

CHAPTER THREE

ROLE OF NATURE VS NURTURE IN PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT

The Victorian era was the one which was constantly engaged in resolving the many conflicts that arose out of the friction of contradictory polarities such as optimism Vs pessimism, materialism Vs spiritualism; intellectual precision Vs imaginative hyperbole and so on. Born in this age of conflicts and compromises Charles Dickens was inherently involved in a quest for the best. Most of his novels revolve around the social, moral and religious set up that existed in his day. Almost all his novels deal with child characters whose moulding unravels the indomitable forces of nature and nurture.

Nature encompasses the idea that it is already determined in the genetic make-up what kind of an individual one will be and what extension of the actions one will take. If the parents are good people, their children are genetically predisposed to be good and honest individuals.

Nature is innate behaviour (behaviour not learned or influenced by the environment), character or essence especially of a human.

Charles Dickens has always seemed to lean towards the “Nature” theory. The child characters of his *Oliver Twist* and *David Copperfield*, were of good birth but humble beginnings. Their lives were fraught with

peril and misery. Nevertheless, they would remain true to their genetics and were not influenced by the bad individuals, they encountered. For instance, Oliver Twist was of good breeding, his mother was described as an aristocratic woman. However, he had not met his mother for she died in childbirth. Throughout the story things go from bad to worse while Oliver remained a “good and honest boy” not swayed by the evil around him.

Oliver, an orphaned boy had instincts to do right, and he was consistently appalled by the vices surrounding him. Nancy also had similar instincts, although she had been raised in “poverty’s vices”, she wanted to do “good”.

Dickens has represented Oliver as incorruptible. Oliver enters his novel fully formed rather than realistically impressionable. It basically was to keep in terms with the tendency of Victorian middle-class culture, where with unprecedented stridency; the home is the primary location wherein each rising generation is groomed for the offices of adulthood and citizenship. The Church, the school, the community, all have their parts to play, but these institutions contribute influences that are conceived of as supplemental to the moral instruction imparted, and the moral example provided within the domestic circle.

It is interesting to compare how Shakespeare treats the nature versus nurture debate in ‘The Tempest’. The inborn nobility of Miranda,

who has grown up on a remote island away from the Court but has instinctive gentleness, is contrasted with the 'deformed slave' Caliban who has grown up in the same environment, but is a born devil, on whose nature-nurture can never stick.

However, there is also a contrast between the gentle and virtuous Prince Ferdinand, brought up in the court of Naples, and the corrupt and Villainous Antonio, also of high rank by birth but evil in nature. As Miranda says 'Good wombs have borne bad sons'.

Genetics have a strong influence on a child's personality regardless of the parent's presence or absence in the child's life.

Nurture consists of the idea that one's environment has more to do with who you become. The idea that if you grew up in a neighbourhood with a lot of violence and crime, your actions and manner of thinking would be influenced towards violence.

Although "nurture" may have historically referred mainly to the care given by their parents, any environmental (not genetic) factor would also count as "nurture" in a contemporary nature Vs. nurture debate, including one's childhood friends, one's early experience with television and one's experience in the womb. Additionally, although childhood experience (especially early childhood experience) is often regarded as more influential in who one becomes than post-childhood experience; a

liberal interpretation of “nature” might count all life experience as “nurture”.

The Nurture theory holds that a person’s surroundings, upbringing and general environment mean more to that person’s personal development than the genetic or racial background. For example, if you took someone born in poverty in a society where he or she would not have much chance to better himself and gave him or her a good education, a loving family life, and the opportunities to become ‘a better citizen’ then nurturing would overcome the ‘nature’ of that person. Most social scientists now believe that Nurturing can overcome any negative natural forces.

Some Philosophers such as Plato and Descartes suggested that certain things are inborn, or that they simply occur naturally regardless of environmental influences. Other well known thinkers such as John Locke believed in what is known as tabula rasa, which suggests that the mind begins as a blank slate. According to this notion everything that we are and all our knowledge is determined by our experience. Today, the majority of experts believe that behaviour and development are influenced by both nature and nurture.

It has been reported that the use of the terms “nature” and “nurture” as a convenient catch phrase for the roles of heredity and environment in human development can be traced back to 13th century

France. Some scientists think that people behave as they do according to genetic predispositions. This is known as the “nature” theory of human behaviour, other scientists believe that people think and behave in certain ways because they are taught to do so. This is known as the “nurture” theory of human behaviour.

The Nature Theory suggests that more abstract traits like intelligence, personality, aggression and sexual orientation are also encoded in an individual’s DNA. In April 1998, article in ‘LIFE’ magazine, “Were you born that way” by George Howe Colt, claimed that “new studies show it’s mostly in your genes.”

If genetics didn’t play a part, then fraternal twins, reared under the same conditions, would be alike, regardless of differences in their genes. But, while studies show they do more closely resemble each other than do non-twin brothers and sisters, they also show these same striking similarities when reared apart, as in similar studies done with identical twins.

While not discounting that genetic tendencies may exist, supporters of the nurture theory believe they ultimately don’t matter that our behavioural aspects originate only from the environmental factors of our upbringing. Studies on infant and child temperament have revealed the most crucial evidence for nurture theories.

American psychologist, John Watson, best known for his controversial experiments, with a young orphan named Albert, demonstrated that the acquisition of a phobia could be explained by classical conditioning. A strong proponent of environmental learning, he said :

“Give me a dozen healthy infants, well-formed and my own specified world to bring them up and I will guarantee to take any one at random and train him to become any type of specialist I might select ... regardless of his talents, penchants, tendencies, abilities vocations and race of his ancestors.”

Harvard psychologist B.F. Skinner’s early experiments produced pigeons that could dance, do figure eights and play tennis. Today known as the father of behavioural science, he eventually went on to prove that human behaviour could be conditioned in much the same way as animals.

If environment did not play a part in determining an individual’s traits and behaviours then identical twins should, theoretically, be exactly the same in all respects even if reared apart. But a number of studies show that they are never exactly alike, even though they are remarkably similar in most respects.

So, was the way we behave engrained in us, before we were born? Or has it developed over time in response to our experiences? Researchers on all sides of the nature Vs nurture debate agree that the

link between a gene and a behaviour is not the same as cause and effect. While a gene may increase the likelihood that you will behave in a particular way, it does not make people do things, which means that we still get to choose who we will be when we grow up.

Thus, it can be said that nature Vs nurture is a colloquialism that refers to popular debates about the degrees by which one's innate nature and their human experiences ("nurture") have a direct or causal influence upon one's ultimate physical and behavioural traits.

Nature deals, with what is in his or her genes. Nurture involves everything around them. The culture and community they grow up in is a major part. How you parent them, how you react to them, how you talk to others in their presence, teachers, other children and other family members can also influence who they will be.

This thesis attempts at an interpretation of the child characters of Charles Dickens in the light of the interplay between nature and nurture and its cumulative effect on the personality development of the child characters.

In his novel, *Oliver Twist*, Dickens has succeeded fully in showing that Oliver is an embodiment of the principles of good. Oliver is by birth a good boy, and he remains good throughout. His goodness is something inborn, or something native to him. The goodness in him is so deep rooted

that it cannot be removed from his nature, and cannot even be diminished by the pressure of circumstances or by the efforts of certain evil minded individuals. The circumstances of the birth of Oliver, and the manner in which he is brought up in the workhouse where he was born were such that he could easily have become a thief and then on growing up into a man, could have become a notorious criminal. But this boy is able to resist all the evils which he meets, and to such evils which he might have fallen a prey. Indeed, goodness is an ineradicable part of the nature in the character of Oliver. Goodness has in this boy, such deep roots that it simply cannot be shaken or pulled out of his mind. There are certain persons who are born wicked, and there are others who are born good. In the majority of cases of human beings, there is a mixture of good and evil, sometimes the good overcoming the evil, and sometimes the evil overcoming the good in the course of their lives. But there is a certain class of people who are born evil and who then can never discard the evil in them. And there are certain persons who are born good, and who can never then shed their goodness. Oliver belongs to the category of those who are born good, and who remain good throughout their lives. Incidentally, Miss Rose also belongs to this category, and she too has had a chequered career like Oliver. Oliver, during the twelve or thirteen years of his life with which this novel deals, goes through many adverse

circumstances; but at every step he is able to maintain his inborn goodness.

The condition in the workhouse was pathetic. Oliver was born under the old Poor Law. But his infancy in the Pauper baby farm, “where twenty or thirty other juvenile offenders against the Poor Laws rolled about on the floor all day, without the inconvenience of too much food or too much clothing”, could equally well have been under the new dispensation. And when, at the age of nine, Oliver returned to the workhouse to be educated by picking Dakum from six in the morning on, the poor Board had the reformed system in full Swing.

When Oliver asks for more, he is punished for that innocent act and is presented before the commission. He remains a close prisoner in the dark and solitary room. Dickens describes realistically the condition of young Oliver, alone in the dark room —

“He only cried bitterly all day; and when the long dismal night came on, spread his little hands before his eyes to shut the darkness, the crouching in the corner, tried to sleep : ever and a non-walking with a start and tremble and drawing himself closer and closer to the wall, as if to feel even its cold hard surface where a protection in the gloom and loneliness which surrounded him.” (*Oliver Twist*)

Dickens description of the feed which was given to the workers at the workhouse is really pitiable — there meals of thin gruel a day, with an onion twice a week, and half a roll on Sunday. “He goes on showing

the approved daily ration for an able bodied man, 12 ounces of cooked meat 1½ pints of broth women and children over nine received slightly less, children under nine were fed “at discretion”.

These facts explain why it was that newly, apprenticed Oliver’s eyes “glistened at the mention of meat”. When some scraps that had been put by for the dog were placed before him

“I wish”, Dickens says “some well fed philosopher whose blood is ice, whose heart is iron, could have seen Oliver Twist clutching at the dainty viands that the dog had neglected. I wish he could have witnessed the horrible avidity with which Oliver tores the bits as under with all the ferocity of femine : there is only one thing I should like better, and that would be to see the philosopher making some sort of meal himself, with the same relish.”

Even if Oliver secretly and almost unconsciously believes that is something other than the “bad un” destined for the gallows, which everyone names him, that belief has no evident source in the external world. It depends only on Oliver himself for its existence, and Oliver can claim his inheritance only after he has proved that he really is who he is in a world which does not give him any reflection or recognition of that identity Oliver can only become himself by forming a relation between what he is initially, a wholly independent self, depending on and sustained by nothing external and the self he discovers himself already to be.

In spite of being very badly treated in the workhouse, and then equally badly treated at the undertaker's establishment, Oliver reacts to the ill treatment at the undertaker's shop by running away, Noah and Charlotte subsequently react to their life with Sowerberrys, also by running away, but they steal their employer's money and only then run away. That is the difference between innate goodness and innate evil. Noah and Charlotte easily fall a prey to the temptations of a life of crime under the persuasion of Fagin, but Oliver strongly resists, all the persuasion of Fagin, and also resists the pressure put upon him by Fagin's disciples. All Fagin's efforts to make a criminal of him fail miserably. Oliver refuses to become a pickpocket and a thief. Fagin is promised a lot of money by Monks if Fagin can succeed converting Oliver from a good boy into a wicked, sinful and vicious person. Fagin therefore, strives to instil the poison of vice and sin into Oliver; but Oliver's goodness prevails against all such endeavours on the part of Fagin.

While describing the criminal slum world, Dickens' primary objective was to show the fatal case with which a workhouse orphan like Oliver, running away from the harsh master to whom he was apprenticed, may fall into the clutches of a gang of law breakers and be subjected to their corrupting influence. The miserable reality Dickens painted in all its deformity — the villainous receiver of stolen goods, the brutal robber and his sum — drinking, the ruffian band of boys being

trained in crime with the ‘great, black, ghastly gallows; always stretching up behind them’.

A realistic description of the workhouse condition is gained through describing various kinds of sufferings that children had to undergo. Apart from the fact that they were beaten and had to work hard, they suffered the tortures of slow starvation for three months ...” (*Oliver Twist* 15). Children were not only abused physically but also mentally. Adults consider Oliver and other children inferior and they often and strongly express that they look down on such beings as children. There is not any hope for children in adult’s behavior and comments on children’s future destinies. Oliver is intentionally terrified about his future and his prospects. Even the authorities do not seem to deal with children as with valuable human beings.” That boy will be hung, said the gentleman in the white waistcoat. ‘I know that boy will be hung.’” (*Oliver Twist* 16).

To the Mrs. Mann who is in-charge of the farm, children are a good deal of income, “under the parental superintendence of an elderly female who received the culprits at and for the consideration of seven pence — half penny per small head per week.” (2007 : 5). Mrs. Mann, who was in-charge of looking after the infants, is described as being “a woman of wisdom and experience : she knew what was good for children, and she had a very accurate perception of what was good for herself. (2007 : 5).

Living under described circumstances children simply could not be healthy looking and happy :

“It cannot be expected that this system of farming would produce any very extraordinary or luxuriant crop. Oliver Twist’s eighth birthday found him a pale, thin child, somewhat diminutive in stature, and decidedly small in circumference.” (2007 : 6)

When Oliver is too old (eight years old) to stay in the farm for infants, he is taken back to the workhouse by Mr. Bumble: “Oliver was then led away by Mr. Bumble from the wretched house where one kind word or look had never lighted the gloom of his infant years.” (2007 : 11).

The anxiety that ensures Oliver entering his novel fully formed rather than realistically impressionable arises out of the tendency of Victorian middle-class culture to nominate, with unprecedented stridency, the home as the primary location wherein each rising generation is groomed for the offices of adulthood and citizenship. The church, the school, the community, all have their parts to play; but these institutions contribute influences that are conceived of as supplemental to the moral instruction imparted, and the moral example provided, within the domestic circle.

After being through much ruthlessness at the hand of the parish masters and villagers, for whom he is put to work, the boy runs to London where he is befriended by the jolly Artful Dodger and drawn into a group

of pickpockets which is run by the wicked Fagin. “That is him, Fagin’, said Jack Dawkins, ‘my friend, Oliver Twist’” (2007 : 72).

In his conveyance of Fagin’s den and its environment, Dickens proposed to show that it was very easy for the abandoned children to get involved in crime, which usually ended in their transportation abroad or death.

The story goes on, and later we get to know, that Monks, Oliver’s half-brother, has discoursed his location and uses Fagin to turn Oliver into a thief, so that he never finds out about the heirloom left to him by their father. “why not have kept him here among the rest, and made a sneaking, snivelling pickpocket of him at one? If you had patience for twelve months at most, couldn’t you have got him convicted and sent safely out of the kingdom, perhaps for life?” (2007 : 243)

Fagin’s group is the Kernel of villainy in the novel where young homeless boys are taken in and taught mischievous trade, trained to become thieves. When Oliver is taken in, in a playful and game like manner, he is also taught to rob and steal. Many seemed to be born to a life of crime and cruelty but Oliver appears to be different. He is horrified by the brutality and heartlessness around him. During the action of robbery at the Mrs. Maylie’s house he cries out loud : “Oh! For God’s sake let me go! Let me run away in the fields. I will never come near London — never, never! Oh! Pray have mercy upon me, and do not make me steal

: for the love of all the bright angels that rest in heaven, have mercy upon me!” (2007 : 205).

It is not easy to understand human nature. Some are born with good qualities while others have the constant desire to do evil deeds. Oliver is the one who wants to turn away from all wickedness. The features on his face reflect the inner qualities of his soul. We find in the novel again and again how Mr. Brownlow, Mr. Sowerberry and Fagin stress Oliver’s face, which left a trace in their memory. Oliver is not like any other child. His thoughts are filled with “angels, heaven, kind faces” and the idea of being sent to jail frightens him (2007 : 63). He wants to be a good boy, and this he expresses in the dialogue with Mr. Bumble : “I will be good indeed; indeed. Indeed, I will, sir!” (2007 : 34). Even in his speech Oliver is polite. In his communication with elders, he uses words like “Sir or please” (2007 : 34) and bows to them, which shows the qualities of being polite and respectful towards others. Oliver is only eight years old. He wants to be loved and needed, exactly what a child calls for in that age; but instead he feels lonely, hated and little : “so lonely, Sir — so very lonely; cried the child. ‘Everybody hates me’.” (2007 : 34).

When Fagin tells Oliver that by becoming good at pick-pocketing, it will make him “the greatest man of all time”. (2007 : 81), in contrast, Oliver wonder to himself, “what picking the old gentleman’s pocket in play had to do with his chances of being a great man.” (2007 : 81). It

shows that the boy already has a formed opinion about what it means to be a great man and Fagin's method does not correspond to his formed idea. Children learn from adults, by watching and imitating them. Oliver respects Fagin who is his senior so he watches and follows his moves in silence. But what good could a child learn from a man who thinks only of golden items, teaches him to pickpocket and makes him stay in a dark and secluded place? Oliver feels as if he is not in the right space.

But let us examine Oliver's opinion when he is given a chance to experience a different type of environment — Mr. Brownlow's home, where "Kindness and solicitude which knew no bounds" (2007 : 96). When Oliver wakes up from the deep sleep, he sees that it is not the same place where he closed his eyes the last time. After his first conversation with Mrs. Bedwin, Oliver realizes how everything is different, people, surrounding and the way he feels. For the first time the boy gets lots of care, tenderness and comforts. He feels "cheerful and happy" surrounded by people who look after him (2007 : 100). Here we find proof that Oliver Twist longs to remain with people who love and care about him and vice versa, he wants to love and have people to take care of.

When Oliver gets Kidnapped by Nancy from the street when he is going with a bundle of books to a book stall where he has to deliver the books and also to hand over some money to the owner of the book stall. Oliver feels most miserable when he finds himself back in the midst of

Fagin and Fagin's associates. When Sikes and Fagin start dividing between themselves the books and the money which Oliver had been carrying, Oliver tells them that the money and the books belong to the old gentleman who had taken him into his house and had nursed him when he was almost dying of fever. Oliver entreats the two criminals to send the books and the money to that kind old gentleman (namely Mr. Brownlow). He even goes to the extent of saying that they can keep him with them all his life long, if they send the books and money to the old gentleman. He feels tortured by the thought that Mr. Brownlow and Mrs. Bedwin would begin to think him to be an unreliable and dishonest boy. This incident marks the high point of Oliver's continuing consistent tendency towards goodness, and his continuing desire that he should not be regarded by anybody, and especially by his benefactor, as a thief.

But the climax of Oliver's goodness comes at the time of the robbery which is attempted by Sikes and Toby Crackit at the house of Mrs. Maylie. Although Oliver has spent sufficient time, among thieves and robbers, and although a boy standing on the border line between good and evil, would have tilted towards evil by now, Oliver remains firm and constant in his resolve to lead a good life and not to be swayed by evil. After Nancy had restored Oliver to the Jew, Fagin had begun to work upon Oliver's mind in order to win him over to the side of evil. Fagin had tried his utmost to induce Oliver to join the other boys in their pick-

pocketing and thieving adventures. He had reminded Oliver that he (Fagin) had given him shelter when he might have perished of hunger. Fagin had also warned Oliver that if he were not to protect him, Oliver might fall into the hands of the police. But Oliver had remained firm against Fagin's persuasion and threats. Fagin and his disciples fail completely in their efforts to instil poison into Oliver's mind.

When Sikes takes Oliver with him to commit a robbery, Oliver does not know the purpose for which he is being taken or the place to which he is being taken. As soon as he comes to know Sike's purpose, he inwardly resolves not to aid or abet Sikes in his nefarious purpose. Infact, Oliver at this time resolves inwardly to raise an alarm and wake up the inmates of the house which Sikes intends to burgle. However Sikes' plan to rob this house goes awry, and Oliver unfortunately gets wounded by a shot fired by one of Mrs. Maylie's servants. The fact is that Oliver feels most wretched and miserable in the company of Sikes, Fagin, and even Fagin's boys. He feels at ease only when he gets shelter first at Mr. Brownlow's house and then at Mrs. Maylie's residence. The time which he spends at Mr. Brownlow's house under the care of Mrs. Bedwin is the first carefree and happy time in his life. Later, when he is provided with shelter at Mrs. Maylie's house, he has another peaceful, joyful and serene period in his life. It is only with good people that this boy feels

happy. The company of Fagin's boys never made him happy because his temperament was entirely different from theirs.

Indeed, in describing the career of Oliver Twist and the adventures and hardships which the boy has to go through, Dickens has succeeded fully in his aim and objective in writing this novel. In the preface to this novel, Dickens says that he wished to show in his novel the principle of good surviving through every adverse circumstances and triumphing at last. Accordingly, Oliver is shown in the novel as falling into the hands of pickpockets, thieves and robbers who are experts in luring young boys to a life of Vice, sin and crime, and he is shown as resisting the attempts of all these criminals to corrupt him.

The education provided to Oliver by Mr. Brownlow only reveals that Oliver has been all along potentially what Mr. Brownlow wants to make him in actuality. His selfhood is both made for him by Mr. Brownlow and yet prior to Mr. Brownlow's education of him. And this reconciliation of contradictory needs is possible because Oliver is willing to exist as the image of his father, willing to take as the definition of his essential selfhood those traits which are the repetition of his father's nature.

He is willing to accept an identification of himself which does not derive, ultimately, from anything he has done, but only from what his parents were.

Eventually, Oliver is adopted by Mr. Brownlow as that gentleman's son and his struggles have now ended. Here, then, is the climax of Oliver's triumph over evil minded persons and over the temptations of evil.

Oliver Twist takes a psychological turn when Dickens joins in the debate of nature Vs nurture and questions if people are born "bad" or they simply become bad as a result of their environment. Using Nancy and Rose Maylie, two characters that initially appear to have little in common, Dickens makes the debate come alive for readers, providing names, faces and histories thereby making the intangible dispute tangible.

Rose Maylie, the model of an ideal 19th century female, is a compassionate young woman who quickly forms an intense attachment to Oliver regardless of his relatively dishonorable past. This forgiving nature is potentially the result of Rose's own history, which also contains blemishes. The daughter of a respectable retired naval officer, Rose is the sister of Agnes Fleming, the deceased mother of Oliver Twist. Largely due to Agnes becoming pregnant with Oliver, Rose is described as having bad blood, and as a result, was "sure to go wrong at one time or other". Nevertheless despite bad blood, Rose is adopted by Mrs. Maylie after the deaths of her father and sister leave her orphaned, and she exceeds class-driven expectations by becoming an exceptionally good

young woman. By all 19th century accounts, Rose was anticipated to become a vile, loathsome human being. Nevertheless Dickens portrayed her exceeding the shortcomings of nature. In doing so, she became an anomaly for 19th century London, defying the popular belief that those born bad, stayed bad, regardless of their environment.

Thus, it would not be wrong to say that in *Oliver Twist* it is ultimately nature which has triumphed over all the odds presented by nurture.

In *Great Expectations*, Charles Dickens uses doubles to explore several of his characters, both to explore and contrast the personalities of his protagonists and to look at the old questions of whether our personalities and actions as adults are shaped by our inherent identity or whether we are forced into patterns of behavior by our social environment — the old ‘nature or nurture’ debate.

When Pip meets Magwitch as an adult, the older man talks about his past, and his wild unloved childhood demonstrates a marked similarity to that of Pip, who as the novel’s narrator depicts himself as unloved and put upon throughout the opening chapters of *Great Expectations*. What purpose does this parallel serve? Is Dickens inviting us to consider that Pip has narrowly escaped the life of a hardened criminal. Is Magwitch’s determination to raise Pip as a gentleman springing from simple gratitude to a childhood act of compassion (and

fear), or is the older man also conscious of their similar circumstances and is desperate to prevent the young blacksmith's apprentice from following his path?

Finally, when Magwitch is hunted down and shackled, Pip reflects that he sees in the man a much kinder creature than he has been to his uncle and most loyal friend Joe Gargery. Dickens holds mirrors up to his characters, facing them to acknowledge, 'there but by the Grace of God go I'.

Pip acts as a mirror to another character as well. The bitter Miss Havisham, still mourning her aborted wedding after countless years, is finally restored to her senses, at least partially, by seeing in Pip's rejection by Estella a reflection of her own rejection on what was to have been the morning of her wedding, so many years previously.

Pip, the hero of the novel, is an orphan child, is ill-treated by his sister. He is brought up by hand by his sister. She bullies both her simple-minded, sweet-tempered husband Joe, as well as her brother. As pip is not wanted by anyone except Joe, his brother-in-law, he feels that his existence is a matter of reproach. It is an irony of his life that he fears both, the slouching fugitive of the marshes and his own real sister, and has to flee away from both. He is also bullied by Pumblechook, Wopsle and Hubble. Naturally, Pip grows out to be a timid boy and suffers from longing, nostalgia and home sickness.

The convict Magwitch is permanently grateful to Pip for having brought his food and a file with which to take off his leg-iron. Years later he expresses his gratitude by assuming in secrecy an economic parenthood; with the money he has made in Australia. He wishes to make 'his' boy a gentleman. But the money the convict furnishes him makes Pip not a true gentleman, but a cad. He lives as a Flanner in London, and when he later discovers the disreputable sources of his income; is snobbishly horrified.

Dickens shared Magwitch's belief that money and education can make a 'gentleman' that birth and tradition count for little or nothing in the formation of style. The greatest wonder of *Great Expectations* is that in spite of all Pip's neglect of Joe and Coldness towards Biddy and all the remorse and self recrimination that they caused him, he is made to appear at the end of it a really better person than he was at the beginning. The novel reveals the clearest artistic triumph of the Victorian Bourgeoisie on its own special ground. The expectations lose their greatness and Pip is saved from the grosser danger of wealth. By the end of the novel he has gained a wider and deeper knowledge of life, he is less rough, better spoken, better read and better mannered.

In the novel Pip has no occupation and no ideal save that of an empty good form. He and the "Finches of the Grove", the club of young men of leisure to which he belongs, do nothing but spend money, play

cards, drink toasts, buy elaborate wardrobes, drive horses, and go to theatre. They don't have any culture, any interest in the arts, in music, in the world of reflective thought. Pip 'reads' with his tutor and has books on his shelves, but we never learn what he reads or perceive that it has had any effect on him. He has no philosophy, only a set of conventions. The virtues that save him ultimately are mainly those that he unconsciously absorbed from Joe in his childhood.

With the return of Magwitch and his revelation that he is the benefactor of Pip, Pip gets disenchanted, and his clouded brain is filled with sense. He regrets that he forsaked, Joe and Biddy for the sake of a convict and he regains his innate goodness which remained temporarily suspended. His snobbery developed because of the circumstances. And yet he does not lose his essential nobility. He hates the humbugs and respects the good natured persons. He hates the purse proud Pumblechook and the Villainous Orlick. He not only respects good persons but also helps them. He realises that he has been responsible for Herbert's debts, and helps him. He has a sort of repugnance for Magwitch. But later all his repugnance melts away and he sees him as his affectionate and generous benefactor. He devoted his whole life for his safety. He is always anxious for him. All his passion for Estella is now turned to him. He loves him and stands by him. At the time of his

death he comforts him by the revelation that his daughter is alone, is beautiful and that he loves her.

Even though Miss Havisham has been instrumental in breaking the heart of Pip, Pip readily forgives her. Not only this. He saves her from fire, and burns his hand. Even though his sister has always ill-treated him, he misses her when she dies, gets infuriated and nurses a desire to wreak revenge on Orlick.

And even though Pip had neglected and ill-treated Joe and Biddy, he had always been repenting for his misbehaviour. When he has been snared by Orlick, he says to himself: "Joe and Biddy would never know how sorry I had been." When Joe comes to London to nurse him in his illness and pays off his debts, he is overwhelmed with feelings: "Oh, Joe, you break my heart! Look angry at me, Joe, Strike me, Joe. Tell me of my ingratitude. Don't be so good to me!" He repents, and bemoans his ingratitude: "Ah! Had I given Joe no reason to doubt my constancy, and to think that in prosperity I should grow cold to him and cast him off."

And even though he has desired great expectations and after having them he has led a life of idleness, pleasure and wrecklessness, he has never been money minded in an acquisitive world. If there is a choice for him between wealth and Estella, he will readily prefer Estella. He is not mad after money. Miss Havisham is prepared to do anything for him, is ready to pay him any amount. But he refuses to accept anything.

The question in the novel is whether Magwitch will be successful in his attempt to make a raw boy, a gentleman by money only or not. In this respect, Magwitch seems hard to censure and easy to discern the seeds of good. At least, when he renounces criminality for the great Victorian virtue of hard work, self-help, thrift and successful capitalism, he does this unselfishly, thinking only of Pip. Magwitch knows that Pip is not at all a gentleman but he believes that money can buy a successful gentleman in his stead.

Estella is a product of a Satis house, a victim of eccentric education. Just as Louisa Gradgrind is victim in Gradgrind's more orthodox school. She has been nurtured to be 'unnatural' sexually frigid to men repaying their love with contempt. This wrapping of sexuality seems psychologically possible, but this training extends back from its intended victims to Miss Havisham herself.

Estella has been trained as *belle dame sans merci*, and Pip in spite of knowing this has been unable to believe it and so suffers the consequences of his disbelief. Miss Havisham's training and Estella's scorn are after all in his portion, he is to be their victim, rather the Chief victim and not a favoured exception as he supposed. It is an aspect of Pip's ignorance that he is deceived yet he blames himself as resolutely and uselessly for his infatuation with Estella, even while he suffers it, as he blames himself for his treatment of Joe.

Pip, like other Dickens heroes, feels guilty because he has no given status or relation to nature, to family or to the community. He is in everyone's eyes in the way, superfluous. He is ignored by the society altogether, and if he is taken care of by the state or by his foster parents, it is an impersonal way which deprive him of any real identity.

Estella serves as one of the methods of Dickens to show the revenge of Miss Havisham against the cruel society. Miss Havisham says, of Estella "... with my praises, and with my jewels, and with my teachings, and with this figure of myself always before her: I stole heart away and put ice in its place." She moulds in to the form, that her wild resentment, spurned affection, and wounded pride found vengeance in" Estella draws men as a Candle attracts moths, but being without a heart, she treats them as Compeyson treated Miss Havisham. Through Estella she takes an indirect and therefore guiltless revenge and breaks a hundred hearts for her own one heart that was broken. Similarly, Magwitch, another victim of Compeyson, creates in Pip an "instrument" of his revenge of society.

Perhaps, Magwitch and Miss Havisham, both hope to attain vicariously all that they lack. They want to enjoy the power of the oppressor without being guilty. No one will blame Magwitch for the arrogance of Pip the gentleman, and no one will blame Miss Havisham for the cruelties Estella practices on her suitors. Estella is brought up to

feel that men are her natural enemies. She experiences no remorse for breaking their hearts since she herself does not have any heart. She becomes like a superhuman goddess, unable to understand the sorrows of mere mortals.

The depiction of Pip's character in the novel is one serious study of the growth of personality. Baker observes: "Nothing Dickens had previously written showed him capable of revealing with such accuracy and delicacy all that went on in Pip's mind, from that midnight interview when Magwitch made himself known, to the terrible moment when Pip and the rest of the boat's crew are flung into the water, and presently he finds himself seated beside the recaptured man, who is on the way back to prison and the gallows."

Pip is such a sincere fellow that he always remains prepared to help others and solve their problems readily and promptly, but always slides his own problems. Thus, once again we find the nature and not nurture winning in the end, even in *Great Expectations* of Charles Dickens.

Charles Dickens has always seemed to lean towards the "nature", theory. David Copperfield was of good birth, but his life was fraught with peril and misery. Nevertheless, he remained true to his genetics and was not influenced by the bad individuals he encountered.

David Copperfield is a novel about development. Here the development is both physical and metaphysical; the child develops into an struggling adult with sexual impulses, economic difficulties and problems in morality and ontology. Infact the course of David's life follows undeviatingly the prescribed pattern of the novel of the development or growth of a young hero.

David is thrown into economic difficulties very early, at the tender age of ten, when he loses his mother and becomes an orphan, entirely at the mercy of his callous stepfather Mr. Murdstone. The "secret agonies" of his soul when he is degraded into "a little labouring hind in the service of Murdstone and Grinby" are real and acutely felt and their poignancy is quite authentic. However, even though he is living hand to mouth on the small wages he earns, David somehow retains self-respect and a sense of aloofness from other workers in the warehouse. The men and the boys at Murdstone and Grinby's in their turn regard him as someone who is "upon a different footing from the rest. It is this distinguished treatment of David at Murdstone and Grinby's which paves the way for his eventual escape from it. His sufferings are real but what supports his morale and identity in this state of hopeless drudgery is not the principle of self-help but his belief in his innate goodness, goodness not necessarily of moral fiber but of birth, David simply cannot consider himself one of the working class. He is always aware that the blood flowing in his veins

is not the blood of the laborer that he is a born gentleman whose natural sphere is in the lofty heights unattainable for Mealy Potatoes and Mick Walkers. Thus, inevitably, he goes back far in the past when he was a little gentleman back even to the very moment of his birth as begins to consider ways of escaping the present life.

It should be quite clear that David's escape to power is nothing less than a return, a temporal and psychological regress, to the beginning of his life. That terrible and wayward Aunt Betsey, hovering over the bed of David's nativity like an evil spirit proves to be the fairy godmother who readily offers motherly protection and economic stability to the child who was born with her blessing. The Victorian spirit of self-help is so alien to David and Dickens heroes like Oliver Twist or Pip that they simply wait for fairy godmothers to turn up, refusing to work their way through life. In other words David rejects, being cultured in the hardships the capitalist social structure presents and goes back to his origin through ancestral ties.

David Copperfield is extremely sympathetic and of helpful nature, he is always ready to serve others, even at the cost of much personal suffering or inconvenience. He is grateful to those who have helped him at any time of his life and does not forget them when they are in difficulty or fallen on evil days. Thus he is attached to Mr. Micawber and helps him by pawning their household goods, when they are in prison for

debt, he frequently visits from there and lends them money, though he is himself hard pressed for it. Similarly, he goes to Pegotty, his nurse, when he hears that Barkis, her husband, is seriously ill and after his death helps her to put her affairs in order.

Thus, he retains his innate goodness and once again we find nature dominating over nurture in shaping up the character of David Copperfield.

It is most significant that *Hard Times* opens and closes in the world of children, the world of the unformed, adults, representing two conflicting attitudes towards life itself, have injected themselves into these two worlds of the school and the circus. Oddly enough, while the school room is seen to dehumanize its little scholars, the crims, all fancy and love, gives humanity back. It is in the journey between the two worlds that the grown-up actuality of an individual town has been presented, whose frightening hard pragmatic values, almost a parody of utilitarianism, are being transmitted — undistilled — to the children.” — Charles Shapiro ‘Afterword’ to *Hard Times* (Signet Classic)

Dickens distinguished between good and evil and maintained that evil should be punished and good rewarded. The childhood of Dickens was far from happy; he had to undergo untold hardships. When he came above them he did not forget the experiences of his early life. It was this dim memory, at the core of his very life success that made him sympathize and voice out the concerns of the children.

Dickens remained a life-long critic of human foibles and inhuman institutions. But his sense of values was firmly middle class. He adorned simple and homely virtues such as goodness and honesty. He abhorred canny, hypocrisy and shams of every kind. He exposed wickedness and absurdity on whatever level it appeared.

In his social criticism Dickens laid more emphasis on individuals. It is they who should lead a virtuous and simple lives. He believes that personal return to wholesome goodness is the only effective solution for the ills of the world. Instead of theories he preferred feelings.

The significance of the novel *Hard Times* lies in the fact that here he shows that imaginative side is always preferable to the practical side. The message of this novel is that facts cannot replace feelings; conformity should not replace curiosity; proof and demonstration cannot replace poetry and drama. He admitted that sense is important but that sensibility is far more important. No other work of Dickens presents so relentless an indictment against the callous greed of the Victorian industrial society and its misapplied utilitarian philosophy as in this novel.

Dickens undoubtedly unmask the hellish industries that imprisoned the bodies of the helpless "Hands" and the equally satanic institutions that shackled the development of their minds.

In the novel *Hard Times* Thomas Gradgrind is the centre of the main action of the novel. He is a retired hardware merchant who believes in the utilitarian philosophy. Later he becomes the Member of Parliament from Coketown. Dickens described him as a “man of realities, a man of facts and calculations”. A man who proceeds upon the principle that two and two are four and nothing over, and who is not to be talked into allowing for anything over.” Dickens further describe him as a person who “with a rule and a pair of scales and the multiplication table always in his pocket, Sir ready to weigh and measure any parcel of human nature, and tell you exactly what it comes to.” In the mathematical world of Gradgrind there is no place for tender feeling or any susceptible emotions. He was a practical man to the very bones. His life is a life of practicality, because this is the way one gets ahead, one succeeds, makes money, and becomes socially and economically successful according to the standards prevalent during Victorian times. Gradgrind is a man of figures and averages and nothing else. He not only bows to this utilitarian God but also wants to rear up his children in the same creed.

His this philosophy is evident in upbringing of his children Tom and Louisa. We have another child also though not born a Gradgaine, certainly reared in this household. Sissy Jupe, who also plays a very significant role in the novel. Louisa is married to a Millionaire of

Coketown, Bounderby But her Life in the Bounderby establishment is far from happy Bounderby purchases a country house but this purchase is not effected to bring happiness to the newly wedded wife. Even the honeymoon trip is more of a business trip. Louisa is tempted to elope from her surroundings. She has almost gone with Harthouse, a handsome city dilettante, who offers her admiration and some degree of excitement. The temptation in which Louisa is ensnared is the first complication in this part of the plot where Gradgrind is the dominant figure. Louisa does not elope. Still her father's Utilitarian philosophy and her upbringing do not provide her any help.

The other Gradgrind child involved in the plot of *Hard Times* is Tom. His environment, his education and his father's philosophy all conspire to ruin his life. He is a complete mercenary whose only god is Mammon, the god of wealth. He is completely selfish, thoroughly ill-natured and hundred percent mercenary He works in the bank of his sister's husband as a clerk. He eventually steals money from the Bank in order to cover his debts contracted in dissipation and idleness. Even the sister's occasional help is of no avail to this dissipated youth. He bears a grudge against his sister because she does not help her in the way he expects and wants help from her. However, he contrives to throw the blame of his evil deed on an innocent worker of the cotton-mill, Stephen Blackpool. In the end the innocence of Stephen is proclaimed

and he escapes from England in order to avoid prosecution. This stage brings the novel to its proper conclusion. The ruin of his life proves that the utilitarian philosophy to which his father adheres is of not much value.

The third member of the Gradgrind household is Sissy Jupe. She is the daughter of a Circus clown, who deserts her feeling well-provided at the Gradgrind school. Jupe becomes so old and stiff that he can no more thrill his audience and in frustration leaves the Sleary circus for good. Sissy represents all the ideas which can be contradistinguished from the ones represented by this Utilitarian philosophy. She extricates Louisa from the clutches of Harthouse. She makes him leave the neighbourhood finally without allowing him as much as to meet Louisa even once. It is she, again, who comes as angel to Tom. It is her plan that finally leads him to escape the country and the law. So she is an antidote of the feelings engendered by Utilitarianism.

Another important personality of the novel is of Bounderby. He again, like Gradgrind is a worshipper of the Utilitarian gods. According to Earle Davis Bounderby “is an even more vicious portrait of the hard-hearted capitalist than was Scrooge and Mr. Domby.” He is part of the Harthouse-Louisa triangle. But in his own capacity too he is extremely significant character. We have a separate course of action in his and Mrs. Sparsit’s relations. Mrs. Sparsit, an elderly lady and a house keeper of

Bounderby is a significant person. This lady is from a higher caste almost and she brings to the Bounderby household, where one's own exertions were worshipped, some social distinction. Since she is destitute and in ruined circumstances she accepts the money offered by Bounderby. She nurses an unrequited affection towards this elderly man. When he marries a young girl, Louisa, she pities him and looks at Louisa with jealousy. This jealousy makes her to spy on the activities and movements of Louisa. She is responsible for the separation between Bounderby and Louisa. Bounderby also has a mother of whom he is ashamed (for reasons he knows better) of her and gives her an annual grant of thirty pounds a year on the condition that she will not disturb him by claiming him as her son. This lady is introduced to us as Mrs. Pegler. This woman elderly and withered, is brought in the presence of Bounderby, much against her wishes, by officious Mrs. Sparsit, in the hope of bettering her prospects at the Bounderby household. In the character of Bounderby we trace the elements of false pride and lack of filial affection. At the end of the novel he, like Gradgrind, stands exposed as having fabricated much of the story he tells about his youth and the lack of opportunities afforded him in his climb to fortune, wealth and power.

Thus in *Hard Times*, a more schematically didactic presentation of the same theme is done. There are again two children who have been deprived of all imaginative cultivation, Tom and Louisa Gradgrind.

These children are potentially normal and they do not take happily to the imaginative desolation that has been imposed on them. Their father is a utilitarian ideologue. Convinced that art and literature are a waste of time and an influence corrupting to mental discipline, he eliminates all such influences from their carefully controlled curriculum. As a consequence of his educational policy, his children are morally and emotionally impaired, and the action of the plot flows from these impairments. As adults, the Gradgrind children can neither achieve personal fulfillment, nor function as responsible citizens. Louisa proves incapable of developing a healthy marital bond, and Tom degenerates into common crime as means of financing his vices.

In *A Christmas Carol* the Scrooge visits his own past, examining it perhaps for the first time for clues to the man he will become. Dickens offers some clues to the Freudian analyst about the root of Scrooge's melancholia. Published in 1843, *A Christmas Carol* introduced Dickens' literary case study : a squeezing, Wrenching, Grasping, scraping, clutching, Covetous, Old Sinner! The Ghost of Christmas Past, Scrooge's first visitor after Marley's warning visit, is all the light and delicacy that are missing from Scrooge's present life.

Scrooge's childhood, was a lonely one. Because Scrooge hates himself and believes himself unworthy of love, he poisons his relationship with Belle and forces her to end it. (1988). Scrooge's own

archetypes, the Ghost of Christmas Past, Present and Future, are recognizable figures to him even though he sees them in his dream for the first time. As she suggests, he does seem to forget her easily, but his dream finally brings him face to face with what he has lost.

Finally, he dreams of the future, a vision that Freud would suggest is a manifestation of Scrooge's self-hatred. The fact that Scrooge's dream contains only the rescue and not the actual holiday at home suggests that there had been already too many Christmases alone to be effectively counterbalanced by this lone exception. Scrooge carried his own low temperature always about him. He himself has become an archetype the miserly skinflint with a cold unopened heart who must learn to remember the warmth of his past in order to have a future, and if that spirit goes not forth in life, it is condemned to do so, after death.

Scrooge very distinctly states, "I wish to be left alone" and scarcely sees the streets he passes through or the people around him except as obstacles in his miserable way. He sees, instead of the large knocker on his own front door, the face of his long-dead partner, Jacob Marley. We meet this cheerless soul on Christmas Eve, begrudging his clerk a whole day off for Christmas, rebuffing his nephew's annual invitation to Christmas dinner, and coldly refusing to contribute even the smallest sum to "buy the poor some meat and drink, and means of warmth."

Scrooge projects his hatred onto everyone around him because admitting that it is himself he hates most would be too unbearably painful, but his admission comes out as he reads his own name on the stone of the neglected corpse whose lonely death he has witnessed. He understands immediately the role they are to play in his journey, so much so that the third spirit does not need to speak at all in order to communicate his purpose and message to the dreamer. His fictional creation was based on a novelist's expert observation of human behavior and character types. Freud speaks of patients whose development has been inhibited, "who fall ill as soon as they pass beyond the irresponsible age of childhood and thus never attain a phase of health — that of unrestricted capacity in general for production and enjoyment". (66) ... To outsiders, he seems prickly, unapproachable and arrogant, and sometimes soured as a result of his anti-social prejudices.

Nevertheless, it is a solid beginning. For the Freudian, Scrooge is clearly suffering from melancholia : a profoundly painful dejection, abrogation of interest in the outside world, loss of capacity to love, inhibition of all activity, and a lowering of the self-regarding feeling to a degree that finds utterance in self-reproaches and culminates in a delusional expectation of punishment (Freud 125). His dejection is evident in the dark and cold with which he surrounds himself, both at work and especially at home, "a gloomy suite of rooms, in a lowering pile

of building”. (*Dickens*, 14). Charles Dickens created Ebenezer Scrooge more than a dozen years before Freud was born. Scrooge’s dreams are filled with rich Freudian possibilities for analysis and offer an example of Jung’s opinion of the predictive nature of dreams.

When Scrooge’s nephew implores him not to be cross, to which he replies, “What else can I be”, Scrooge serves as a classic example of Freud’s melancholic and Jung’s introverted thinking type. It is why Scrooge remains an enduring literary creation and a recognizable prototype for a very particular personality type. The fact that he so closely fits symptomatic descriptions formulated many years later is attribute to the writer’s art. This analysis allows us to examine some of the ways in which Freud and Jung’s theories of the psychology of the human mind come together and differ. Freud could argue that Scrooge’s fiscal obsession represents his attempt to replace what he has lost. (Dickens is vague on what happened to Scrooge’s mother, but she remains an absent figure throughout his visits to the past) with an inanimate object of measurable worth which he can possess completely. By the end of the story, Scrooge, using dream work that both Freud and Jung would have heartily endorsed, has brought himself out of his melancholia / introversion. Freud writes, “The individual feels ‘incomplete’ if he is alone.” Marley’s Ghostly visit brings him a warning of his impending doom.

It is only when Scrooge's ego can assert itself enough to admit his self-loathing that he can break-free ... when he awakes it is Christmas morning, and the patient is a changed man. Most significantly for the Freudian diagnosis, Scrooge dreams of his own death. Freud writes, "The fear of death in melancholia only admits of one explanation : that the ego gives itself up because it feels itself hated and persecuted by the super-ego, instead of loved." (233) Christmas books, Dr Christine Johnson notes : Scan the literature of the profession and you discern a very real discomfort with the subject of money.

Freud emphasizes "the unexpected importance of the role which impressions and experiences from early childhood exert on the development of men". While Scrooge has avoided remembering his youth until this fateful night, he seems to have spent most of his time away at school even over the holidays. Ignoring all signs of the holiday season, Scrooge trudges sourly home that night. As he enters his house, he experiences a thrilling and horrible moment. Scrooge's entire life seems an attempt to hide, to escape. He thinks his withdrawal into ever — increasing solitude will protect him from the unconsciousness influences, but as a rule it plunges him deeper into the conflict that is destroying him from within. Scrooge's misanthropic bachelorhood, prickly outside and anti-social withdrawal are evident; his childlike heart is harder to see but comes out in such things as his delight at the party games he

watches at his nephew's house when "he begged like a boy to be allowed to stay until the guests departed." (64). Scrooge's instincts towards gregariousness was extinguished by his abandoned isolation.

A Christmas Carol thus tells the story of the rejuvenation of the miser Ebenezer Scrooge. A flashback to the neglect Scrooge experienced during his own childhood assists in understanding the deprivation of affection which motivated Scrooge to become cold in adulthood, showing how childhood can motivate the personality of an individual.

Charles Dickens seems to often write of the importance of the preservation of goodness and innocence in children. Equally Dickens condemns the corruption of children, perhaps making Dickens one of the greatest champions of childhood.

A flashback to the neglect scrooge experienced in his own childhood assist in understanding the deprivation of affection which motivated Scrooge to become cold in adulthood, showing how childhood can motivate the personality of an individual.

The study of the novels reveal the psychological insight with which Dickens treated the characters. As a social reformer, his purpose was not just to confine himself to the need of entertainment through art but to awake the slumbering conscience of the reader to understand the plight of children whose moulding takes place both by nature and nurture.

Works Cited List

- Bandura, A. & Walters, R.H. *Social Learning and Personality Development*. New York : Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963. Print.
- Bee, Helen. *Child and Adolescent Development*. 2004. Print
- Bradley, P. *Victorian Lessons : Education and Utilitarianism in Bentham*. Mill and Dickens, 1999. Print.

- Cooke, J. *Children Reap Significant Benefits When Exposed to Quality Early Childhood Education Experiences*. Reading Today, 2007. Print.
- Erikson, H. Erik. *Identity and the Life-cycle*. Norton, 1980. Print.
- Eysenk, H.J. *Dimensions of Personality*. Transaction Publishers, 1947. Print.
- — —. *The Structure of Human Personality*. Michigan, Methuen, 1970. Print.
- Flook, L., Repetti, R., & Ullman, J. *Development Psychology*. 2005. Print.
- Gorden Willard Allport. *Pattern and Growth in Personality*. Michigan, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961. Print
- Hull, C.L. *Principles of Behaviour : An Introduction to Behaviour Theory*. New York : Appleton Century – Crofts, 1943. Print.
- Jung, C.G. *The Development of Personality*. California : Pantheon Books, 1964. Print.
- Meldrum, Ronald, R. *Charles Dickens as Artist and Reformer*. Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies, 1971. Print
- Pykelt, Lyn. *Critical Issues : Charles Dickens*. New York : Palgrave, 2002. Print.
- Santoni, Angela. *Dickens and the Needs of Children*. University of Michigan, 2008. Print.

Sucksmith, Harvey Peter. *The Narrative Art of Charles Dickens : The Rhetoric of Sympathy and Irony in his Novels*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1970. Print.

Thorndike, E.L. *The Elements of Psychology*. New York : A.G. Seiler, 1905. Print.
