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摘要

《遠大前程》(Great Expectations) 是英國作家查爾斯·狄更斯(Charles Dickens)在1861年所撰寫的作品，文本主要有三篇，深刻描繪維多利亞時期資本主義興盛的時代，以及敘述孤兒皮普成長的空間。然而，Alan Lelchuk、J. Hillis Miller、Rosa Mucignat等評論家主張《遠大前程》是一部以主角為主的空間，而忽略其他角色的重要性。儘管世上已有眾多以空間的研究存在，大部分的人卻忽略資本主義在文本中的重要性。因此，我認為《遠大前程》仍有進一步探討的可能，藉由分析資本主義與空間之間的強大聯繫，我主張文中的次等角色和主角同樣具有代表性，文本不僅描述空間在文中代表的意義，同時藉由空間來討論資本主義。這部作品不僅是維多利亞時期的代表作，同時也是一部有空間與資本主義的文本。

本論文共分為三章，第一章探討文本中的空間和資本主義的關聯性，以彰顯空間與資本的重要性。第二章以絕對空間(absolute space)為基礎，分析文中的家庭生活與娛樂，以展示異化(alienation)的重要性。第三章以相對空間(relative space)為出發點，解析商品拜物教(commodity fetishism)，突顯神祕化(mystification)的運作方式。三章分別描述資本空間的重要性。本碩士論文試圖探討空間與資本主義在文本中呈現，藉由參考大衛·哈維(David Harvey)的《社會正義與城市》(The Social Justice and the City)，以及採用列斐伏爾(Henri Lefebvre) 的《日常生活批判理論》(Critique of Everyday Life)，這份研究希望能提升空間在文本的重要性，並賦予《遠大前程》以往不同的解讀。

關鍵字：《遠大前程》、空間、資本主義、維多利亞研究
Abstract

*Great Expectations*, written by Charles Dickens in 1861, vividly demonstrates space as a social product to expose the dynamics of capitalism, alienation and mystification. Dickens’ narrative is published in the era of industrialization. Nevertheless, most critics, such as Alan Lelchuk, J. Hillis Miller, Rosa Mucignat, and many others have focused on the spatial reading of Pip, overlooking the importance of secondary characters and the aspects of capitalism in the novel. However, despite the multiple spatial aspects presented in the fiction, I believe that Dickens presents a strong connection with capitalism that can be further examined. I aim to approach the work with the notion that the peripheral figures are as significant as the protagonist. Dickens’ fiction not only provides a spatial image of alienation and mystification in capitalism, but also emphasizes the importance of secondary characters, revealing space as socially constructed.

This thesis consists of three chapters. Chapter One discusses the connection between space and capitalism to explain the spatial framework that is applied to analyze the thesis. Chapter Two is based on the concept of absolute space to analyze the feelings of alienation in family life and leisure. Chapter Three uses the concept of relative space to examine the mechanism of mystification. All three chapters are dedicated to examining the social roles of different characters and the dynamics of space to emphasize their importance in the novel. This thesis aims to explore the role of space by employing a Marxist reading of *Great Expectations*. Drawing on Lefebvre’s *Critique of Everyday Life* and David Harvey’s *Social Justice and the City*, I contend that the novel cleverly illustrates multiple characters to expose the dynamics of alienation and mystification in a capitalist society.

**Keywords:** *Great Expectations*, space, capitalism, Victorian Studies
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Introduction

This thesis, “The Dynamics of Space: Alienation and Mystification in Charles Dickens’ *Great Expectations,*” proposes to expose the dynamics of space and the workings of capitalism in Charles Dickens’ thirteenth novel, *Great Expectations.* Published in 1861, the work is the first-person account of a youth from the pastoral countryside of Kent who ventures to the center of the capital to realize the dream of becoming a prestigious gentleman. From the misty marshes where Pip’s home and family graveyard are situated to the industrial streets of London, the novel provides luminous descriptions of the surrounding landscape. It is also a story of diverse characters, including the honest Joe Gargery, bewitching Estella Havisham, friendly Herbert Pocket, deceitful Compeyson, and many others. Dickens’ vivid narration of assorted individuals and their surrounding environment in the novel provide the context for conducting this study.

There are three primary reasons for my study. First, I combine the fields of Marxism and human geography to offer a new reading of *Great Expectations* since most critics deal with these two fields separately in analyzing Dickens’ novels. Second, I problematize the notion that the novel is simply a story about Pip’s personal experience in growing up; rather, it, represents the expectations of all the characters featured in the novel. I regard the secondary characters are of equal significance to the protagonist in the narrative to present a space as a reproduction of social relationships. Furthermore, I argue that spatial imagery is both created and reproduced in the capitalist society. I believe that the depictions of the rural marshes and urban London in the novel are continually created and replicated to sustain the social order of capitalism. Dickens’ work uncovers various individuals that are unconsciously imprisoned in a capitalist space and unable to satisfy their individual desires. Therefore, in applying a Marxist and spatial approach to the novel, I propose Charles Dickens’ *Great Expectations* is not only a novel filled with vivid illustrations of people and landscape, but a novel that reveals the
capitalist mode of production, including alienation and mystification.

I approach the spatiality of the novel from both a Marxist and spatial perspective to argue that space is dynamic in the development of the plot and present the novel as a story of diverse characters. The purpose of this thesis is to argue that the novel can be approached from a spatial perspective both to explain the novel’s depiction of capitalism and to understand the importance of periphery characters. Taking the spatial theories of Henri Lefebvre and David Harvey into consideration, I demonstrate that the idea of space as a social product. Space is not merely an environment that people inhibit, but is a complicated and diverse product that is created from social interactions with people and place. Making space as the frame of reference provides a new angle to reading the aspects of capitalism in Dickens’ novel.

First, Harvey’s two concepts of space (absolute and relative space) is placed as the frame of my thesis, which is introduced from his book, *Social Injustice and the City* and further explained in “Space as a Keyword.” According to Harvey, space corresponds to time, which expands Lefebvre’s threefold dialectical categories of space in *The Production of Space* (the perceived, conceived and lived) into his own division of categories: absolute and relative space. Absolute space is the space where objects are locked in a given time. For instance, space is perceived as an object (Satis House), represented by a concept (family life and leisure) and lived through the demonstrations of feelings (alienation). Relative space involves process, moving from one object to another. In other words, space is determined by the other objects that are relative to it. Examples of the perceived, conceived and lived in relative space are money, money fetishism, and mystification. These spatial concepts complicate the readings of the novel in which capitalism is maintained and produced through human interactions, spaces, and multifarious landmarks.

Second, I identify the social roles of space in the mode of alienation and mystification in the novel. According to Lefebvre, in *Critique of Everyday Life*, alienation stems from two concepts: leisure and disalienation. The enactment of alienation comes not only from labor, but
also from leisure. The more you attempt to disalienate yourself by escaping from work through leisure, the more you become alienated. Mystification is a method of ensuring the workings of capitalism so that workers are deceived by the owners of capital to believe that they are able to enjoy the fruits of their labor. It stabilizes the workings of capitalism. The working class remains working for the capitalist, while the capitalist sustains the control of taking advantage of the working class to earn more money. Similar to alienation, mystification also involves two concepts: individualism and fetishism. Lefebvre states that individualism is a form of mystification that can be related to fetishism. Alienation and mystification relate to one another, yet are tackled from different perspectives in the sense that alienation is the feeling that is created from the environment, while mystification is the process through which alienation takes place. Alienation and mystification demonstrates how space is a socially created product, exposing Victorian realities and complex social relations in a capitalist society. This thesis scrutinizes the interaction between space and the characters in Great Expectations by taking a Marxist and spatial approach, adopting Lefebvre’s and Harvey’s theories of space as theoretical support. This reading allows readers to understand that the novel is not only a story of Pip, but also a story of multiple characters, which brings the readers into a much more complex and multifaceted reading of the novel. Following the introduction, this thesis is primarily composed of three chapters, entitled as follows: “Chapter One: Space and Capitalism in Great Expectations,” “Chapter Two: Alienation in Family Life and Leisure,” and “Chapter Three: The Mystification of Money.”

“Chapter One: Space and Capitalism in Great Expectations” explains the reasons for combining the fields of space and capitalism in reading Dickens’ work to argue for the importance of secondary characters and capitalist space. First, it introduces Lefebvre’s and Harvey’s spatial concepts that have been applied to Dickens’ works, such as Hard Times and David Copperfield. The purpose is to investigate the theoretical connection with Dickens’ other works, extending them to an analysis of Great Expectations. Second, this chapter highlights
the traditional study of space in the novel, emphasizing that space is a reflection of the characters’ mental and physical condition, as well as a dominating force that affects the characters’ actions in *Great Expectations*. Third, it concludes with the themes of capitalism that are acknowledged in the text to provide a theoretical background to the thesis.

“Chapter Two: Alienation in Family Life and Leisure” examines the characters from the perspective of Harvey’s concept of absolute space to introduce the theme of alienation. In other words, this chapter discusses how space isolates characters from themselves and humanity. The ultimate goal of this chapter is to demonstrate that the landscape, houses, and settings are not merely a reflection of the characters’ mental and physical status, but also represent of their expectations in life. Focusing on Pip’s interaction with the characters, Mr. and Mrs. Joe, Biddy, Miss Havisham, Estella, and Abel Magwitch, and their spaces, this chapter demonstrates the dynamics of space in the novel and how it contributes to the feelings of alienation.

“Chapter Three: The Mystification of Money” focuses on the theme of mystification from Harvey’s spatial concept of relative space to explain how the desire for money mystifies the individual. Rather than exploring the issue of exploitation in the novel, this chapter proposes that space consists of illusions that eventually deteriorate into nothingness. Taking Harvey’s concept of relative space into consideration, I explain the process through which the characters are deceived by their expectations. This chapter not only explores the novel’s brilliant deceivers, but also the victims of money fetishism. Following from Chapter One’s discussion of space as a dynamic force, this chapter discusses space as a deceptive device in mystifying the characters into believing that they are able to fulfill their expectations.

These chapters are dedicated to the understanding of space as a dynamic force which develops the plot of the story. The novel is not only a comic relief for readers but also could be viewed from a Marxist and spatial perspective. I explore the Marxist themes of alienation and mystification as they arise through the depictions of space, which serve as a dynamism of capitalism in the novel. This serves to integrate the plots of alienation and mystification to
interpret the novel not solely as a moral text which provides an entertaining story, but also as a novel that reveals Victorian realities. Furthermore, this thesis argues that the characters and their spaces are crucial in examining the novel. *Great Expectations* is not a story of Pip but multiple stories of different characters, each contributing to the plot as well as part of the narration of space. Each character has his or her own story to tell the reader and individual plots that manifest themselves throughout the text. This is not a novel solely about Pip, but a consolidation of characters that create a world of capitalism.

There are three primary claims that organize this thesis. First, I aim to present *Great Expectations* as a serious text, which demonstrates the workings of capitalism. Second, I propose to explain the dynamics of space and how space is illustrated to explain the plots of the story. Third, I intend to criticize the assumptions of Pip being the central focus of spatial studies to emphasize the importance of other characters. These three claims help enrich our understanding of how capitalism, space, and social relations are construed in Dickens’ novel. The presence of the characters in Dickens’ *Great Expectations* offers readers a dynamism of space, revealing the workings of alienation and mystification.

**Chapter One: Space and Capitalism in *Great Expectations***

Critics of Charles Dickens’ *Great Expectations* have carefully examined the subject of space and capitalism in the novel. From the physical landscapes and mental growth of the characters to the unseen processes of the capital, Dickens’ work demonstrates the spatial interior of the characters, as well as their significance in the story. Space and capitalism have been conceivably important in the *Great Expectations*, yet relatively few studies acknowledge their close association in the text. By emphasizing the term “space” and “capitalism,” I exemplify the social relationships that are elucidated in the novel, as well as the importance of peripheral characters. The characters are not merely interesting individuals that appear in the story to reflect the moral growth of the protagonist, but are intentionally allocated to display
the production of alienation and mystification. Examining the text according to Henri Lefebvre’s and David Harvey’s spatial concepts, I critically explore the significance of space and capitalism in *Great Expectations*.

**A Matter of Space**

Some Marxist and sociological theorists, such as Lefebvre and Harvey, examine the relation between space and capitalism. In “Reflections on the Politics of Space,” Lefebvre highlights the role of space in production by defining it as a social product:

> Space is not a scientific object removed from ideology or politics. It has always been political and strategic. There is an ideology of space. Because space, which seems homogeneous, which appears as a whole in its objectivity, in its pure form, such as we determine it, is a social product. (171)

In other words, space is socially constructed and valued under the mode of capitalism. Every society creates its own special space, and is in turn, affected by its space. It is a reflection of social relations and a material product that influence others. In addition, in *The Production of Space*, Lefebvre explains that space emerges dialectically from three categories: material space, the representation of space, and the space of representation. Material space, also known as perceived space, is a concrete object that can be touched, felt, sensed, and perceived. For example, a wall, a building, and the school are examples of the concrete entity. The representation of space, the conceived, is the conceptual replacement of the material object. A map, a grid, or graph represents material space in symbolic form. The space of representation is the living reaction to the environment, in which one has feelings and sensations of being alive. For instance, one feels happy after viewing beautiful scenery or one undergoes stress while meeting people in a new environment.

Spatiality is also often related to temporality. In *Social Justice and the City*, Harvey
combines space with time, explaining that space is the unification of different dimensions. Influenced by Lefebvre’s threefold concept of space, he also divides space into three dimensions: absolute space, relative space, and relational space. Absolute space is an object fixed in a given time. It is a space of individuation, such as people, private property, place, or territorial designations. Relative space refers to the space created from movement. It is a space that is reliant on time. For example, objects such as money, capital, and information create space through an exchange. Relational space implies the process of internalizing the external influences. The process itself defines its own space, which could include social relations that affect one to have visions, dreams, and fantasies. In “Space as Keyword,” Harvey further complicates the three-dimensional aspects of space by integrating Lefebvre’s three divisions of space to reinforce the relation between spatiality and temporality. He argues that absolute, relative and relational space can each be divided into three smaller sectors: the conceived, perceived, and lived. Take the wall as an example. Being an immovable object, it is classified as part of Harvey’s absolute space. However, the wall as absolute space can be further divided into Lefebvre’s categories of the perceived, conceived and the lived. The building (the perceived) transforms into a map for urban planning (the conceived) and creates personal experience (the lived).

Space has always been a popular theme in the study of Dickens’ works, such as *David Copperfield, Hard Times* and many others. In *Dickens’s London: Perception, Subjectivity and Phenomenal Urban Multiplicity*, Julian Wolfreys examines London in *David Copperfield* by applying Lefebvre’s spatial theory. He highlights Micawber’s relationship with London, arguing that “Micawber is someone who knows not only how to move through the city but also, importantly, how to read it, and to respond to the play, always in place with the local and the unknowable, the fixed point and the limit of knowledge” (21). In other words, Micawber is one who can adapt well to the urban city because of his personal experience in his inhabited space. He argues that Micawber demonstrates that space and identity are intimately interwoven.
Similarly, in *Reading Victorian Schoolrooms: Childhood and Education in the Nineteenth-Century*, Elizabeth Gargano uses Lefebvre’s space of representation to explore the school room in *Hard Times*. From an architectural perspective, she argues that Gradgrind’s school room is a symbol “of a church stripped of its sacral trappings, reinforcing the separation of new professionalized schools from their earlier church affiliations” (27). The new schooling system recruits massive numbers of students. This massive production of educating students is similar to the workings of the factories and warehouses in Coketown. In addition, she also identifies the school room as an embodiment of Gradgrind. She compares the descriptions of the human body with the visuals of the schoolroom, including the schoolmaster’s hair with the plants in the plantation.

Specific locations are also examined in Dickens’ other works. In *Metropolis and Experience: Defoe, Dickens, Joyce*, Hye-Joon Yoon analyzes the location of Mews Street in *Little Dorrit*. He emphasizes that Dickens’ description of the streets reveals both the location and diverse social relationships. Brian Robinson looks at Dickens’ work as a whole and focuses on the geography of London to demonstrate that Dickens’ extraordinary knowledge of London enables “his works the seeming seamlessness of mappable verisimilitude” (61). He argues that the landscapes that appear in his works have actual references that can be mapped and found in reality. Examples include landmarks, such as The Cross Keys in *Great Expectations*, The Golden Cross in *David Copperfield*, the Saracen’s Head in *Nicholas Nickleby*, and The White Hart Inn in *The Pickwick Papers*.

In addition, the landscape in *Great Expectations* has been read as analogous to the emotional and physical condition of the characters. Traditionally, critics have approached space as a reflection of the character’s feelings and sensations. Alan Lelchuk identifies space as a reflection of Pip’s internal thoughts, which plays an important role in Pip’s identity. He explains that “[t]he bleak landscape of the surrounding reflects accurately the vast gloom flooding Pip’s heart” (407). The graveyard and the marshes embody the intense feelings of fear
and his yearning to unite with his deceased family members. Satis House and London are symbolic of Pip’s initiation into English society, when Pip learns of the darkness of Victorian society. On one hand, Satis House educates the young hero in the English snobbery and the perversity behind the glamour of being a gentleman. On the other hand, London becomes the image of the harsh reality of growing up.

Miss Havisham’s Satis House, a distinguished landmark, meaning “enough” in Latin as pointed out by Estella in the novel, is also a focus of spatial study that demonstrates the physical and mental state of the characters. Susan Walsh suggests that Satis House “serves as the architectural correlative of its female inhabitant, a public digest of a thwarted woman’s private and mental bodily decay” (73). Satis House echoes the mental and physical condition of Miss Havisham’s deterioration after being deceived and abandoned by her fiancé. In Charles Dickens: The World of His Novels, J. Hillis Miller takes the perspective of Pip by analyzing Satis House in relation to social class. He argues not only is Satis House symbolic of Miss Havisham’s mental and physical state, but also represents the image of the values and restrictions of social class. He suggests that “Miss Havisham and her house are images of a fixed social order” and the house has “the power which can judge Pip at first as course a common, and later as a gentleman” (267). Not only does Miller accepts the mansion as a mirror of Miss Havisham’s character, but he also reveals the house as a representative of upper-class values and codifications which compel Pip to realize the ambition to become a gentleman. Being completely transfixed by the lovely Estella and attracted to the upper-class lifestyle from the moment Pip entered Miss Havisham’s mansion, Pip begins the long yearning to become a gentleman.

More recent studies continue this interpretation of space as an active agent that manipulates the protagonist’s psyche. In Realism and Space in the Novel, Rosa Mucignat argues that “[t]he marshes, the forge and Satis House have the power to awake fear, guilt, desire and loathing, and touch the most intense and obscure areas of Pip’s psyche” (124). Beginning
with the concept of space as the carrier of energy in modern physics to social science and sociology of culture, Mucignat explains that space is an influential feature that affects not only individual behavior, but also concrete and abstract objects. She criticizes the concept of space as a passive feature and proposes that space is a force that compels the hero to experience feelings and sensations. In addition, she emphasizes Pip’s emotional relationship with space, by claiming that Pip is the only protagonist worthy to be examined, while “secondary characters and periphery episodes are treated only briefly” (123).

Mucignat’s bold assertion to read space as a force brings a new interpretation of the novel. Nevertheless, she overlooks that the story is not solely about Pip, but a story of diverse characters. Many critics excessively attend to Pip’s psychological maturation and neglect the spiritual growth and development of other characters. Even if one acknowledges Pip as the primary rounded character, one must also acknowledge that peripheral characters also play a part in the construction of space since, according to Lefebvre’s and Harvey’s terms, space is socially constructed. The importance of secondary characters is acknowledged, however, in narratology. Alex Woloch argues that “Pip is constantly overwhelmed by the marginal characters who surround him” (178). In other words, other characters have the power to affect the actions of the protagonist from the margins. It is not the protagonist’s own will that influences his progression into maturity but the hero’s interaction with other spaces that completes his journey into manhood.

By placing Pip outside the focus of study, the assumption of Pip as the implied author is also questioned. Eiichi Hara rejects that the novel is a story of Pip and questions his control of the story. He argues that the implied author of the text is not Pip, but Abel Magwitch, who “is both the author of Pip’s story and the father who has secretly adopted him as his son, begetter of the text and its hero at the same time” (593). In other words, Magwitch is the protagonist of the story since he is able to control the development of the story, while Pip is the object of Magwitch’s narrative. An example of Pip being unable to control his own narration of the story
is explained from the beginning scene, in which the name “Pip” is not given by the living but from the gravestones of his family tomb.

Therefore, space should not merely be investigated from the protagonist’s perspective in the novel. Other characters should also be taken into consideration. Space is an integration of complex relations and social interactions. Space has been a popular subject to study in analyzing Dickens’ novels, particularly *Great Expectations*. In his work, most scholars focus on the spatial aspects that associate with the protagonist, while disregarding the importance of secondary characters. In addition, they view space as either passive agent or active influence in the characters’ psyche, revealing the duality and simplicity of exploring space. However, space is complex and socially constructed, as shown by Lefebvre’s demonstration of spatiality and Harvey’s spatio-temporal relationship. It is not only constituted of material objects, but also includes abstract concepts, such as money and ideas. Space is not merely an environmental or location-based study. Since space is a product of social relations, it is possible to combine the social aspects of Victorian reality into the analysis of Dickens’ novel.

**Exploring Aspects of Capitalism**

*Great Expectations* is a novel that depicts multiple layers of Victorian reality. Jess Nevins lists the themes of capitalism in the novel:

Other themes include the necessity of finding one’s place in the world and being defined by work… the possibility of social mobility and the rise of the middle classes; the morality of self-reliance and self-help; affection, loyalty, and conscience are more important than social advancement, wealth and class. (12)

Written from a first-person perspective, the novel includes a variety of diverse themes. It is a novel that integrates various themes related to the social context of the Victorian Era, a social novel of class mobility in which Pip struggles to change his status from a lower-class
blacksmith to an upper-class gentleman in society. For instance, class mobility is presented through an economic perspective, such as the education paid from a convict. Pip’s love for Estella also proves to be part of the irony of his aspirations to climb the social ladder, since he later succeeds in changing his social status but no longer feels attracted towards Estella’s beauty.

In the world of capitalism, Pip is dehumanized to fit into the social role of society. Gail Turley Houston argues that “[F]allen into the world of production and consumption, Pip is not born: he is made, and that makes him particularly vulnerable in the cannibalistic world of Victorian England” (21). She highlights that Mrs. Joe and Biddy do not take on the role of Pip’s mother, despite that he tries to replace them as his real mothers. Abandoned from the safe wings of family, Pip becomes the object which can be manipulated in market relations. He is either to be consumed or become the consumer. Placed as a vulnerable victim of capitalist production, he is created to disregard the feelings of humanity. For instance, his profound guilt for running away from Joe does not stop him from continuing his ambitious pursuit of becoming a educated gentleman.

Thus, Pip becomes alienates from society. Alienation, a Marxist concept that refers to the estrangement of humanity, manifests itself in the novel. Miller identifies the feeling of isolation of the youth from the opening scene of the novel. Similar to many Dickens’ heroes who have been abandoned from childhood, Pip also is estranged from society as an outcast, an orphan with no particular standing. Nature, family and community harshly treat him as a shameful existence. He argues that Pip is a character that “is either ignored by society altogether, thrown into the streets to beg or starve, or he is taken care of by the state or by his foster parents in an impersonal way which deprives him of any real identity” (253). This sense of guilt traumatizes Pip to fit into his role in the capitalist world.

In Charles Dickens: The Uses of Time, James Marlow further expands this point by arguing that Pip’s change in status that alienates him from the working class is not due to his
grand ambition to climb up the social ladder or to escape the environment but due to his acceptance of the divisions of class. Not only is Pip alienated from youth, but also estranged from the working class throughout his adult life. The hostility of the environment that Pip grew up in did urge him to find comfort elsewhere but did not corrupt his thinking. It is Pip’s own willingness to take on the new role as a gentleman that estranged him from the others. In other words, Pip accepts “the convention that he is permanently alienated from people in the lower station of society” (99). This acceptance of adopting the upper-class culture and throwing away the old is demonstrated from Joe’s visit to London, when Pip treated Joe with contempt.

On the other hand, alienation strongly ties to the space that Pip inhabits since childhood. Iain Crawford argues “the village and the forge” have alienating powers which estrange Pip from himself and society (629). He emphasizes that Pip’s struggle to climb the social ladder is the bondage of joy, since he is influenced by the envy of class since childhood. The child’s attempt to climb the social ladder is a struggling, yet satisfying at the same time. Examples of class envy include Mrs. Joe, who is forever complaining of being married to a blacksmith, Estella, who is always laughing at Pip for his coarse appearance, and Mr. Pumblechook who pressures Pip to learn mathematics as a way to enhance his social class. Later, as he fits into the social role of a gentleman by living with the Pockets, he does not feel accepted either, but remains estranged.

However, alienation does not link solely to the young hero. It is also manifested in other characters: Miss Havisham who lives in the lonely Satis House, Estella, who is unable to love other people, Mr. Joe, who is stuck in the forge as a black-smith, and many others. Patricia McKee expands the concept of alienation of the individual to alienation of common experience. She argues that the novel is not about “moral failure and personal alienation,” but “the formation of constellations of different persons and different histories in which characters are revealed in their different parts and as parts of one another” (39). In other words, alienation in the novel is a mutual feeling that is recognized by the characters as part of the self and others.
It is “parts of the self interrupted by others, living in others, part of others.” She believes that the novel expresses the Victorian realities of the nineteenth-century, which the Victorians were concerned with the loss of the self through rapid industrialization.

Alienation is also manifested in the theme of forgery in the novel. In *Forgery in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Culture*, Sarah Malton argues that the crime of forgery in Dickens’ narrative indicates the cultural anxiety against the theft of identity and the call for forgery as a serious penalty. It is a response to the abolition of forgery as a death penalty. She elaborates that Pip’s life is built upon a falsehood created by Abel Magwitch. The relationship between Pip and his financial supporter becomes the metaphor for the negative effects of forgery, loss of identity and property. The protagonist is “embedded in a network of fraud and deceptions that he has become utterly alienated from himself” (11). In other words, Pip’s sense of alienation appears when he realizes the falsity and the instability of his supposed identity.

Despite Malton’s attempt to interpret forgery as a form of alienation, she fails to acknowledge the essence of forgery, which is to mystify others from the truth of reality. Her argument of forgery brings out another theme, the concept of mystification, a Marxist term that designates the workings of capitalism which disguises people from the truth of reality. Mystification and alienation often go hand in hand. According to Lefebvre in *Critique of Everyday Life*, people’s lives are “alienated because it is not only fragmented, but artificial, and it is this artificially which makes mystification possible” (v1, xvi). Mystification is the process of alienation that depends on the value of objects, which distances people from reality. In terms of mystification, Pip’s feelings of alienation emerge from attachment to objects or commodities, making him mystified to believe he can climb the social ladder. He is deceived by Miss Havisham to believe that she is the benefactor in his pursuit to become a gentleman after visiting Satis House. The young man is also deceived by Estella’s charm as a consequence of his visits. As Pip becomes fascinated with the upper-class life style, he becomes mystified to believe that he will one day marry Estella, whereas Estella marries Bentley Drummle, the
arrogant aristocrat, in reality.

Mystification involves in the roles of the deceiver and the deceived. In contrast to the deceived, such as Pip and Miss Havisham, there are also deceivers in the novel. Philip V. Allingham identifies Compeyson as one of “the novel’s most powerful characters, terrifyingly and almost supernaturally so upon occasion” (453). Unlike Pip, who knows nothing of his situation, as well as the source of his wealth, Compeyson know everything that happens so that they are able to manipulate the events to their advantage. Compeyson tricks Miss Havisham into buying her brother’s brewery by promising her marriage, which in fact did not occur. Another obvious deceptive character is Pip, who deludes himself and others that he will become a gentleman through his acquaintance with Miss Havisham.

Yet, mystification mostly encompasses the idea of the individual disorienting the self through individual possession. Andy Merrifield elucidates that Lefebvre emphasizes the act of owning private property “deprives the self of real selfhood” (150). An explicit demonstration of this disillusion is Pip’s expectations to become a gentleman. The boy mistakenly assumes that Miss Havisham had provided the money for him to enhance his social standing so that one day he could marry Estella. Heather L. Braun offers another example of the boy’s wishful fantasies. She argues that “Pip deludes himself with another story: he need only return home and marry Biddy, Estella’s domestically rooted foil, to find his happy domesticated ending” (66). Pip’s failure to marry Estella and find a home can only be remedied when he goes back to the marshes to wed Biddy. In other words, Pip’s eventually perceives that the house in the marshes is his real home, disorienting himself to believe his past mistakes in the road of gentrification will be mended.

In addition, other characters are deceived by their own anticipations. Miss Havisham also deludes herself by adopting the baby Estella as a means to compensate for her lost love and keeping dead objects of the past as a reminder of her tragic history. Laurie Garrison accentuates that Estella “is deliberately trained to interact with man in certain ways in order to help Miss
Havisham carry out her plot of revenge against the entire male gender” (136). Moreover, Miss Havisham also wears a deteriorating bridal gown and have objects placed in the exact position since the day of her wedding day. Roger Kennedy highlights Miss Havisham’s fetishism towards the dead objects of the past. He emphasizes that the old lady clings to the objects from her wedding day not only implies her psychological condition which she remains mournful from her unfortunate experience, but also acts as a reminder for her daughter to learn from her mistakes.

Rachel Bowdy argues that Magwitch “like Miss Havisham, has devoted himself to gratify fancies of his own” (129). Magwitch’s intention of offering Pip his fortune seems to be a decent and noble act on the surface, but it is in reality, a method which the criminal resolutely attempts to redeem himself from the previous wrongs that he had committed. Magwitch ignorantly thinks he is helping the boy by giving money and status for him to have the chance to find happiness and love. He assumes that he is doing a good deed in sponsoring the orphaned child, unaware that he had done is exactly the opposite. Pip could not accept the fact the fortune he had received had come from a criminal, which is why he ended up numb with fever.

An important factor of self-delusion lies in the characters’ fetishism for commodity. Critics have also identified the commodities that come from Australia, such as tobacco. In *The Idea in Things: Fugitive in the Victorian Novel*, Elaine Freedgood argues that the name of the tobacco, “Negro Head,” presents the aboriginal genocide in Victorian Australia. She emphasizes that the drug is a representation of bringing the racial ideologies from the Old World to the New World. “Negro” is a term that originally refers to the African American, but is transferred to designate the Australian Aborigines. She argues that “the presence of negro head tobacco symbolizes the crime of Aborigine genocide without requiring conscious acknowledgment of it, and therefore without forcing the reader to deny, repress, oppose the fact of genocide” (83-4). She gives the example of the scene where Abel Magwitch, rich from the plantations of Australia, visits Pip while smoking the Negro Head cigar.
Other commodities, such as jewelry, are also identified in the novel. John Wemmick, one of the clerks that work at Mr. Jagger’s office, has the habit of collecting jewelry from the clients in the prison, which he defines as portable property. Henrietta Lidchi argues that Mr. Wemmick’s jewels reveal “Wemmick to be a tolerant and moral man, who while connecting with those less fortunate than himself, is fatalistic and sanguine about his own prospects” (133). Unlike Pip, who is burdened by the fortune he anonymously received from the criminal Magwitch, the clerk never turns down a gift from a client and keeps their gifts in his small collection. For the clerk, the jewelry stands for economic value, as well serves as a reminder of his client’s history.

Lidchi’s argument overlooks the individual attachment to private property, or commodity fetishism in Marxist terms. She does not explain the economic relationship between the object and the subject, which is fetishism. Mr. Wemmick is strongly engaged in expanding his collection of jewels, as well as being proud of his collection. In fact, his fetishism towards the jewelry allows him to deceive himself that the value of the jewelry is part of his identity. Each piece of jewelry is valued and becomes part of the clerk’s identity, “connoting the nature of his profession and embodying his social connections” (Lidchi 133). This commodity fetishism relates to other characters as well, including Pip’s irresistible fascination with the Satis House and the churchyard, Joe’s genuine devotion to the forge, and Miss Havisham’s emotional attachment to her bridal gown.

Other characters have also been identified in their attachment to other objects. In “Circumventing the Subject/Object Binary,” Isobel Armstrong acknowledges commodity fetishism, pointing out Pip’s relationship with the table. In the Christmas scene where Pip strongly attaches himself to the table leg, she explains that the table symbolizes “the parental support he has lost” (22). Being constantly persecuted by family and friends, he felt that he was out of place, an orphan without any roots despite that he has Mr. Joe as a surrogate father to look for support. The act of clinging the table is a materialization of fetishism that demonstrates
Pip’s desperate urge to belong in society.

Capitalism is an important subject for the analysis of the novel. Many critics have carefully examined the workings of capitalism, alienation and mystification, in Dickens’ fiction. The protagonist, Pip, is frequently criticized for his alienating relationship with society, while secondary characters are examined according to their mystifying fetishisms, including drug, private property, and many more. Nevertheless, many of the critical investigations have overtly placed their emphasis on one character while neglecting other characters. Pip is either omitted from the analysis or magnified in the discussion.

In this chapter, I explore space and capitalism separately to introduce the theoretical framework, as well as to point out the diverse fields that will be integrated into the following chapters. Space is examined in the relation to the protagonist’s mind and actions. On the other hand, the novel also features aspects of capitalism, specifically alienation and mystification. This chapter demonstrates space and capitalism as interesting studies to bring into the discussion of the novel, as well as demonstrate that secondary characters are of equal importance of the protagonist.
Chapter Two: Alienation in Leisure and Family Life

In the preface to Pip’s life in the marshes of Kent, the young hero callously addresses to the imaginary audience about alienation. Unfortunately secluded from the sweet comforts of family life, the young hero collects information of his biological family from his leisure visits to the churchyard. Orphaned at birth and taken directly into custody by his overbearing older sister, Pip unconsciously alienates himself from the world through leisure and family life:

I give Pirrip as my father’s family name, on the authority of his tombstone and my sister—Mrs. Joe Gargery, who married the blacksmith. As I never saw my father or my mother, and never saw any likeness of either of them (for their days were long before the days of photographs), my first fancies regarding what they were like, were unreasonably derived from their tombstones. (1)

This introduction indifferently provided by the young child is one of the many examples of alienation. Pip’s desolated feelings in reference to his family name and leisure visits to the graves pave the way towards alienation, a term that describes how an individual is isolated from the world due to the mysterious workings of capitalism.

Through Pip’s narration of the small house on the marshes and Miss Havisham’s Satis House, Great Expectations brings together the unification of different characters, displaying alienation in family life and leisure. Estrangement is evenly distributed in every corner of Pip’s childhood. Feelings of alienation systematically duplicate themselves in the paradoxical process of alienation and disalienation from the solemn churchyard in the rural marshes to the Pocket’s household in the capital. The characters are continually experiencing the extrinsic powers of the houses they live in, alienating themselves from each other and themselves. They are frozen in an “absolute space,” a term defined by David Harvey as space which an object or person is ardently locked in a certain place and time. The characters are unconsciously marginalized in a space where time and place is firmly fixed.
Alienation is a Marxist term that designates loneliness, isolation, and indifference. According to Henri Lefebvre in *Critique of Everyday Life*, alienation pertains to all the aspects of living space. Lefebvre suggests the concept “is not only economic, it is the inability in all areas of life to think the other” (*v*, *xvi). Estrangement is strongly attached to every social relation. People are accustomed to experience detachment from the individual, society, and themselves. Everything automatically refers to a particular value and people are manipulated into accepting it as a fundamental part of reality. The world is a space where isolation and the ongoing process of isolation repeatedly occurs. People correspondingly separate themselves from the self and others. Social relationships are fragmented and artificial. There are no substantiated relations that are constructed without alienation, making human relationships fragile and easy to break. People unknowingly distance themselves from each other and other living beings, relying merely on external objects to determine their existing value. They eventually dehumanize themselves and lose their sense of identity.

Family life and leisure expose the mechanism of alienating spaces. Lefebvre emphasizes that leisure is the direct opposite of work, yet part of the production of capitalism. He believes that leisure, as well as aspects of family life, sports, and etcetera, “cannot be separated from work” (29). The purpose of leisure and other recreational aspects is to provide occasional entertainment and create momentary distractions from the unpleasant aspects of work. It serves as an escapism of the daily pressures and heavy responsibilities from the workplace. Examples of leisure encompass simple activities, such as strolling in the park and drinking in a bar. It also involves passive exercises, such as a person watching a movie on a couch or reading a book. Furthermore, it enlightens strong interests in specialized fields and professions, such as photography, marine biologists, and much more. Family life includes the pastimes of having to spend precious time with family, including going out on a picnic with one’s family, talking with them, and eating with them.

These aspects of life perspicuously reveal alienation as a dialectical process of alienation
and disalienation. Lefebvre emphasizes that alienation “persists, or is even born again in new forms, along with its contradictory process, the process of ‘disalienation’” (63). Despite the goal of leisure and family is to provide entertainment and distraction from the workplace for the individual, it does not liberate him or her from the restraints of alienation. It is created by people participating in recreational activities. As people purposely attempt to disalienate themselves through leisure and family life, they become more estranged. There is a paradox in alienation, which aspects of life serve as a retreat from the unpleasant realities, yet promptly enacts the process of alienation. Through leisure, the individual expects to have overcome alienation, but in reality, one is actually further distancing further from humanity. One can never escape from the confinements of the dominating structures of capitalism. People are trapped in the vortex of estrangement, not only because of their social stratification, but due to their desperate urge to overcome alienation.

*Great Expectations* dramatically uncovers how aspects of alienation and disalienation operate in the world of capitalism. Dickens’ perspicuously creates a place where the rich effortlessly remain the rich, while the poor work hard to sustain their living in hopes of changing their social environment. Harold Bloom exclusively claims that the novel “offers a dark vision of the psychological effects of the particular kind of class society fostered by industrial capitalism in nineteenth-century London” (13). Dickens builds an oppressive atmosphere of capitalist economy, which shows people constantly struggling to climb the social ladder, yet remain in their original social standing. Moreover, the depiction of family business is narrated in the novel. Christopher Parkes explains that the novel illustrates the vivid descriptions of “family homes with business attached to them” and the irony of exploiting the children in the firm as part of the process of capitalist production (44). A perceptible example includes Mr. Joe’s small forge where Pip is apprenticed as a blacksmith.

It is under the scope of capitalism that alienation is fully manifested in the novel. Alienation is not only embedded in the economics of family business in the novel, but also in
leisure and family life. Pip’s childhood home in the marshes and Miss Havisham’s Satis House, and Pocket’s household are examples of the alienated spaces that dominantly force the innocent residences, Pip, Mr. and Mrs. Joe Gargery, Biddy, Miss Havisham, and other characters to succumb to their social roles in society. They are distinctively separated from each other not because of their eccentric personality or the harshness of society, but from the alienation that originates from their restrictive environment. They all expect to absolve their feelings of alienation through leisure and family life, but they unfortunately end in failure and become further isolated from the world. Alienation is omnipresent, undermining the characters’ social relationships with each other.

In the novel, distinct boundaries of the industrial workplace and ideal home obscure in the portrayal of Mrs. Joe’s and Biddy’s association with the small house on the marshes. Mrs. Joe and Biddy are the images of traditional Victorian women whose sole responsibilities lie in the domestic affairs despite of their unconventional personalities. They assert great effort in maintaining the household and devotes themselves to take care of the family. Mrs. Joe, particularly, is frequently praised for bringing Pip up by hand. In one of the annual Christmas gatherings held by Mrs. Joe, Mr. Pumblechook, Pip’s uncle, annoyingly reminds the youngster of Mrs. Joe’s efforts in giving him a home. He publicly scolds Pip in front of all the house guests with his most often repeated words, which is “be grateful, boy, to them which brought you up by hand” (22). Pip has frequently heard this praise for his sister from Mr. Pumblechook a thousand times. His uncle’s emphasis on the child’s upbringing strongly designates that a woman’s virtue is generally equated to the women’s dedication in domestic activities. It is an indication that women should concern themselves over the considering the best future perspectives for their family. Mrs. Joe’s best interest lies in Pip’s success in pursuing a better

1 Other alienated characters that are not discussed in this thesis may include Mr. Wemmick who owns the Castle at Walworth, Mr. Jaggers who lives near the office, and Herbert who stays at the Inn.
2 Unconventionally, Mrs. Joe is not a submissive individual who obeys to the husband’s wishes. As a matter of fact, she is obstinate and reproachful, often taking control of family affairs. On the other hand, Biddy is docile and obedient, but also nontraditional in a sense that she believes that education is important.
life, which she becomes overjoyed when Pip makes his acquaintance with Miss Havisham, an aristocratic figure.

Mrs. Joe is entrapped in Pip’s home, specifically the kitchen. The kitchen alienates Mrs. Joe from society, although it primarily functions as an essential place in maintaining the workings of the household. From the prepared meals that Mrs. Joe skillfully cooks for the family to the occasional family gatherings, the kitchen is an important place for family life regardless of Mrs. Joe’s scolding nature. It is a workplace for the professional house wife to comfortably bake her delicious pies. Ironically, it is also the place of her being attacked by Orlick, Mr. Joe’s lazy assistant. As Pip quickly arrives at the crime scene after abruptly notified of Mrs. Joe’s being offensively assaulted in the kitchen, he swiftly identifies the sizable crowd in the kitchen. Pip describes the event in an urgent tone:

We were running too fast to admit of more being said, and we made no stop until we got into our kitchen. It was full of people; the whole village was there, or in the yard; and there was a surgeon, and there was Joe, and there was a group of women, all on the floor in the midst of the kitchen. (111)

This scene in the kitchen is the complete and physical embodiment of alienation. The crowded quarters and the unconscious victim sarcastically display a striking contrast of human closeness and loneliness. It fully manifests itself as she struggles to disalienate herself from society by inviting family and friends for feasts and providing food for the family. As she continues to busy herself in the trifles of every life, her isolation deepens, which eventually leads to her ultimate death.

On the other hand, Pip’s household gradually estranges Pip’s clever classmate, Biddy, from her expectations of becoming a teacher. The young lady promptly replaces Mrs. Joe’s female role in the family after Mrs. Joe’s disabled condition. In Pip’s house, Biddy becomes a brilliant caretaker, a responsible nanny, a helpful assistant, and a great friend. She patiently attends to Mrs. Joe and the rest of the family, stewing scrumptious meals and aiding Joe’s
family business. The longer she stays in the Gargery residence, the more she loses her senses of what is happening in the real world. She is no longer a girl who loves to read and teach, but a woman who abides by the strict rules of society. Biddy becomes a younger and more refined version of Mrs. Joe, eventually becoming another Mrs. Joe by marrying the honest blacksmith. She is allured by the house and imprisoned under the restrictive order of the domestic environment.

In contrary to Mrs. Joe, who is unaware of the effect of the environmental powers, Biddy fully understand that the household is more than capable to influence the individual. Under the formal apprenticeship of Joe, Pip curiously questions Biddy about her mastery in taking over the household chores and forging metal without encountering any difficulty. Biddy simply answers, “I suppose I must catch it—like a cough” (119). Biddy compares her talent to a contagious disease rather than proudly accepting the praise. The young girl is not born to be an excellent mother figure or a caretaker, but manipulated by the domestic atmosphere into applying her talent to the domestic sphere. Greatly influenced by the social expectations for women and spiritually confined to the small house, Biddy is incapable of overcoming the political powers of the domestic household.

The house effectively entraps innocent Biddy from thinking outside the domestic sphere. In Pip’s idle stroll with Biddy, passing the village and into the marshes, the young boy confesses his innermost desires which is “to become a gentleman” (120). Instead of praising Pip for his great ambition. Biddy then immediately answers without any thought, “Oh, I wouldn’t, if I was you!” Her negative response indicates the frigidity and absolute power of the space dominating the individual. As she becomes accustomed to living in Mr. Joe’s household, she becomes less reluctant to reach outside the comfort zone, alienating herself from the rest of the world. She does not understand the reasons for Pip’s eagerness to run away from his responsibilities of the forge nor does she acknowledge that there is a world outside Joe’s house where Pip may have the chance to find his place in society. While most people
concern themselves with the issue of social mobility, Biddy chooses to support the opposite perspective, unconsciously estranging herself from the views of the public.

Mrs. Joe and Biddy relation to home presents alienation from the workplace, as well as family life. Another explicit example of alienation in the workplace and home is Pip’s and Joe’s relationship with the forge. The forge is a family firm located directly next to Pip’s house. The young child oftentimes finds Joe in the forge when he seeks a fatherly advice. It is a workstation where Joe industriously works in forging metal and steel and a parental space where he plays the role of the kindhearted father, bringing patient guidance and counsel of the orphaned child. After visiting the graveyard, Pip goes home and narrates the details of the forge:

Joe’s forge adjoined our house, which was a wooden house, as many of the dwellings in our country were—most of them, at that time. When I ran home from the churchyard, the forge was shut up, and Joe was sitting alone in the kitchen. Joe and I being fellow-sufferers, and having confidences as such, Joe imparted a confidence to me, the moment I raised the latch of the door and peeped in at him opposite to it, sitting in the chimney corner. (6)

The adjacent building and the comforting presence of Joe in the kitchen explicitly presents the forge as an extension of home and Pip’s alienation from the building. It is the place where the young child realizes his spiritual disjunction towards Joe’s kindness and profession. The “adjourned” building refers to the closeness of social relationships, while “shut up” forge symbolizes Pip’s disconnection from the family and his dislike of Joe’s occupation as a blacksmith. He knows that Joe is someone who he can go to whenever he needs to talk, yet he feels that there is a gap between him and Joe.

The forge is suitable home where Pip learns the feelings of guilt and responsibilities in Joe’s profession as a blacksmith. In addition, it is also a place where the boy suffocates under the Joe’s expectations for Pip to inherit his family business. It is not that Pip purely detested life at home so much that he intensely desires to escape from the struggle of accepting his sister
and her husband as his family and the societal expectations of becoming a local craftsman. On the contrary, Pip highly values home as a sanctuary, a safe haven where all the external troubles can be resolved. It is an ideal home, being forced to live with a sister whose nagging nature and domineering temperament can irritate anyone let alone a supposedly unwanted child. Nevertheless, it remains to be a home where any child would be content to grow up in. In Pip’s personal confession of the guilt of feeling ashamed of his social background after his visits to Satis House, he genuinely outlines the feelings that he has towards home:

Home had never been a very pleasant place to me, because of my sister’s temper. But, Joe had sanctified it, and I had believed in it. I had believed in the best parlour as a most elegant saloon; I had believed in the front door, as a mysterious portal of the Temple of State whose solemn opening was attended with a sacrifice of roast fowls; I had believed in the kitchen as a chaste though not magnificent apartment; I had believed in the forge as the glowing road to manhood and independence. (100)

It is a divine home where a child would happily dream of living in and an educational institution that tolerantly teaches the human morals of humiliation and responsibilities of life. The small forge symbolizes “manhood and independence,” indicating the child’s profound respect and devout admiration for Mr. Joe’s effort in making a living and supporting the family economically. The kitchen and the front door are allegorically connected the sacred grounds of the temple to denote home as a place which provides mental protection and safety. Pip ultimately experiences the overwhelming guilt in betraying Joe’s expectations and feels the heavy burden on family finances.

Whereas Pip feels psychologically immobilized in the forge and the house, Joe finds the house exceeding relaxing and comfortable undeterred by his domineering wife. For the honest blacksmith, home is a place where Joe placidly enjoys the plesantries of taking the role of a loving father, supportive husband, and decent blacksmith. The kitchen, the forge, and the rooms of the house are the spatial locations where he appreciates the aspects of family life. The small
house with the adjourning forge is a space where he ignores everything that is happening in the real world. It is his safe haven where he feels blessed from the ordinary trivialities of life. In other words, it is a comfort zone where life is perfect and nothing wrong ever happens. Hence, Pip’s often mischievous deeds cannot destroy the serenity and peacefulness of Joe’s household.

Consequently, it is specifically in the house that Joe unconsciously grows isolated from the rest of society. As he remains content in taking the permanent position as the local blacksmith, he becomes completely ignorant of the people who ambitiously seeks to enhance their social standing. He firmly refuses to yield to the overpowering temptation of following the public’s anticipation to climb the social ladder, not because of his saint-like personality which makes him view everything from a bigger picture, but in accordance to his solitary seclusion in the forge. As Pip’s confidential advisor, Joe strenuously trains the young teenager in the professional arts of the blacksmith, believing that Pip will one day take his place and neglect other possible future prospects.

In addition, Joe wholeheartedly opposes Pip’s decision to accept the anonymous fortune from the prominent lawyer despite that the money can easily realize the child’s subconscious desires to become an educated and respected nobleman. Joe strongly encourages Pip to continue working in the family business rather than engage in social advancement. As Mr. Jaggers, the city lawyer, abruptly announces that he is appointed by a mysterious client to become Pip’s guardian and generously offers Joe a compensation for the loss of the child, Joe angrily brushes off the lawyer’s suggestion and immediately responds that “if you think as Money can make compensation for the loss of the little child—what come to the forge—ever the best of friend” (133). Not only does his passionate reply reveals his devoted attention and love for the child, but also signifies Joe’s refusal for appreciating the kindness from other people. As Joe tediously endeavors to escape alienation by nurturing and teaching Pip to inherit his forge, the wide gap of isolation between him and the child deepens. It highlights Joe’s disconnection with Pip since the young boy obviously has other ideas for his future than taking
over the family business.

Joe’s estrangement from society is further exposed when compared to the public’s expectations for social mobility. In contrast to Mr. Joe, who does not care for social advancement, the majority of the people anticipates that there is a good outcome from climbing the social ladder, including gaining money, fame, and title. The characters become plainly envious in Pip’s good fortune to rise above his previous station. Uncle Pumblechook and Mrs. Joe greatly regard the enhancement of social status as the main priority in achieving a better and more luxurious lifestyle. For example, Mr. Pumblechook is a snobbish and pompous person who falsely claims that he is the one responsible for Pip’s fortune, selfishly taking praise for the real hero’s accomplishments. His greedy desire to become associated with the rich is also expressed in the beginning of Pip’s cognition of class difference. As soon as Mr. Pumblechook knows that Pip is chosen to attend to Miss Havisham, he quickly notifies the members of the Gargery family and voluntarily offers to escort Pip to the Manor. On the way to Miss Havisham’s house, Mr. Pumblechook orally prepares Pip by endlessly testing the boy on the multiplication of numbers, secretly hoping that rich old lady will take a liking to the boy so that something good may come from his association with the boy.

Mrs. Joe passionately aspires Pip to associate himself with the aristocracy to greatly advance his naïve views of the hierarchical society, as well as to elevate his socioeconomic class whenever there deems a chance. After Pip miserably retreats home from Satis House, insulted and hurt by the mocking words that have come from the beautiful Estella, Mrs. Joe and Mr. Pumblechook pressure the young boy to illustrate every single detail of his visit. Pip briefly complains that “[M]y sister with an exclamation of impatience was going to fly at me—I had no shadow of defense, for Joe was busy in the forge” (62). Pip’s sister’s intolerance and excitement for Pip’s association with the lady imply her enthusiasm for the boy to have the chance to associate himself with the upper-class although Miss Havisham is known to be eccentric in character. Without gentle Joe to protect him from the atrocious attack from his
sister, the young boy could do nothing but miserably lie in order to satisfy her sister’s high expectations.

It is under the tremendous pressure and stress from home that Pip desperately seeks refuge in Miss Havisman’s Satis House. Satis House strongly influences Pip to view home from an indifferent perspective, secluding him from his family in the process. After his brief visits to the manor, Pip emotionally experiences the feelings of shame due to the individual’s ignorance in social standing. The young boy gradually begins to realize that people are distinguished according to their social standing and not morals. In Pip’s own words, he narrates, “when we went in to supper, the place and the meal would have a more homely look than ever, and I would feel more ashamed of home than ever, in my own ungracious breast” (101). The boy’s overwhelming emotions, shameful of his station regardless of Joe’s unwavering love and consciously aware of his unforgivable betrayal to Joe, force him to accept the order of society.

Pip’s home and Satis House have the power to not merely vigorously compel the youngster into acknowledging guilt, but also destructively alienates him from Joe. The child becomes ungrateful for Joe’s teachings on morality and looks down on him due to Joe’s lack of education and class. He becomes alienated further from his family in his pursuit of disalienation.

Pip becomes immensely allured by Satis House to fulfill his desires to refine himself, undaunted by Joe’s disagreement of accepting the money from the lawyer and the crowd’s opinion of social mobility. As Pip meets the mysterious residences in the manor, the young boy realizes that there is a distinctive difference between his family and theirs. The closed brewery is located next to the manor, deteriorating from the outside with barren castes of wine and unruly bushes growing the yards. Very different from the homely and warm forge, Satis House and the decaying brewery serves as a reminder of Miss Havisham’s broken heart. In Pip’s first visit to Satis House, Pip finally meets the Miss Havisham’s adopted daughter, Estella, who explains the meaning of Satis House. She clarifies that Satis denotes “enough” and “when it was given, that whoever had the house, could want nothing else” (51). It is an “enough” house
which provides all the satisfaction one needs in living in the house. The latest owner and her
daughter do not have financial problems that they are required to confront or concern
themselves over. As a matter of fact, Miss Havisham and Estella have more money than
necessary to live in a luxurious lifestyle.

The “enough” house abominably disaffects the female residences by abolishing their
chance at love. “Enough” also has as a negative connotation that implicates entrapment and
restriction. Miss Havisham is mentally imprisoned in the enormous manor, completely
devastated from the emotional damage inflicted by Compeyson, while Estella becomes
indifferent to her long line of devoted suitors. As a rich and articulated heiress, the rich lady’s
mother died when she was a baby and she was forced to unwilling share her father’s love with
her good-for-nothing step-brother. Miss Havisham desperately seeks to find a prospective
husband to match her social standing and dispel her feelings of isolation. In her pursuit of
happiness, she becomes utterly smitten with the handsome Compeyson, who is also as arrogant
and proud as her father. Nevertheless, her earnest effort to reach her goals tragically ends in
failure. Compeyson merely strives to profit from manipulating her into buying her brother’s
half of the brewery.

Estrangement also occurs after Miss Havisham begins to satisfy her insatiable thirst for
revenge by using Estella’s beauty to mock and inflict pain on innocent boys. Miss Havisham
invites young boys, such as Pip and Herbert, to come to the manor and escort the charming
Estella as a retaliation for being brutally abandoned by the deceptive criminal and left alone in
the manor. It is her joy to ascertain that Estella can easily manipulate Pip. She encourages Pip
to fall in love with her daughter in order to see him pathetically rejected and heartbroken. In
one of the Pip’s occasional visits to Satis House, Miss Havisham aguishly whispers the words,
“[L]ove her, love her, love her” (230). The misanthropic lady wholly deploys her house and
Estella with the intention of dissolving her recurring nightmares. Yet, her expectation to
disalienate herself from love fails and she remains unable to look past her sorrows. In the
conclusion of Miss Havisham’s fate, she suicidally leaps into the fire as an attempt to end her alienation.

On the other hand, Miss Havisham’s daughter is constantly tormented by the solicitude under the roof of Satis House. Alienated as a child, Estella is a helpless victim of Satis House and influenced by Miss Havisham to view men as devious creatures, which she explains to the reasons for her isolation. In the conversation with Pip, Estella bitterly mentions that she had been unfairly treated as an object without feelings in the depressing household:

‘It is not easy for even you.’ said Estella, ‘to know what satisfaction it gives me to see those people thwarted, or what an enjoyable sense of the ridiculous I have when they are made ridiculous. For you were not brought up in that strange house from a mere baby. —I was. You had not your little wits sharpened by their intriguing against you, suppressed and defenceless, under the mask of sympathy and pity and what not that is soft and soothing. —I had. You did not gradually open your round childish eyes wider and wider to the discovery of that impostor of a woman who calculates her stores of peace of mind for when she wakes up in the night. —I did.’ (253)

Estella assumes that even Pip, who is also an orphan like herself, could not understand the motives behind her apathetic attitude towards love. Yet, her feelings of estrangement had not come from Miss Havisham, but from the environment. In the manor, the innocent girl transforms into a younger version of Miss Havisham. Unknowingly, the young lady grows cold-hearted and cynical to the people around her. Pip is only one of the many people who witnesses her disconnection from other people.

In Estella’s willingness to escape the rigid confines of the manor, she consents to obey Havisham’s objectives to take revenge on all men. Estella’s method of disalienation stems from the leisure of breaking the hearts of men, an art that she had learned while living in Satis House during her childhood years and later enhanced at boarding school. She deliberately applies her seductive charms to Pip and many others, as well as Herbert and Drummle. Men
are easily lured by her extraordinary beauty and physically forced to comply with her every wish. Herbert remarks that she is “haughty and capricious to the last degree, and has been brought up to wreak revenge on all male sexes” (166). Estella knows precisely how to use her charming beauty to the fullest, while pleasantly enjoying the process. However, her struggle to overcome her loneliness ultimately leads to her unhappy marriage to Bentley Drummle. Her goal to escape alienation with her erotic powers is useless against the isolating influence of the manor.

Adversely, Pip’s alienation from his family unravels in Satis House when he confesses that “under its influence I continued at heart to hate my trade and to be ashamed of home” (118). Pip is obsessively attracted to the dark and mysterious manor, despite that it is a dull house and daylight “never entered the house as to my thoughts and remembrances of it, any more than as to the actual fact” (118). The rooms are dark and gloomy and its long hallways are lit only by portable candles. Satis House is different from an ordinary household. Accustomed to the loud and cheerful household, the gloominess of the manor makes him uncomfortable despite his beautiful companion, Estella. As Pip obediently follows Estella to meet Miss Havisham, he remarks that “we went through more passages and up a staircase, and still it was all dark, and only the candle lighted us” (52). The burning candle in the dim interiors of the household reveals the Pip’s anxiety towards making acquaintance with the old lady and the frightening feeling of going into an unknown world.

In the young hero’s pursuit of disalienation, Pip accepts the offer to be tutored in London. However, the atmosphere of London was not what he expected, glamorous and heavenly. It is precisely the opposite. The country boy narrates, “I was scared by the immensity of London, I think I might have had some faint doubts whether it was not rather ugly, crooked, narrow, and dirty” (153). This intense feeling for London only intensifies in the Hammersmith household. In Hammersmith, the family members of the Pocket family that Pip encounters two distinctive and peculiar individuals. Matthew Pocket is a great tutor who wisely teaches students on
everything related to gentry. Nevertheless, he is constantly troubled by the obstinate anticipations of Mrs. Pocket and her hypocritical parents who wanted their daughter to marry a man of titles. Educated in Cambridge, he is respected by his students and people who know him. As he attempts to disalienate himself from his occupation as a teacher, educating students in his household, he becomes further estranged from his wife. His alienation originates from his wife’s expectations to gain title, as well as his anticipations to receive prestige from his profession.

Sarah Pocket’s alienation stems from her stubbornness to neglect everything that happens around her and her anticipation to become a lady of titles. Not only does she have the habit of reading a book of titles, she is constantly having her children tumbling and falling around her, which indicates her failure to take care of children as a mother. In Pip’s meals with the Pockets, Pip notices that Mrs. Pocket did not care for the baby who is playing dangerously with the nutcracker and was on the verge of sticking it into his or her eye. One of her children, Jane, notices this image and stands up to take the vicious weapon away from the baby. However, instead of complimenting Jane’s act of love and protection for the baby, she becomes highly agitated. She absurdly shouts at little Jane for her un-lady behavior, because she believes that her regal order has been disobeyed.

Mathew and Sarah Pocket are alienated from each other and their family as are other characters in their distinctive households. As each individual attempt to escape from the difficulties and hardships of humanity by participating in family affairs and recreational activities, they become further isolated from themselves and each other. They are unconsciously confined, fixed, and captured in the production of capitalist society despite of their ambitious expectations to have a close relationship with others. Their enthusiastic desires to realize their great expectations for a better future have mercilessly backfired, leaving them in the same place where they were before. The feelings of alienation merely become stronger as each individual attempts to search for comfort in their separate houses.
In the novel, the characters represent the alienation from family life and leisure to demonstrate the dynamism of space. Distinctions between the alienation and disalienation have been contrasted by the various characters. Joe, Mrs. Joe and Biddy are confined to the house and the forge in the marshes, incapable of building a solid relationship with Pip as a consequence of their individual interests. Pip is also alienated from his family members from his visits to the graveyard and Satis House. On the other hand, Miss Havisham and Estella are trapped in Satis House, isolating themselves from affection. In the Pocket’s household, Sarah and Mathew dissociate with each other, incapable of understanding the other’s thoughts. All of these individuals demonstrate alienation as examples of absolute space.
Chapter Three: The Mystification of Money

Imagine that an ordinary individual comes across a lot of money and becomes mystified to expect that the money can easily fulfill his or her great expectations in life. The person may be like Pip, who has grown up in an alienated environment where money is scarce and people work only enough to sustain their living. On the other hand, the individual may be like Estella, who is brought up in an affluent household, but also strongly relies on money to maintain her extravagant lifestyle. As a wealthy parvenu, the individual may encounter both wealthy and poor people and acknowledge the diverse lifestyles of different social classes. Is it possible for the parvenu to become mystified by its dominating influence of money? Is the individual confined in the space of mystification as a consequence of his or her money fetishism?

The spatial process of mystification, or the distortion of reality, is manifested through various characters and their money fetishism in *Great Expectations*. The characters are unknowingly contained in a “relative space,” a term by Harvey which involves a process in a certain time frame, unable to escape the powerful influence of the capital. They are mystified by their own expectations to fulfill their innermost desires projected from their fetishism for money. Deception from money fetishism is one of the important themes of novel as presented by Compeyson’s betrayal of marriage, Magwitch’s deception of Pip’s fortune, Estella’s manipulation of man, and many others. These individuals are continually trapped in mystified space by their excessive desires and expectations to gain money. Through their self-delusions and fetishism towards money, the characters are continually exposed to the mystifying powers of the capital.

Mystification is a Marxist term that explains the process of deceiving and manipulating the individual in order to maintain the illusion that is based on a value. The purpose of mystification is to deceive the people of the actual realities that are associated with the society and social relationships. It effectively distorts ideological concepts and social realities.
Traditionally, the process of mystification involves two different classes, the exploiters and the exploited. The exploiters, the owners of the capital, effectively outsmart the exploited, the industrious worker or laborer, into increasing potential productivity. However, according to Henri Lefebvre in *Critique of Everyday Life*, the process of mystification is not merely applied to the division of class, but enforced in the individual.

In bourgeois society, the individual thinks he ‘knows who he is’, and perceives himself as ‘his goods and his property’; when this illusion is shattered, the individual sinks into the anguish of ‘unhappy consciousness’ as he discovers the chasm which separates him from his self. Just as the subject (the individual) is separated from itself, the object, by becoming a commodity, becomes detached, so to speak, from itself, and the relations between men are masked by relations between objects. (v1, xvi)

Individualism is a form of mystification. It defines the idea of private or individual consciousness being built on material objects. Since the individual projects his or her desires on a material object, the individual automatically loses the sense of identity immediately after the object is destroyed. In other words, once the material object vanishes, the individual becomes alienated from the self and others. An example would be a person who keeps faith in the gospels of individualism becomes so mystified that he or she becomes completely deluded from reality.

Commodity fetishism is the result of mystifying individual consciousness. Mystification relates to fetishism “because economic ‘things’, fetishes, envelop and disguise the human relations which constitute them” (Lefebvre 179). Fetishism can occur from the individual’s attachment towards objects, such as commodities, money, and capital. These include Mr. Wemmick’s jewels, Satis House, and Jagger’s office. The individual’s fixation on an object occurs when the individual deludes the value of the self to be based on external things. These things become substantiated projections of the inner self. In other words, through fetishism,
people become mystified to believe in their expectations when it is actually a disguise used to manipulate individuals. For example, people who are obsessed with making money believes that money will bring him happiness when money and happiness are not in a positive correlation. Happiness does not necessarily have anything to do with money.

Mystification is pervasively displayed throughout the novel, imprisoning the individuals in a political sphere that prevents them from fulfilling their expectations. Soon after Pip swiftly accommodates to his guardian’s amicable arrangements for the enthusiastic boy to be privately tutored in London, Pip gradually begins to comprehend that his stubborn determination to journey to the city is, as a matter of fact, an overt act of mystification. In the adolescent’s contemplation on the event of receiving a great fortune, he mildly recounts his repressed guilt for being blinded by his expectations to become a gentleman and his ambition to marry Estella. The boy relives his shame and remorse for confronting Joe and Biddy with such an arrogant and contemptuous attitude. The gentleman-to-be realizes that he has been cleverly tricked by his fetishistic desires for money to fulfill his great anticipations:

As I had grown accustomed to my expectations, I had insensibly begun to notice their effect upon myself and those around me. Their influence on my own character, I disguised from my recognition as much as possible, but I knew very well that it was not all good. I lived in a state of chronic uneasiness respecting my behaviour to Joe.

My conscience was not by any means comfortable about Biddy. (258)

This vivid description of Pip’s guilty conscience obliquely elucidates the powerful effects of mystification, deceiving Pip from the morals of society. He uses word such as “effect” and “influence” to present the self-delusions that have originated from his great expectations. The young hero tacitly acknowledges that his shame and guilt are an inevitable consequence of his individual pursuit of expectations, albeit his lucky fortune can easily satisfy his dreams. He falsely deceives himself into relying on the money so that he can undertake his mission to enhance his social status. Pip realizes that he has deluded himself into believing that he can
accomplish anything as long as he has the money to do so.

It is exactly Pip’s reliant of money that imprisons the young man to fall prey to mystification. Pip is extremely reliant on money to make payment for his exuberant expenses, but he does not realize that until he discretely separated himself from his fortunes. After the youth discovered that he have been receiving bountiful money from Abel Magwitch, the criminal he met in the marshes, and not from Miss Havisham, the rich lady, he immediately decides to cease drawing money from his benefactor. The outcome of his prompt decision results in his realization that an individual cannot survive without money. Pip dolefully admits that “I myself began to know the want of money (I mean of ready money in my own pocket), and to relieve it by converting some easily spared articles of jewellery into cash” (361). As Pip virtuously imparts from his great fortune, he imperceptibly suffers from the financial pressures that have originated from his previous spend-thrifty habits. He exchanges valuable jewels for money out of necessity. Pip’s conscientious revelation of the “want of money” uncovers the idea that an individual’s money fetishism undoubtedly stimulates the distortion of reality. He has never considered the possible outcome that he may have to find ways to survive without the fortune.

Likewise, Pip’s first love, the bewitching Estella who instinctively appreciates the luxuries and comforts of wealth, demonstrates an individual confined in self-illusions that originates from money. Nurtured and educated in an affluent household, she consciously recognizes the value of money, which not only provides the financial support of her well-being, but also the chance of having a prospective marriage. As a haughty and spoilt child, she contemptuously ridicules Pip on the high grounds that she narrowly distinguishes Pip and herself as individuals from two different worlds: the owner of capital and the laborer class. When Miss Havisham proposes to her daughter to play cards with Pip, Estella disrespectfully responds, “With this boy? Why, he is a common labouring-boy” (55). She called Pip “boy” and rarely acknowledged his name. Her outright dismissal of Pip is both from the results of Miss Havisham’s teachings
to morbid distrust of men, as well as her environmental cognition that the upper-class have more power and wealth than the working-class, which establishes them as people who are most eminent and respected.

Estella’s unwavering fixation towards money is overtly exemplified when she coquettishly flirts with Bentley Drummle, the obnoxious and affluent gentleman, and decisively resolves to marry him. In the incident when Pip frantically confronts her to question her motivations for accepting Drummle’s hand in marriage, she indirectly answers that she can wed another not for love but for money. As Pip jealously describes his rival in love as a “deficient, ill tempered, lowering, stupid fellow” and offensive remarks that “he has nothing to recommend him but money,” Estella opens her lovely wide eyes to display her delightful surprise (296). Her charming round eyes evidently demonstrates her willingness to marry the rich individual, despite the obvious deficiencies of his character. She does not love Drummle, but cares for her own welfare in continuing to live a life of luxury and to free herself from Miss Havisham’s desires to avenge on men. Estella tells Pip that she is tired of living with Miss Havisham and she would want nothing better to get out of Miss Havisham’s grasp.

Nevertheless, Estella’s relentless longing to emancipate herself from the mental constraints of Miss Havisham and to maintain the extravagance of her lifestyle ultimately ends with her unhappy marriage. The result of her loveless marriage merely leads her from one miserable life to another. She barely has the chance to celebrate the swift victory of escaping the powerful clutches of her cynical foster mother only to be violently imprisoned by Drummle. Estella becomes an unfortunate victim of domestic violence and a young widow. In the conversation between the heart-broken Pip and Mr. Jaggers, the insightful lawyer happily expresses his opinion for the marriage between Estella and Drummle. He astutely foretells that Drummle is the type of person whose violent nature “either beats, or cringes” (369). At the end of the novel, Pip validates the truth of Mr. Jaggers’ words: “I had heard of her as leading a most unhappy life, and as being separated from her husband, who had used her with great cruelty, and who
had become quite renowned as a compound of pride, avarice, brutality, and meanness” (458). She is unconsciously mystified and trapped in her own distortions of wealth, unable to realize the truth of reality.

Estella’s mother, Miss Havisham, in a similar manner, is confined in this cloud of mystification, heavily depending on money to buy her way into happiness. The wealthy lady landlord passionately anticipates to gain love by obediently complying with Compeyson’s wishes to purchase her brother’s portion of the brewery. As the sole heiress of the family of Havisham, Miss Havisham has more money than she financially needs to afford a carefree lifestyle. The only thing she obviously lacks is a prospective husband, whom she can jubilantly share her fortune and happiness with. Compeyson, with his genteel upbringing and charming personality, undeniably appears to be an excellent subject for her devout adoration. She has never expected that her ardent ambitions to be completely destroyed as she steps closer to accomplishing her dreams. Her profound belief that money can easily overcome all the potential obstacles from her path is mercilessly obliterated on the day of her wedding day.

The mechanism of mystification eventually reveal itself as the proud lady discovers Compeyson’s treachery. Viciously abandoned by her malicious finance, Miss Havisham never comes out of the grief. She strictly confines herself to the manor, constantly keeping the rooms and passageways dark and gloomy. Strangely dressed in a tattered bridal gown, she consistently torments herself with unbearable pain that she had previously experienced. The disgrace and misery oscillate back and forth from the wasted brewery and the clock that fully stopped at “twenty minutes to nine” to the objects that have been intentionally placed in the same position since her wedding (53). In addition, her facial appearance drastically changes from that of an ordinary person to a restless ghost, perpetually haunting anyone who comes into close contact. The delusion of the self is completely shattered.

Yet, she has not learned from her previous mistakes in heedlessly trusting in the influential powers of money. As a consequence of her unresolved grief, she adopts Estella as a slight
compensation of her loss in love. She devoutly entrusts all her available resources to raise the beautiful girl and purposely sends her to an oversea boarding school to master the arts of an elegant lady. Before leaping into the burning fires, she confesses her feelings to Pip about her daughter and regrets to have “stole her heart away and put ice in its place” (378). Miss Havisham realizes that she is wrong in the ways of raising Estella to hate men and becomes sympathetic towards the genuine lad. Instead of warning her daughter of the treacheries of love, she encourages Estella to become incapable to love another. Blinded by the grief and hatred, Miss Havisham has unconsciously compelled Estella to do the same despite her good intentions to warn her from the betrayals of men. The vengeful lady is unable to look past her mistakes, which ultimately leads to her physical and mental destruction. Miss Havisham’s end reveals the spatial process of deluding the self with expectations that originate from money.

On the other hand, Arthur, Miss Havisham’s half-brother who malevolently betrays her sister in his desire to steal his sister’s riches, also plays a role in mystification. Born as a member of the wealthy Havisham family, he naturally masters the ability to spend money wastefully. In Herbert’s narration of Miss Havisham’s unfortunate story of betrayal, he distinctively points out that the young Arthur did not become a gentleman but “turned out riotous, extravagant, undutiful, altogether bad” (170). His bad character and gambling habits consequently drive his father to disown him from the family. Nonetheless, his father eventually forgives him and leaves a considerable sum for him after his death. As Arthur continues to audaciously gamble away all of his inheritance and is ceaselessly pursued by debtors, he commences to develop a cunning scheme to corruptively prey on his sister’s weakness of man in order to manipulate her into buying the brewery. In the end, the villainous plan succeeds and he promptly receives the money he had desired to pay for his expenses.

The deceptive brother’s expectations easily proves to be merely illusions after he committed the atrocious crime. He is captured in the mystifying belief of getting rich without ever being caught. Rather than being content with his effortless victory, Arthur becomes so
remorseful that he grows completely delirious and abruptly dies. Before his tragic death, the
guilt-crazed man disorientate himself with delusions of Miss Havisham “all in white” with and
“a shroud hanging over her arm” (330-1). He starts seeing distinct visions of her sister, standing
in the rooms of Compeyson’s house. He is panic-stricken with terrifying delusions from the
heinous felony that he had inflicted on his sister and insanely believes that she will spitefully
murder him to avenge for her broken heart. The intense guilt of preying on his sibling’s
weakness and the consequence of his selfish act is too much for the young man. In his struggle
between his insanity and conscience, Arthur horribly dies in the bed.

Arthur devilishly cooperates with the charming Compeyson to manipulate Miss Havisham
into giving money. Similar to Arthur, his wicked accomplice also obsesses over money. He is
a “showy-man and the kind of man for the purpose” and “a true gentleman in manner” (171).
Cultivated in the arts of gentry, he cunningly employs his charisma to trick Miss Havisham
into acceding to marry him. In Magwitch’s vivid narration of his unfortunate encounter with
the criminal, he describes that Compeyson “had been in a bad thing with a rich lady some years
afore, and they’d made a pot of money by it; but Compeyson betted and gamed, and he’d have
run through the king’s taxes” (330). Magwitch’s account of the criminal history subtly reveals
not only the unspeakable crime that has been committed by the deceptive fellow, but also the
man’s fetishistic desires for money. Compeyson believes that by promising to marry Miss
Havisham and tricking her to buy the brewery, he will have the ability to make tons of money.
The fact is that the dishonorable Compeyson already married a wife and never intended to
accede to Miss Havisham’s determination for love or marriage. The whole purpose of his
devIOUS plan to fool the rich lady is to greatly profit from the selling of the brewery.

However, the dishonest gentleman’s unquenchable thirst for money does not end with Miss
Havisham. He vehemently strives to gain more money by initiating his criminal business in
counterfeiting. The criminal becomes confined to the delusions that he can make more money
from his illegal dealings. After Compeyson greedily divides the considerable fortune with
Arthur, he evilly concocts other deviant plan to become rich. In Magwitch’s narration of the criminal, he plainly explains the illicit dealings he had with his employer many years before he met Pip:

Compeyson’s business was the swindling, handwriting forgery, stolen bank-note passing, and such-like. All sorts of traps as Compeyson could set with his head, and keep his own legs out of and get the profits from and let another man in for, was Compeyson’s business. He’d no more heart than an iron file, he was as cold as death, and he had the head of the Devil afore mentioned. (330)

The inevitable outcome of money fetishism gradually influences him to easily prefer the criminal ways to pocket money. He continues to be controlled by his desires to the point that he resembles a Devil, having no sympathy for his suffering victims. The vicious convict is not afraid to be caught by the judicious justice because of his unshakable belief that only money can solve all his economic problems. By assuming that he will become rich with money, he mystifies himself so that he will easily escape the law despite of all the atrocious criminality.

The mysterious veil of mystification unravels at the conclusion of the novel when Compeyson ultimately pays for all the heinous crimes that he had committed various times. Justice is served when the convict unavoidably ends up chased by Magwitch, and drowned in the river. As a consequence of Compeyson’s manipulation of Magwitch and Miss Havisham in the aggressive pursuit of profit, he does not become wealthy but dies unexpectedly. As his lifeless body is discovered by the authorities, Pip acutely identifies the moist objects in the dead man’s pocket:

When his body was found, many miles from the scene of his death, and so horribly disfigured that he was only recognizable by the contents of his pockets, notes were still legible, folded in a case he carried. Among these, were the name of a banking-house in New South Wales where a sum of money was, and the designation of certain lands of considerable value. (465)
The only things that are recognizable are the notes in the convict’s pockets. The soggy notes in his pocket symbolize his selfish desires to hold money even after his death, as well as the tragic outcome in making too much effort to make money. His money fetishism made him believe that he could live a luxurious life, but it, in fact, leads to the destruction of his own fate.

Even before Compeyson’s death, the evildoer has shown signs of inducing his own destruction by recruiting Abel Magwitch into his criminal business. In order to ensure the profits of his criminal business, he immediately employs Magwitch, a professional expert of “[T]ramping, begging, thieving,” and “working” illegal businesses (329). Magwitch is an individual who earns money in dishonest ways and greatly knows the powers of money. As Compeyson’s accomplice, he dangerously participates in forging signatures and performing fraudulent schemes to make a living. Undaunted by the eventual realization that he is not merely Compeyson’s productive worker, but particularly deployed as a black slave who is easily manipulated to carry out the deviant plans, he diligently continues to take direct orders from the condemnable gentleman. Sufficiently experienced in criminal activities and prejudicially labeled as a notorious thug since childhood, Magwitch confidently expects that he had smartly accepted a stable job that is suitable for his social background.

Magwitch’s distortion of reality is revealed when the professional crook is forced to take all the blame for the dirty business. It is not until Magwitch was prosecuted for his felonious activities did he realize that he had unknowingly been too reliant on the illicit means to gain money, carelessly neglecting the mendacious nature of Compeyson’s character. After the deceptive gentleman and the illiterate thug was seriously charged for their crimes, Compeyson arbitrarily demands to answer to the criminal accusations separately. The gentleman fully understands the advantages for individual defenses. The cunning man shifts the entire blame on Magwitch, by claiming that he should be “recommended to mercy on account of good character and bad company” (333). The result of the unfair trial ended with Magwitch sentenced to fourteen years in prison, while Compeyson is sentenced to merely seven years.
Magwitch’s strong reliance on money promptly resumes when he determines to compensate for the crimes. In Magwitch’s effort to redeem for all the wrongs he had committed, the convict generously gives the money that he had worked hard to earn from sheep farming and stock breeding in Australia to Pip, who kindly provided food and drink when the runaway convict had narrowly escaped from the prison ship in pursuit of his enemy. He credulously believes that by anonymously becoming the young boy’s benefactor, he will be able to effectively assist the poor child to enhance his social status and become a gentleman. He expects that the funds that he provided for the child will be sufficient enough to change the child’s life. As a skilled criminal, he knows very well of the dominating powers that money can assert over the individual and strongly depends on that influence to amend his former misdoings.

However, his good intentions for the boy is intensely repudiated by Pip when the excited convict frankly declares the truth of the great fortune that the young man have received since childhood. In his eager anticipation to see the gentleman that he made out of Pip, he mystifies himself to believe that Pip will be pleased with his support and arrangements. Never had he imagined that the boy (now a grown man) will become completely shocked by his sincere act and refuse to take more of his money. Pip grows utterly devastated from Magwitch’s unexpected visit after realizing that Miss Havisham had never played a part in his great fortune or groomed him into a gentleman in the hopes of becoming Estella’s future husband. In reaction to the young man’s desolation, the convict feels disappointed and confused.

On the other hand, Magwitch directly employs Mr. Jaggers, the famous city lawyer who diligently works for money, to safely secure his private fortune and become Pip’s guardian until the innocent child comes of age. The lawyer does not randomly choose clients according to their social standing or out of sympathy, but selects clients based on whether they have paid. Those who cannot decently pay for his services are rudely dismissed. In Pip’s encounter with Mr. Jaggers in London, he immediately notices Mr. Jaggers has a strange habit of inquiring the
client about the payment before they communicate any further. In his confrontation with his client, he usually starts the question with “[H]ave you paid Wemmick” (157) before continuing to talk with the client about their individual cases. Mr. Jagger’s primary concern for his professional business is whether the client has obediently paid for his services or not.

Brisk and affirmative, Mr. Jagger unkindly dismisses individuals in order to remain oblivious from his professional negotiations with criminals and civilians alike. It is possible that the prominent lawyer merely intends to efficiently manage his cases without having any emotional or physical attachment. He isn’t fond of being overly familiar regardless of how pitiful or unfortunate the client is. His uncaring personality is perceptibly from his habit of washing hands, which Pip carefully observes that Mr. Jagger frequently “washed his clients off, as if he were a surgeon or a dentist” and “had a closet in his room, fitted up for the purpose, which smelt of the scented soap like a perfumer’s shop” after arriving at the lawyer’s office (199). Mr. Jagger’s obsession of keeping hands clean simply implies his unconscious desire to remain on neutral grounds and disregard of his emotional relationship with the clients.

The proceedings of mystification grudgingly unveil when the outcome of his cases becomes overtly personal. As a consequence of the lawyer’s detached personality due to his pragmatic career, he eventually encounters unsolvable problems which eventually force him to grow excessively involved in the lives of others. In one of his multiple cases, he graciously offers Molly, Magwitch’s wife and Estella’s mother, a position in his household after defending her in a serious case. Upon Pip’s visit to Jaggers’ residence, the lawyer abruptly snatches Molly’s wrist to reveal the disfigured scars and oddly asserts that he has a “never saw stronger than in that respect, man’s or woman’s, than these” (203). Ironically, Pip notices that “he said these words in a leisurely critical style,” implying that he did not really respect Molly or did he keep clear of their relationship. In fact, he is influenced by Molly’s case to the extent the he became angry for taking Molly in and even mocking her to compensate for his services. The same goes for Magwitch and Molly’s daughter, whom he agreed to assist in becoming Pip’s
guardian and giving Estella to Miss Havisham.

On the other hand, Mr. Jagger’s clerk, John Wemmick, fetishizes valuable and easy-to-carry property. The practical clerk privately invests money on material objects, such as jewelry and small gifts that he has received from the Newgate prisoners. He distinctively labels his collection as “portable property” and insistently advises Pip to start his own collection. After Pip unreservedly befriends the presumably cold-hearted Wemmick, the practical clerk wisely suggests the young boy to make investments in portable property. He assertively claims that “[E]very man’s business… is portable property.” (388). For instance, when Pip mysteriously receives a short note from Wemmick, Pip hurriedly travels to Wemmick’s Castle the next day to uncover the mystery. After explaining to Pip about the note which concerns Magwitch, the clerk scrupulously cautions the young man to get hold of the convict’s portable property. He rationally predicts that the Magwitch’s fortune is at high risk of confiscation.

Moreover, Wemmick’s portable property indicates money. When Pip privately confides to Wemmick about secretly initiating Herbert’s commercial trade, the practical clerk explains his views on investing money in a friend is equivalent to throwing money into the river. Outraged, Pip seeks for confirmation and is answered with a contradiction:

“Then is it your opinion,” inquired, with some little indignation, “that a man should never—”

“—Invest portable property in a friend?’ said Wemmick. “Certainly he should not. Unless he wants to get rid of the friend—and then it becomes a question how much portable property it may be worth to get rid of him.” (277)

For Wemmick, portable property refers to money. He believes that investing money in a friend is not a wise thing to do. Money should be safely secured by the individual in material objects and not in people. He believes people cannot be trusted to handle another’s fortune. He is a materialistic person who knows very well what the power of money can make the individual do crazy things.
This persistence for portable property keenly reflects his divergent attitudes towards workplace and home. Wemmick intentionally separates work from private life, which results in what people recognize as a split personality. After Pip secretly confides to Wemmick about his intentions to help Herbert to set up a fund to become the owner of capital, the clerk reminds him that he can simply acquire professional assistance in the workplace and personal advice can only be acquired from his home at Walworth. In his persistence, he expresses the difference to the young man:

‘Mr. Pip,’ he replied, with gravity, ‘Walworth is one place, and this office is another. Much as the Aged is one person, and Mr. Jaggers is another. They must not be confounded together. My Walworth sentiments must be taken at Walworth; none but my official sentiments can be taken in this office.’ (277)

In the office, he is remote and uncaring, only interested in the areas of his profession, while he is caring and friendly to his friends and family in his home. Wemmick is fully aware of the difference between personal and public life. He needs to keep his life apart in order to keep his life from falling apart.

In addition, Wemmick’s split personality is demonstrated by the bizarre way of decorating his home at Walworth with pre-capitalist objects, such as flags and cannons. He names his house “Castle” and even has a small moat with a drawbridge. For the man, he believes that by building his house in the form of a castle, the house would become a safe haven that protects him from the violence of the workplace, as well as keep him sane. During Pip’s initial visit to the Castle, Pip remarks that Wemmick has become a completely different person. Instead of being dry and wooden which Pip has previously observed from the office, the man is rather converse and easy-going. In fact, he cares a lot for his father and has a fiancée who he eventually marries.

The workings of mystification gradually unravel when Wemmick realizes that family life and life at the workplace cannot be separated. In deciding to marry his Miss Skiffin, he chooses
to take a day off from work and pretends to go fishing while inviting Pip to accompany him on his stroll when he is actually going to attend his own wedding. As an industrious and diligent worker, he has never taken a day off from work for years, yet the clerk realizes that he must make sacrifices at work in order for him to go on with his personal life. However, despite his cautious attempt to keep his marriage and his true personality a secret, Pip eventually tells Mr. Jaggers the truth of Wemmick’s dual attitude towards the workplace and home.

Both Mr. Wemmick and Mr. Jaggers not only demonstrate that money is greatly valued in Victorian society, but also reveal that money has the power to change a person’s lifestyle. This is emphasized by other characters, including Estella, Magwitch, and many others. The act of lusting after money does not simply imply an ambitious act of pursuing a better lifestyle, but encompasses diverse motives and expectations that involve the process of mystification. The characters are completely mystified by money that they believe that money can fulfill their greatest expectations in life. They are awed and mesmerized by the illusions that money can do and become incapable to realize the dangerous outcome of their choices. Blinded, disoriented, and manipulated, these individuals are trapped in the space of mystification.

Dickens’ novel implicitly illustrates a money-oriented society of diverse individuals with different expectations and are unfortunate victims of mystification. The exchange of money mystifies the characters from seeing truth of reality, which ultimately leads the characters to destructive outcomes. The unfortunate orphans, Pip and Estella, anticipate that wealth will bring happiness and are ultimately disappointed. Miss Havisham and Magwitch believe that money can buy happiness, either for the self, for others, and are unfortunately betrayed. Compeyson and Arthur, whose crime involves earning money illegally, end up tragically dead. Likewise, Mr. Jaggers and Mr. Wemmick, who have materialistic personalities due to the regard for money, are equally deceived by their expectations. The characters are ineluctably detained in a mystified space, where they are constantly deluded by the expectations that have derived from their fetishism for money.
Conclusion

In this thesis, I have conducted a spatial and Marxist reading Dickens’ *Great Expectations*, discussing the spatial significance of secondary characters by using Harvey’s and Lefebvre’s theories. The invisible workings of capitalism, alienation and mystification, is implicitly demonstrated from multiple characters, such as Mrs. Joe, Biddy, Biddy, Miss Havisham, Estella, Mr. Wemmick, and many more. My central argument is that the presence of secondary characters are not only fictional characters that make up an interesting story, but also uncovers a spatial world of capitalism. Furthermore, I contend that Dickens’ created an irony by illustrating “great expectations” of individuals who most end up incapable of fulfilling their expectations. Dickens uses the term “great” not merely to indicate the courageous attempt of the protagonist to climb the social ladder, but also serves as a political satire to demonstrate that it is unproductive to have great expectations in a capitalist society.

First, I address the critical aspects of space and capitalism that have been identified in Dickens’ novel to emphasize their connection by applying Lefebvre’s and Harvey’s theories of spatiality. This chapter distinguishes the two diverse fields, space and capitalism, that have been critically examined by scholars to present how they have arguably overlooked the possibility of integrating these two fields into the analysis of the novel. In addition, the purpose is to acknowledge the importance of space in Dickens’ works, as well as to emphasize the value of secondary characters. The study of space has been critically investigated in Dickens’ novels, such as *Hard Times*, *David Copperfield*, and many others, bringing Lefebvre’s and Harvey’s concept of space into focus. On the other hand, critics of *Great Expectations*, particularly, identify space as a reflection of the character’s mental and physical condition, overlooking the dynamic power of space, as well as overemphasizing the importance of Pip. The workings of capitalism, alienation and mystification, have also been identified in the analysis of Pip’s narration. Unlike the study of spatiality, most critics have displaced Pip as the focus of study.
with other characters in investigating the aspects of capitalism. While many critics have identified the subject of alienation, primarily focusing on the protagonist’s dehumanization in society, others have placed their focus on mystification, exposing the commodity fetishism of periphery characters. This chapter uncovers the study of the characters unconsciously alienated from humanity, as well as unconsciously mystified to remain imprisoned in their social roles.

Second, I argue that alienation is manifested from the characters’ family life and leisure. Approaching the novel from Harvey’s absolute space, this chapter reveals not only Pip’s social interaction with the environment, but also demonstrates the social space of secondary characters. These characters in discussion are not merely minor figures that influence the innocent protagonist to mature into a responsible and virtuous adult. They are fascinating characters that play significant roles in advancing capitalism, isolating from themselves and each other. Expanding on Lefebvre’s argument of alienation, which refers to the estranging process of alienation and disalienation, I assert that the characters de-ludes themselves to believe that they are escaping the confinements of alienation when they are doing precisely the opposite. Examples of alienation include the honest Joe, who works diligently in the forge, Mrs. Joe and Biddy, who both take care of the domestic affairs, Miss Havisham and Estella, who convince themselves in Satis House, and the Pockets couple who lives with contradictory beliefs from one another. This chapter discusses alienation by exploring the social relationships of the individual and the environment as the device to sustain the individual’s social positions.

Third, I contend that characters’ great expectations derive from their money fetishism as an embodiment of mystification, Lefebvre’s theory of the distortion of reality. The novel elucidates the deceptive relationship between the characters and their anticipations of money. Expanding on the workings of alienation which reveal life as fragmented and unreal, mystification is unraveled by the individual’s strong reliance on money to fulfill their grand expectations. The lovely Estella and eccentric Miss Havisham depend on wealth to seek their happiness in matrimony. Arthur, Compeyson and Magwitch, the deceptive criminals betray
other people and themselves to believe that they can become prosperous without being prosecuted by the law. The prominent lawyer, Mr. Jaggers, disillusioned himself to be detached from his clients that have paid for his services. His diligent worker, Mr. Wemmick, desires to invest money in portable property, leading to his dual attitude in the office and the Castle, which ultimately undermines at the end of the novel. Dickens’ work is not simply a story of Pip’s great expectations to become a gentleman, but a manifestation of diverse expectations that expose the process of mystification in money fetishism.

This study investigates the novel’s depictions of diverse characters and their role in the Capital to complicate the readings of the fiction; it also offers recognition of the spatial significance in the work from a Marxist and human geographical approach. Adopting David Harvey’s *Social Justice and the City* and Lefebvre’s *Critique of Everyday Life* in reading Dickens’ fiction, I present a new perspective of the relations of space and capitalism in the nineteenth-century fiction. Rather than concentrating on the protagonist Pip, secondary characters in this context are valued and appreciated. Most vitally, this thesis signals the relation between space, Marxism, and Victorian studies.

In combining these three completely diverse fields in analyzing *Great Expectations*, my goal was to bring a brand new perspective to reading the novel. The challenges faced herein include the integration of the different approaches to investigate the aspects of capitalism of the novel, partially overcome by constructing my thesis with Lefebvre’s theory of Marxism. This thesis argues the significant oversight of the spatial context of the characters in the connection with Capitalism.

The relationship between space and Capitalism are essential in the interpretation of the text, yet there had not been many discussions or studies that combine these two fields. The presence of the periphery individuals in Dickens’ work should not be ignored or neglected despite the novel being categorized as an autobiographical account of Pip; most scholars base their studies on Pip’s great expectations. Dickens not only created a fiction with diverse motifs,
but also established a spatial image of capitalism, illustrating the workings of alienation and mystification. The lucid portrayals of the individuals not only enhances the comical values of the novel, but also cultivates our understanding on how capitalism is maintained and replicated. It also uncovers a satire of having great expectations in capitalist society. By putting the space into focus, I hope to provide a new reading of *Great Expectations* and to recognize the significance of capitalism and space in Victorian literature.
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