

# CHAPTER ONE

# INTRODUCTION

---

## INTRODUCTION

This thesis is an attempt at applying psychoanalytic theories on the child characters of Dickens. Consequently this resulted in finding the fundamentals of psychoanalytic criticism.

Psychoanalytic criticism originated in the work of Austrian psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud, who pioneered the technique of psychoanalysis. Freud developed a language that described, a model that explained and a theory that encompassed human psychology. His theories are directly and indirectly concerned with the nature of the unconscious mind.

Psychoanalytic criticism is a form of applied psychoanalysis, a science concerned with the interaction between conscious and unconscious processes and with the laws of mental functioning. It should not be confused with psychotherapy, which is concerned with mental

illness and behavioral problems, although many psychotherapists use various kinds of analysis in their work. Rather, psychoanalytic criticism is one of the many different forms of study that uses psychoanalytic concepts to understand particular subject matter. Thus psychoanalytically inclined critics use concepts and insights from psychoanalytic theory in their work.

Psychoanalytic criticism, thus builds on Freudian theories of psychology. While we don't have a room here to discuss all of Freud's work, a general overview is necessary to explain psychoanalytic criticism.

Freud began his psychoanalytic work in the 1880s while attempting to treat behavioral disorders in his Viennese patients. He dubbed the disorders 'hysteria' and began treating them by listening to his patients talk through their problems. Based on his work, Freud asserted that people's behaviour is affected by their unconscious. "... the notion that human beings are motivated, even driven, by desires, fears, needs and conflicts of which they are unaware... ." (*Tyson* 14-15)

Freud believed that our unconscious was influenced by our childhood events. Freud organized these events into developmental stages involving relationships with parents and drives of desire and pleasure where children focus, "... on different parts of the body ... starting with the mouth ... shifting to the oral, anal and phallic phases

...” (*Richter* 10-15). These stages reflect base level of desire but they also involve fear of loss (loss of genitals, loss of affection from parents, loss of life) and repression : “... the expunging from consciousness of these unhappy psychological events.” (*Tyson*, 15)

Tyson reminds us, however, that “... repression doesn’t eliminate our painful experiences and emotions ... we unconsciously behave in ways that will allow us to ‘play out’... our conflicted feelings about the painful experiences and emotions we repress.” To keep all this conflict buried in our unconscious, Freud argued that we develop defenses: selective perception, selective memory, denial, displacement, projection, regression, fear of intimacy, and fear of death, among others.

Freud maintained that our desires and our unconscious conflicts give rise to three areas of the mind that wrestle for dominance as we grow from infancy, to childhood, to adulthood:—

id – “ ... the location of drives” or libido.

ego – “ ... one of the major defenses against the power of the drives ...” and home of the defenses listed above.

Superego — the area of the unconscious that houses judgement (of self and others) and “... which begins to form during childhood as a result of the Oedipus Complex.”

(*Richter* 1005-1016)

Freud believed that the Oedipus complex was “... one of the most powerfully determinative elements in the growth of the child”. (*Richter*

1016). Freud believed that the impact of unconscious, id ego, Superego, the defenses and the Oedipus complexes was inescapable and that these elements of the mind influence all our behaviour (and even our dreams) as adults. Of course this behaviour influences what we write.

So what does all of this psychological business have to do with literature and the study of literature? Put simply, some critics believe that we can “... read psychoanalytically ... to see which concepts are operating in the text in such a way as to enrich our understanding of the work and ... to yield a meaningful, coherent, psychoanalytic interpretation (*Tyson, 29*) In Lois Tyson’s educational text ‘Critical Theory Today, the author expertly considers varying theoretical approaches to literary criticism in five detail, starting with the theoretical lens of psychoanalytic criticism. A fundamental premise of this approach focuses on the unconscious processes of cognitive perception to reveal characters’ inner world. More specially, this literary theory explores the extent to which repressed desire and unresolved emotional distress motivate a character’s actions beyond presumed obstacle, conflict and resolution in a story. Tyson provides us with some meaningful and applicable questions to help guide our understanding of psychoanalytical criticism. These typical questions constitute :—

How do the operations of repression structure or inform the work?

Are there any oedipal dynamics - or any other family dynamics at work.

How can characters' behaviour, narrative events, and/or images be explained in terms of psychoanalytic concepts of any kind (for example— fear or fascination with death, sexuality— which includes love and romance) as well as sexual behavior — as a primary indicator of psychological identity on the operations of ego-id-superego?

What does the work suggest about the psychological being of its author?

What might a given interpretation of a literary work suggest about the psychological motives of the reader?

Are there prominent words in the piece that could have different or hidden meanings? Could there be a subconscious reason for the author using these 'problem words'?

The psychoanalytic approach to literature not only rests on the theories of Freud; it may even be said to have begun with Freud, who wrote literary criticism as well as psychoanalytic theory. Probably because of Freud's characterization of the artist's mind as "one urged on by instincts that are too clamorous", psychoanalytic criticism written before 1950 tend to psychoanalyse the individual author.

After 1950, psychoanalytic critics began to emphasize the ways in which authors create works that appeal to readers' repressed wishes and fantasies. Consequently, they shifted their focus away from the author's psyche toward the psychology of the reader and the text. Norman

Holland's theories concerned more with the reader than with the text, helped to establish reader response criticism.

Jacques Lacan, another post-Freudian psychoanalytic theorist, focused on language and language related issues. Lacan treats the unconscious as a language. Consequently he views the dream not as Freud did (that is, as a form and symptom of repression) but rather as a form of discourse. Thus we may study dreams psychoanalytically in order to learn about literature, even as we may study literature in order to learn more about the unconscious.

From the perspective of literary studies, the discovery of Lacan in the mid-1970s revitalized the rather moribund practice of psychoanalytic criticism and reinstated psychoanalysis at the cutting edge of critical theory. Lacan's conception of the unconscious as structured like a language and the relationship between the symbolic order and the subject opened up a whole new way of understanding the play of unconscious desire in the text. The object of psychoanalytic criticism was no longer to hunt for phallic symbols or to explain Hamlet's hesitation to revenge his father's death by his repressed sexual desire for his mother but to analyse the way unconscious desire manifest themselves in the text, through language. The focus of Lacanian criticism, therefore, is not upon the unconscious of the character or the author but upon the text itself and the relationship between text and reader.

Jungian criticism attempts to explore the connection between literature and what Carl Jung called the “Collective unconscious” of the human race: “... racial memory, through which the spirit of the whole human species manifests itself.” (*Ritcher* 504)

Jungian criticism, closely related to Freudian theory because of its connection to psychoanalysis, assumes that all stories and symbols are based on mythic models from mankind’s past.

Based on these commonalities, Jung developed archetypal myths. These archetypes are the shadow, the Anima, the Animus and the spirit.

In literary analysis, a Jungian critic would look for archetypes in creative works: “Jungian Criticism is generally involved with a search for the embodiment of these symbols within particular works of art.” (*Ritcher* 505)

Archetypal literary criticism is a type of critical theory that interprets a text by focusing on recurring myths and archetypes in the narrative symbols, images, and character types in a literary work. As a form of literary criticism it dates back to 1934 when Maud Bodkin published *Archetypal patterns in Poetry*. Archetypal literary criticism’s origins are rooted in two other academic disciplines-social anthropology and psychoanalysis. Archetypal criticism was most popular in the 1950’s

and 1960's largely due to the work of Canadian literary critic Northrop Frye.

Jung's work theorizes about myths and archetypes in relation to the unconscious, an inaccessible part of the mind. From a Jungian perspective, myths are the "culturally elaborated representations of the contents of the deepest recess of the human psyche: the world of archetypes." (Walker 4)

The archetypes to which Jung refers are represented through primordial images, a term he coined. Primordial images originate from the initial stages of humanity and have been part of the collective unconscious ever since. It is through primordial images that universal archetypes are experienced and the unconscious is revealed

By itself, Jung's theory of the collective unconscious accounts for a considerable share of writings in archetypal literary criticism. The Jungian archetypal approach treats literary texts as an avenue in which primordial images are represented.

Bodkin's *Archetypal pattern in poetry*, the first work on the subject of archetypal literary criticism, applies Jung's theories about the collective unconscious, archetypes and primordial images to literature.

Psychoanalytic criticism appeared in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. It is an extrinsic approach which consists in the application of some

psychological values to the study of literature. Psychoanalytic criticism focuses on the writer's psyche and the study of mental processes of creation, psychological types and principles within works of literature, on the effects of literature upon its readers.

Psychoanalytic criticism takes the techniques of psychoanalysis as originally developed by Sigmund Freud and applies them in examination of Literature.

Psychoanalysis is an interpretative art. It seeks to find meaning in the behaviour of people and in the arts they create. One way we can apply psychoanalytic theory is by understanding how the psyche works and learning how to interpret the hidden significance of what people and characters in fiction do. We ask ourselves questions, such as "What does it mean when Hamlet says this or that?" or "What does it mean when Hamlet is unable to act?" We want to know why? Characters of the play are often symbolic and thus can be interpreted in terms of all the things they stand for. Symbols are keys that enable us to unlock the doors shielding our unconscious feelings and beliefs from scrutiny.

From the point of literary criticism, psychoanalysis tends to be either about the author, the reader the characters in the text or the formal aspects of the work. For example, one can analyze a work to reveal the mind of the author, explore how a reader creates meaning or explain the actions and motivations of characters in a work. Based on Lacan's

famous dictum “the unconscious is structured like language”, psychoanalytic critics also apply their techniques to examine the formal aspects of literature.

Psychoanalytic criticism adopts the methods of “reading” employed by Freud and later theorists to interpret texts. It argues that literary texts, like dreams, express the secret unconscious desires and anxieties of the author, that a literary work is a manifestation of the author’s own neurosis. One may psychoanalyze a particular character within a literary work, but it is usually assumed that all such characters are projections of the author’s psyche.

This approach validates the importance of literature, as it is built on a literary key for the decoding. Freud himself wrote:—

“The dream-thoughts which we first come across as we proceed with our analysis often strike us by the unusual factor in which they are expressed. They are not clothed in the prosaic language usually employed by our thoughts, but are on the contrary represented symbolically by means of similes and metaphors, in images resembling those of poetic speech.”

(Sigmund Freud, *On*

*Dreams*)

Like psychoanalysis itself this critical endeavour seeks evidence of unresolved conflicts, emotions, psychological conflicts, guilts, ambivalences and so forth within what may well be a disunified literary work. The author’s own childhood traumas, family life, sexual conflicts,

fixations and such will be traceable within the behaviour of the characters in the literary work. But psychological material will be expressed indirectly, disguised, or encoded (as in dreams) through principles such as “Symbolism” (the repressed object repressed in disguise), “Condensation” (several thoughts or persons represented) in a single image and “displacement” (anxiety located onto another image by means of association).

Psychoanalytic criticism is similar to New criticism in not concerning itself with “What the author intended”, but what the author never intended (that is repressed) is sought. The unconscious material has been distorted by the censoring conscious mind.

Psychoanalytic critics will ask question as “What is Hamlet’s problem?” or “Why can’t Bronte” seems to portray any positive mother figures?”

“The practice of art constitutes a psychological activity.” *C.G. Jung* 202) Sigmund Freud’s psychoanalysis starts from three principles: some somatic alterations are result of a psychic influence. Our psyche has unconscious processes, and association of ideas can make the unconscious tangible. This unconscious is full of repressed desires. They try to get out of unconscious. Freud called this power Id. Id’s main feature is uncontrollability and the pleasure pursuit. It houses libido (sexual energy) wishes, and fears. On the other hand there is the Ego which has a coherent organisation of mental processes. It houses reason and sense. Moreover, there is another level: Super-ego. It comes from the pressure of society, family,

morality, law etc. It makes individual repress his sexual desires since he was born. Both Id and Super Ego put pressure on the Ego. (*Manuel Asensi Pe'rez* 534)

Literature is for Freud, a means to express repressed desires: “Happy men never fantasize: just unsatisfied men fantasize. So, it is a kind of auto-therapy.”

The psychoanalytic approach has interest in the relation between the text and its author. It tries to find “latent ideas” (repressed desires that are hidden), to decipher the real meaning (“patent content”). The approach must take into account every textual detail as a unit of sense. It analyses, symbols, images that could deal with the human psyche or sexual aspects. It also looks for the relationship between these elements and author. For example, Freud said that Shakespeare’s “Hamlet” was written because of the death of Shakespeare’s father. The fact provoked the comeback of old repressed instincts against his father. So, Hamlet doubts if he must or not revenge his father’s death.

(*Manuel Asensi Pe'rez* 541)

Franz Kafka’s works also have clear examples of psychoanalytic elements. We can observe several symbols of the “Oedipus complex” In “The Metamorphosis”, Kafka tells us the story of a man who wakes up in a body of a big beetle. His family rejects him, and his main enemy is his father, who wants to kill him. His father acts as an impetuous, cruel and despotic figure. He only finds his sister’s help. If we have a look at Kafka’s biography, we find that he was the only boy of a Jewish family

(he had sisters). His father was too dominant for him and traumatised his childhood. He felt like an “insect” before his father.

To sum up, it can be said that the psychoanalytic approach tries to decipher the hidden repressed desires of its author; so they look for phallic or feminine elements, the “Oedipus complex”, wishes, fears and other unconscious material. A work of literature is like a dream. So we can know more about its author, but also more about ourselves, because we can also feel identified with one of the characters as a means of alleviating our repressed desires.

Psychoanalytic literary criticism can focus on one or more of the following :—

the author : the theory is used to analyze the author and his/her life, and the literary work is seen to supply evidence for this analysis.

the characters : the theory is used to analyze one or more of the characters, the psychological theory becomes a tool that to explain the characters’ behaviour and motivations. The more closely the theory seems to apply to the characters, the more realistic the work appears.

the audience : the theory is used to explain the appeal of the work for those who read it, the work is seen to embody universal human psychological processes and motivations to which the readers respond more or less unconsciously.

the text : the theory is used to analyze the role of language and symbolism in the work.

Thus, psychoanalytic literary criticism is a literary approach where critics see the text as if it were a kind of a dream. This means that the text represses its real (or latent) content behind obvious (manifest) content. The process of changing from latent to manifest content is known as the dream work, and involves operations of concentration and displacement. The critic analyzes the language and symbolism of a text to reverse the process of the dream work and arrive at the underlying latent thoughts.

Freud wrote several important essays on literature, which he used to explore the psyche of authors and characters to explain narrative mysteries, and to develop new concepts in psychoanalysis for instance, Delusion and Dream in Jensen's *Gradiva* and his influential readings of the Oedipus myth and Shakespeare's Hamlet in the *Interpretation of Dreams*.

Like all forms of literary criticism, psychoanalytic criticism can yield useful clues to the sometime baffling symbols, actions, and settings in literary work.

Professor Sigmund Freud has laid bare some of the fundamental mechanisms by which artistic and poetic creativeness proceeds. He has shown that the main characteristics of these mechanisms are common to many apparently dissimilar mental processes, such as dreams, wit, psychoneurotic symptoms etc. and further that all these processes bear

an intimate relation to fantasy, to the realisation of non-conscious wishes to psychological “repression” to the re-awakening of childhood memories, and to psycho-sexual life of the subject.

Often the artist is not distinctly aware of the real meaning of what he is seeking to express, and is never aware of its source. The difficulty experienced by the artist in arriving at the precise meaning of the creation to which he is labouring to give birth has been brilliantly demonstrated by Bernard Shaw in the case of Ibsen and Wagner. The artist works under the impulsion of an apparently external force; indeed, being unaware of the origin of his inspiration, it frequently happens that he ascribes it to an actual external agency, divine or otherwise. This origin is to be found in mental processes which have been forgotten by the subject, but which are still operative, in Freud’s language, the creative output is sublimated manifestation of various thwarted and repressed wishes, of which the subject is no longer conscious. The artist, therefore, gives expression to the creative impulse in a form which satisfies his internal need, but in terms which he cannot translate into easily comprehensible language; he must express it directly as it feels to him, and without taking into consideration his possible audience. An evident Corollary of this is that the farther away the artist’s meaning from the minds of those not in possession of any of his inspiration the more difficult and open to doubt is the interpretation of it.

It is to be expected that the knowledge so laboriously gained by the psycho-analytical method of investigation would prove of great value in an attempt to solve the psychological problems concerned with the obscurer motives of human action and desire. In fact one can see no other scientific mode of approach to such problems than through the patient unravelling of the deeper and hidden layers of the mind by means of the dissecting procedures employed in this method. The stimulating results obtained by Muthmann, Rank, Riklin,; Sodger, Abraham and others are only a foretoken of the application that will be possible when this method has been employed over a larger field than has hitherto been the case.

Oedipus complex is a psychological term. After reading *Sons and Lovers* by D.H. Lawrence, "its understanding becomes much easier, once the concept of Oedipus complex is clearly understood. A very strange relationship between a son and his mother has been shown, where son loves no other woman except his mother and the mother is equally obsessive about her son. She wants her son all to herself. Psychologically over dependence upon his mother makes the protagonist of the novel Paul Morel unable to love any other woman. The novel is centered around this main issue where Paul Morel is torn by a conflict between his love for Miriam a young lady and his strong desire to please his mother who dislikes Miriam and the real cause for this dislike is that Miriam would take away Paul from her. Mr. Morel's death too could not

shatter his love for her and always asked himself whether his mother was really dead.

*Sons and Lovers* was the first modern portrayal of a phenomenon that later, thanks to Freud, became easily recognizable as the Oedipus complex. Never was a son more undentured to his mother's love and full of hatred for his father than Paul Morel. D.H. Lawrence's young protagonist. It is by Lawrence's own account a book aimed at depicting Mrs. Morel's grasp :—

“as her sons grow up she selects them as lovers ... first the eldest, then the second. These sons are urged into life by their reciprocal love of their mother, urged on and on. But when they come to manhood, they cannot love because their mother is the strongest power in their lives.”

Of course, Mrs. Morel takes neither of her two elder sons (the first of whom dies early, which further intensifies her grip on Paul) as a literal lover, but nonetheless her psychological share is immense. She loathes Paul's Miriam from the start, understanding that the girl's deep love of her son will oust her. “She's not like an ordinary woman, who can leave me my share in him. She wants to absorb him.” Meanwhile, Paul plays his part with equal fervor, incapable of committing himself in either direction. “Why did his mother sit at home and suffer?... And why did he hate Miriam, and feel so cruel towards her, at the thought of his mother.

If Miriam caused his mother suffering, then he hated her ... and he easily hated her.”

The result of all this is that Paul throws Miriam over for a married suffragete, Clara who fulfills the sexual component of his ascent to manhood, but leaves him, as ever without a complete relationship to challenge his love for his mother.

Psychoanalytic literary criticism aids our examination to find out how Lady Macbeth turn from a single minded, ambitious, unforgiving murderer to a guilty, sleep-walking absent minded mess. Instances from the text suggest what Lady Macbeth was going through at the time and shows how, psychologically, Sigmund Freud’s theory of psychoanalysis would be suited best to find the reasoning behind Lady Macbeth’s metamorphosis. In order to make any headway into this subject, an overview of Freud’s psychoanalytical theory is needed. Psychoanalysis is a theory that derives on the idea that the unconscious mind is driven by sexual urges and primal instinct of man. One of the most significant points in this theory is the idea that our inborn desires are governed by three separate entities designated as the Id, the Ego, and the Superego.

*Macbeth* is the ultimate story of betrayal, ambition and greed. The play is written in a dream like state, sometimes considered a dream itself, and the two leading characters have been analyzed by more

psychologists and scholars alike than almost any other character in literature.

There are few approaches one can take when psychoanalyzing the Lord and Lady Macbeth. First of all one has to decide to read the characters as such or as real people. For the purposes of psychoanalysis, it makes the most sense to assume the latter of the two. Once that is decided, it can then either be assumed that Lord and Lady Macbeth are two separate entities or that they are two parts of one being.

According to Norman Holland's book *Psychoanalysis and Shakespeare*, Lady Macbeth is discouraged by her husband's impotence. She therefore decides to focus all her energies on her husband's ambitious plans. She even goes so far as to give up all that is womanly and dedicate herself to cruelty, in order to gain status.

"Come to my woman's breasts and take my milk for gall, you murdering ministers' (*Macbeth* Act 1, Scene 5, lines 47-48).

As the play progresses, it seems obvious that Lady Macbeth is stronger than her husband. This is most apparent in the banquet scene of Act three. Macbeth begins to imagine Banquo's ghost everywhere. It is Lady Macbeth who maintains a sense of order in the situation. She admonished her husband's behaviour, goes on to excuse her husband's apparent illness and then sends the guests away.

“You have displaced mirth, broke the good meeting with most admired disorder. ...”

“He grows worse and worse. Question enrages him. At once good night. Stand not upon the order of your going. But go at once.” (*Macbeth* Act 3, Scene 4, Lines 109-110, 118-121).

She is able to do this by stifling her conscience.

However, this proves to be her demise. As her defenses begin to fail, she has no way to release the intense feelings of guilt, as her husband has become more and more distraught. Eventually these nagging feelings of guilt overtake her and reduce her to the sleep-walking figure that is seen in Act 5. The constant washing of her hands is her mind's way of ridding herself of that guilt. Her agitation, tendency to aggression, desire for death and feeling as if there was no road back lead to the assumption that she has developed a form of psychosis. Washing her hands did nothing to relieve her grief. Therefore, she feels that suicide is the only adequate course of action to appease her dissatisfied conscience.

In reality, psychoanalysis is an effective technique of exploring repressed or unconscious, impulses and anxieties as well as internal conflict. This technique can often be quite effective when used to characters in various fictional texts, such as Shakespeare's *Othello*. By

applying such a reading to the text, we can gain a much greater understanding of the characters, the ways their 'minds' work, and the effect their thought patterns have on the themes portrayed in drama. While performing a psychoanalytic reading of the characters in the text, one needs to consider various physically presented manifestations of their mind's workings just like the psychoanalysis of 'real' people. These generally include signs such as resistance or transference of certain ideas or suggestions. This sort of behavior, could indicate a deep rooted sub-conscious aversion to the ideas being discussed.

From the beginning of the play, Othello is felt by many of the characters, as well as himself, as being an outsider to the Venician Society.

In relation to Cassio being chosen by Othello for the position of lieutenant instead of Lago, Lago complains, "I know my price, I am worth no worse place. Reputation, reputation, reputation! Oh, I have lost my reputation! I have lost the immortal part of myself, and what remains is bestial" his proposed subjective reality, in which he was loved and accepted, began to unravel at the thought. This can be seen through the idea that if Othello had trusted Desdemona none of the concluding Chaos would have taken place. Pride is a theme present in most readings of *Othello*. It is likely that *Othello* suffered much repressed personal insecurity as a result of his feelings of estrangement and alienation. He

tries to resist being an outsider in this manner. By understanding Othello's basic subconscious anxieties, we can strengthen the idea that Othello trusted Iago. The idea of ignorance as one theme is recurring throughout *Othello*. It is *Othello's* infelicitous trust in Iago that partly leads to his downfall. This is another perhaps subconscious revelation of his feelings of his being ostracized from the Venetian society. His insecurities were seemingly validated and his worst nightmare realised, he believed he had nothing left, and so felt a need to kill Desdemona for her crime.

Neurosis reminds us of the fact that there is a seamy side to our civilization. Society compels every individual to repress instinctual urges and the desire for the free exercise of will, all in the name of upholding its ideals and expectations which are very oppressive and anti-human. If the individual is too ill-equipped to oppose the societal sanctions openly he or she will find an alternative in neurosis because it is a form of protest among other things. Neurosis is thus invested with profound psychological and social significance. It is basically subversive. Indian society continues to be rigid and conservative and the repression one has put up with is often very severe. Women especially bear the brunt of it as the social norms and moral Codes are heavily loaded against them.

It is against this background that some of the Indian women novelists in English have fictionally treated the neurotic suffering of

susceptible characters in the light of Freudian and post-Freudian psychoanalysis which has equipped the modern literary critic with remarkable knowledge of the inner struggles of literary characters and other aspects of literary product.

The fiction of Anita Desai is relevant to all times because she writes about the predicament of modern men. She digs into man's inner psyche and goes beyond the skin and flesh. Literature for her is a means of the exploration of human psyche, inner climate and she unravels the mystery of inner life of her characters. Thus, the most common themes in her novels are the complexity of human relationships, particularly the man-woman relationships. She writes mostly about the miserable plight of women suffering under their insensitive and inconsiderate husbands, fathers and brothers. So man-woman relationship brings characters into alienation, withdrawal, loneliness, isolation and lack of communication that frequently occurs in her novels.

Tension, worries, depression, disappointment, anxiety and fear become their lot and they lose their sense of sanity and mental poise for example 'Maya In *Cry, the Peacock*', Sita in ' *Where shall we go this summer?*' And Nanda Kaul in ' *Fire on the Mountain*'.

Her female protagonists try to discover and rediscover meaningfulness in life through the known, the established. Thus, characters in her novels are generally neurotic females, highly sensitive

and engage with their dreams and imagination and alienated from their environments. *In voices in the city*, Anita Desai's concern is primarily with human relationships and how in the absence of meaningful relationships the individual suffers. She probes the psychic compulsion that may affect an individual in forging long term and significant relationships and how an individual is affected if he is unable to forge such relationships.

Nirode, one of the main characters, is obsessed with the relationship of his mother with major Chadha and considers her a she-Cannibal. Nirode's relationship with his mother is a love-hate relationship. Suggestions of his mother fixation have been veiled and according to psychologists hatred often is a defense mechanism of the psyche to stop one from committing incest.

If Maya's tragedy in *Cry, the Peacock* emanated from her obsession with a father figure, Nirode's tragedy lies in his love-hate relationship with his mother.

*In where shall we go this summer?*, Anita Desai takes up the theme of alienation and lack of communication in married life. Sita finds herself alienated from her husband and children. She remains an ignored personality since childhood. She is the product of a broken family. She yearns to have love and attention of others but her father remains busy with his chelas and patients. Even after marriage, she remains lonely.

Her husband is also busy. He fails to fulfil her expectation. As a result, there is marital discord, tension between husband and wife.

Novel shows Desai's tragic vision of life, in which the innocents suffer. They pay a heavy price for their sincerity and innocence, as ordained by an unkind fate.

To conclude, Anita Desai presents to reader her opinion about complexity of human relationship as a big contemporary problem and human condition.

The extensive experience of the psycho-analytic researches carried out by Freud and his school has amply demonstrated that certain kinds of mental processes show a greater tendency to be "repressed" than others. In other words, it is harder for a person to own to himself the existence in his mind of some mental trends than it is of others. One might in this connection venture the generalisation that those processes are most likely to be "repressed" by the individual which are most disapproved of by the particular circle of society to whose influence he has been chiefly subjected.

The whole picture presented by Hamlet, his deep depression, the hopeless note in his attitude towards the world and towards the value of life, his dread of death, his repeated reference to bad dreams, his self accusations, his desperate efforts to get away from the thoughts of his

duty, and his vain attempts to find an excuse for his recalcitrancy, all this unequivocally points to a tortured existence, to some hidden ground for shirking his task, a ground which he dare not or cannot avow to himself. We therefore need to seek some evidence that may serve to bring to the light the hidden motive. It is in such instances, wherein psychoanalytic literary criticism facilitates the understanding of the psyche of the characters, thereby enabling the readers, an insight into his real self.

Short summary of the novels undertaken in this research:—

Charles Dickens was an exponent in portraying a child as the victim of society. The possibilities of childhood for romance or paths had been suggested by Shakespeare, by Fielding and by Blake; but none of these had brought children into the very centre of the action or had made them highly individual.

In *David Copperfield*, Dickens centred his story in a child, David Copperfield. David Copperfield, stand out in divine innocence and goodness, in contrast to the civil creatures whose persecution he suffered for a time. And further they represent in most effective manner the complaint of the individual against society.

David Copperfield was born at Blunderstone in Suffolk, soon after the death of his father. David was brought up with great love and affection by his mother and his nurse Miss Peggotty. But his happy

childhood came to an end soon. His mother, a gentle, weak woman, marries again and her second husband, Mr. Murdstone is a harsh and cruel man. He and his sister, Miss Murdstone fully dominated David's simple and child-like mother. Miss Murdstone soon took charge of the home and finances, and Mr. Murdstone took upon him the education of David. The poor boy was ill treated and rebuked for nothing. He was severely beaten when he failed to prepare his lessons to the satisfaction of his step-father. His life was miserable and wretched. Young Copperfield, who has proved recalcitrant, is sent to school, where he is bullied by the tyrannical headmaster, Creakle, but makes two friends, in the brilliant and fascinating Steerforth and the good-humoured plodding Traddles. At school, a notice, "Take care of him, he bites", was tied to his back, with the result that the other boys laughed and jeered at him whenever he appeared in the school. It was a great humiliation for the sensitive boy. The Headmaster, Mr. Creakle was very harsh and unsympathetic and caned the boys for sheer joy of it. He was especially cruel to David. It was the help and support of Steerforth and Traddles that made life at school bearable for David.

During his second term at school, on his birthday, he was given the sad news of the death of his mother after a brief illness. Poor David was now an orphan in the wide world, with no one to look after him or sympathise with him. He hurried home for the funeral, and after it was

sent for a fortnight to Yarmouth with Miss Peggotty. He had a happy time there in the company of little Emily, and the love and affection of Mr. Peggotty and others made him almost forget his great loss.

On his return home, David was told by Mr. Murdstone that he was too poor to give him any further education, and that now he was old enough to earn his own living. The result was that he was sent to menial employment in London. Here in the midst of dirt and squalor, poor David had to slave from morning till night and was paid hardly enough to provide him with two square meals a day. The other boys with whom he worked were the very scum of the city, and the very thought of working in such company was mortifying to David. The only ray of light in the darkness which surrounded him was the genial company of Mrs. Micawber with whom David lodged.

However, even this ray of light was short-lived as Mr. Micawber was arrested for debt and put in the Marshalsea for debtors. David, thus once again became alone and friendless in the wide world. He could no longer bear his life at warehouse, and decided to run away. His plan was to go to Dover where he had heard that his great aunt Betsy Trotwood lived, find out her residence and throw himself at her mercy. Accordingly, he packed his box, and one fine morning started on his journey. However, in the very beginning of the journey, he was robbed of his money and his box by the driver of the Cart he had hired to take him to Dover. His

misery knew no bounds. He wept tears of deep anguish. With a heavy heart he continued his journey on foot. In the way, he suffered many hardships. He has to sell his clothes to buy food, and at night had to sleep in the open without any roof over his head except the sky.

At last, he reached Dover and after inquiring at several places could find the house of his aunt. His feet were blistered, his clothes were torn, and his appearance was shabby and unkept. Betsy Trotwood, therefore mistook him to be a beggar boy, when David addressed her as 'aunt' and appealed for help and protection, she was much pained and surprised. She was a kind hearted lady, though a little eccentric. She treated David kindly, and soon he felt at home with her. She adopted him as her own son, and showered love and affection on him, so that David soon forgot all the hardships he had undergone.

In due course, David was sent to school at Dr. Strong's Academy at Canterbury, and arrangement for his food and lodging were made with Mr. Wickfield, the lawyer of Miss Betty Trotwood. Dr. Strong's Academy was a good educational institution where the boys were sympathetically treated and educated in the real sense of the word. Mr. Wickfield soon made him quite comfortable, and in his young and beautiful daughter, Agnes, David found a sympathetic and affectionate companion. Agnes, was a girl of exceptionally sweet and high minded disposition and she continued to exercise a powerful influence on the rest of his life. However,

he did not like Mr. Wickfield's clerk Uriah Heep, who was a dirty, slimy fellow with a very cold hand. Though he pretended humility, he was in reality ambitious to become a partner in the firm and marry Agnes.

After David had completed his education at Dr. Strong's Academy, his aunt had him apprenticed with the firm of "Spenlow and Jorkins" solicitors. During a visit to the home of Mr. Spenlow he fell violently in love with his daughter, Dora. They were married in due course. However, Dora was a mere child entirely irresponsible and incapable of managing the home. This was a serious handicap for David who was now a polished young man desirous of making his way in the world. Though not very successful as a lawyer, he could make much headway as a writer and press reporter.

Dora dies after a few years of married life and Copperfield, at first disconsolate, awakens to a growing appreciation and love of Agnes. Her father has fallen into the toils of a villainous and cunning clerk, Uriah Heep, who under the cloak of fawning humility to the verge of imbecility, had nearly ruined him, Uriah also aspires to marry Agnes. But his misdeeds, which include forgery and theft, are exposed by Micawber, employed as his clerk, with the assistance of Traddles, now a barrister. Uriah is last seen in prison, under a life sentence.

David's Yarmouth friends were also involved in trouble. He had himself introduced Steerforth to the family. However, Steerforth did not

act honourably and eloped with Emily who had been betrothed to Ham. It was a severe shock to Mr. Peggotty who sets out to find her following her through many countries, and finally recovering her after she has been cast off by Steerforth. Emily did return to England, but Steerforth perished in a shipwreck near Yarmouth. Ham too, was drowned while trying to save Steerforth. Mr. Peggotty could no longer bear to remain in England and so with Emily, Miss Peggotty and Mrs. Gummidge he sailed to Australia, where David had the satisfaction of knowing, he prospered and did well. Mr. Micawber, too, with his family, migrated to Australia where he rose to the rank of a magistrate.

David Copperfield married Agnes, who came to his comfort, after the death of Dora, and lived happily with her ever afterwards.

The Novel *Oliver Twist* tells the story of a child who was born in a workhouse. (A Workhouse in those days was a Charitable Institution where paupers and orphans, with nobody to maintain and support them, lived at the expense of the concerned parish). The woman, who gave birth to this child, was not a married woman. The child, to whom she gave birth, was therefore an illegitimate child. The name Oliver twist was given to this child by the parish beadle, Mr. Bumble who selected this name for the child according to a formula which he had evolved for the naming of illegitimate children born in the workhouse. For the first nine years of life, *Oliver Twist* lived on the charity of the workhouse under

the care of a woman by the name of Mrs. Mann who was an expert in misappropriating the money which was given to her by the parish, and who therefore gave only scanty and meager food to the children under her charge. Mr. Bumble, who was an official visitor at the workhouse, was himself a very heartless man, having no pity at all for the orphaned children.

At the age of nine years, Oliver was put as an apprentice to an undertaker by the name of Mr. Sowerberry to learn Mr. Sowerberry's trade. Here Oliver Twist proved himself very useful to Mr. Sowerberry, but Mrs. Sowerberry did not take kindly to the boy. One day, when Oliver Twist was taunted by a boy named Noah Calypole about the character of his dead mother, Oliver Twist became furious and made a physical attack upon that fellow. Noah Calypole's girl friend, Charlotte, and the undertaker's wife, Mrs. Sowerberry, took Noah's side and reported to Mr. Sowerberry what they thought was gross misconduct on the part of *Oliver Twist*. Thereupon, Oliver Twist was given a severe beating by Mr. Sowerberry. Unable to endure this kind of treatment by the undertaker Oliver Twist ran away from his place of employment.

Oliver now made up his mind to go to London. Having no money in his pocket, he decided to walk the whole distance to that big city. Having nowhere else to go to, he now set out on foot to make a journey to the big city. On the way he encountered a fellow whose name was Jack Dawkins

but who had been given the nick name of the Artful Dodger by his friends and associates. This fellow offered to take Oliver to London and to introduce him to an old Jew who would provide Oliver with bread and lodging. Oliver was glad at this offer because he did not know anybody in London to give him shelter or food. Oliver then accompanied the Artful Dodger to London where the latter introduced Oliver to a Jew by the name of Fagin.

Fagin was a man who made a living from criminal activities such as stealing, pick-pocketing and robberies. This man had three or four boys who committed all sorts of petty thefts and robberies under his directions and who brought the stolen goods and articles to him for disposal. These boys lodged with him, and were, in a sense, in his service. Fagin now decided to train Oliver to work for him in the same way as the other boys were doing. Oliver did not understand what Fagin wanted to do with him. All that he could see was that there were a few boys sitting and drinking at Fagin's place and carrying out whatever orders Fagin gave to them. Oliver also saw two girls, Betsy and Nancy coming frequently to see Fagin and to meet the boys who were working under him. Besides the Artful Dodger, he who saved Fagin were Charley Bates and Tom Chitling.

One day Fagin asked Oliver Twist to go with the Artful Dodger and Charley Bates, and observe how they did their work. He also directed

Oliver to watch carefully the methods which the other two boys adopted in doing their work. Oliver Twist saw the two boys, take out a handkerchief from the pocket of a gentleman and having done so, the two boys ran away from the spot, and disappeared in a side-lane. The gentleman, on realizing that his handkerchief had been stolen, began to run to capture the pickpockets. He caught hold of Oliver who had also started running on seeing his companions run. The gentleman considered him to be a thief. Oliver was taken to the police station and charged with theft. He was sentenced to imprisonment by the judge but was saved by the timely arrival of the owner of the book-stall, who testified that Oliver was absolutely innocent. Oliver was thereupon released, but by this time, Oliver's condition had become so bad that he fainted.

The old gentleman, whose pocket had been picked, was a very kind-hearted man. He took pity upon the unconscious Oliver and took him to his own house. Oliver remained ill for many days, but he was looked after by Mrs. Bedwin (old gentleman's housekeeper) with great affection. Eventually he recovered from his illness, and he then told his whole story to Mr. Brownlow. Mr. Brownlow, feeling apprehensive that Oliver might again fall into the hands of Fagin, decided to keep Oliver in his own house. Oliver felt deeply grateful to Mr. Brownlow and also to Mrs.

Bedwin for taking such good care of him. A new life for Oliver had now begun.

One day, Mr. Brownlow gave Oliver a bundle of books and asked him to deliver it at a nearby book-stall from where Mr. Brownlow, a studious man, used to buy books. When Oliver was walking through a street on his way to the book-stall, he was seen by the girl Nancy who now pounced upon the boy and told the people in the street that he was her brother and had run away from home. People in the street sided with Nancy and allowed her to take Oliver by force. Fagin wanted Oliver back, because he did not want Oliver to act as an informer against him and have him arrested by the police. Nancy handed over Oliver back to Fagin.

Oliver was one day forced by Fagin to go with Sikes who was to commit a burglary at a house, which was situated at a very long distance from Fagin's den. Oliver's heart was not in this business of theft and stealing at all. All his thoughts were at this time centred upon Mr. Brownlow who had sent him on an errand and who must be thinking that Oliver had run away with the money which Mr. Brownlow had given to him to be handed over to the owner of the book-stall. Indeed, Oliver was feeling miserable at the thought that Mr. Brownlow must be thinking him to be a dishonest and crooked boy.

Sikes used Oliver as a tool in his attempt to commit a burglary at the house of a rich lady whose name was Mrs. Maylie. The burglary

attempted by Sikes failed; and in the course of the attempt made by Sikes to commit the burglary, Oliver was hit by a gun-shot from one of the servants of the rich lady, and was wounded. Sikes carried the wounded boy away from the house but soon afterwards left him in a field, and then fled to save himself from being captured. Oliver was unconscious at this time. However, on regaining consciousness he got up and walked unknowingly to the same house for help and shelter where an attempt to commit a burglary was made. Mrs. Maylie and Rose, feeling sympathetic towards the young, wounded boy, decided to give him shelter and also send for a doctor to attend upon him. When Oliver told his unhappy story to these persons, they all decided to help him as far as they could. They did not want that Oliver should once again fall into the clutches of the criminals who had tried to exploit him. Oliver now began to live with Mrs. Maylie and Miss Rose. His life with this family proved to be peaceful and happy as his stay in Mr. Brownlow's house had been.

A man called Monks now appeared on the scene. The real name of this man was Edward Leeford. This man began to feel an intense hostility towards Oliver after seeing him one day just by chance. From that time onwards, it became an obsession with that man to have Oliver changed into a criminal if possible, or at least to make Oliver's life miserable. In pursuance of this intention. Monks contacted the Old Jew, Fagin, and hatched a conspiracy with him against Oliver. The private

conversation held by Monks with Fagin on this subject was overheard by Nancy. Nancy felt great sympathy for Oliver who seemed to her to be an innocent lad and who, in her opinion, should not be made a thief or a robber through the efforts of Fagin and Monks. Having overheard the conversation between Fagin and Monks, she was shocked to learn that the two men had been scheming to pervert Oliver and to lead him into evil ways. She therefore, rushed to the London hotel where Rose and her aunt Mrs. Maylie were at that time staying temporarily, and about whom also Nancy had come to know from the private conversation which she had overheard. Nancy told Rose all about the evil designs of a man called Monks, but she refused to say much about Fagin or about Sikes. Rose told Mr. Brownlow about the danger which threatened Oliver. Nancy had a second meeting with Rose and this time Rose had Mr. Brownlow with her. On hearing the details about Monk's wicked plan, Mr. Brownlow decided to investigate the matter and to trace the man called Monks in order to save Oliver's life from the evil designs of that man. Nancy gave to Mr. Brownlow all the details about Monks, but she refused to tell him anything about Sikes because she was deeply attached to Sikes and did not want that any harm should come to that man. Even about Fagin, she said as little as possible to Mr. Brownlow. But this time Nancy's own private talk with Rose and Mr. Brownlow was secretly overheard by a fellow called Noah Claypole who was in the pay

of Fagin, and who had been directed by Fagin to keep a watch on the movements and activities of the girl Nancy. Noah Claypole told Fagin all that he had overheard. Fagin and Sikes thus thought that Nancy had betrayed them.

Mr. Brownlow now started his investigations and found, to his great surprise, that Monks was the son of a man called Edwin Leeford, whom Mr. Brownlow had intimately known many years before. He found further that Oliver was the illegitimate son of that very man. In other words, Monks was the legitimate son of Edwin Leeford, while Oliver was his illegitimate son. Monks was aware of this fact and he had to confess these facts to Mr. Brownlow. Mr. Brownlow had told Monks, that if he failed to admit these facts, he would have Monks arrested by the police on the various charges which could be brought against Monks.

Edwin Leeford had left behind some property, all of which now belonged to Monks, but to which Oliver could also lay a claim because he too was the son of the dead man, even though he was an illegitimate son. Monks had been wanting to put Oliver out of his way permanently so that Oliver should not be able to make a claim to the property which was now in Monks possession. But now Mr. Brownlow stood up for Oliver's rights. Mr. Brownlow therefore, now proposed to Monks that he should surrender half of the property to Oliver. Here, again, Mr. Brownlow threatened Monks with a disclosure to the police of all Monks's crimes in

case Monks did not agree to his proposal. Monks had no alternative now but to accept Mr. Brownlow's proposal.

But now another important fact also came to the surface. The girl, Rose, was found to be the younger sister of Agnes, the woman who had given birth to the child Oliver as a consequence of her love-affair with Edwin Leeford. The discovery of Rose's relationship with Agnes revealed the fact that Oliver was Rose's nephew. The revelation of all these facts proved to be a great source of delight to both Rose and Oliver.

In the meantime, Fagin and Noah Claypole had told Sikes about the role of Nancy in having gone to meet Rose and Mr. Brownlow and having told them all, about Monk's plan to harm Oliver. Sikes thought that, if Nancy had spoken to Mr. Brownlow and Rose about Monks, she must also have told Mr. Brownlow everything about Fagin and about himself (Sikes). Being a desperate kind of criminal, Sikes did not even pause to question, Nancy about it. He simply took hold of the girl and battered her to death.

During this time Fagin too had been traced and arrested by the police. Now he was produced before a magistrate and, in view of the long list of crimes which he had committed, he was sentenced to death. Noah Claypole having become an approver in the case, was pardoned by the Court.

Oliver was adopted by Mr. Brownlow as his son. And, of course, Oliver was now entitled to half of the property which had been left behind by Edwin Leeford because Monks had already agreed to a division of that property on a fifty-fifty basis. However, not long afterwards, Monks, continuing to lead a life of sin and vice, died of an epileptic fit. And thus the story ends happily for all the good persons. The criminal have received the punishment which they deserved, and the good persons have duly been rewarded.

*'Great Expectations'* recounts the development of the character of the narrator, 'Phillip Pirrip', commonly known as 'Pip'. Pip is an orphan. After the death of his parents he is brought to the house of his sister who is twenty years elder to him. His sister Mrs. Joe is an irritable and ill tempered woman who scolds him at the slightest provocation. Dickens has portrayed Pip's sense of insecurity his doubts and fears, his sensitiveness and his poignancy.

Pip never feels secure at his home. As a matter of fact he has never developed the feeling of homeliness. He is always afraid of his sister when she holds the tickler in her hand. Mrs. Joe ill-treats 'Pip. He is also rebuked and bullied by Pumblechook, Wopsle and Hubble whenever they visit his sister's house.

When an orphan is rebuked by his sister and her cringing companions in this unsympathetic manner, it is very natural that he will regard them as friends and will regard his home only as a house.

The fear of a child is expressed when Pip strays into the churchyard marsh and a ferocious convict suddenly appears from behind a gravestone and seizes him by the heels. The convict releases him on path of death to bring for him victual and a file. His conscience pricks when he steals these things for the convict. When he has handed over these things to the convict, he is so much scared that he wants to slip away.

From one fear Pip jumps to another fear. He fears that his theft may be detected by his cruel sister or the police awaits his doom. The fear of being found out renews itself in the Christmas party. Pip had taken wine for the convict and had filled up the empty bottle from the tar-water jug. As soon as Mr. Pumblechook drinks tar he springs to his feet, turns round several times in an appalling spasmodic whooping-cough dance, rushes out at the door and makes the most hideous faces. The theft however is not detected but when Mrs. Joe offers to bring from the kitchen a savoury pie, Pip feels utterly terrified. The irony lies in the fact that Pip runs away for his life not only from the ferocious convict but also from his sister. His sister and the convict have been ironically equated. And when the convict, Magwitch, takes the responsibility of stealing the file and victual upon himself and Pip is exonerated from being found out

guilty, he has feelings, naturally enough not for his sister but for his brother-in-law. And then, there is a conflict in the mind of the child. He fears to lose the confidence of Joe and ties up his tongue.

The fear, however, does not come to an end. When his sister sends him to Miss Havisham's Satis House, he finds himself standing in the dark, mysterious passage, enough to terrify a child.

Pip became an apprentice in Joe's forge. A common laboring boy this was his aspiration, and this was his destiny. Later he was employed to play with Estella in Satis House, the house of Miss Havisham. Pip saw there the bright and gentle aspect of life. He was attracted to Estella who was beautiful but proud and haughty. For the first time he felt ashamed of his drudgery at Joe's forge when Estella snubbed him as a common labouring boy. He now aspired to become a gentleman in order to be worthy of Estella. He became discontented with his work and surroundings. He now longed to rise above his low status and surroundings.

Keeping in lieu with his these feelings, fortune smiled on him, when there appeared in his village a lawyer from London with bright prospects. The lawyer tells him of his great expectations of his benefactor's desire to make him a gentleman. This proved to be the most significant day in the life of Pip. His dreams seemed to be fulfilled. The fulfilment of his aspiration to become a gentleman was in the offing and

his hope to win the hand of Estella was revived. As desired by Jaggers, Pip left for London to make the most of the opportunity. But the new gentleman was an upstart. Pip grew selfish after acquiring wealth. He became a snob, became indifferent to his friends Joe and Biddy, and almost forgot them. Pip did not welcome Joe warmly when he (Joe) went to London to deliver him news about Estella. He received Joe coldly which was gross ingratitude towards him. His head had been turned by Estella and his great expectations. He felt a sort of pride in deluding himself that he was the protege of Miss Havisham.

However, when he gets to know that Miss Havisham is not his benefactress and that she never meant to give him Estella in marriage, he was broken. He had been utterly in delusion: his dream-world was shattered and he suffered the buffets of misfortunes.

Where there is sorrow there is a holy ground. Suffering makes him humble and he realises that affluence had made him a snob. He repents, for having been ungrateful to Joe and Biddy.

By repenting for his ingratitude to Joe and Biddy and helping his friend Herbert he redeems his snobbishness and ingratitude. He is now released from the magneticism of Havisham, Estella and his great expectations, and can act normally. His efforts to help Magwitch whom he almost hated, also redeems his character. He is now pure and truly noble. All that is dross in him is burnt in the fire of suffering. His innate

nobility which had been hidden under the Camouflage of affluence and deception shines now in all its brightness. He pleads with Miss Havisham to grant some money for, Herbert without his knowledge. He thus helps Herbert financially, making him a partner in a firm without revealing to him that he has done it for him. He also pleads with Havisham to grant to Mr. Pocket a portion of her fortune. The affluence could not make him noble, rather it hid his nobility. It is his unselfish act of love and kindness that reveals his innate nobility. His love for the haughty Estella, his servility under Miss Havisham and his great expectations had clouded the essential goodness and nobility of Pip. But as soon as he is released from their influence he becomes his normal self, and shows his innate nobility. At the end Pip marries Estella as both have been chastened by suffering.

The tale of *A Christmas Carol* begins on Christmas eve, seven years after the death of Ebenezer Scrooge's business partner Jacob Marley. Scrooge is established within the first stave as a greedy and stingy businessman who has no place in his life for kindness, compassion, charity or benevolence. After being warned by Marley's ghost to change his ways Scrooge is visited by three additional ghosts-each in its turn, and each visitation detailed in a separate stave who accompany him to various scenes with the hope of achieving his transformation.

The first of the spirits, the ghost of Christmas Past, takes Scrooge to the scenes of his boyhood and youth which stir the old miser's tender and gentle side by reminding him of a time when he was more innocent. The second spirit, the ghost of Christmas present takes Scrooge to several radically different scenes (of a joy-filled - market of people buying the makings of Christmas dinner, the family feast of Scrooge's near impoverished clerk Bob Cratchit a minor's cottage, and a lighthouse among other sites) in order to evince from the miser a sense of responsibility for his fellow man. The third spirit, the ghost of Christmas yet to come, harrows Scrooge with dire versions of the future if he does not learn and act upon what he has witnessed. Scrooge's own neglected and intended grave is revealed, prompting the miser to change his ways in hopes of changing these "shadows of what may be."

In the fifth and final stave, Scrooge awakens on Christmas morning with joy and love in his heart, then spends the day with his nephew's family after anonymously sending a prize turkey to the Cratchit home for Christmas dinner. Scrooge has become a different man overnight, and now treats his fellow men with kindness, generosity and compassion, gaining a reputation as a man who embodies the spirit of Christmas. The story closes with the narrator confirming the validity, completeness and permanence of Scrooge's transformation.

The novel *Hard Times* opens with a report about the experimental school of Thomas Gradgrind which he established in the industrial town of Coketown. He insists that children should not be allowed to learn anything but facts. Fancy and imagination have no place in his scheme of things. His own five children are models of education based on facts and facts alone. Humanities and liberal arts have never become part of their studies. Hence they are ignorant of literature and fine arts as well as of human beings as individuals.

Gradgrind is happy that his children have learnt facts. However, his pleasure is short lived. One day as he return; from his school he finds his two children, Louisa and Tom, trying to peep through the canvas walls of a circus tent. This act of his children makes him extremely unhappy. His displeasure increases on the thought that his children do not feel at all sorry for violating the principles and ideals on which they have been brought and bred up.

In his unhappiness he comes to his industrialist friend, Josiah Bounderby, both the friends discuss the ways that lead children away from the study of facts and arrive at the conclusion that Louisa and Tom have been influenced by another school pupil, Sissy Jupe, who is the daughter of a clown in the circus.

Gradgrind and Bounderby decide that Sissy Jupe must be removed from the school immediately. However, they decide to inform her father,

the circus Clown, about their decision before implementing it. With this purpose they visit the inn where the Jupes are staying. To their dismay they find that Jupes have deserted his daughter, Gradgrind, then decides against the earlier decision and offers to keep Sissy in his own home as a companion to his daughter Louisa.

Years roll by and Louisa and Tom grow up. Gradgrind decides to marry Louisa to Josiah Bounderby who is 30 years older than herself. Louisa consents partly from the indifference and cynicism engendered by her father's treatment, partly from a desire to help her brother, who is employed by Bounderby and who is the only person she loves.

In the meantime everything goes on well everywhere at the Gradgrind home, at the Bounderby bank and everywhere. Soon after Gradgrind is elected to Parliament, things begin to change. From London, where he lives as the member of Parliament, he sends an adventurous young political adventurer, called James Harthouse, to study and collect facts about the industrial town of Coketown. However, Harthouse tried to take advantage of Louisa's unhappy life with Bounderby, attempts to seduce her.

One fine morning everyone is astounded to hear the news of a robbery at the Bounderby Bank. Stephen Blackpool, who has been an unfortunate victim of circumstances, is suspected of committing this heinous crime. Another person, who is also suspected of committing the

robbery is a woman called Mrs. Pegler. Mrs. Pegler, who had once visited Stephen at his residence is also seen loitering aimlessly near the Bank and the house of Bounderby.

In the meantime the relations between Louisa and Harthouse have become very deep. Harthouse feels that she will run away with him. She leaves the house of Bounderby but she does not go with Harthouse. Instead she goes to her father's house. Now her father Gradgrind is able to understand that the education that he has given to his daughter has been useless. It is this education that has plunged his daughter in such a great misery. He becomes a changed man and tries to help her. He shelters her from Bounderby and the couple is permanently separated. But further trouble is in store for Gradgrind. Tom has robbed the bank of his employer, and thought he continues for a time to throw suspicion on a blameless artisan, Stephen Blackpool he is finally detected and hustled out of the country.

After a few years Bounderby dies of a fit. Tom also dies, penniless and dejected in a foreign land. Sissy is happily married and she and her children provide solace and joy to noble Louisa.

In the novel *Nicholas Nickleby*, Nicholas Nickleby's father dies unexpectedly after losing all his money in a series of poor investments. Nicholas, his mother and his younger sister Kate are forced to give up their comfortable lifestyle in Devonshire and travel to London to seek

the aid of their only relative, Nicholas's uncle Rulph Nickleby. Ralph, a cold and ruthless businessman, has no desire to help his destitute relations and hates Nicholas on sight. He gets Nicholas a low-paying job as an assistant to Wackford Squeers, who runs the school Dotheboys Hall. Nicholas is initially wary of Squeers because he is gruff and violent towards his young charges. Nicholas, however tries to quell his suspicions. As Nicholas boards the stagecoach for Greta Bridge, he is handed a letter by Ralph's Clerk, Newmann Noggs expressing concern for the innocent young man and offers assistance if Nicholas ever requires it.

Once he arrives in Yorkshire, Nicholas comes to realise that Squeers is running a scam : he takes in unwanted children for a high fee, and starves and mistreats his charges while using the money sent by their parents to pad his own pockets. Squeers and his monstrous wife whip and beat the children regularly while spoiling their own son rotten. While he is there, Nicholas befriends a simple, boy named Smike, who is older than the other "students" and now acts as an unpaid servant. Nicholas attracts the attention of Fanny Squeers, his employer's plain and Shrewish daughter, who deludes herself into thinking that Nicholas is in love with her. She attempts to disclose her affections during a game of cards, but Nicholas does not catch onto her meaning. Instead he ends up flirting with her friend Tilda Price, to the consternation of both Fanny

and Tilda's friendly but crude-mannered fiancé John Browdie. After being accosted by Fanny again, Nicholas bluntly tells her he does not return her affections and wishes to be free of the horrible atmosphere of Dotheboys Hall, earning her hatred.

One morning, Smike runs away, but is caught and brought back to Dotheboys. Squeers begins to beat him, but Nicholas intervenes. Squeers strikes him across the face and Nicholas snaps, beating the schoolmaster violently. Quickly packing his belongings and leaving Dotheboys Hall, he meets John Browdie on the way. Browdie finds the idea that Squeers himself has been beaten uproariously funny, and gives Nicholas money and a walking staff to aid him on his trip back to London. At dawn, he is found by Smike, who begs to come with him. Nicholas and Smike set out towards London.

Nicholas seeks out the aid of Newman Noggs, who shows him a letter that Fanny Squeers has written to Ralph viciously exaggerating the events of the beating. Noggs tells Nicholas, who is intent on confronting his uncle, that Ralph is out of town and advises him to find a job. Nicholas goes to an employment office, where he encounters a strikingly beautiful girl. His search for employment fails, and he is about to give up when Noggs offers him the meager position of French teacher to the children of his neighbours, the Kenwings family and Nicholas is

hired under the assumed name of “Johnson” to teach the children French.

Meanwhile, Kate and her mother are forced by Ralph to move out of their lodgings in the house of the kindly portrait painter Miss La Creevy and into a cold and drafty house Ralph owns in a London slum. Ralph finds employment for Kate working for a milliner, Madame Mantolini. Her husband, Mr. Mitolini, is a gigolo who depends on his wife to supply his extravagant tastes and offends Kate by flirting with her.

Ralph asks Kate to attend a dinner he is hosting for some business associates, and when she arrives, she discovers, she is the only woman in attendance. Hawk humiliates Kate at dinner by making her the subject of an offensive bet. After too many drinks he attempts to force himself on her but is stopped by Ralph. Ralph shows some unexpected tenderness towards Kate but insinuates that he will withdraw his financial help if she tells her mother about what happened.

Several days later, Nicholas discovers that his uncle has returned. He visits his mother and sister just as Ralph is reading them Fanny Squeers’s letter and slandering Nicholas. He confronts his uncle, who vows to give no financial assistance to the Nicklebys as long as Nicholas stays with them. His hand forced, Nicholas agrees to leave London, but warns Ralph that a day of reckoning will one day come between them.

The next morning, Nicholas and Smike leave London and travel towards Partsmouth with the intention of becoming sailors. At an inn, they encounter theatrical manager Vincent Crummles, who hires Nicholas on sight as his new juvenile lead and playwrighter with the task of adapting French tragedies into English and then modifying them for the troop's minimal dramatic abilities. Nicholas and Smike join the acting company and are warmly received by the troupe. They make their debuts and are met with great acclaim from the provincial audiences.

Back in London, Mr. Mantolini's reckless spending has bankrupted his wife. Madame Mantolini is forced to sell her business to Miss Knog, whose first order of business is to fire Kate. Meanwhile Sir Mulberry Hawk begins a plot to humiliate Kate for refusing his advances. He uses Lord Frederick, who is infatuated with her, to discover where she lives from Ralph. He is about to succeed in this plot when Mrs. Nickleby enters Ralph's office and the two rakes switch their attentions from Kate's uncle to her mother, successfully warming their way into Mrs. Nickleby's Company and gaining access to the witterly house. Kate goes to her uncle for assistance, but he refuses to help her, citing his business relationships with Hawk and Verisopht. It is left to Newman Noggs to come to her aid, and he writes to Nicholas, telling him in vague terms of his sister's need for him. Nicholas immediately quit the crummles troop and returns to London.

When he arrives, he searches the city for Noggs Miss La Creevy and his family to discover what has occurred. This search proves unsuccessful until he overhears Hawk and Lord Frederick rudely toasting Kate in a restaurant. He is able to glean from their conversation what has happened and confronts them.

Nicholas himself fell in love with "Madeline Bray". The support of a selfish father and the object of the conspiracy of Ralph Nickleby and another revolting old Usurer, Gride to marry her to the latter. Ralph whose hatred for Nicholas has been intensified by the failure of his plans, knowing Nicholas's affection for Smike, conspires to remove the latter from him, his plots are thwarted with the help of Newman Nogg, his eccentric clerk, but nevertheless Smike falls a victim to consumption and eventually dies in the arms of Nicholas confronted with ruin and exposure and finally shattered by the discovery that Smike was his own son, Ralph hangs himself. Nicholas befriended by the Cheerybles marries Madeline and Kate marries the Cheerybles' nephew Frank. Squeers is transported and Gride is murdered.

The wealth of personal experiences is richly blended in the novels of Dickens. His poverty, sufferings and deprivations sharpened his insight into child psychology.

## Works Cited List

- Abraham. *Traum and Myths* : Eine Studie Zar Volker Psychologie, 1909.  
Print.
- Abrams, M.H. "*Psychological and Psychoanalytic Criticism*". *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. *Fortworth*. Harcourt Brace Publishers, 1999. Print.
- Davis, Derek Russell. "*Hurt Minds*". *Focus on Macbeth*. ed. John Russell Brown. London : Roultedge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1982. Print.
- Davis, S.F. & Palladino, J.J. *Psychology*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall, 2004. Print.
- Desai, Anita. *Clear Light of Day*. London : William Heinemann, 1980.  
Print.
- — — . *Cry The Peacock*. London : Peter Owen, 1963. Print.
- — — . *Fire on the Mountain*. Penguin Group, USA, 1990. Print.
- — — . *In Voices in the City*. South Asia Books, 2003. Print.
- — — . *In Where Shall We go this Summer*. Indus, 1982. Print.
- Freud, Sigmund. "*On Dream*" *Excerpts*. *Art in Theory 1900-1990*. ed. Charles Harrison and Paul Wood, Cambridge : Blackwell Pub. Inc. 1993. Print.

- — — . “*Some Character types Met within Psychoanalytical Work*”.
- Shakespeare : Macbeth – Freud on the Macbeth, 1916. Print.
- Holland, Norman H. *Psychoanalysis and Shakespeare*. New York, McGraw Hill Book Company, 1966. Print.
- Jung, C.G. *The Development of Personality*. California, Pantheon Books, 1967. Print.
- Knapp, Beltina L. “*Introduction*”(1964). *Jungian Approach to Literature* Carbondale and Edwardsville : Southern Illinois University Press, 1984, Print.
- Lesser, Simon O. “*Macbeth : Drama and Dream*”, *The Whispers Meanings*. Ed. Robert Spirch and Richard Noland. Amherst, University of Massachusetts Press, 1977. Print.
- Lynn Steven. *Texts and Contexts: Writing about Literature with Critical Theory*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Longman, 1998. Print.
- Murfin, Ross and Supriya M. Ray. *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms*. Boston, Bedford Books, 1997. Print.
- Richter C. Gregory. *The Incest Theme in Literature and Legend. Fundamentals of a Psychology of Literary Creation*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992. Print.

- Shakespeare, William. *Macbeth, The Necessary Shakespeare*. Ed. David Bevington, New York, Pearson Education, Inc. 2005. Print.
- Singh, R.S. *Indian Novel in English*. New Delhi, Heinemann, 1971. Print.
- Srivastava, Ramesh K. *Perspective on Anita Desai*. Ghaziabad; Vimal Prakashan, 1984. Print.
- Tyson, Lois, *Critical Theory Today : A User Friendly Guide*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, New York, 2006. Print.
-