

# Notes

## Introduction

- <sup>1</sup> “Gruppierung aller Stämme um eine Idee oder Hauptanschauung”; “Formlosigkeit von Inhalt und Inhaltslosigkeit von Form”. Otto Ludwig, *Romane und Romanstudien*, ed. by William J. Lillyman (Munich: Hanser, 1977), pp. 551f. Cf. Heinrich Lohre, ‘Otto Ludwig und Charles Dickens’, *Archiv*, 124 (1910), 15–45; L. H. C. Thomas, ‘Otto Ludwig and Charles Dickens: A German Reading of *Great Expectations* and Other Novels’, *Hermathena*, 111 (1971), 35–50.
- <sup>2</sup> Cf. Richard Stang, *The Theory of the Novel in England, 1850–1870* (London: Routledge and Kegan, 1959), pp. 84f.
- <sup>3</sup> David Cecil, *Early Victorian Novelists* (London: Constable, 1934), p. 27.
- <sup>4</sup> In poststructuralist theory the text is regarded as open and unlimited.
- <sup>5</sup> Cf. Rosemary Mundhenk, ‘Creative Ambivalence in Dickens’s *Master Humphrey’s Clock*’, *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900*, 32 (1992), 645–661 (p. 645); *Charles Dickens*, ed. by Steven Connor (London: Longman, 1996), pp. 5–10.
- <sup>6</sup> Cf. LD, Preface 1857, and LD, II, ch. 34. Cf. *The Quarterly Review*, 84 (1848) on *Vanity Fair*: “The whole growth of the narrative is so matted and interwoven together with tendril-like links and bindings that there is no detaching a flower with sufficient length of stalk to exhibit it to advantage,” in *Thackeray: The Critical Heritage*, ed. by Geoffrey Tillotson and Donald Hawes (London: Routledge and Kegan, 1968, p. 86). In a letter to John Forster, Dickens speaks of the “pivot on which the story will turn” with reference to *Great Expectations* (CDL, IX, p. 325).
- <sup>7</sup> G. K. Chesterton, *Charles Dickens* (London: Methuen, 1906), p. 78.
- <sup>8</sup> Suzanne Keen, *Victorian Renovations of the Novel: Narrative Annexes and the Boundaries of Representation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- <sup>9</sup> Claude Bremond, *logique du récit*, Paris 1973.
- <sup>10</sup> Cf. Francis Xavier Shea, ‘Mr Venus Observed: The Plot Change in *Our Mutual Friend*’, *Papers on Language and Literature*, 4 (1968), pp. 170–181.
- <sup>11</sup> Cf. Stang, pp. 80f.; G. H. Lewes in *Fortnightly Review*, 17 (1872), 141–154. “But all his works have this great literary fault, that they want unity,” maintains *Parker’s*

- London Magazine*, (1845) 127; cf. *Charles Dickens: The Critical Heritage*, ed. by Philip Collins (London: Routledge, 1971), p. 171; cf. George Ford, *Dickens and His Readers* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), ch. 6.
- <sup>12</sup> Stang, pp. 80f., 84, 115f., 122.
- <sup>13</sup> *Westminster Review*, October 1864, p. 419; cf. Stang, p. 85; cf. Collins, pp. 390–401, 455f.
- <sup>14</sup> Letter to Edward Lytton Bulwer, November 1865 (CDL, XI, p. 113).
- <sup>15</sup> Cf. John Butt and Kathleen Tillotson, *Dickens at Work* (London: Methuen, 1957); Archibald C. Coolidge, *Dickens as a Serial Novelist* (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1967); Jerry Don Vann, *Victorian Novels in Serial* (New York: MLA, 1985); John Sutherland, *Victorian Fiction: Writers, Publishers, Readers* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995); *Literature in the Marketplace: Nineteenth-Century British Publishing and Reading Practices*, ed. by John O. Jordan and Robert L. Patten (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- <sup>16</sup> Cf. Jerry Don Vann, *'David Copperfield' and the Reviewers* (Texas Technological College, Ph. D. Dissertation, 1967); Jerry Don Vann, 'Pickwick in the London Newspapers', *Dickensian*, 70 (1974), 49–52; Brahma Chaudhuri, 'Dickens and the *Critic* 1852–1853', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 21 (1988), 139–144; Brahma Chaudhuri, 'Dickens's Serial Structure in *Bleak House*', *Dickensian*, 86 (1990), 66–84. Charlotte Rotkin, 'The *Athenaeum* reviews *Little Dorrit*', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 23 (1990), 25–28; Kathryn Chitwick, *The Critical Reception of Charles Dickens 1833–1841* (New York: Garland, 1989); Richard D. Altick, 'Varieties of Readers' Response: The Case of *Dombey and Son*', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 10 (1980), 70–94 (92); Colin Brooks, 'Mysteries of the Dombey Family', *Dickensian*, 46 (1949), 31f. During the publication of *Little Dorrit* the Duke of Devonshire appealed to the author to reintroduce Flora Finching in the next number (CDL, VIII, pp. 128f., 149f.). There is every reason to assume that Dickens received numerous similar requests over the years.
- <sup>17</sup> Cf. Forster, p. 484; Butt and Tillotson, p. 109; DS, p. xxxv.
- <sup>18</sup> Cf. Kathleen Tillotson, *Novels of the Eighteen-Forties* (London: Oxford University Press), p. 35; CDL, III, pp. xv–xvi, 520; Forster, p. 302.
- <sup>19</sup> Tillotson, pp. 29f., 33.
- <sup>20</sup> *Fraser's Magazine*, April 1840, in Collins, p. 90, cf. also p. 264f. "The plot seems to have grown as the book appeared by numbers, instead of having been mapped out beforehand" (*Examiner*, 27 October 1839).
- <sup>21</sup> Cf. Brahma Chaudhuri, 'The Interpolated Chapter in *Bleak House*', *Dickensian*, 81 (1985), 103f.
- <sup>22</sup> Butt and Tillotson, p. 28
- <sup>23</sup> Butt and Tillotson, p. 29, n. 1; *Charles Dickens's Book of Memoranda*, ed. by Fred Kaplan (New York Public Library, 1981).
- <sup>24</sup> Forster, p. 26; DC, pp. xv–xvii, 133.

- <sup>25</sup> Cf. *Quarterly Review*, 64 (1839), 83–102; *Blackwood's Magazine*, 52 (1842), 783–801; *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine*, April 1845; *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, 29 August 1864, 407, commenting on OMF asserted that Charles Dickens “can not draw a gentleman”; cf. also *Temple Bar*, 43 (1874/75), 171; *The Times*, 26 December 1871.
- <sup>26</sup> Robin Gilmour, *The Idea of the Gentleman in the Victorian Novel* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1981); J. M. Brown, *Dickens: Novelist in the Market Place* (Totowa, N. J.: Barnes and Noble, 1982); John O. Jordan, ‘The Social Sub-Text of *David Copperfield*’, *Dickens Studies Annual*, 14 (1985), 61–92; Pam Morris, *Dickens's Class Consciousness: A Marginal View* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991); Andrew Sanders, *Dickens and the Spirit of the Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 22–36; Anny Sadrin, *Great Expectations* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), ch. 8; David Hennessee, ‘Gentlemanly Guilt and Masochistic Fantasy in *Great Expectations*’, *Dickens Studies Annual*, 34 (2004), 301–308.
- <sup>27</sup> Cf. Sigmund Freud, ‘Der Dichter und das Phantasieren’ (Creative Writing and Day-Dreaming) (1908).
- <sup>28</sup> Tore Rem speaks of a “continuous struggle between melodrama and parody” in the novel. ‘Melodrama and Parody: A Reading that *Nicholas Nickleby* Requires?’, *English Studies*, 77 (1996), 240–254 (p. 254).
- <sup>29</sup> Michael Mason, *The Making of Victorian Sexuality: Sexual Behaviour and Its Understanding* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 1.
- <sup>30</sup> Edmund Wilson, ‘The Two Scrooges’, in *The Wound and the Bow: Seven Studies in Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1941).
- <sup>31</sup> Walter Bagehot, *Collected Works*, 2 vols. (London: The Economist, 1965), vol. II, p. 98. The essay on Dickens was first published in *The National Review* (1858), 458–486. Cf. “He never wrote an improper word, or penned a sentence that could give rise to an improper thought.” (J. H. Friswell, *Modern Men of Letters, honestly criticised* [London, 1870], quoted from *Lives of Victorian Literary Figures*, vol. 2, *Charles Dickens*, ed. by Corinna Russell [London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003], p. 102).
- <sup>32</sup> W. M. Thackeray, ‘Going to see a man hanged’, *Fraser's Magazine*, 22 (1840), 154f.
- <sup>33</sup> Cf. Meinhard Winkgens, ‘Natur als Palimpsest: Der eingeschriebene Subtext in Charles Dickens’ *David Copperfield*’, in *Das Natur/Kultur-Paradigma in der englischsprachigen Erzählliteratur des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. by Konrad Gross, Kurt Müller and Meinhard Winkgens (Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1994), pp. 35–61.
- <sup>34</sup> Cf. Patricia Ingham, *Dickens, Women and Language* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992), pp. 40–61.
- <sup>35</sup> Cf. Marie-Laure Ryan, *Possible Worlds, Artificial Intelligence and Narrative Theory* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991); Ruth Ronen, *Possible Worlds in Literary Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

## Errors Like Straws

- <sup>1</sup> Cf. Ann Y. Wilkinson, 'Bleak House: From Faraday to Judgement Day', *elh*, 34 (1967), 225–247. Richard Altick would after all assign a metaphorical significance to the dinosaur in 'Bleak House: The Reach of Chapter One', *Dickens Studies Annual*, 8 (1980), 73–102.
- <sup>2</sup> Cf. Paul Pickrel, 'Bleak House: The Emergence of Theme', *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, 42 (1987), 73–96 (p. 74).
- <sup>3</sup> Cf. Richard D. Altick, 'Varieties of Readers' Response: The Case of *Dombey and Son*', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 10 (1980), 70–94 (p. 92). Cf. Colin Brooks, 'Mysteries of the Dombey Family', *Dickensian*, 46 (1949), 31f.
- <sup>4</sup> Drawing on Derrida, Edward Said has suggested a reading of the episode whereby the dilettante rendering of the play as well as the unappreciative response it elicits may be construed as alternative versions of *Hamlet*. Cf. Edward Said, *The World, the Text, and the Critic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), pp. 196–199.
- <sup>5</sup> Cf. *Fraser's Magazine*, 21 (1840), 381–400; *Quarterly Review*, 64 (1839), 9.
- <sup>6</sup> Burton M. Wheeler has pointed out numerous changes, often resulting in inconsistencies, that seem to have occurred to Dickens while writing the novel. 'The Text and Plan of *Oliver Twist*', *Dickens Studies Annual*, 12 (1983), 41–62.
- <sup>7</sup> *Household Words*, 16 (1857), pp. 97–100.

## Tom Pinch and the Chuzzlewits

- <sup>1</sup> Nancy Aycock Metz, 'Dickens, Punch, and Pecksniff', *Dickens Quarterly*, 10 (1993), 6–17.
- <sup>2</sup> This revealing observation is repeated in a letter to J. S. Le Fanu where Dickens assures his correspondent that he agrees with him "that no story should be planned out too elaborately in detail beforehand, or the characters become mere puppets and will not act for themselves when the occasion arises" (CDL, XII, p. 535).
- <sup>3</sup> Cf. Pam Morris, *Dickens's Class Consciousness: A Marginal View* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991), p. 50. Patricia Ingham also totally dismisses Tom Pinch in her Introduction to *Martin Chuzzlewit* (Penguin Classics, 1999), p. xxiv.
- <sup>4</sup> Cf. Alan R. Burke, 'The House of Chuzzlewit and the Architectural City', *Dickens Studies Annual*, 3 (1972) 14–40; Steven Connor, 'Babel Unbuilding: The Anti-archi-rhetoric of *Martin Chuzzlewit*', in *Dickens Refigured: Bodies, Desires and Other Histories*, ed. by John Schad (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), pp. 178–199; J. Tambling, 'Martin Chuzzlewit: Charles Dickens and Architecture', *English*, 48 (1999), 147–168.
- <sup>5</sup> Sylvère Monod, *Dickens the Novelist* (Norman: Oklahoma University Press, 1968), p. 212.

- <sup>6</sup> Sylvère Monod, *Martin Chuzzlewit* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985).
- <sup>7</sup> Jerry C. Beasley, 'The Role of Tom Pinch in *Martin Chuzzlewit*', *Ariel*, 5 (1974), 77–89 (p. 80).
- <sup>8</sup> But cf. John Bowen, *Other Dickens: Pickwick to Chuzzlewit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 191f.; 195f.

## The Semiotics of Ribbons

- <sup>1</sup> Cf. Torster Petterson, 'The Maturity of David Copperfield', *English Studies*, 70 (1989), 63–73.
- <sup>2</sup> Cf. Bert G. Hornback, 'Frustration and Resolution in *David Copperfield*', *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900*, 8 (1968), 564.
- <sup>3</sup> Ross H. Dabney regards Clara Peggotty's marriage one of the few well-considered, dispassionate and hence durable matches in the novel, as opposed to impulsively concluded unions. Cf. *Love and Property in the Novels of Dickens* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1967), pp. 66f.
- <sup>4</sup> Cf. Michael Waters, *The Garden in Victorian Literature* (Aldershot, England: Scolar, 1988) pp. 229f.
- <sup>5</sup> F. R. Leavis and Q. D. Leavis, *Dickens the Novelist* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1970), p. 67.
- <sup>6</sup> George Eliot, *Middlemarch*, ed. by David Carroll (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 161f.
- <sup>7</sup> Cf. Gwendolen B. Needham, 'The Undisciplined Heart of David Copperfield', *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, 9 (1954), 87–107. This reading is still upheld in a recent publication by Lyn Pykett, *Charles Dickens* (Basingstone: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 111f.
- <sup>8</sup> Cf. R. D. Sell, 'Projection Characters in *David Copperfield*', *Studia Neophilologica*, 55 (1983), 21–24; Meinhard Winkgens, 'Der eingeschriebene Subtext in Charles Dickens' *David Copperfield*', p. 52.
- <sup>9</sup> Leavis, pp. 86f.
- <sup>10</sup> Cf. DC, ch. 38, p. 467 and ch. 43, p. 538. The charming servant girl in Mrs Steerforth's house also wears blue ribbons on her cap (DC, ch. 29, p. 367); and Emily ties a blue ribbon round the neck of a child before her flight (DC, ch. 32, p. 392; cf. number plans, p. 779), which would constitute a paradigmatic series. Iain Crawford has pointed out that blue was Dickens's favourite colour. 'Sex and Seriousness in *David Copperfield*', *Journal of Narrative Technique*, 16 (1986), 41–54.
- <sup>11</sup> Butt and Tillotson, pp. 132–135; cf. DC, p. xxxviii.
- <sup>12</sup> Milton Millhauser, '*David Copperfield*: Some Shifts of Plan', *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, 27 (1972/73), 339–345.

- <sup>13</sup> Sylvia Manning, 'Dickens, January, and May', *Dickensian*, 71 (1975), 75.
- <sup>14</sup> As Michael Steig suggests, the moth circling the candle in the illustration might symbolise the danger of seduction. Conversely, the blinded insect may equally allegorise the futility of Doctor Strong's scholarly endeavours: *Dickens and Phiz* (London: Indiana University Press, 1978), p. 124.
- <sup>15</sup> Butt and Tillotson, pp. 132–135; cf. DC, p. xxxviii.
- <sup>16</sup> Cf. DC, p. xli; also CDL, V, pp. 674f.
- <sup>17</sup> William Shakespeare, *The Taming of the Shrew*, V, II, 153.
- <sup>18</sup> Harry Stone, *Dickens and the Invisible World: Fairy Tales, Fantasy, and Novel-Making* (London: Macmillan, 1979), p. 271.

## Two Modes of Reviving the Past

- <sup>1</sup> Cf. Vanda Foster, 'The Dolly Varden', *Dickensian*, 73 (1977), 18–24; cf. Dickens's letter to W. S. Frith, requesting a picture of Dolly (CDL, III, p. 373f.).
- <sup>2</sup> G. K. Chesterton, *The Victorian Age in Literature* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1913) p. 54.
- <sup>3</sup> Cf. Dickens's statement: "I set myself the little task of making a *picturesque* story, rising in every chapter with characters true to nature, but whom the story itself should express, more than they should express themselves, by dialogue. I mean, in other words, that I fancied a story of incident might be written" (CDL, IX, pp. 112f.).
- <sup>4</sup> Cf. Linda M. Shires, 'Maenads, Mothers, and Feminized Males', in *Rewriting the Victorians: Theory, History, and the Politics of Gender* (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 147–165.
- <sup>5</sup> The Companion to *A Tale of Two Cities* prints the whole text of a passage from the original manuscript of the novel which Dickens covered with a new half-page. After "I have seen her" the original text continues: "She is my sister, Doctor. They have had their rights, these nobles, in the modesty and virtue of our sisters many years, but we have had good girls among us. I have heard my father say so too. She was a good girl not long ago, and had a good lover. She <illegible> deceived him for this man's brother, the worst of a bad race. You hear that she counts twelve. She met him every night at twelve o'clock." The text then tells that the nobleman had pretended to marry her and took her away from her family. The passage was apparently covered over afterwards to be replaced by the final, less revealing version. Andrew Sanders, *The Companion to 'A Tale of Two Cities'* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), pp. 156f.

## The Author's Dilemma

- <sup>1</sup> Charles *Dickens's Book of Memoranda*, ed. by Fred Kaplan (New York Public Library, 1981), entry 112.

- <sup>2</sup> Frederic G. Kitton, *Dickens and His Illustrators* (London: Redway, 1899), p. 197. Cf. also Ernest Boll, 'The Plotting of *Our Mutual Friend*', *Modern Philology*, 42 (1944), 96–122.
- <sup>3</sup> Cf. Tillotson, *Novels of the Eighteen-Forties*, pp. 177–179; Michael Slater, *Dickens and Women* (London: Dent, 1982), pp. 260f.; Juliet John, *Dickens's Villains: Melodrama, Character, Popular Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 215.
- <sup>4</sup> Butt and Tillotson, p. 106.
- <sup>5</sup> George Gissing, *Charles Dickens, A Critical Study* (London: Gresham Publishing Co., 1903), p. 66.
- <sup>6</sup> Butt and Tillotson, p. 33.
- <sup>7</sup> Leavis, *Dickens the Novelist*, p. 329.
- <sup>8</sup> Anny Sadrin, *Great Expectations* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), pp. 87–110.
- <sup>9</sup> Edwin M. Eigner, 'Bulwer Lytton and the Changed Ending of *Great Expectations*', *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, 25 (1970), 104–108.

### A Gritty State of Things

- <sup>1</sup> D. A. Miller, *The Novel and the Police* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).
- <sup>2</sup> *Charles Dickens's Book of Memoranda*, ed. by Fred Kaplan, entry 72.
- <sup>3</sup> ED, pp. xx, xxvi–xxvii; F. G. Kitton, *Dickens and His Illustrators* (London: Redway, 1899), p. 197.
- <sup>4</sup> Cf. Andrew Sanders, *Charles Dickens Resurrectionist* (London: Macmillan, 1982), pp. 216f.
- <sup>5</sup> Cf. Lillian Nayder, *Unequal Partners: Charles Dickens, Wilkie Collins, and Victorian Authorship* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002), pp. 140–161.
- <sup>6</sup> Cf. Joachim Stanley, 'Opium and Edwin Drood: Fantasy, Reality, and What the Doctors Ordered', *Dickens Quarterly* 21 (2004), 12–27.
- <sup>7</sup> 'No Thoroughfare', *All the Year Round*, 12 December 1867, p. 13.
- <sup>8</sup> Juliet John regards John Jasper as a romantic melodramatic villain: *Dickens's Villains: Melodrama, Character, Popular Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 190f.
- <sup>9</sup> David Parker would argue for Drood's survival as a crucial element in his *education sentimentale*: 'Drood Redux: Mystery and the Art of Fiction', *Dickens Studies Annual*, 24 (1996), 185–195.
- <sup>10</sup> Cf. Suvendrini Perera, *Reaches of Empire: The English Novel from Edgeworth to Dickens* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991); Miriam O'Kane Mara, 'Sucking the Empire Dry: Oriental Critique in the *Mystery of Edwin Drood*', *Dickens Studies Annual*, 32 (2002), 233–246; Lilian Nayder, *Unequal Partners*; Hyungji Park, "'Going to Wake Up Egypt": Exhibiting Empire in *Edwin Drood*', *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 30 (2002), 529–550.

- <sup>11</sup> A case in point would be offered by a musical adaptation by Rupert Holmes which was performed in New York City's Central Park in 1985, then transferred to Broadway. The solution was resolved democratically by audience voting, which it seems only elicited further indeterminacies. Cf. Leslie Bennetts, 'In *Drood* the Cast Gives Clues and the Audience Gives Cues', *New York Times*, 5 January 1986.

## Finale

- <sup>1</sup> *The Children's New Testament*, written in 1846, was published in 1934 only under the changed title *The Life of Our Lord*.
- <sup>2</sup> CDL, VIII, pp. 244f.; cf. CDL, X, p. 444.