialistic nature of the company present, this last detail is most important. Similar to what we will see in Boffin’s case, the public perceives Harmon as nothing but the man who will inherit a fortune; none of the anguish and the alienation experienced by the young man matters to this society. Money, and those who possess it, are everything.

Mortimer’s narrative omits many of the details of Harmon’s story, including his near death at the hands of Job Potterson and Jacob Kibble (836), and, of course, the discovery of George Radfoot’s body, which is mistaken for that of Harmon’s. This last detail is of particular importance to Harmon’s identity because, as society believes he is dead, he no longer has an identity as John Harmon. In the immediate aftermath of the ‘murder,’ he comments:

... next day while I hesitated, it seemed as if the whole country were
determined to have me dead. The Inquest declared me dead, the
Government proclaimed me dead; I could not listen at my fireside for five
minutes to the outer noises, but it was borne into my ears that I was dead.

So John Harmon died, and Julius Handford disappeared, and John
Rokesmith was born. (428)

With these words, we are given a privileged glimpse into the birth of a new individual. This birth, or rebirth, of identity is made possible, even forced upon Harmon, by the general opinion of society. It leaves the putatively deceased Harmon free to investigate his proposed wife’s character and protect the Boffins from the horde of self-seeking charities that inevitably descend upon those who have just acceded to a fortune.

In his ensuing peregrinations, Harmon will assume various personas, including Julius Handford, John Rokesmith, and Riderhood’s “Captain” (418). His ostensible purpose, an inquiry into the true nature of his proposed wife, is also a quest to discover his own identity. Having been removed from England, his estranged father, and his family (i.e., the Boffins) for some fourteen years, he is, no doubt, unfamiliar with his English and familial identity. Added to this unfamiliar mode of existence are the possibilities presented by marriage to a strange, supposedly mercenary, woman, and as a consequence, acceding to his deceased father’s estate and a tremendous rise in fortune.

The only immutable fact of Harmon’s life is that he can be sure of nothing, including his own identity. His doubling is a somewhat mechanical means of indicating this fact. Even though he actively assumes and divests himself of personas with histrionic ease, there is a sense that the actor has become the parts he plays: the true John Harmon is part John
Rokesmith, the able man of business affairs; part Julius Handford, the stranger implicated in the Harmon ‘murder’; part Rogue Riderhood’s ‘Captain’ implicated in the murder of George Radfoot; and part the Boffins’ little Johnny, a lonely, pitiable boy, with a dead mother, an anathematized sister, and an abusive father. We see the multiplicity of Harmon’s personality clearly in the revelatory soliloquy, “A Solo and a Duet” (bk. 2. ch. 13). Upon commencing his narrative, he pauses over the equivocal first person pronoun as applied to himself: “I cannot possibly express it [his narrative] to myself without using the word I. But it was not I. There was no such thing as I within my knowledge” (426).

Obviously, Harmon cannot adequately grasp and define the first-person signifier as it applies to himself.

The fault is not entirely his, for each of his assumed personas has become a different personality for Harmon; a social construct born of multiple interpretations and perceptions have been projected into his psyche. Rokesmith is an able man of affairs primarily because the Boffins construed him as such: due to the suspicions of Mr Inspector, Handford is implicated in the Harmon ‘murder’; Riderhood’s ‘Captain’ is implicated in Radfoot’s murder because of the rogue’s recognition of the Captain’s possession of Radfoot’s knife and jacket; and lonely little Johnny is at least a partial construct of the Boffins’ sentimentality. In being what people wish him to be, we witness Harmon play diverse roles with uncanny realism, as if the social construct is somehow also a part of his own psyche. Before the various personas can be developed too much (and thus become unwieldy), Dickens will choose to subsume them under the overarching identity of John Harmon. Harmon seamlessly assumes his ‘proper’ position in society.
(wealthy, happily married, and dutifully tended by the Boffins) as if none of the traumatic events of his life had ever transpired, and as if John Harmon had none of Julius Handford. John Rokesmith or Rogue’s “Captain” subsumed within him.

Bradley Headstone is not so fortunate. Arguably Dickens’ most penetrating psychological study, he is a composite of Sydney Carton’s libido. Pip’s will to middle class leisure, and Orlick’s murderous fury. This dual or multiplicitous nature is suggested when he is first described:

Bradley Headstone, in his decent formal black coat and waistcoat, and decent white shirt, and decent formal black tie, and decent pantaloons of pepper and salt, with his decent silver watch in his pocket and its decent hair-guard round his neck, looked a thoroughly decent young man of six-and-twenty. . . . Yet there was enough of what was animal, and of what was fiery (though smouldering), still visible in him, to suggest that if young Bradley Headstone, when a pauper lad, had chanced to be told off for the sea, he would not have been the last man in a ship’s crew. (266-67)

The repetitive “decent” is indicative of just how thoroughly Headstone subscribes to the middle class notions of respectability and decency. In doing so, he forfeits any ability to discern the middle class oppression of the working class. the strategies of containment and extirpation of individuality inherent in such ideological constructs. He is, in short, a study of the individual subject positioned at the intersection of conflicting classes, torn between his urge to middle class respectability and his will to escape his lower class origins.
This social conflict is highlighted when Headstone, with his aspirations to middle class respectability, finds himself in competition with the upper class Eugene Wrayburn for the affections of the working class Lizzie Hexam. The first encounter between Headstone and Wrayburn (341-47) is loaded with class innuendo, notably Eugene’s upper class disdain for Bradley’s working class aspirations to middle class respectability as a schoolmaster. In this meeting, Headstone represents the rising meritocracy, a class in which “men of no birth and of little wealth were trained up beyond the attainments of their betters” (Gill 27); Wrayburn represents the upper end of the professional class (like Tulkinghorn of Bleak House, his legal profession has the potential for giving him access to, and power over, even the aristocracy). The tie that binds the two otherwise very different men is their mutual attraction to Lizzie: Headstone intends to marry her, despite the repercussions for his respectability; Wrayburn is torn between the societal dictates that would prohibit him to marry below his socioeconomic station, and his personal disdain for the opinion of society (as evinced by his behaviour at the Veneering gatherings). In The Dickens Hero: Selfhood and Alienation in the Dickens World, Beth Herst comments on the implications for both men of pursuing the working class Lizzie:

Both are men whose self-image has been radically called into question by love of the same woman, a woman who represents for each a denial of the social identity which alone defines him: respectable schoolmaster, gentleman of good family... Much can be, and has been, made of Headstone and Eugene Wrayburn as symbolic doubles, inverted reflections united in a common obsession. (171-73)
The suggestion of doubling is appropriate, for the pursuit of Lizzie reveals much about the psychological well being of the two men, in particular, how reliant they both are upon their painstakingly constructed social identities.

More important than the possibilities of symbolic doubling engendered by class conflict, is the internal doubling that takes place within Headstone. The psychological toll taken by the constant repression of his lower class origins is high. Under the added stress of Wrayburn’s class-informed goading, Headstone’s double nature erupts into the world:

Tied up all day with his disciplined show upon him, subdued to the performance of his routine of educational tricks, encircled by a gabbling crowd, be broke loose at night like an ill-tamed wild animal. Under his daily restraint, it was his compensation, not his trouble, to give a glance towards his state at night, and to the freedom of its being indulged.

He knew equally well that he fed his wrath and hatred, and that he accumulated provocation and self-justification, by being made the nightly sport of the reckless and insolent Eugene. (609)

Here, with our privileged omniscient perspective, we see that Headstone is a case study in neurotic, obsessive-compulsive behaviour resulting from internalized social dictates and excessive repression. In *Civilization and its Discontents*, Sigmund Freud comments “It is impossible to overlook the extent to which civilization is built up upon a renunciation of instinct, how much it presupposes precisely the non-satisfaction of powerful instincts” (34). Headstone is the individual subject who has taken Freud’s postulate to its neurotic
extreme, and tried to ‘civilize’ himself by renouncing, or ruthlessly repressing, his own instincts. Unfortunately, much like that most famous doubling, Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde, he finds those instincts are not to be repressed, returning with such a vengeance that he is effectively made two persons inhabiting one body: one of his personalities is the meek school master who would be respectable; the other, a murderous incarnation of instinctual drives, who uses violence as a means of resisting societal dictates.

The school master-psychopath also has an external double. Rogue Riderhood, who functions to reinforce the inescapability of his lower class origins. When they first encounter one another, these two liminal figures find that they are united by mutual antagonism towards Wrayburn. During this first encounter, Headstone comments: “Haven’t you yourself declared that the fellow has heaped provocations, insults, and affronts on you, or something to that effect? He has done the same by me” (615). While Wrayburn’s disdainful treatment serves as a signal for class comparison of the two liminal figures, it does not in itself make a double: we must recall Headstone has shown much industry and perseverance in establishing himself as a school master, a profession well above the thieving and river dredging practiced by Riderhood. When they next meet at Plashwater Weir Mill Lock, however, Headstone has carefully imitated Riderhood’s attire in an attempt to implicate him in the coming homicide of Wrayburn. The narratorial comments concerning Headstone in his ‘new’ clothes are significant:

Truly, Bradley Headstone had taken careful note of the honest man’s dress in the course of that night-walk they had had together. . . . It was exactly reproduced in the dress he now wore. And whereas, in his own

...
schoolmaster clothes. he usually looked as if they were the clothes of some other man, he now looked, in the clothes of some other man or men, as if they were his own. (697)

The class implications of the word “men.” in particular, are manifest: whereas Headstone’s attempt to attain middle class membership through correct dress and deportment is a failure (much like it is for Uriah Heep of *David Copperfield* and for Pip), his attempt to emulate the lower class attire of Riderhood is a marked success because, do what he will, Headstone cannot escape his working class origins. Headstone is an example of what occurs to the individual who adheres to such notions as decency and respectability in outward appearance only (much as the Veneerings and their set adhere to the ideal of ‘gentleman’ in form only): he will remain of the lower class. This inability to achieve upward mobility might seem a conservative anomaly in a book that otherwise advocates the breaking down of traditional class barriers. It is not, for unlike Pip or Twemlow, Headstone has not learned that being a true gentleman involves much more than the material trappings of supposed respectability.

The doubling between Riderhood and Headstone is emphasized by the events leading up to their deaths. Before the attempted homicide, Riderhood notes Headstone’s efforts to copy his dress. Using the stratagem of putting on a red handkerchief (Dickens makes much of the associated blood symbolism), noting Headstone’s adoption of the same, and knowing the school master’s extreme antagonism towards Wrayburn, Riderhood quickly pieces together Headstone’s intentions of murdering Wrayburn and using himself as a scapegoat. After the attempted homicide, Riderhood’s suspicions are
confirmed by the fresh blood stains on Headstone’s clothes, the submersion in the
Thames of the same, and the school master’s reemergence. Riderhood dredges the bundle
of clothes, publicly confronts Headstone with the knowledge of his deed, and in his
attempt to extort all he can from the knowledge of Headstone’s attempted homicide.
 promises, “I’ll keep you company, wherever you go” (871). This promise evokes the
image of a man and his shadow, one of the traditional representations of doubling.14
Much as Headstone has tried to do to him, Riderhood will become his victim’s double.
parasitically deriving his sustenance from the school master that he might live the life of
middle class ease wished for by Headstone. He is forestalled in doing so, however, by
Headstone’s desperate murder-suicide:

‘Let go!’ said Riderhood. ‘Stop! What are you trying at? You can’t
drown Me. Ain’t I told you that the man as has come through drownings
can never be drowned? I can’t be drowned.’

‘I can be! . . . I’ll hold you living, and I’ll hold you dead.’ (874)

The repeated interchange between the first person and second person pronouns here
disturbs and questions the boundaries between ‘I,’ ‘Me,’ and ‘you,’ suggesting Riderhood
has indeed assumed the function of Headstone’s shadow. Their mutual death, locked
arm-in-arm “under the ooze and scum behind one of the rotting gates” (874) re-confirms

14 In *The Double: A Psychoanalytic Study*, Otto Rank comments on the concept of the soul:
“Savages believe that the soul is embodied in the image reproduced by glass [i.e., a
mirror], water, portrait, or by a shadow” (65). The concept of the soul, here, is clearly
construed as a double of the person being reflected, painted, shadowed, or what have you,
and is closely allied to what we, today, conceptualize as the double.
their doubleness and their lower class lives with a finality that is inescapable. The class symbolism and the psychological verisimilitude of Bradley Headstone’s internal and external doubling is as fully developed as any in Dickens’ final three novels.
Conclusion

In conclusion, we have noted some striking similarities between the doubles of *A Tale of Two Cities*, *Great Expectations*, and *Our Mutual Friend*. We have seen the moral contrast between Sydney Carton and Charles Darnay reiterated and developed in the relationship between Eugene Wrayburn and Mortimer Lightwood, so that we gain more insight into Wrayburn's psyche than we do Carton's; we have witnessed the split between the public and the private self explored in Jarvis Lorry, Jerry Cruncher, Wemmick, Jaggers, and Riah; and we have observed John Harmon assume various personas, rendering himself an instance of self-doubling similar to that of Charles Darnay-D'Aulnais-Evrémonde before him. Dickens' tendency towards psychological verisimilitude in his characters has been noted by many critics (Gillman and Patten, Robin Gilmour, and Michael Wheeler, among them). Observing these echoing instances of doubling chronologically, we discern Dickens' development of a double which gradually focuses on individual psychology, but which finds its causes and ramifications located equally in the social and psychological domains (thus bearing witness to the interpenetration of the two spheres). We cannot reduce Dickens' use of the double to one domain or the other. To do so would do the social and psychological complexity of the Dickensian double in these final novels an injustice.

Gillman and Patten have noted that Dickens inherited two rather static

---

15 As John Lucas suggests in *The Melancholy Man: A Study of Dickens's Novels*, this trend is due, in part, to the influence of a more realistic mode of writing practised by George Eliot and Henry James.
conventions of doubling: the moral, good/evil dichotomy, and the naive/worldly-wise opposition. These conventions still make their appearance as late in Dickens' career as *A Tale of Two Cities*: remnants of the naive/worldly-wise opposition are to be discerned in the Carton-Darnay double; the influence of the good/evil dichotomy is readily apparent in the doublings engendered by the Eros-Thanatos conflict. But even in this, the earliest of the final novels, the doubles cannot be construed as merely conventional: even Madame Defarge, that most archetypal of figures, cannot be perceived simply as a member of the Thanatos forces. for we are presented with her story, her family's victimization at the hands of the Evrémonde brothers: we are thus able, on some level, to empathize with her, to discern the humanity overshadowed by her intense hatred. This social and psychological complication of the otherwise static convention of doubling continues and develops, as we have seen, until we reach *Our Mutual Friend*, in which doubles are very subtle, depending not so much upon mechanical indicators such as physical likeness, twinship, or moral polarities, but on more subtle connections such as similar socioeconomic situations or types of neuroses that arise from those situations. Perhaps there is a case to be made (one which is outside the scope of this thesis) for Dickens as an innovator vis-à-vis the double motif. In these final novels he certainly took the motif outside the realm of Shakespearian comedy or the Gothic of the German Romantic movement, using it not for humour or for invoking terror, but to examine some of the social and psychological problems of his era.

To the end of his career, Dickens remained a social problem novelist, maintaining his focus on the 'condition of England' issue. His novels might well have been received
as the very avant-garde of resistance to the prevailing ideology. They also functioned, however, to reify ideology as much as to subvert it. His efforts to develop psychological verisimilitude in his characters suggest he began to recognize the complicity of his earlier texts in reifying middle class ideology, that his character portrayals, like his earlier conventional doubles of the type mentioned by Gillman and Patten, committed the same ideological violence as the very socioeconomic institutions he was out to denounce: they reduced individuals, with unique emotions, anxieties, hopes, and aspirations, to mere subjects of the prevailing ideology. As with Riah’s portrayal, his later doublings were attempts to correct this marked injustice.
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