

**T.C.
MANİSA CELAL BAYAR ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ**

**YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
YÜKSEK LİSANS PROGRAMI**

**ANALYSING THE MASTER AND SERVANT DIALECTIC IN
CHARLES DICKENS' *THE PICKWICK PAPERS* AND *LITTLE DORRIT***

Tuğba KARAARSLAN

**Danışman
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Papatya ALKAN GENCA**

MANİSA-2018

**T.C.
MANİSA CELAL BAYAR ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ**

**YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
YÜKSEK LİSANS PROGRAMI**

**ANALYSING THE MASTER AND SERVANT DIALECTIC IN
CHARLES DICKENS' *THE PICKWICK PAPERS* AND *LITTLE DORRIT***

Tuğba KARAARSLAN

**Danışman
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Papatya ALKAN GENCA**

MANİSA-2018

	T.C. MANİSA CELAL BAYAR ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ YÜKSEK LİSANS EĞİTİMİ FORMLARI Tez Savunma Sınavı Tutanağı	Doküman Kodu	FRYL-031
		Yayınlanma Tarihi	26/03/2018
		Revizyon No/Tarih	2/23/03/2018
		Sayfa	1/1

TEZ SAVUNMA SINAV TUTANAĞI

Manisa Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü 19.06.2018 tarih ve 22/Ek19 sayılı toplantısında oluşturulan jürimiz tarafından Manisa Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim ve Öğretim Yönetmeliği'nin 9. Maddesi gereğince Enstitümüz İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Tuğba KARAARSLAN'ın *"Analysing the Master and Servant Dialectic in Charles Dickens' the Pickwick Papers and Little Dorrit Charles Dickens'in The Pickwick Papers ve Little Dorrit Romanlarında Efendi-Köle İlişkisinin Analizi"* Konulu tezi incelenmiş ve aday 03.07.2018 tarihinde saat 10.30'da jüri önünde tez savunmasına alınmıştır.

Adayın kişisel çalışmaya dayanan tezini savunmasından sonra 90 dakikalık süre içinde gerek tez konusu, gerekse tezin dayanağı olan anabilim dallarından jüri üyelerine sorulan sorulara verdiği cevaplar değerlendirilerek tezin,

BAŞARILI olduğuna ☒ OY BİRLİĞİ ☒
DÜZELTME yapılmasına * ☐ OY ÇOKLUĞU ☐
RED edilmesine ** ☐ ile karar verilmiştir.

ÜYE
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi
Yasemin Yavaşlar Özakıncı

BAŞKAN
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Papatya
Alkan Cence

ÜYE
Prof. Dr. Dilek
Direnc

Evet

Hayır

Tez, burs, ödül veya Teşvik programına (Tüba, Fullbright vb.) aday olabilir.

☐
☐

Tez, mutlaka basılmalıdır.

☒
☐

Tez, mevcut haliyle basılmalıdır.

☒
☐

Tez, gözden geçirildikten sonra basılmalıdır.

☐
☐

Tez, basımı gereksizdir.

☐
☐

* Bu halde adaya 3 ay süre verilir. İkinci tez savunma sınavında da başarısız olan öğrencinin Enstitü ile ilişkisi kesilir.

** Bu halde adayın Enstitü ile ilişkisi kesilir.

Hazırlayan
Enstitü Sekreteri

Onaylayan
Enstitü Müdürü

YEMİN METNİ

Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak sunduğum “Analysing The Master and Servant Dialectic in Charles Dickens’ *The Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit*” adlı çalışmanın, tarafımdan bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin bibliyografyada gösterilen eserlerden oluştuğunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanmış olduğumu belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım.

05/07/2018

Tuğba KARAARSLAN

ÖZET

CHARLES DICKENS'İN *THE PICKWICK PAPERS* VE *LITTLE DORRIT* ROMANLARINDA EFENDİ-KÖLE İLİŞKİSİNİN ANALİZİ

Viktorya Dönemi (1837-1901) Britanya'nın birçok çelişkili yeniliklere şahit olduğu bir dönemdir: ülkenin ekonomik ve endüstriyel olarak gelişmesi, imparatorluğa dönüşmesi ve orta sınıf ile işçi sınıfı arasında ciddi bir sınıf ayrımı gibi. Bütün bu değişimler Britanya yazarlarının eserlerinde yerlerini almıştır. Viktorya Dönemi'nin en önemli yazarlarından biri olan Charles Dickens'ın eserlerinde, özellikle *The Pickwick Papers* ve *Little Dorrit* romanlarında, sınıf çatışması kurgunun büyük bir parçası olmuştur. Bu iki eserinde Dickens karakterlerinin yaşamlarını efendi ve köle ilişkisi bağlamında yansıtır.

Bu tezin amacı Dickens'ın iki romanını Hegel'in efendi ve köle diyalektiği ışığı altında analiz etmektir. Bu diyalektiğin bu romanlarda iki farklı tezahürü vardır: *The Pickwick Papers*'ta efendi ve kölenin karşılıklı birbirini tanıması ve *Little Dorrit*'te ise efendinin üstlendiği çift rol şeklinde. Bunun için de romanların farklı zaman aralıklarının etkisinin daha iyi anlaşılması için 1830 ve 1850'lerin Viktorya Britanyası'nın bir panoraması verilmiştir. Tez Charles Dickens'ın *The Pickwick Papers* ve *Little Dorrit* romanlarında Hegel'in efendi ve köle diyalektiğini tanımlaması ve göstermesiyle ve bu betimlemelerin birbirinden farklı olduğu tartışmasıyla sonuca ulaşmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Charles Dickens, *The Pickwick Papers*, *Little Dorrit*, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Endüstri Devrimi, Viktorya Dönemi, Efendi ve Köle Diyalektiği

ABSTRACT

ANALYSING THE MASTER AND SERVANT DIALECTIC IN CHARLES DICKENS' *THE PICKWICK PAPERS* AND *LITTLE DORRIT*

The Victorian Age (1837-1901) is the period in which Britain witnesses such contradictory novelties as the economic and industrial development of the country, the conversion of the country to the empire, and a strict class division between the middle class and the working class. All these changes find a place in the works of British authors, especially in the works of Charles Dickens (1812-1870), one of the most prominent writers of the Victorian Age. In his works, particularly in *The Pickwick Papers* (1836-7) and *Little Dorrit* (1855-7), the class division becomes a big part of fiction. In both of these works, Dickens reflects the lives of the characters in terms of the master and the servant relationship.

The aim of this thesis is to analyse Dickens' two novels in the light of Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic. This dialectic has two distinct manifestations in these novels: the mutual recognition of the master and the servant in *The Pickwick Papers* and the dual role of the master in *Little Dorrit*. In order to do so, a panorama of Victorian Britain in the 1830s and the 1850s is given so that the effect of the different time-spaces of the novels could be better understood. This thesis concludes that Charles Dickens portrays and represents Hegelian Master and Servant Dialectic in *The Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit* and argues that these portrayals are different from one another.

Keywords: Charles Dickens, *The Pickwick Papers*, *Little Dorrit*, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Industrial Revolution, Victorian England, Master and Servant Dialectic.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I am deeply grateful to my thesis supervisor Assistant Professor Dr. Papatya Alkan Genca for her assistance, guidance, friendship, and endless patience throughout this study. She devoted her free time, even her holidays to check my drafts. I really appreciate her sacrifice and invaluable knowledge which helped me write my study.

I owe special thanks to Professor Dr. Zehra Seçkin Ergin for her eternal help and for her inspiration to continue my studies. Without her support, I would not be able to succeed in this field.

I would like to thank Professor Dr. Nafize Sibel Güzel, Associate Professor Berna Ayça Ülker Erkan, Associate Professor Atalay Gündüz, Assistant Professor Dr. Şefika Nüvid Alemdaroğlu, and Assistant Professor Dr. Burcu Alkan for encouraging me to do my master's and for expanding my horizon in this field with their courses.

I am deeply indebted to Associate Professor Lütüye Filiz Özbaş, Assistant Professor Dr. Nazife Aydınoğlu, Assistant Professor Dr. Sena Tulpar, and Assistant Professor Dr. Hümeysra Erdim, who made me love the Literature of English during my BA education at Dokuz Eylül University and guide me to do master in this field unconsciously.

Many thanks to my friends, Müge Akçiçek and Vanessa Fanroy Spencer for editing my study, to the personnel at Gediz University Library, Izmir University of Economics Library, Ege University Library, Dokuz Eylül University Library for supplying the necessary sources for me, to the personnel at Pembe Köşk Library for providing me a quiet and peaceful atmosphere to study, and to the owners of the Rezone Cafe in Bornova for their delicious tea and cookies.

Above all, I am deeply grateful to my family, Hikmet Karaarslan and Mehmet Yaşar Karaarslan for their love and understanding. Although both of my parents lost their health and recovered during this process, they did not deprive me of their support. Without their reassuring presence, I would not have completed this study.

Tuğba KARAARSLAN

Manisa, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: MUTUAL RECOGNITION IN <i>THE PICKWICK PAPERS</i>	26
CHAPTER TWO: THE DUAL ROLE OF THE MASTER IN <i>LITTLE DORRIT</i>	45
CONCLUSION	70
WORKS CITED.....	78



INTRODUCTION

Charles Dickens is one of the most widely acclaimed and popular Victorian novelists. His novels can be seen as entertaining artefacts with their rich characters, expansive settings, and prolific subject matters. They are also exemplary Victorian texts, providing insight to understanding Dickens' time and society. One particular concern in many of Dickens' novels is the relationship between people as well as the relationship between classes. In this respect, Dickens and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel can be claimed to come together to share this common concern. Hegel is one of the most outstanding philosophers of the nineteenth century, whose main concern is to reach "a mutually recognising and so mutually reassured social subjectivity" (Beiser 78). This recognition is argued within a dialectic understanding between the master and the servant in Hegel's writing. Thus, Dickens' texts can be discussed within Hegelian Dialectic of Master and Servant. In order to do so, a historical survey of the development of the novel genre in the Victorian Age and a thorough discussion of Hegel's Dialectic are necessary.

Although the novel emerged as a distinct genre in the eighteenth century in Britain, as various critics such as Ian Watt, Arnold Kettle, and Georg Lukacs have noted, it is the nineteenth century which produced its most distinct examples. While the eighteenth century is considered to be "the golden age of the novel" (Fox 62), the nineteenth, as David Daiches indicates, is "the great age of the English novel" (1049). It was the nineteenth century in which the novel became a dominant literary genre and in which it has become the novel in today's sense.

The rise of the novel in the eighteenth century is assumed to have a connection with the ascension of the middle class, increasing number of literate people, accessibility of the novels due to technological innovations in printing, and the audience that it appeals to (Watt 53). With the establishment of circulating libraries, the readers of the eighteenth century are provided with an opportunity to obtain books easily and much more cheaply.

The popularity of the novel in the nineteenth century, on the other hand, can be attributed to the appeals of the readers to the life of ordinary people similar to themselves and to their experience. Although the "novel genre has always been associated with the concept of realism" in both the eighteenth century and the

nineteenth century, the novel in the nineteenth century “became more deeply engaged with realism both technically and thematically” (Genca 1). In other words, while the novel in the eighteenth century is focused on an individual, the nineteenth century novel is focused on an individual within a social context. Hence, it could be stated that Victorian authors portray people and the social and cultural changes that Britain undergoes with the advent of the Industrial Revolution and industrialisation following it. They are very much invested in the social and political concerns of Victorian society; that is why the Victorian novel is considered to be a social realist one. The recurrent themes of the novels written in this age are the ills of the working people and their children, and the social, political, and cultural issues of the working class, which emerge as a consequence of the Industrial Revolution.

The Industrial Revolution, which not only affects the economic life but also has serious ramifications for the literary world, dates back to the early years of the long reign of George III, the grandfather of Queen Victoria. The Industrial Revolution, however, is “the outcome of a movement begun centuries earlier when the discoveries of new lands in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries opened the possibility of increased trade and commerce” (Gregg 46). Although the Revolution has its origins in the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries, it is the eighteenth century in which it accelerates, and “between about 1760 and 1830, change was so rapid as to deserve the term ‘revolutionary’” (Gregg 46). The Revolution starts, in the initial stages, in the field of cotton, and causes unprecedented economic expansion. Due to several inventions like “the flying shuttle, spinning jenny, water frame, spinning mule, and weaving loom,” the cotton industry progresses significantly and manufacturing improves enormously (Balkaya 6). It brings about “the rapid expansion of the cotton industry, important improvements in transport by road and canal, the birth of the chemical industry, and the first successful industrial employment of steam power” (Seaman 28). Canals are built, which enables coal to be distributed until railways are constructed. With the introduction of the railways, all products can be transported easily to everywhere. Not only do roads and canals have an important role in the earlier stages of capitalism, railways are of prime significance as well (Gregg 98). Through the railways, markets are opened, raw materials are carried from one place to another with ease, the cost of transport is reduced, and, a demand for iron, steel and, labour are created (Gregg 98-9). The new

transportation system changes the economy of the whole country. It strengthens the resources of the middle class “by supplying fields of investment, at home and later abroad, by mobilising capital, including small savings, and by rewarding the contractor and speculator with fortunes” (Gregg 99). The prosperity of agriculture and industry increases the standard of living of the middle class.

However, the Industrial Revolution has many adverse effects as well. For instance, the increasing number of the factories necessitates labour force. Therefore, women and even small children become part of the labour force. Towns and cities are filled with people who migrate from villages to find better jobs. Even new cities emerged; Birmingham, Manchester, and Leeds, for instance, once “small market towns before the nineteenth century” developed into “large industrial centres in the early decades of the century” (Nelson 189) due to the rush of agricultural labourers’ search of work in the textile mills. This sudden influx leads to the emergence of many problems such as overcrowding and unplanned urbanisation, unemployment, poverty, poor nutrition, and pollution. These economic and urban problems have already existed but the Victorian Age experiences them in a larger scale. Walter Allen notes this as follows:

In a sense, the Industrial Revolution changed nothing; but it did bring to public attention, in the most startling way, evils that had always existed. There had always been overcrowding, there had always been drunkenness, there had always been sweat-shops in cellars, and exploitation of children in industry. But now they existed on so colossal a scale that awareness of them had become unavoidable, and the viciousness and misery they bred were such as no man of goodwill could contemplate without horror. [...] In the eighteenth century the abuse of power had been comparatively simple; it was man’s tyranny over man. In the nineteenth century that tyranny had been displaced by the much more complex tyranny of economic forces. (144)

According to Allen, the Revolution alters the economic life. The exploitation of the man by the man in the eighteenth century is replaced by the exploitation of the man by economic forces in the nineteenth century (Allen 145). For this reason, it could be maintained that the Industrial Revolution expands to many fields in Britain with unprecedented outcomes, leading to dramatic changes in the Victorian society.

The shift from an agrarian economy to an industrialised urban one is so rapid that its effects are ostensibly visible in different classes of society. As a matter of

fact, this rapid shift results in the polarisation in society as the middle class, or in Marx's terms the "bourgeoisie" and the working class, or the "proletariat." The middle class consists of "successful industrialists and extremely wealthy bankers, [...], Church of England clergymen, military and naval officers, men in the higher-status branches of law and medicine, [...] at the upper levels of governmental service, university professors, and the headmasters of prestigious schools, [...], large-scale merchants, manufacturers, and bankers" (S. Mitchell 21). The working class, on the other hand, is made up of "agricultural labourers, domestic servants, and factory hands" (S. Mitchell 21). While the middle class becomes more securely established both socially and financially with the Industrial Revolution, at the same time, the gap between the middle class and the working class expands. The expansion of the gap leads to a conflict between them. What gives rise to this conflict is the unequal working conditions as there are "few laws to regulate hours, wages, safety, job security, or working conditions" (S. Mitchell 41). The conflict between the working class and the rest of the society is pronounced in the literary world as well. Benjamin Disraeli, a British novelist and a politician of the nineteenth century, for instance, portrays this in his novel *Sybil* as follows:

'[...] say what you like, our Queen reigns over the greatest nation that ever existed.' 'Which nation?' asked the younger stranger, 'for she reigns over two.' 'You speak of –' said Egremont, hesitatingly. 'THE RICH AND THE POOR.' (59-60)

Disraeli is not the only Victorian novelist who "address[es] the looming problem of the industrialised working classes" (Ingham 27). There were others such as Elizabeth Gaskell, Charlotte Brontë, Charles Kingsley, and George Eliot, just to name a few, who deal with the troubles of the working class. The problems of the working class indeed become a significant thematic marker in the Victorian Age. The novelists in the Victorian Age use the novel as a medium of informing the readers of the unsuitable living and working conditions of the working class by "deluging their readers with descriptions of deplorable conditions" (Childers 79). Joseph W. Childers maintains that the novels "acted as a sort of *cordon sanitaire* [sanitary corridor] insulating the middle classes, while defining and broadening the gap between the classes, or [...] the two nations" (79). Therefore, these novels serve as a bridge between the classes since the novelists are of the opinion that the sufferings of

the working class are ignored in society and that this should be taken into the account by the men of letters.

Like Childers, Arnold Kettle states that the rise of the industrial capitalists as a result of the Industrial Revolution makes the world of the nineteenth century “less amicable;” therefore, the novels of the nineteenth century are “novels of revolt” and the novelists are “rebels” (83-4). He believes that while the novelists portray the reality of the age as it is, they need to become rebels. He claims that it is “a rebellion of the spirit, of the total consciousness” (Kettle 84). The rebel novelists, according to Kettle, depict the struggles of the people in their age and the conflicts of their age. Their reaction to the influences and consequences of industrialisation for the society can be discerned in almost every work, especially in the novel, which is used as an instrument to convey social criticism. This social criticism; however, varies in focus and intent in different periods of the Victorian Age.

As far as the novel genre is concerned, the Victorian Age is divided primarily into three periods, though this division varies. Sally Mitchell, for example, divides it as the Early Victorians (1837-1851), the Mid-Victorians (1851-1875), and the Late Victorians (1875-1901), whose division is based on the significant events that the country experiences. The Early Victorian Period, for instance, commences with the ascension of Queen Victoria to the throne. The organisation of the Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations in 1851 marks the start of the Mid-Victorian Period. The Late Victorian Period coincides with the transition period of Britain economically, culturally, and politically (S. Mitchell 459). Walter Allen and James G. Nelson, on the other hand, divide the Victorian Age into two according to the reaction of the novelists to the social, cultural, and political changes of the nation. There appears a significant divergence between the writers of the first half of the Victorian Age and the second half in terms of how they reflect the changing Britain in their novels. The changing social conditions result in reflecting the social realities in the novel in a different way. Since the Victorian Age is a long period, the way the writers handle the subject matters shows variety in time. Therefore, some of them belonging to the former period do not question the transition period that the country goes through and they accept the prevalent social institutions as they are. They are conscious of the evils of the transition period that Britain experiences. Yet, they are aware of the blooming prosperity in the country as well. Nevertheless, the others, as

Walter Allen stresses, are “critical, even hostile, to its dominant assumptions” (139). They attack the supposed morality of the society, the taboos of the Victorian period, and the institutions of marriage, education, and politics. They reflect their views in their works, which contain social and political messages.

The novels of the Victorian Age mostly deal with the problems that the working class is faced with: the growing number of cities and factories leading to agricultural depression, the rapid urbanisation and the polarisation of the society, the consequent effects of the Industrial Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, creating “unprecedented and unfamiliar social and economic problems to be solved by the kingdom’s governing bodies” (Nelson 189). All these problems manifest themselves most ostensibly in class conflict. Hence, class conflict becomes one of the main themes of the Victorian novelists. William Thackeray, for instance, satirizes in *Vanity Fair* the members of each class with irony and wit. Elizabeth Gaskell, on the other hand, in *North and South*, depicts the agonies of the working class. In this respect, Charles Dickens is the one who writes the most popular works.

Charles John Huffham Dickens (1812-1870), who produces his works in both halves of the Victorian Age, occupies a highly important position in English literature with his popular themes. He criticises the corruption in society and politics and depicts the plight of the working class in his fiction. The economic, social, and political turmoil in the country and their effects on people become one of the focal points in his writing as well.

Belonging to both the middle class and the working class background, Dickens has witnessed and experienced many economic ups and downs. The experiences in his life constitute the core of his works: his having to work at the Warren Black Factory upon his father’s imprisonment, meeting young labourers, visiting his father in the prisons, working for the newspapers, his being neglected by his family, and his mother’s indifference to him serve as thematic foundations for most of his novels. He starts his literary career with his short story titled “A Dinner at Poplar Walk.” After this story, he publishes many novels and becomes a critically acclaimed novelist. With his first novel *The Pickwick Papers*, Dickens attains huge success both at home and in America. His other novels include *Oliver Twist* (1837-8), *The Life and Adventures of Nicholas Nickleby* (1838-9), *Master Humphrey’s*

Clock (the periodical), *The Old Curiosity Shop* (published in *Master Humphrey's Clock*, 1841), *The Life and Adventures of Martin Chuzzlewit* (1843-4), Christmas stories (*The Christmas Carol*, *The Chimes*, *The Cricket on the Hearth*, and *The Haunted Man*, 1843-8), *Dombey and Son* (1846-48), *The Battle of Life* (1846), *The History of David Copperfield* (1849-50), *Bleak House* (1852-3), *Household Words* (1850-1), *Hard Times* (1854), *Little Dorrit* (1855-7), *A Tale of Two Cities* (1859), *Great Expectations* (1860-1), *Our Mutual Friend* (1864-5), and *The Mystery of Edwin Drood* (1870- incomplete).

Since he has moved in different circles, experiencing the high as well as the low, Dickens is able to portray various characters belonging to various stations with great accuracy and detail. Moreover, he becomes the voice of the voiceless people like women, children and workers, and he also becomes “the champion of the oppressed, [...] the censor of the selfish rich” (Mackenzie 29). With his characters from all walks of life like “eccentrics, villains, unfortunates, hypocrites, social climbers, *nouveaux riches*, criminals, innocents, bureaucrats, exhibitionists, self-deceivers, roisterers, and confidence men” (Daiches 1051) and mostly from the lower and middle classes, Dickens, especially at the beginning of his literary career, “satirises social privilege, misused wealth, maladministration and the law” (Hawes 7). Yet, his sarcasm is not only for ridicule but also for pointing at the problems in his society. He later criticises the ills of his own time like “the plight of the poor in the workhouses and slums, the lack of urban sanitation, the absurdities and delays of legal proceedings, the incompetence and obstructiveness of the Circumlocution Office and the force-feeding of facts in schools” (Hawes 6). In his novels, Dickens shows real concern for the struggle of people from different classes, but he was especially interested in the working class.

It could be asserted that important events that leave their marks on the age have an effect on Dickens' life as well. Most ostensibly, he experiences the adverse effects of the Industrial Revolution. Starting working life at a very early age, for instance, is one of the negative effects of the Industrial Revolution, whose influence can be seen in many novels. *The Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit* are two of his novels in which his experiences and as well as the time matters are depicted most prominently. For this reason, it could be stated that *The Pickwick Papers* (1836-37) and *Little Dorrit* (1855-7) are two of his novels in which the significant events of the

age are discussed. As a matter of fact, these novels differ from one another in not only the period in which they are written but also the way of their discussing the issues of their respective time-space. While *The Pickwick Papers* is written in the Early Victorian Age and it argues the social and political issues of his time, *Little Dorrit* is written in the Mid-Victorian Age and it deals with the same issue in different conditions and with different perspective.

The Pickwick Papers, the complete title of which is “*The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club containing a Faithful Record of the Perambulations, Perils, Travels, Adventures and Sporting Transactions of the corresponding Members,*” is written and published between the years 1836 and 1837. This is a time in which Britain witnesses not only “industrial transformation” but also “the first great industrial depression,” which results in “the increasing economic and social distance between the rich and the poor” (Nelson 189). With this novel, Dickens becomes an immediate success both on a national and an international level. Through *The Pickwick Papers*, Dickens portrays the

picture of London at its best and worst, in its humours and enjoyments as well as its sufferings and sins, pervaded everywhere not only with the absolute reality of the things depicted, but also with that subtle sense and mastery of feeling which gives to the reader’s sympathies invariably right direction, and awakens consideration, tenderness, and kindness precisely for those who most need such help. (qtd. in Forster 115)

In the novel, London has an important place since it is the focal centre of industrialisation in which the working class have felt the class conflict most. Therefore, with his depictions Dickens draws attention to the ill effects of industrialisation. Although he gives references to the negative sides of industrialisation, his novels have entertaining features as well. He takes the reader to various parts of Britain, and in this way, he “gives us a sense of the early nineteenth-century social scene, a feeling of English town and country just before the Industrial Revolution changed its face so startlingly, in the last phase of the great coaching days before the railways put an end forever to that phase of English life” (Daiches 1052). With the depictions of the country, he shows the reader the places that have not been touched by industrialisation. That is why travelling by coaches and staying in wayside inns are overwhelmingly dominant all over the novel. In addition to the features of the period, Dickens focuses on the changing social and political

conditions such as “electioneering methods, [...] political journalism, [...] the law, [...], social convention” (Daiches 1052) by bringing together different characters. Since *The Pickwick Papers* is written “in a period of mistrust, of renewed scepticism about institutional change, when political and legal discourses had had time to reappear as inadequate, as not working properly” (Mengham 20), it discusses all this social turmoil. With the elements of wit and humour, the effects of his own childhood experiences and of the social problems the Industrial Revolution brings to the Victorian society, and the characters of the novel, Dickens both amuses and engages his readers in *The Pickwick Papers* with important social messages.

The Pickwick Papers commences with the meeting of the four Pickwickians in the Pickwick Club. It focuses on the adventures of the Pickwickians who travel all around the country and make notes whatever draws their interest. The novel reaches a climax with the involvement of Sam Weller in the novel. On the one hand, there is Mr. Pickwick, “the gullible old fool,” Tupman, “the plump, middle-aged dandy,” Winkle, “the inept and timid pretender to sporting valor,” and Snodgrass, “feebly poetical” (Johnson 158). On the other hand, there is the reasonable Sam Weller, who, “infallibly recognises and comments his master’s inability to deal with the wiles and deceits of the world” (Müller 81). Although he is hired as a servant by Mr. Pickwick, his role as servant is not a static one for he sometimes assumes the position of a master. From the relation between these two men, it can be understood that a strict class hierarchy does not exist in the novel. The relationship between the master Pickwick and the servant Weller can be explained as an inverted relationship: Weller, in the position of the “servant,” indirectly protects his gullible master from the deceptions of people and the wicked world around him. Mr. Pickwick, in the position of the “master,” is submissive to Sam’s attitude towards him. It seems that both of them are pleased with their status, and they do not have any attempts to change it. Their mutual recognition accounts for their content. It can be stated that in *Pickwick Papers*, while picturing the first stage of the social and political transformation of the country and its ill effects, Charles Dickens touches upon the relationship between the master Pickwick and the servant Weller using humour and wit.

Little Dorrit, on the other hand, is written in 1855 to criticise the British bureaucracy and how the relationship between people is affected by it. Deeply influenced by the maladministration of the government especially during the

Crimean War and the bureaucracy after seeing the negative effects of urbanisation in the Victorian people's lives, Dickens expresses his feelings towards the government as follows: "My faith in the people governing is, on the whole, infinitesimal; my faith in the People governed is, on the whole, illimitable" (qtd. in Forster 298). *Little Dorrit*, like other novels Dickens writes in the 1850s, has a political message: "The novels Charles Dickens wrote in the 1850s, with their capacious social canvases and their voice of social reform, seem to invite readings of their political message" (Schor 64). He focuses on political themes in the 1850s. Therefore, *Little Dorrit* "develops his preoccupation with society and misgovernment, or 'How Not to Do It,' interwoven with his own autobiography and overshadowed by a concern with religion and self-examination" (Fielding 278).

Initially, he plans to give *Nobody's Fault* as the title to the novel since, according to Michael Slater, the title *Nobody's Fault* "was no doubt meant as an ironic comment on how Britain's ruling class managed to deny or evade responsibility for national disgraces and disasters" (391). During the Crimean War, which results in the deaths of hundreds of British soldiers from cold and hunger in the winter of 1854-1855, Dickens portrays the ineptitude and incompetence of the government by creating the Circumlocution Office in *Little Dorrit*; and in the preface to the novel, he contends that "If I might offer any apology for so exaggerated a fiction as the Barnacles and the Circumlocution Office, I would seek it in the common experience of an Englishman, without presuming to mention the unimportant fact of my having done that violence to good manners, in the days of the Russian War, and of a Court of Enquiry at Chelsea" (1). He accepts that he is the inventor "of a certain fiction called the Circumlocution Office, said to be very extravagant, but which I *do* see rather frequently quoted as if there were grains of truth at the bottom of it" (qtd. in Forster 298). As Hugh Cunningham asserts, Dickens sees that "the efforts of Britain's valiant soldiers were being seriously hampered by the incompetence and bumbling of the senior command and the inefficiency of the support services" (171); however, the government does not accept their responsibility for the consequences of the war, Dickens reflects his anger towards the indifference of the government by headlining *Little Dorrit* initially as *Nobody's Fault* because it would be about "a leading man for a story who should bring about all the mischief in it, lay it all on Providence, and say at every fresh calamity, 'Well it's a mercy,

however, nobody was to blame you know!” (qtd. in Forster 221). He loses his trust towards the state of the government. However, he changes the title of the novel into *Little Dorrit*. According to John Lucas, Dickens changed the title because he “did not want his novel to be regarded primarily as a social satire” and the new name of the novel “implies that [Dickens] is more concerned to direct our attention towards the qualities of his heroine” (247). Much as Dickens deals in the life of Amy Dorrit in *Little Dorrit*, he depicts the turbulent period that Britain undergoes by creating the characters like the Barnacle family and the fictitious governmental places like the Circumlocution Office.

In the 1850s the distinction between the middle class and the working class is more marked due to industrialization. One of the consequences of the Industrial Revolution is that Britain is converted to an industrialised country and with mechanisation and urbanisation, cities grow with the population of the working class. While the middle class gains power, the working class is oppressed by the rising power of the middle class. Most of the writers in Victorian Age, particularly Charles Dickens, pay specific attention to reflecting this gap in their works. In *Little Dorrit*, for instance, Dickens presents a realistic picture of the conflict between classes. Dickens illustrates this conflict among the people in Victorian society through the characters created in the novel. Hence, the relationships between the characters in *Little Dorrit* can be explained, according to Avrom Fleishman, as master and servant (575). On the one hand, there is Amy Dorrit, “a genuine servant,” who, willingly accepts her role in serving her master, William Dorrit, until his death. On the other hand, there is William Dorrit, Amy’s father, “a gentleman, a member of the master-class” (579), who uses his fellow-prisoners as his servants. Not only does he use his friends in the prison, but he also abuses his daughter’s goodwill by accepting her sacrifices. Sometimes he behaves like his family’s servant by “erect[ing] himself as a martyr of self-sacrifice” (579). The master Dorrit is dependent upon his fellow-friends’ in the prison and Amy’s servitude to sustain his mastery whereas the servant Amy is ready to serve her master all the time without any question. In *Little Dorrit*, whilst portraying the whole corruption in every state of institution, Charles Dickens establishes a master and servant relationship among the characters.

The master and servant relationship between the characters both in *The Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit* can be analysed with Hegel's Master and Servant

(or Slave) Dialectic. In his non-fiction texts, his correspondence, or in his biography there is no indication that Charles Dickens has any awareness of the Dialectic of Hegel. Nevertheless, as this thesis discusses, *Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit* provide outstanding examples for a theoretical and practical discussion of Hegel's famous Master and Servant Dialectic. However, it should be noted that the way Master and Servant Dialectic is manifest in these novels differs from one another in many respects. Due to the different period of time in which these novels are written, the application of Hegel's Dialectic to them is examined in different ways. While the time *The Pickwick Papers* was written coincides with the Early Victorian Age and *Little Dorrit* was created in the Mid-Victorian Age, they both bear the traces of the negative effects of the Industrial Revolution. However, the way Dickens lays this bare in the novels is different. While the relationship between the characters in both of the novels can be explained in accordance with the Dialectic of the Master and the Servant, the way the characters indicate their mastery and servitude is different in each novel. Before dwelling on the application of the Dialectic to these novels, it would be necessary to present the historical background of the Master and Servant Dialectic.

Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic is based upon the doctrines of Thomas Hobbes. Like Marx and Hegel, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) lives in a period of turmoil due to the Civil Wars in the seventeenth century during the reign of Charles I, and presents the doctrine of equality in his masterpiece, *Leviathan* (1651), "the greatest, perhaps the sole, masterpiece of political philosophy written in the English language" (Oakeshott 3). Just as the Industrial Revolution results in the civil war and the beheading of Charles I in Hobbes' time, all this turbulence affects the works of the writers. Hobbes is one of the writers who reflects the turbulent time of Britain; he discusses "Liberty," "Authority," and "Civill Power" in *Leviathan* as these are key concepts for Hobbes for the resolution of conflict. He advocates that the only way for the safety of men, and for the state of security and peace, is to accept the power of one man, "who has the final say on all ethical, religious and political matters" (Finn 85). In this context, Michael Oakeshott remarks that as man is "the dupe of error, the slave of sin, of passion, of fear, of care, the enemy of himself or of others or of both;" therefore, "the civil order appears as the whole or a part of the scheme of his salvation" (6). It could be deduced that the salvation of man is dependent upon the

establishment of civil order. Therefore, according to Hobbes, to preserve security and to ensure the civil order, man has to make sacrifices like laying down their rights and transferring their rights to a person entitled to govern them, which is actualised by making a covenant by individuals with each other by saying: *“I Authorise and give up my Right of Governing my selfe, to this Man, or to this Assembly of men, on this condition, that thou give up thy Right to him, and Authorise all his Actions in like manner”* (120) (italics in the original). Therefore, the one who “consisteth the Essence of the Common-wealth” is called “*SOVERAIGNE*, and said to have Sovereigne Power; and every one besides, his *SUBJECT*” (121). In Hobbes’ Dialectic, the security of the civil state depends not only on the fulfilment of the sovereign’s duties but also on the obedience of the subjects to the power of the sovereign.

While the missions of the “soveraigne” are ensuring peace and security and preventing “Discord at home, and Hostility from abroad” (124), the “subject” is liable to be loyal to the “soveraigne.” As a consequence, the power of the “soveraigne” “cannot be forfeited” (122). The “subject” has to comply with the decision of the majority as well; otherwise, he could “be left in the condition of warre,” and then he “might without injustice be destroyed by any man” (124). The “subject” does not have any rights to complain about the actions of the “soveraigne” since “every particular man is Author of all the Sovereigne doth;” therefore, if he complains about the “soveraigne,” in this case, he complains about himself and “ought not to accuse any man but himselfe; no nor himselfe of injury; because to do injury to ones selfe, is impossible” (124). What is more, the “subject” does not have the right to punish the “soveraigne” as “no man that hath Sovereigne power can justly be put to death, or otherwise in any manner by his Subjects punished” (124). Thomas Hobbes states that the order of the commonwealth depends on the obedience of the subjects as well, who are obliged to comply with the decisions that the sovereign makes because it is the power of the sovereign “to be Judge, or constitute all Judges of Opinions and Doctrines, as a thing necessary to Peace, thereby to prevent Discord and Civill Warre” (125). To him, the unity of the sovereignty entails not only the absolute power of the “soveraigne,” but also the eternal obedience of the “subject.” Thus, Master and Servant Dialectic, according to Thomas Hobbes’ point of view, is based on the covenant, which signifies that unless the sovereign

“command[s] a man (though justly condemned,) to kill, wound, or mayme himselfe; or not to resist those that assault him; or to abstain from the use of food, ayre, medicine, or any other thing, without which he cannot live” (151); and as long as the sovereign ensures the safety of his people, the subject retains his obedience to the sovereign. Thomas Hobbes is not the only philosopher who claims that keeping security and order is dependent upon the mutual recognition of the sovereign and his subject. With his philosophy, he has an effect upon the philosophers that succeed him.

Like Hobbes, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) is one of the representative voices of his time. His writing is affected by the economic stagnation in Prussia and the social turbulence in the world. In Hegel's words, the world is at the dawn of a new era: “ours is a birth-time and a period of transition to a new era” (Hegel 2). The transition he mentions is the result of the French Revolution, which has widespread effects, as well as of the Haitian Revolution (1791-1804). As Susan Buck-Morss claims in her book entitled *Hegel, Haiti, and Universal History*, it is the Haitian Revolution that influences Hegel considerably and brings about the formation of the subsection of Chapter 4, “Lordship and Bondage” in *The Phenomenology of Spirit*. She maintains that “we cannot think Hegel *without* Haiti” (16) (*italics in original*) because “the revolutionary struggle of slaves, who overthrow their own servitude and establish a constitutional state, provides the theoretical hinge” (11) of Hegel’s overall discussion of the Master and Servant Dialectic. What happened in Haiti is the demolition of Napoleon’s establishment of slavery in the French colonies in Haiti in two years’ time by a slave-born man called Jean-Jacques Dessalines. His attempt ends up with the declaration of Haiti’s independence. Not only the Haitian Revolution but also the Battle of Jena breaks out while Hegel writes *The Phenomenology of Spirit*.

The outbreak of the Battle of Jena takes place during the reign of Napoleon, who attacks Prussia and Austria when they forge an alliance with Britain. The war concludes with the defeat of Prussia. In this way, Napoleon breaks the alliance of these countries. Thus, the writing of the book overlaps with the turbulent period for which “Hegel was convinced that he was living in a time when one world was crumbling to give birth to a new, incompletely formed world, warning signs of which could be detected” (Bodei 33). This “incompletely formed world” is both his own

personal world, which is confused and disordered owing to the Battle of Jena, and the world outside him, which is in chaos due to the same reason. Despite the adverse effects of the Battle of Jena on Hegel's personal world, Napoleon, the commander of the Battle, affects Hegel as a leader substantially. When he sees Napoleon at the Battle of Jena, he is impressed so much that he expresses this admiration in one of the letters to Friedrich: "I saw the Emperor – this world-soul – riding out of the city on reconnaissance. It is indeed a wonderful sensation to see such an individual, who, concentrated here at a single point, astride a horse, reaches out over the world and masters it [...] this extraordinary man, whom it is impossible not to admire" (qtd. in Pinkard 228). Alexandre Kojève, a twentieth-century philosopher, who lectures on Hegel's *Phenomenology* in Paris from 1933 to 1939, attributes this admiration to Hegel's seeing Napoleon as a man of action who changes the course of the history of the world, which, in essence, consists of Master and Servant Dialectic. In his own words, "to understand Napoleon is to understand him in relation to the whole of anterior historical evolution, to understand the whole of universal history" (34). Kojève posits that among the philosophers living in Hegel's time, Hegel is the only one "to accept, and to justify, Napoleon's existence" (34). He insists that Hegel "must know that the Napoleonic Wars realise the dialectical synthesis of the Master and the Slave" (44).

In a similar vein, in her work entitled *Hegel Bilinç Problemi, Köle-Efendi Diyalektiği, Praksis Felsefesi* [*Hegel's Problem of Consciousness, The Master and Servant Dialectic, The Philosophy of Praxis*] Tülin Bumin maintains that *The Phenomenology of Spirit* is "an epic which explains the adventure of human spirit in achieving this end" (8) (translation mine). According to her, Hegel and Napoleon are correlated in that "in this end, the action man creating history (Napoleon) and the philosopher (Hegel) understanding him make a compromise and the synthesis of knowledge and action, of theory and practice actualises" (8-9) (translation mine). As such, the Battle of Jena and the Haitian Revolution, along with the intellectual debates initiated by the French Revolution, are significant milestones in the formation of what is to become the most famous concept in Hegel's discussion.

The Master and Servant Dialectic stems from the struggle between two self-conscious beings, each of whom desires recognition from the other; however, neither of them identifies the other as an individual being. Desire, according to Allen Wood,

is the first stage of the ego on the way to achieve its constant goal, which is absolute independence, which signifies that “the ego does not depend on anything outside itself, and [...] it has power over its entire world” (181). In this context, the fulfilment of desire is highly important because “self-consciousness attains its satisfaction only in another self-consciousness” (Hegel 173). Therefore, the fulfilment of desires is achieved through struggles to get recognition from other beings since mutual recognition is “the necessary condition of absolute independence” (Wood 185). To achieve its absolute independence, the self-conscious being not only controls but subjugates the other beings as well. On the way to absolute independence, the struggle, therefore, is converted into a life-and-death fight, in which two beings fight to compel recognition from each other. As Robert Stern states, “in order to achieve recognition, I must show you that I am a subject and not a mere living; but although each of us knows that we are subjects, we need to convince the other that we are, for otherwise we may be seen as merely living creatures lacking in subjecthood, and so fail to be granted the recognition we require” (77). Therefore, to reach this goal, each of the beings is ready to risk his life and “to sacrifice its existence as an object” (Stern 78). Risking his life, the subject is also ready to fight the other subject in the expectation of contriving recognition, but he does not grant any recognition in return. In this struggle, the one who considers his life more important than its honour prefers to be subjugated by the more powerful one rather than to die. It is a fight because, as Alexandre Kojève states, “each will want to subjugate the other” (41). It is a life-and-death fight because each being is determined to be confirmed by the other. Both of them are ready to die rather than to be yielded. Hence, for the existence of humanity, the life-and-death fight, in which one of the beings accepts the position of being subordinated by the more powerful being, is possible because “the human reality is nothing but the fact of the recognition of one man by another man” (Kojève 41). In this regard, Stern concurs with Kojève’s contention about the result of the life-and-death struggle, and says that only “when one of us concedes defeat, and succumbs to the will of the other” (76) can this conflict be resolved; otherwise, as a result of this fight, “either the subject succeeds in killing the other, in which case there is no other subject to do the recognizing, or the first subject is killed, in which case their selfhood is lost” (Stern 83). As such, the Master and Servant Dialectic necessitates the interaction of the two entities, each of whom desires recognition from the other.

Hence, their journey to self-consciousness, whose aim is to be self-satisfied initiates the Master and Servant Dialectic.

The struggle for recognition between two self-conscious beings paves the way for the Master and Servant Dialectic. In this struggle for recognition, the one who yields to the other and feels compelled to recognise the other's superiority is called "the bondsman" or "the servant (or the slave)," whereas the one who assimilates the weaker one is called "the lord" or "the master." In Hegel's words, the one who is "the independent consciousness whose essential nature is to be for itself" is called *Herr* (master) (Hegel 115). The one who is "the dependent consciousness whose essential nature is simply to live or to be for another" is called *Knecht* (servant) (115). There has been a lot of controversy about the title of the Master and Servant Dialectic among some writers. Donald Philip Verene, for instance, in his book *Hegel's Absolute* argues the title of this dialectic whether it is "Master and Servant" or "Master and Slave." He explains that the original title is "*Herrschaft und Knechtschaft*." "*Knecht*" does not mean "slave" (*der Sklave*); according to him, "had Hegel intended this to be a dialectic of slavery he would have used the word, *der Sklave*" (57). He contends that "slavery" and "servitude" involve completely different logics: "[i]ndependence from slavery is [...] gained through rebellion;" however, "independence from servitude is gained through work" (57). While the "slave" has "the status of property," the "servant" has "the status of a self" (Verene 57). Jon Mills in his book *Unconscious Abyss* discusses the title of the dialectic as well. He explains that while what is meant by "*Der Herr*" is at present "Lord, also God," in Hegel's time; however, it is "reserved for wealthy landowners, sometimes of nobility, not for the average man," "*Knecht*" means a person "who works the land without owning it, but who is a free man-not a slave, although poor" (Mills 136). He also maintains that the correct translation of "*serf*" is, in German, "*ein Leibeigener*," who "would physically be a property of his Herr, and work his land," and, who "could be sold, but generally only together with the land" (Mills 136). In this thesis, for the sake of consistency and of conceptual conveniency, Master and Servant is used throughout.

The relation between the master and the servant in terms of recognition is a matter of debate as well. As Frederick Beiser claims, the relation is a reciprocal recognition, in which "the self knows itself through the other as the other knows

itself through the self” (177). Reciprocal recognition is realised through the mutual movements of two entities. However, according to Richard Gunn, the relation between the master and the servant is not reciprocal, rather, it is “one-sided and unequal” (2). Gunn puts forward in his article titled “Notes on Master and Slave in Hegel’s Phenomenology of Spirit” that the struggle between two self-conscious beings arises from not “a fight for recognition” but “a fight for the other’s death” (1) since Hegel says “each seeks the death of the other” (113). Death, without a doubt, has a metaphorical place in Hegel’s Dialectic. It does not mean ending a life literally, but it “would mean the absolute end of all possibilities” (Williams 61). As Robert Williams contends, for both the master and the servant, life, on the way to recognition, is very important. In William’s own words, “if the other is simply eliminated, his death is an abstract total negation that produces the opposite of what is desired. For what each seeks is not the death of the other so much as his recognition” (61). What is aimed is to secure recognition. However, if one of the beings is killed, there is no possibility of providing recognition. Therefore, in this struggle, what both the master and the servant desire is the desire to survive. Gunn explains this situation with a metaphor: “one self-consciousness slips and tumbles and cowers on the ground as the other raises his or her arm to deliver the death-blow” (1). To him, when one of the self-conscious beings sees that the death-blow will result in his own death, he, therefore, has to yield to the master and accept his inferiority to survive. With his submission, “a recognition that is one-sided and unequal” (Hegel 116) emerges. In this relation, the Master desires recognition from the Servant so as to be esteemed; therefore, the servant, since he desires to survive, recognises the master. Gunn maintains that “one-sided and unequal recognition is contradictory or alienated,” because the reciprocal recognition is “a situation where self-consciousnesses recognise themselves as mutually recognising one another” (2). For this reason, the recognition is just one-sided, not mutual. Taken into account both claims, in this thesis, this recognition is taken to be possible both as a mutual and an asymmetrical one. This dual possibility is rendered visible in *The Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit*.

On the other hand, according to Remo Bodei, the relation between the master and the servant is “a mutual back-scratching” (35). Bodei in his article “The Roots of Hegel’s Master-Slave Relationship” delves into the roots of Hegel’s master-slave

Dialectic. He asserts, from the slogan “Freedom or death!” echoed during the French Revolution, that freedom is a test of sorts, which determines “who is capable of dominating” and “who is only capable of obeying” (36). Those who do not dare to oppose the power of the other and who desire to survive than acquire freedom deserve to be subordinated; therefore, they are recognised as servants. Conversely, those who “despise death” and those who suffer for freedom deserve to be esteemed; therefore, they are recognised as masters (36). Thus, the relation between the master and the servant is, as Bodei puts it, “mutual;” in other words, the master is “free and self-sufficient” while the servant is “dependent on the master” (39). To Bodei, both of them need each other to satisfy their own basic necessities of life. Each of them needs to be recognised by the other.

Similarly, Quentin Lauer examines this situation in terms of the issue of recognition in his *A Reading of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*. He commences his argument by explaining the terms of “dependence” and “independence” while making clarifications of Master-Servant Dialectic. To Lauer, these two terms are differentiated from each other with regard to “their attitude toward life” (129). The one whose “attitude toward life” is “independence” chooses “freedom” when offered an option of either “life” or “freedom,” whereas the one whose “attitude toward life” is “dependence” chooses “life” when offered the same option (129). In Hegel's words, “independence” is termed as *Herr* (the master) while “dependence” is *Knecht* (the servant) (Hegel 115). On the surface, the relationship between “dependence” and “independence” seems to be appropriate for the master's interests. In this relationship, that is to say, the servant provides what the master desires, thereby, the master does not have to work to fulfil his own desires. The master, in this way, attains satisfaction of his desire with the service of the servant. As Hans-Georg Gadamer holds, whatever the servant does, he keeps the master in his mind, not himself (68). However, in reality, as Quentin Lauer points out, the master, in this way, is placed into the position of “consumer,” while the servant into the position of “producer.” As a consequence of this, “what the master does to the slave in subjugating him the slave does to himself” (Lauer 131). Therefore, the independent master becomes “dependent on dependence” and “the slave of his own situation” (Lauer 131). In other words, the master becomes dependent on the service of the servant. In this respect labour plays a crucial role in determining dependency. While

the servant labours, he improves himself. The master, on the other hand, becomes idle and gets dependent on the servant and his labour. He cannot attain a full self-consciousness. In reality, the master is enslaved; however, for the servant, “fear of the lord is [...] the beginning of wisdom” (Hegel 117-8); therefore, the servant, by labouring for the master, “becomes conscious of what he truly is” (Hegel 117-8) and makes an advancement in self-consciousness. The servant begins to realise his own worth and he achieves mastery over the master who becomes a passive consumer. Hence, the servant proves himself and the master that he himself can achieve his desires, and he becomes the master of the master he is enslaved to. Nonetheless, the master ignores it. As Kojève maintains, the process of the servant’s transformation, while he makes a progress on the way to the self-consciousness, is long and painful, and his desire for recognition is not fulfilled since he does not risk his life (53). Therefore, the recognition the master has gained for himself is zero recognition as the master does not recognise the servant and as the servant’s recognition is coerced. In this respect, for Charles Taylor, compared to the fight to death, this kind of recognition is better. He asserts that although the servant is forced to recognise the master, the master’s recognition by the servant is worthless (154). For this reason, much as the master’s recognition is one-sided on the surface, it is zero recognition, on a deeper level, since neither the master nor the servant recognises the other being.

Alexandre Kojève examines the relation between the master and the servant from a different perspective in his seminal work *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel*. In Kojève’s reading, society is made up of the struggle between the master and the slave (he uses the “slave”) since man is “never simply man,” that is to say, he is either master or slave (8). He takes the matter further arguing that “without this fight to the death for pure prestige, there would never have been human beings on earth” since through this fight, “the human reality is begotten, formed, realised, and revealed to itself and to others” (7-8). Kojève claims that if both sides fight with the aim of being “recognised,” “the fight would necessarily end in the death of one of the adversaries, or of both” (8). The outcome of this fight would be that “the realisation and the revelation of the human being would be impossible” (8). Kojève maintains that if the fight ends with the death of one of the adversaries, “the survivor, unable to be ‘recognised’ by the dead adversary, cannot realise and reveal his humanity;” therefore, “both adversaries must remain alive after the fight” (8). The end of this

fight, then, depends on the behaviour of each of the adversaries. In other words, one of them “must ‘recognise’ the other without being ‘recognised’” (Kojève 8) by him. This process engenders the “Master” and the “Master’s Slave” (8). Likewise, Frederick Beiser thinks that if the fight were fatal, there would be no one to recognise the other and “a corpse cannot salute” (188); therefore, it cannot be anticipated that the self kills its opponent since, as a result of the death of one of the entities, there would be no master and no servant. It would be not improper to claim that there is a division of society into masters and servants. The servant serves and satisfies the master’s desires while the master enjoys and gains the recognition by the servant.

Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic is central to Karl Marx's discussion of class struggle. The Dialectic gives way to the struggle between the “bourgeois” and the “proletariat” in Karl Marx (1818-1883). The struggle between the lord and the bondsman in Hegel evolves into the struggle between two classes in Marx's historical materialism. The struggle between the bourgeois and the proletariat is the product of history as he puts at the beginning of *The Manifesto of the Communist Party*, “the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles” (55). Class struggle, as Marx holds it, between “freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman” is “uninterrupted, now hidden, now open;” however, it ends in either “a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large” or “the common ruin of the contending classes” (55). Since “class” in Marx is based on economy, he posits that the relation between classes is based on exploitation, in other words, one class is dependent upon the other. Karl Marx's distinction between the classes in society, which stems from economic differences rather than “differences in religion, race, ethnicity, and gender,” leads to a polarisation which results in a split into two camps: “the bourgeoisie,” “those who control the world's natural, economic, and human resources” and “the proletariat,” “the majority of the global population who live in substandard conditions and who have always performed the manual labour – the mining, the factory work, the ditch-digging, the railroad building – that fills the coffers of the rich” (Tyson 50). The polarisation between these two classes leads to the establishment of a new society without classes.

The “bourgeoisie,” which is “master” or “lord” in Hegel's *Dialectic* and “sovereign” or “dominus” in Hobbes, is defined by Karl Marx in *The Communist Manifesto* as well. Once “an oppressed class under the sway of the feudal nobility,” or sometimes it is “an armed and self-governing association in the medieval commune,” or an “independent urban republic (as in Italy and Germany),” or a “taxable ‘third estate’ of the monarchy (as in France),” “the bourgeoisie” has “at last, since the establishment of modern industry and of the world market, conquered for itself, in the modern representative state, exclusive political sway” (57). The emergence of the bourgeoisie is based on the “chartered burghers of the earliest towns” in the Middle Ages (56). According to Marx, the discovery of America and the revolving around the Cape are the causes of “the rising bourgeoisie” (56). As the markets grow and the demands for new markets increase, along with trade with colonies, industrialisation takes the place of the manufacturing, all of which accelerate the emergence of the bourgeoisie.

The “proletariat,” on the other hand, which is the “bondsman” or “servant” (for some “slave”) in Hegel's *Dialectic* and “subject” in Hobbes’, is defined in *The German Ideology* as follows:

the division of labour, [...], one of the chief forces of history up till now, manifests itself also in the ruling class as the division of mental and material labour, so that inside this class one part appears as the thinkers of the class (its active conceptive ideologists, who make the formation of the illusions of the class about itself their chief source of livelihood), while the others’ attitude to these ideas and illusions is more passive and receptive, because they are in reality the active members of this class and have less time to make up illusions and ideas about themselves. (67-8)

In *The Communist Manifesto*, the “proletariat,” according to Marx’s definition, is “a class of labourers, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labour increases capital” (61). Marx asserts that the lower level of the middle class transforms into the proletariat both “partly because their diminutive capital does not suffice for the scale on which modern industry is carried on, and is swamped in the competition with the large capitalists,” and “partly because their specialised skill is rendered worthless by new methods of production” (62). As Marx points out in *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, under all conditions in capitalism, the worker suffers. The working class suffers when the

wealth of society both declines and even increases. When the wealth of society increases, on the surface, it seems that it is advantageous for the working class; however, “the demand for workers exceeds their supply” (22). The increase in wages of the working class necessitates, according to Marx, for the worker to overwork. As they work more to earn more, the workers lose their freedom since they have to “sacrifice their time and carry out slave-labour” (22). The end for the worker even in society whose conditions seem favourable to him is “overwork and premature death, decline to a mere machine, a bond servant of capital, which piles up dangerously over against him, more competition, and for a section of the workers starvation or beggary” (23). The differentiation between the capitalist and the working class is evolved into “the tiller of the soil” and “the factory-worker,” and then ultimately the whole society is divided into classes: “the property-owners and the propertyless workers” (69). The proletariat’s, the propertyless workers,’ “burden of toil also increases” (*Communist Manifesto* 61) as Marx puts it, as a consequence of the extensive use of machinery and the division of labour. Through modern industry, the proletariat becomes the slave of the bourgeois class and it also is “enslaved by the machine, by the overlooker, and, above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself” (61-2). Industrialisation spreading all over the world leads to the advent of a huge gap between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

The struggle between the “bourgeoisie” and the “proletariat” is fuelled with the increasing number of the proletariat awakening of the class consciousness as well. Although Marx is influenced by Hegel, his Dialectic is not the same as Hegel's. He expresses the difference in *Capital* as follows: “My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite” (29). Unlike Hegel’s Dialectic, which is philosophical, Marx’s has a political significance. He firmly believes that the fall of the bourgeoisie and “the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable” (*Communist Manifesto* 66). According to Marx, the class struggle must conclude with the dissolution of the ruling class with a revolution through which the proletariat would rise up and overthrow their masters. As Nina Rowe remarks, Marx's class struggle “embraces at its core the lord (capitalist)-bondsman (proletariat) struggle, anticipating a real-world revolution in which the lord is overthrown” (132). This revolution would end capitalism and initiate communism, through which there will be no classes in society. However, this process is hard and long. When a journalist

asks Marx whether it is normal to shed so much blood in carrying out the principles of socialism, he replies that “no great movement has ever been inaugurated without bloodshed” (qtd. in McLellan 138). What he dreams is to create a classless society even with bloodshed. Unlike Hegel's Dialectic, Karl Marx's Dialectic has a political purpose, which is actualising a classless society through revolution, thus salvaging the proletariat from enslavement to their masters. Marx believes in the power of the proletariat as an indispensable class on the way to build a new society; however, Hegel “saw the rabble only a corrupter of social order” (Wood 433). Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic, emerging from Hobbes' doctrine of equality between the “sovereign” and the “subject,” evolves into Karl Marx's ideology regarding the “bourgeoisie” and the “proletariat.” As Jon Mills in *Unconscious Abyss* claims, “the problem of [...] spirit's struggle for recognition has received overwhelming attention in Hegel's literature, influencing the rise of Marxism” (135). It could be deduced that Hegel is influenced by Thomas Hobbes and Hegel himself influences the philosophers who succeeded him in later generations.

Hegel's groundbreaking discussion also has significant ramifications for literary analysis. Taking all these arguments as its frame of reference, the aim of this thesis is to examine Charles Dickens' *Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit* in light of Hegel's conceptualisation of Master and Servant Dialectic. It traces the historical roots of Master and Servant Dialectic from Thomas Hobbes to Karl Marx and shows how the Dickens who wrote *The Pickwick Papers* is different from the Dickens who wrote *Little Dorrit*. It argues that *The Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit* are significantly different from one another in terms of their employ and representation of Master and Servant Dialectic due to the changing social, historical, and political conditions of the time they were published. In *The Pickwick Papers*, while Dickens presents a society in which every one is content with his or her class, actually the “master” class is the aristocracy and the “servant” class is the merchant class; in *Little Dorrit*, however, Dickens assumes the role of a critic of the Victorian society on behalf of the proletarian cause, since the “master” class is the high class and the “servant” class is the working class. The contentment in *The Pickwick Papers* turns into discontent in *Little Dorrit* because the Britain of 1855 makes it impossible to ignore the sufferings of the working class and the ever-growing chasm between classes.

To this end, this thesis is comprised of an introduction, two chapters, and a conclusion. Following a brief historical background of Master and Slave Dialectic as well as Victorian Britain in the Introduction, Charles Dickens' *The Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit* are analysed in two chapters respectively in the light of Master and Slave Dialectic presented in the Introduction with the background of the author and the Victorian Age in which both of the novels are set. In the conclusion, *The Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit* are compared and contrasted, and they are shown to provide good examples to discuss Hegel's Dialectic in different ways in terms of the changing social, historical, and political conditions of the Victorian Age.



CHAPTER ONE

MUTUAL RECOGNITION in *THE PICKWICK PAPERS*

This chapter discusses the mutual recognition of the “master” and the “servant” in accordance with the Hegelian Master and Servant Dialectic in *The Pickwick Papers*. The novel offers a picture of the master-servant relationship between the characters especially between Mr. Pickwick and Sam Weller. However, in this relationship, the servant Sam is depicted to interfere in his master’s position, which does not annoy Mr. Pickwick. Although Hegel’s Master and Servant Dialectic involves a struggle between two beings, this kind of struggle between the master and the servant, which is the recognition of one another does not exist in the novel. Therefore, the relationship between Mr. Pickwick and Sam can be read in light of mutual recognition, in which both characters recognise each other as a self-consciousness. Neither make any effort to change their status or to have an upward mobility in terms of class. Therefore, both characters can be said to be content with their position. Hence, *The Pickwick Papers* is analysed in terms of mutual recognition between Mr. Pickwick and Sam. Before the analysis of the novel, however, it would be necessary to look into Charles Dickens’ life, and the political, historical, and cultural background of the period in which the novel is produced since the background of the writer and of the period casts light on understanding the master and servant relationship between Mr. Pickwick and Sam Weller.

One of the most prolific and well-acclaimed authors of Victorian Britain, Charles Dickens (1812-1870) enters the literary scene as a novelist with *The Pickwick Papers* in 1836. Although born into a lower-middle class family, Charles Dickens makes an upward mobility with his success (Hawes 34). His grandfather on his father’s side works in an aristocratic household as a butler, which becomes like a “springboard for an upward social mobility on the part of Dickens’s father, John, who was a clerk in the Navy Pay Office” (Jordan 3). His position as a clerk endows Dickens’ father with promotion many times, and in this way he earns a good salary and receives a good pension. However, “wanting to live beyond his means and keeping up appearances” (Glancy 2) cause him to borrow a large amount of money, which marks the beginning of a steep fall for the Dickens family. Losing their income and social security, Charles Dickens quits school at the age of twelve and begins to work at Warren’s Blacking, a shoe factory, in which his job is “to cover

the pots of paste-blackening; first with a piece of oil-paper, and then with a piece of blue paper; to tie them round with a string; and then to clip the paper close and neat, all round, until it looked as smart as a pot of ointment from an apothecary's shop" (qtd. in Forster 52). He works there for a year so that he can provide financial support for his family. Meanwhile, he has to live in the cellars of a warehouse with uneducated juvenile labourers and visit his father in the Marshalsea Prison during the time he does not work as John Dickens' debts result in his incarceration (Jordan 3), which is later used as a setting in some of his novels such as *The Pickwick Papers*, *Great Expectations*, *Barnaby Rudge*, *A Tale of Two Cities*, and *Little Dorrit*.

The grimmy atmosphere of the Prison as well as the grueling conditions Dickens encounters while working at Warren's Blacking substantially affect him. He expresses his intense feelings as follows:

The deep remembrance of the sense I had of being utterly neglected and hopeless; of the shame I felt in my position; of the misery it was to my young heart to believe that, day by day, what I had learned, and thought, and delighted in, and raised my fancy and my emulation up by, was passing away from me, never to be brought back any more; cannot be written. (qtd. in Forster 53)

This creates a chance for him to reflect what he sees in the prison and the sufferings of the child labourers and of the working class in his novels. Then, his father sends him to Wellington House Academy despite his mother's objection to his education (qtd. in Jordan 5). His mother objects to her son's studying and she would rather him work to provide for the family. Dickens studies there for only two years, because another financial blow necessitates his return to the work force when he is fifteen. This time he works as an office boy for a law firm, which opens the doors for a career in journalism for him. In the law firm, he improves "his skill in taking down speeches until he was the most accurate and speedy stenographer in Parliament" (Jordan 18). Two years later, he is qualified as a parliamentary reporter, and at the age of twenty, he begins to work in *The Mirror of Parliament*, which is "a publication devoted to recording the proceedings of the House of Commons" (Jordan 6). This makes him renowned in the editorial rooms, through which he gains access to the debates of the First Reform Bill (Schramm 279), so he continues to work for *The True Sun*, a London evening paper, as a reporter and later, at the age of twenty

three, for *The Morning Chronicle*. With his new job, he gets the chance to write all the societal issues that he has observed out. He depicts his time there as follows:

There never was anybody connected with newspapers who, in the same place of time, had so much express and post-chaise experience as I. And what gentlemen they were to serve, in such things, at the old *Morning Chronicle*! Great or small it did not matter. I have had to charge for half a dozen break-downs in half a dozen times as many miles. I have had to charge for the damage of a great-coat from the drippings of a blazing wax candle, in writing through the smallest hours of the night in a swift-flying carriage-and-pair. I have had to charge for all sorts of breakages fifty times in a journey without question, such being the ordinary results of the pace which we went at. I have charged for broken hats, broken language, broken chaises, broken harness –everything but a broken head, which is the only thing they would have grumbled to pay for. (qtd. in Forster 98-9)

Hence, working as a journalist enables him to acquire the jargon of this world, which he will later employ in his novels such as *The Pickwick Papers*, *David Copperfield*, *Bleak House*, and *Little Dorrit*, just to name a few. As Michael Slater maintains, the language of the very first chapter of *The Pickwick Papers* shows Dickens' experiences of Parliament (70). Through his job at *Morning Chronicle*, his views for politics are formed and what he sees there – “self-importance, long speeches and little action, manoeuvring for power” (Cunningham 170) – remains with him for the rest of his life. All these experiences make an enormous contribution to his literary imagination. The characters he creates in his works are the products of his vivid imagination, his experience, and the reflection of what he has observed all of his life since childhood. As Donald Hawes remarks,

more potent influences were the people, scenes and things he saw, heard and felt at first hand: the noisy crowded London streets of the 1820s and 1830s, the boys who worked alongside him in the blacking warehouse, [...], prisoners in the cells in the Marshalsea, his schooldays in Chatham and London, the cases he came across in the lawyer's offices and witnessed in the courts, and the parliamentary debates and elections he reported for newspapers using his amazing skill in writing shorthand. (11)

His novels such as *The Pickwick Papers*, *David Copperfield*, *Bleak House*, *Hard Times*, *Little Dorrit*, and *Our Mutual Friend* thematically draw from his own experience, his background, and the issues of his time. Hence, Dickens can be said to be a true representative of his time, the voice of the voiceless people like women and

children and, as Arthur Quiller claims, “the chief of sufferers” (14). His experiences and observations of his society constitute the themes of his novels.

Although he is renowned for his novels, Dickens’ literary career starts with the publication of his first short story, “A Dinner at Poplar Walk” (1833), and thereafter he moves towards the novel genre and produces numerous works. With each novel he calls the attention of the readers of those times to the issues of the time yet it is with *The Pickwick Papers* that he reaches actual recognition. Coming from a journalistic background as opposed to a literary one makes his entry into literature surprising. As Edgar Johnson indicates, no one expects such a big ascendancy in Dickens’ career with this book:

Who would have predicted that a book undertaken as a hack piece of journalism, issued in instalments as it was turned out month by month, and begun only a few weeks after the appearance of his first book, when its author was still a youthful twenty-four, should be not merely one of his own great fictions, but one of the world’s masterpieces of sane and inexhaustible laughter? (157)

Producing this novel just after his career at journalism at a very young age highly astounds people. Even Dickens himself does not anticipate a big success from this novel. He takes great pride in the success of this book and articulates his feelings as follows: “If I were to live a hundred years, and write three novels in each, I should never be so proud of any of them, as I am of *Pickwick*, feeling as I do, that it has made its own way, and hoping, as I must own I do hope, that long after my hand is withered as the pens it held, *Pickwick* will be found on many a dusty shelf with many a better work” (qtd. in Hartley 30). Charles Dickens employs his first-hand experience of the middle class and the working class life in *The Pickwick Papers*. Hence, the novel has a great place in Victorian literature in terms of presenting life as experienced by multiple classes instead of focusing on one single stratum of society.

Starting with the meeting of the four men in the Pickwick Club “on the morning of the thirteenth of May, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-seven” (PP 10), *The Pickwick Papers* focuses on the adventures of these four members of the club who are called Pickwickians. The outcome of this meeting, under the presidency of Samuel Pickwick, is to travel all around Britain and write out reports on whatever draws their interest. The members of the Pickwick Club include Mr Snodgrass, to whose heart “poetic fame was dear” (PP 8); however, he does not have

any knowledge of poetry. Another member is Mr Tupman, a middle-aged dandy, to whom “the fame of conquest was dear (*PP* 8); however, he cannot succeed at winning the hand of even an old maid. The third member is Mr Winkle, in whose heart, “the desire of earning fame in the sports of the field, the air, and the water, was uppermost” (*PP* 8); however, he cannot sit on a horse or use a gun, and therefore, he leads his friends into loads of silly difficulties. The last member is Mr. Pickwick, a gullible old fool, who is “their illustrious leader” (*PP* 12); however, he makes himself ridiculous by skating and jumping despite his old age. These four members are depicted by Julia McCord Chavez as “silly boffoons” (799) who are not productive of the society and who fall into troubles. Similarly, Edgar Johnson states that the other characters in the novel that surround these four members are created from the same material as well: “the greasy adventurer, the man-hungry old maid, the pompous and ignorant magistrate, the fraudulent solicitors, the raffish medical student and drunken apothecary, the shrewish landlady who terrifies her husband and her lodgers with fainting fits and fury” (158). According to his analysis, all the characters in the novel are made up of comedy and silly elements both in their appearances and in their personality traits. Mrs Leo Hunter, for instance, is portrayed as a funny woman both with her foolish poem that she has written and with her scary and dominant attitude towards her husband.

The plot of the novel revolves around funny and ridiculous events but the inclusion of Sam Weller marks a decisive turn of events for the characters and the plot itself. While the members of the Pickwick Club visit new places and meet new people, the novel reaches a climax with the involvement of Sam Weller, without whom, as Donald Hawes claims, the novel is “unimaginable” since Weller is “omnipresent high-spirited but down-to-earth commentator on the ways of the world” (22). Sam provides a visible comparison and he elevates Pickwick's character as they are completely different. Contrary to Pickwick's cheerful gullibility, Sam is portrayed as a man with a cheerful knowledge of the world (Chesterton 5). He knows the realities of the facts of life and the lives of the poor and the homeless. The reason why he accepts Pickwick's job offer lies in the promises Pickwick presents: “I wonder whether I'm meant to be a footman, or a groom, or a game-keeper or a seedsman? I look like a sort of compo of every one of 'em. Never mind; there's change of air, plenty to see, and little to do; and all this suits my complaint

uncommon" (*PP* 154). Since the opportunities are better than his present job, he accepts Pickwick's proposal.

With Sam Weller's inclusion to the novel, *The Pickwick Papers* begins to narrate the travels of the members of the Pickwick Club over Britain on horses and by coaches in all weather conditions and their accommodation in various inns. Their companionship also marks the first encounter between the "master" and the "servant." Upon the introduction of Sam, the novel converts into a journey of the "master" Mr. Pickwick to the real world under the guidance of the "servant" Sam. The way Sam Weller is brought up forms his character: "I took a good deal o' pains with his eddication, sir; let him run in the streets when he was wery young, and shift for his-self. It's the only way to make a boy sharp, sir" (*PP* 258). It is deduced from this quotation that Sam learns the realities of life by wandering around the streets, living on the streets, and meeting the people from the working class by his father's way of educating him. This kind of education makes Sam aware of the difficulties of life. Hence, it could be stated that while Sam is streetwise who knows how to take care of himself under any circumstances, Mr. Pickwick is unaware of the harsh realities of life. With the journeys of the Pickwick Club, the novel transforms into the journey of Mr. Pickwick, whose "heart must ha' been born five-and-twenty year arter his body, at least!" (*PP* 556), in Sam's words. His child-like attitude will change as a result of these journeys and he will turn into "a sensible gentleman who speaks with dignity and acts nobly" (Johnson 172) through the help of Sam Weller. While the relationship between Pickwick and Sam starts as a conventional master and servant relationship at the beginning of the novel, it converts the master Mr. Pickwick into the servant Pickwick and the servant Sam into the master Sam Weller in the course of the novel. This gradual change of roles in the relationship between Pickwick and Sam accounts for the changing conditions of the period that the novel is written.

Charles Dickens writes *The Pickwick Papers* in the Early Victorian Age, the characteristics and problems of which are reflected in the novel. The Early Victorian Age is marked by the transformation of Britain from a rural country to an industrial one and from an aristocratic society to the securely established middle class. Friedrich Engels depicts this transformation and argues that:

Sixty, eighty years ago, England was a country like every other, with small towns, few and simple industries, and a thin but *proportionally*

large agricultural population. Today it is a country like no other, with a capital of two and a half million inhabitants; with vast manufacturing cities; with an industry that supplies the world, and produces almost everything by means of the most complex machinery; with an industrious, intelligent, dense population, of which two-thirds are employed in trade and commerce, and composed of classes wholly different; forming, in fact, with other customs and other needs, a different nation from the England of those days. (70)

As such, Britain undergoes many economic major alterations with the advent of the Industrial Revolution. While the economic face of the country is obviously altered, the social structure is affected by the Revolution as well. It should be noted that industrialisation started way before the Industrial Revolution but it is the Industrial Revolution that really accelerated the change and advancement. One of the effects of the Industrial Revolution is the emergence of a new class. As Engels asserted, “the mightiest result of this industrial transformation is the English proletariat” (71). The working class, or the proletariat in Marx and Engels’ terms, emerging as a consequence of the Revolution, worry about being replaced by machines due to redundancy. Moreover, with the Revolution, they begin to face harsher and more unjust working conditions. They have to work more but they earn less. In addition to these, the working class struggle against not only the aristocracy but also the middle class. Although the power of the middle class rises gradually, they do not have “adequate representation in Parliament and influence over local administration” (Birch 33). Though the working class make many contributions to the industrialisation of the country, they do not have any right to speak in the administration of the country. This situation accelerates the introduction of the Reform Bill of 1832.

The introduction of the Bill aims at changing the existing electoral system, in which not all the counties are represented in the House of Commons and not all the classes of the nation have the right to vote. However, there is no significant change in the situation as Richard Price states that “there was no decisive change in the social composition of Parliament, no evidence of new kinds of policies that could be linked to exclusively ‘middle class’ interests” (266). Through the Bill, large numbers of middle-class men are empowered to be represented in the House of Commons. In this respect, Price asserts that “the expansion of the electorate from under 400,000 to around 600,000 meant the inclusion of new middle-class types in the political nation”

(265). The Bill also makes the working class gain the right to vote. However, the Bill “did not bring democratic government” (S. Mitchell 1). Instead of improving the conditions for the workers, it brought new problems to the fore. According to David Daiches, by supporting this movement of the Reform, the working class causes a “complete bourgeois domination” to be formed since giving the right to vote to the middle class means “putting Parliament directly under the control of the class, [...] – the very class whose *laissez faire* economic views and practices had brought about the social conditions against which the workers were protesting” (950-1). Hence, although the Bill of 1832 increases the number of the voters, it brings several unforeseen problems in addition to intensifying already existing ones:

Patronage structures remained intact; birth rather than merit or ability was the essential qualification for holding office; powerful families squeezed relations and clients into jobs, with little or no concern for the national interest. As a consequence, the civil service was both incompetent and self-seeking, and members of both Houses of Parliament saw their involvement in politics as nothing more than a way of protecting vested interests. (L. Mitchell 229)

Thus, it could be understood that the state is ruled by incompetent administrators.

Until the Bill of 1832, it is the landowners that have the supreme power, through which they “controlled the three organs of government – the legislature, the judiciary, and the executive” (Gregg 147). Through their power given by the House of Lords, the landowners control the House of Commons. Therefore, it is the landowners or men of the upper classes who are allowed to vote for their representatives to have a seat in the House of Commons. Thus, although it seems that the Commons are represented, the representatives are in fact strictly regulated by the House of Lords. For this reason, it could be maintained that the existing system does not represent the whole population especially the working class in the Parliament however much it seems to be providing representation. It could be claimed that the Bill of 1832 does not provide many privileges to the middle class; moreover, it does not give any privileges to the working class.

Apart from the problems in the government resulting from the Reform Bill of 1832, the process of elections is problematic as well. The elections take place in an open area and last for several days or weeks. This situation has a place in the

fictional world of Dickens as well. He portrays this ill-course of the election at Eatanswill in *The Pickwick Papers*:

It appears, [...], every man in Eatanswill, [...], felt himself bound to unite, heart and soul, with one of the two great parties that divided the town – the Blues and the Buffs. Now the Blues lost no opportunity of opposing the Buffs, and the Buffs lost no opportunity of opposing the Blues; and the consequence was, that whenever the Buffs and Blues met together at public meeting, Town-Hall, fair or market, disputes and high words arose between them. (PP 155)

In view of what has been described, the town is completely focused on the election during this time. Therefore, there is no tolerance towards different opinions in town during the election time. This may be taken as one of the many instances Dickens criticises the polarisation and intolerance he observes in his society. As in the elections at Eatanswill, the town is divided into two by the supporters of both of the parties, and once they meet in the town, they have a row about their different political views.

If the Buffs proposed to new skylight the marketplace, the Blues got up public meetings, and denounced the proceeding; if the Blues proposed the erection of an additional pump in the High Street, the Buffs rose as one man and stood aghast at the enormity. There were Blue shops and Buff shops, Blue inns and Buff inns; - there was a Blue aisle and a Buff aisle, in the very church itself. (PP 155)

The supporters of both of the parties are on a collision course that leads to a constant opposition with each other in every sphere. The election day is chaotic with “the beating of drums, the blowing of horns and trumpets, the shouting of men, and tramping of horses” (PP 162). When Mr. Pickwick and his companions go to Eatanswill to observe the elections, they are startled by the chaos in town. They are shocked by the illegal course of the election. During the elections, allowing drinking and affecting the voters’ preference with money or treats stamp on the course of the election. While Dickens depicts the town of Eatanswill during the elections, he illustrates that “the processes of democracy are shown to be based on a corrupt electorate and timeserving puppets” (Axtion 672). His depiction regarding the Eatanswill election explains why Dickens is discontent towards the inhumanity and corruption in the parliamentary system in the Early Victorian Age. It could be highlighted that the Reform Bill of 1832 does not bring full democracy. It rather

brings confusion to the country, which Dickens reflects in the novel. The world he fictionalises in *The Pickwick Papers* contains traces from the real world of the 1830s.

Another law that the Industrial Revolution brings forth and affects the lives of the working class adversely is The Poor Law Amendment, which coincides with the time-space of *The Pickwick Papers*. The Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834, also called the New Poor Law, is based on two principles: “workhouse test” and “less eligibility.” In accordance with these two principles, workhouses, founded to “provide a standard of living and comfort lower than that of the lowest paid labourer” (Cunningham 163), become much more uninhabitable for the poor. In this way, the poor “would take any job at all rather than ask for relief” (S. Mitchell 92). This is realised by “tyrannising over the helpless by public officials, [...] the provision of food just above the level of deprivation, and the separation of children from parents, and of married couples even when they were long past child bearing” (Jordan 14). Sally Mitchell remarks all the deterrent conditions in the workhouses indicating that

People were put into separate wards by age and sex. Families were split up, elderly couples divided from each other. In the earliest years, parents did not have the right even to see their children. People could not leave the workhouse during the day and come back at night; those who claimed public assistance went “into the house” and stayed there until they had some way to support themselves outside. Most workhouses required everyone to wear coarse clothes of some distinctive and uniform color. Smoking and drinking were forbidden. Outsiders could visit only during limited hours and in the presence of a matron or master. (92)

All these adverse conditions incite hatred for the workhouses among the working class. Dickens characterises this in one of the tales in the novel, which is about the confrontation of a convict who returns home years later with his father, whose “dress denoted him an inmate of the workhouse” and who “had the appearance of being very old” (PP 82). However, his dress “looked more the effect of dissipation or disease, than length of years” (PP 82). From this description, Dickens draws attention to the harsh conditions that the poor encounter in the workhouses. All these events the Industrial Revolution brings forth affect especially the working class. Having experienced both the master and the servant classes, Dickens is highly attuned to the conflict between the middle class and the working class. Therefore, the

relationship between the master class, which is the middle class in the novel and the working class has a place in *The Pickwick Papers*.

All these social, political, cultural, and economic changes taking place in the Early Victorian period as a consequence of industrialisation and urbanisation with the advent of the Industrial Revolution have undeniable implications for classes. The old ruling aristocratic class begins to lose its power while most of the middle class gains the right to vote. However, in the fictionalised world of Dickens in *The Pickwick Papers*, the aristocracy still retains its power over the middle class in society. The party the members of the Pickwick Club joins, for instance, gives the reader a clear insight into the hierarchical structure of society. The deployment of the classes in the party is the typical example of the placement of each class in society: “While the aristocracy of the place – the Bulders, and Clubbers, and Snipes – were thus preserving their dignity at the upper end of the room, the other classes of society were imitating their example in other parts of it” (PP 25). Dickens exemplifies this gap between the classes through Mr. Pickwick’s depiction of Dockyard: “[...] – nobs not come yet – queer place – Dockyard people of upper rank don’t know Dockyard people of lower rank – Dockyard people of lower rank don’t know small gentry – small gentry don’t know tradespeople – Commissioner don’t know anybody” (PP 24). From the description, it can be understood that none of the classes is aware of the existence of the other. Dickens illustrates this huge gap between the master and the servant class through the description of the Dockyard people.

The Bill of 1832 and the Act of 1834 do not bring any considerable change to the working class in terms of the attitudes of the high class and the middle class. In *The Pickwick Papers* the arrangement of sleeping in the inn for the masters and the servants exemplifies lack of change. When Mr. Pickwick and Sam Weller chase after Jingle and Trotter, they stay at an inn, in which the servants sleep at the bottom of the inn while the masters like Mr. Pickwick sleep at the top of the inn: “Have the goodness to step downstairs” (PP 458). However, the situation of the middle class is no different from the working class in this context. Pickwick's case, for instance, is an example for this. Belonging to the middle class, Pickwick is welcomed with reverence wherever he goes. Nevertheless, when he is found asleep in a wheelbarrow by the owner of the property, who belongs to the high class, Pickwick is not treated with respect since he has “no human dignity at all” (Baer 177) for the

landed gentry as he does not appertain to the high class. This event illustrates the class distinction which is still evident between the aristocrats and the classes below. In this case Mr. Pickwick is humiliated by a man belonging to the upper class. The struggle between these classes brings about redefining their roles. One of them becomes the “master” and the other “servant.” The relationship between the “master” Mr Samuel Pickwick and the “servant” Sam Weller is a recurring theme that reflects the friction between the middle class and the working class which is studied in this chapter. Although a gap between the classes apparently exists, this gap is not huge and serious. Each class in the novel is content with his status. There is no rigid class distinction; rather, there is a fluidity that can be observed in the characters’ identities as class members throughout *The Pickwick Papers*.

The relationship between the “master” Mr. Pickwick and the “servant” Sam Weller can be read in terms of Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic because their relation is based on mutual recognition. On the one hand, there is Mr. Pickwick, “the gullible old fool” (Johnson 158), who does silly things. However, at the same time, he is the leader of the four members of the Pickwick Club: “The attachment and fervour of his followers lighted up a glow of enthusiasm within him. He was their leader, and he felt it” (*PP* 137). On the other hand, there is the reasonable Sam Weller, who is hired as a servant by Pickwick. However, he assumes the role of the master of Mr. Pickwick on the very first day when Pickwick summons him to his house to inform Sam of the news of hiring him as his manservant and asks him whether Sam remembers him: “I should think so,” replied Sam, with a patronising wink” (*PP* 152). Mr. Pickwick, at first sight, somehow gets aware of his intelligence to deserve to be entitled as his manservant when he bumps into Sam who is busy cleaning the boots of the customers of the White Hart Inn.

As the novel proceeds, Pickwick conceives that “the boots,” which means Sam, “has a considerable knowledge of the world, and a great deal of sharpness” (*PP* 149). Sam fulfils his duty and achieves his role as the master of his master by leading Pickwick indirectly. With his common sense, he protects the naive Pickwick from the deceptions of people and the wicked world around them. When Pickwick, for instance, goes into a wrong room belonging a woman at the inn by mistake, it is Sam who rescues him from this embarrassing situation and takes him to his room. Sam expresses to him that Sam is the one who is the savior: “You rayther want someone

to look arter you, sir, wen your judgement goes out a wisitin" (*PP* 296). While Mr. Pickwick who is in the position of the master is expected to behave more comfortably and not to ask for help from Sam, it is Sam, who helps and saves him. When Mr. Pickwick is sent to the prison, he does not want to go into the prison under the care of his lawyer, Mr Perker: "I would rather go without any other attendant than Sam" (*PP* 530-1). However, when Pickwick does not need Sam's help, he reminds Sam of his being servant to him by giving orders:

"He must be found, Sam. Found and brought back to me." "And s'pose he won't come back, sir" said Sam. "He must be made, Sam," said Mr. Pickwick. "Who's to do it, sir?" inquired Sam with a smile. "You," replied Mr. Pickwick. "Very good, sir." (*PP* 494)

Nevertheless, Sam is self-content and he does not question his status. He undertakes the role of Mr. Pickwick's advisor. As Florence E. Baer succinctly puts it, whenever Pickwick needs help, Sam is ready to help him "with the task of protecting Pickwick from and educating him in the ways of the world" (174). On the way to educate Pickwick, Sam treats his master by talking to him rudely as if he himself is the master of Pickwick.

The financial and social position of Pickwick does not change the masterly role of Sam. Although Pickwick shows his mastery over Sam by ordering him to do his errands, he is submissive to Sam's approach towards him. In the event of Pickwick's wish to meet the lawyers, Dodson and Foggs, alone, for instance, Sam's reaction to this meeting exposes his mastery over Pickwick:

"Sam, I will go immediately to Mr Perker's." "That's just exactly the very place vere you ought to have gone last night, sir," replied Mr Weller. "I think it is, Sam," said Mr. Pickwick. "I *know* it is," said Mr Weller. (*PP* 256)

Sam's omitting "sir" (Kincaid 135) in this dialogue is really remarkable as it is contrary to the expectation of a dialogue between the master and his servant. Sam's way of talking to Mr. Pickwick exemplifies Sam's mastery approach towards Pickwick. In another dialogue between them, Sam even uses an imperative. When they both wander around in Ipswich, they see a very poor place. Sam tries to draw his attention to the poverty of the place since his mission is to educate Pickwick. Therefore, he says "look here" (*PP* 285) with a masterly spirit. Considering all these exemplary dialogues, it can be concluded that there is no strict hierarchical

relationship which exists between them. Hegel pinpoints this lack of hierarchy by saying that “no man is a hero to his valet; not, however, because the man is not a hero, but because the valet is a valet” (Hegel 404). In Hegel’s Master and Servant Dialectic, the master strives for the recognition from the servant either by force or by the threat of death. As opposed to this, the master Pickwick is not in the expectation of any claim from his servant, Sam. It would be not wrong to say that during this transformation process, Pickwick recognises his servant as a self-conscious being after faced with the difficulties of life. Accordingly, the apparently dialectical relationship between Pickwick and Sam is based on a relationship between a father and a son.

In the case of the relationship between Mr. Pickwick and Sam Weller, from a Hegelian standpoint, it can be said that a mutual recognition exists between them. In Hegel’s Dialectic, the question of recognition is placed in the centre of the struggle between the lord and the bondsman in their relationship. Craig B. Matarrese claims in *Starting with Hegel* that recognition “refers to those practical encounters through which one grants to another person a kind of status or standing, namely, as a person and as a moral subject” (60). Mr. Pickwick’s granting Sam the title of his manservant accounts for his desire to be recognised by Sam as a master since, as Frederick Beiser alludes, “without the recognition of others the self cannot prove its claim to be a rational being, and so it cannot know itself as rational” (177). Craig B. Matarrese divides recognition into two forms: “pure recognition” and “impure recognition” (60). He differentiates “pure recognition” from “impure recognition” in that the former is “the ideal inter-subjective interaction, where neither consciousness treats the other as an object to be consumed, but rather confers upon the other the status of free selfhood,” whereas the latter is “the degenerate form, the way recognition often occurs, and was bound to occur historically before there were modern political arrangements to solidify relations of pure recognition” (60). In “pure recognition,” in other words, both entities recognise each other, hence “through mutual recognition” they both “recover self-consciousness” (60). Neither of them sees the other as a threat. As a result of “pure recognition,” “an individual comes to understand him or herself as a genuinely self-directing agent, not because he or she is radically independent from other objects and persons, but because these are no longer seen as threatening; one is recognised as an individual who can affirm and embrace the

paradox that our independence is a kind of dependence” (61). In “pure recognition” or “mutual recognition,” both of the individuals are to be free and independent. In Hegel's own words, pure or mutual recognition is a recognition in which “each [self-consciousness] sees the *other* do the same as it does. [...] Each is for the other the middle term, through which each mediates itself with itself and unites with itself. [...] They *recognise* themselves as *mutually recognising* one another” (Hegel 112). Hence, pure recognition entails a mutual recognition of two self-consciousness beings.

As far as the relationship between Pickwick and Sam is concerned, there is a pure recognition. Both of them are free self-consciousnesses and both of them are dependent upon each other. While the master Pickwick depends on Sam for his service, the servant Sam is pleased with his status and he does not attempt to change it. Sam, disregarding the class difference between them, expresses by saying: “I wonder whether I’m meant to be a footman, or a groom, or a gamekeeper, or a seedsman. I looks like a sort of compo of everyone on ‘em. Never mind; there’s change of air, plenty to see, and little to do; and all this suits my complaint uncommon; so long life to the Pickwicks, says I!” (154) When Pickwick calls him “servant,” Sam does not resent it, indeed he is “proud o’ the title” (*PP* 200). Likewise, the master Pickwick does not seem to take any heed of Sam’s way of counselling him. He does not make any attempt to desire Sam’s recognition of him as a being nor does he anticipate any humbled submission from him. Towards the end of the novel, the relationship between them transforms into a friendship; the man they meet in the cab on the way to Ipswich supposes that Sam is Mr. Pickwick’s friend: ‘Friend of yours, sir?’ (283). Pickwick’s reply to the man sounds so interesting: ‘Not exactly a friend. The fact is, he is my servant, but I allow him to take a good many liberties; for, between ourselves, I flatter myself he is an original, and I am rather proud of him’ (*PP* 283). The word “original” is used in those times to denote “an eccentric or unusual person” (“Original,” def. 2). Therefore, whatever Sam does, he is regarded as an unusual person, which is a positive unusualness. Pickwick considers him as an original man but still his servant. His reaction serves to illustrate that he does not react positively so as to be considered as intimates. In Hegel's Dialectic, this kind of intimacy between the master and the servant does not exist. While the servant remains a servant, he cannot be recognised as “a man and a

brother” (J. Taylor 187). Hegel's Dialectic consists of the master and the servant relationship in which both sides recognise the other. In this respect, Pickwick's establishing a boundary between them would not be unexpected. He accepts Sam's indispensable place in his life, but he still defines Sam's status as his “servant.”

On the other hand, while Mr. Pickwick is not an absolute master, Sam is not merely a servant. In accordance with Hegel's Dialectic, the servant struggles to be recognised by his master. He is to fulfil his duty by satisfying his master's desires. However, as for Sam, he reverses his role of Mr. Pickwick's “faithful servitor” (*PP* 495) by helping him in his journey of transformation to the real world. In a way, he becomes the master of his master. When he talks to Mr. Pickwick, he addresses to him “with a patronising air” (*PP* 317). Michael Slater highlights the important role of Sam in this process as follows: “If Pickwick were going to metamorphose from farcical pedant into a Dickens version of Don Quixote he would need a Sancho Panza to ground him in reality, and Sam would fit the bill perfectly” (74). Christopher Herbert also makes an analogy between Don Quixote's Sancho Panza and Pickwick's Sam. He maintains that the mission of Sam, with his superior good sense, is to make his master confronted with his follies (2). James Kincaid, on a similar vein, refers to Sam's position as Pickwick's fool, who “subverts his position to educate the master whose defects he sees and fears” (129). In view of what has been discussed, it can be underlined that Sam is considered as Don Quixote's Sancho Panza or King Lear's fool, who functions as his master's loyal and honest friend and who similarly enables his master to be cognizant of the evils of the world. In his transformative journey, Pickwick is educated after each event he encounters with Sam Weller. His naivety, on which the plot is based at the outset, gradually disappears in the course of the novel. Pickwick, who, at the beginning of the novel, “dances the minuet, slides on the ice, plays at blindman's buff, scales walls, eats and drinks in astonishing excess” (*PP* 28), meets “the tortured families,” poverty, and corruption of the courts later, and rescues the prisoners and “shelter[s] them from harm in Edenic, suburban retreats” (35). Sam cannot hide his astonishment before his gullibility and therefore, calls him “a reg'lar thoroughbred angel” (596). Like King Lear's fool, Sam is the only man who criticises Pickwick openly. His criticism makes it possible for Mr. Pickwick to be more aware of the realities of life, and thus he moves away from innocence and towards maturity. He is not an innocent child any

more. As W.H. Auden delineates, he “changes from an innocent child into an innocent adult who no longer lives in an imaginary Eden of his own but in the real and fallen world” (69). Indeed, Pickwick’s becoming mature does not necessarily mean losing all his innocence. This time he just transforms into an innocent adult. Like Auden, James Kincaid thinks that Pickwick begins to delve into a “fallen world”. In this world, he “must suffer and emerge from that suffering less bland and more fully human” (129). Kincaid compares Pickwick’s character in the early chapters and his character on the subsequent chapters of the book in terms of his attitude towards people and events. While Pickwick is a proud and an arrogant man before his education starts, he is transformed from an unconscious man to a conscious man that “must be educated to see the final cruelty of disinterestedness and to see that it is not Jingle or Mrs. Bardell who is at fault but something deeper in the commercial society - its inhumanity” (Kincaid 131).

His journey to the realities of life starts with his landlady Mrs. Bardell’s misunderstanding of Mr. Pickwick when he is trying to tell her about his plan for hiring Sam Weller. Whatever he says is perceived as an implication for a proposal by Mrs. Bardell, who “observed a species of matrimonial twinkle in the eyes of her lodger” (*PP* 149). When he gets a letter from Dodson and Fogg, the lawyers, informing him of her prosecution for “a breach of promise of marriage,” Mr. Pickwick’s visits to the courts begin. His visit to the courts provides an opportunity to observe injustice and misadministration of the courts.

Another step to his transformation is his refusal to pay for the costs of his trial, which results in Pickwick’s imprisonment in the Fleet. Despite having more money than he needs, he does not pay for his debts. This can be taken as an example of him learning to stand up against the rules and conventions. Hence, it can be argued that he has learned to say no when it needs. By portraying the prison and the prisoners there, Dickens draws attention to the mismanaged prisons of Britain in that period and the suffering of the poor in the prisons. This experience is the beginning of Pickwick’s journey to the real world, which is full of disorderliness, injustice, and chaos of the 1830s in the Victorian Britain. As Edgar Johnson lays out in *Charles Dickens: His Tragedy and Triumph*, Dickens cannot but portray these taking place in the prisons: “He knows well enough, and gives examples to show, that there are vicious wastrels there who have amply deserved their incarceration. But that even

these should be allowed to dwell in filth unless they have means to bribe their jailors, and that impoverished victims of legal injustice should be condemned to sink in slow misery, while the burglar and the pickpocket must be cared for, fills him with wrath” (170). After seeing the sufferings of the people in prison, Pickwick “feel[s] that for a debtor in the Fleet to be attended by his man-servant is a monstrous absurdity” (559); and therefore, he wants Sam to leave him. What is more, after visiting all the corners of the prison and meeting the prisoners there, he confines himself in his room for three months, “only stealing out at night to breathe the air when the greater part of his fellow prisoners were in bed or carousing in their rooms” (*PP* 599). According to Philip Rogers, the lesson Pickwick takes from this experience is to use “the power of his wealth to satisfy human desires” (24). He implements this lesson in two obvious occasions: the first one is when he is in the prison by purchasing the freedom of Jingle and Trotter and upon his discharge from the prison by easing the life of the newly-married couple Winkles, and the second one is by establishing a small business for Sam Weller. It could be said that on his transformative journey, Mr. Pickwick gets the chance of observing all the ills of Britain’s society and he metamorphoses into a conscious being from a naive old man with the help of Sam.

Mr. Pickwick is a true master now as he has finally completed his education. When his education is completed so does the novel come to an end. He delivers a speech to his comrades and explains all his experiences during this process:

I shall never regret having devoted the greater part of two years to mixing with different varieties and shades of human character: frivolous as my pursuit of novelty may have appeared to many. Nearly the whole of my previous life having been devoted to business and the pursuit of wealth, numerous scenes of which I had no previous conception have dawned upon me – I hope to the enlargement of mind, and the improvement of my understanding. If I have done but little good, I trust I have done less harm, and that none of my adventures will be other than a source of amusing and pleasant recollection to me in the decline of life. God bless all! (738)

What is notable in the final scene is the sitting position of Sam Weller, which is “behind his master’s chair” (741). Contrary to his cool attitude he exhibits throughout the novel, the image created with his sitting behind his master in the final scene shows his acceptance of his subservient position. From this position, hence, it can be inferred that Sam recognises his subservient position and accepts Pickwick’s

superiority. Likewise, Mr. Pickwick is firmly established in his position as the master. This mutual recognition which exists between them is very distinct. Their relationship is so close that they have “a steady and reciprocal attachment which nothing but death will terminate” (*PP* 743).

Dickens and Hegel examine the relationships between the oppressed and the oppressor in their works. In the light of all the issues analysed in this chapter, it is clear that the relationship between Mr. Pickwick and Sam Weller can be interpreted as the relationship between the “master” and the “servant.” In accordance with the Master and the Servant Dialectic, both the master and the servant struggle to attain the recognition of the other. The oppressed and the oppressor determine who the master and the servant are. Although this is a hierarchical positioning, in the case of Pickwick and Sam Weller there is no loser. It can be claimed that a mutual recognition exists between them. While Mr. Pickwick recognises him as a philosophical man who guides him on his way to maturity, Sam Weller recognises him as his master and he is not disturbed being called his “servant.”

CHAPTER TWO

THE DUAL ROLE OF THE MASTER IN *LITTLE DORRIT*

This chapter aims to analyse the rebellion of the “servant” and the dual role of the “master” from the Hegelian Master and Servant Dialectic in *Little Dorrit*. The insubordination of the servants and the transformation of the masters’ position which is initially the dominant role of the master yet which ends in undertaking the role of the servants due to the changing conditions are seen in the novel. This reversal of positions can be discerned in the text specifically in the relationships between the characters such as Mr. Dorrit and Amy, Miss Wade and Tattycoram, and Rigaud and Cavelletto, all of which are discussed in this chapter in accordance with Hegel's Dialectic. Before applying the Dialectic to the analysis of the characters, it is necessary to examine the political, historical, and cultural background of the period in which *Little Dorrit* is composed since understanding the period will shed light to the technical and thematic concerns of the novel.

Little Dorrit (1855-7) is one of the novels written in Charles Dickens’ late period, in which he sets out to explain the increasing bureaucratization of the government with “how not to do it” and the imprisonment of the individual citizen for his debts (Schor 64). He gives a portrayal of the political and social vices of the 1850s (Forster 136). In contrast to *The Pickwick Papers* and the novels following it, *Little Dorrit* achieves less critical acclaim owing to its dark and gloomy atmosphere. John Lucas, for instance, finds the novel not necessarily pessimistic but very sombre (246). Likewise, Edgar Johnson thinks that, due to the image of the prison, the novel has a sombre theme (884). Edwin Barrett considers the novel as the darkest of all Dickens’ novels (199). It is obvious, then, that critics agree on the tone of the novel being different from Dickens’ other works. The setting of the novel accounts for its dark and bleak tone. *Little Dorrit* starts with a dull description of Marseilles, which “thirty years ago, [...], lay burning in the sun, [...], strongly smelt and tasted” (LD 2-3), continues with of Mrs. Clennam’s house, “musty smell of an old close house” (LD 28), and of the Marshalsea, “a close and confined prison for debtors” (LD 40). Compared to *The Pickwick Papers*, then, Dickens can be said to have moved from a populist narrative to a more bleak one. One reason is that these novels are written in completely different time periods and this makes their focus different. More

importantly, this difference in focus is also evident in their employ of the Master and the Servant Dialectic.

Charles Dickens composes *Little Dorrit* in the Mid-Victorian Age, in which Britain is “the world’s workshop, the world’s shipbuilder, the world’s carrier, the world’s banker, and the world’s clearing-house” (Briggs 10). The time *Little Dorrit* was written coincides not only with the aristocrats’ losing power but also with the outbreak of the strife between the working class and the rest of the society. Therefore, this era from 1851 to 1867 is the period, as Asa Briggs claims, in which “contemporaries talked openly of class war and imminent revolution” (9). Although urbanisation and industrialisation stamp their effects onto the period, business bankruptcies and great working-class distress increase (Briggs 12). It can be noticed that this Age witnesses not only innovations and reforms in technology, science, economy, and politics, but it also sees the exploitation of labour, a strict class division, and ineptitude of the state in governmental concerns. Whilst Britain expands around the world and becomes a great empire, the division between classes becomes more pronounced. The polarisation is markedly evident in the suffering of the working class. The gap between the working class and the others grows so much so that it is almost as if two different nations reside in one country. This duality and rift is also manifest in the literary products of the time. For instance, it is outlined by Dickens at the beginning of *A Tale of Two Cities* as follows:

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to Heaven, we were all going direct the other way – in short, the period was so far like the present period, that some of its noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or for evil, in the superlative degree of comparison only. (3)

Dickens’ concern with his own time is discernible in his other works as well. In *Little Dorrit*, Dickens similarly portrays the polarisation between classes in Victorian society in which poverty and prosperity coexist. This polarisation is conveyed through the transformation of family life for the Dorrits as they go from poverty to prosperity in dramatic changes of fortune.

In *Little Dorrit*, which portrays the story of the Dorrit family through the years, Charles Dickens is also critical of his time. He is of the opinion that the government, which, under the pretext of the outbreak of the Crimean War, runs the country ineffectively. At the beginning of the war, he supports the war, which is noted in his biography as follows:

[if] ever there were a time when the true spirits of the two countries were really fighting in the cause of human advancement and freedom. [...] If ever there were a time when noble hearts were deserving well of mankind by exposing themselves to the obedient bayonets of a rash and barbarian tyrant, it is now, when the faithful children of England and France are fighting so bravely in the Crimea. Those faithful children are the admiration and wonder of the world, so gallantly are they discharging their duty; and therefore I propose to an assembly, emphatically representing the interests, and arts of peace, to drink the health of the Allied Armies of England and France, with all possible honours. (qtd. in Forster 164)

Thus, Dickens considers the War necessary for humanitarian reasons. However, when he is informed of the deaths of hundreds of British soldiers from cold and hunger due to managerial ineptitude, Dickens accuses the aristocratic Tories for these deaths, although no one in the government takes the blame. For this reason, Dickens entitles the novel *Nobody's Fault* initially, and he aims to satirize the incompetent policy of the government with regards to the Crimean War. Upon seeing that no one in the government shoulders the responsibility, he draws attention to the “nobody” who pays the price:

The power of Nobody is becoming so enormous in England, and he alone is responsible for so many proceedings, both in the way of commission and omission; he has so much to answer for, and is so constantly called to account; that a few remarks upon him may not be ill-timed. The hand which this surprising person had in the late war is amazing to consider. It was he who left the tents behind, who left the baggage behind, who chose the worst possible ground for encampments, who provided no means of transport, who killed the horses [...] who decimated the British army [...] for the sake of Everybody, give me Somebody! I raise my voice in the wilderness for Somebody. My heart, as the ballad says, is sore for Somebody [...] Come, responsible Somebody; accountable Blockhead, come! (qtd. in L. Mitchell 231)

Evidently, Dickens raises his concern about negligence and nonchalance of the state in this case. He reflects his concerns in his works. He criticises this matter not only by writing about it but he also actively fights for this cause in deed.

Hence, he registers as a member of the Administrative Reform Association to try to raise some concern about this issue since he loses hope for the power of the ballot and respect for the Parliament, which is busy, in his opinion, with “drowsy twaddle, unmeaning routine or the absurdest worn-out conventionalities” (qtd. in L. Mitchell 232). According to him, the Parliament is not likely to be inclined either to make any reforms or to find any remedy to improve itself. It is with these concerns in mind does Dickens concentrate on the issue of Administrative Reform throughout *Little Dorrit* through the portrayals of prisons and working class people. In this respect, it can be claimed that all the historical and political context of the period and his experiences related to his father's incarceration at the Marshalsea Prison contribute to the production of *Little Dorrit*. In other words, *Little Dorrit* is the epitome of his discontent with the administration. In the words of Edwin Barrett, “all his career [Dickens] had been creating comedy out of people who make a ghastly flourish of archaic manners, but never before had he despised so bitterly the shitty shepherds who were the masters of England” (206). Hence, the bleak tone of the novel compared to Dickens’ earlier ones can be explained with his vexation with the administration of his time. Since the publication of *The Pickwick Papers*, in which he uses language with “great comic effect” (Philpotts 206), Dickens has been transformed from a writer who reflects his observations with his comic tone to a narrator who satirises the rulers of his country with his “frankly apocalyptic” (L. Mitchell 238) language in his works, which is especially evident in *Little Dorrit*. Dickens is concerned with not only the social and the political conditions which the country suffers from but also with the growing polarisation within the country. The huge clash between the working class and the middle class is exemplified by Dickens in his depiction of London in the novel. There are two distinct locations inhabited by two distinct classes, which do not merge with one another. On the one hand, there is Bleeding Heart Yard, which “was inhabited by poor people, who set up their rest among its faded glories, as Arabs of the desert pitch their tents among the fallen stones of the Pyramids” (*LD* 94). On the other hand, there is Mews Street, in which the Barnacles live:

It was a hideous little street of dead wall, stables, and dunghills, with lofts over coach-houses inhabited by coachmen's families, who had a passion for drying clothes and decorating their window-sills with miniature turnpike-gates. The principal chimney-sweep of that fashionable quarter lived at the blind end of Mews Street; and the same corner contained an establishment much frequented about early morning and twilight for the purchase of wine-bottles and kitchen-stuff. Punch's shows used to lean against the dead wall in Mews Street, while their proprietors were dining elsewhere; and the dogs of the neighbourhood made appointments to meet in the same locality. Yet there were two or three small airless houses at the entrance end of Mews Street, which went at enormous rents on account of their being abject hangers-on to a fashionable situation; and whenever one of these fearful little coops was to be let (which seldom happened, for they were in great request), the house agent advertised it as a gentlemanly residence in the most aristocratic part of town, inhabited solely by the elite of the beau monde. (LD 76)

Although the house of the Barnacles is located in the aristocratic part of Mews Street, it "was like a sort of bottle filled with a strong distillation of Mews" (LD 76). Dickens also shows the rift between the middle class and the working class by reflecting the attitudes of the working class to their master, Mr. Merdle, "a Midas without the ears, who turned all he touched to gold" (LD 170). When Mr. Dorrit meets Mr. Merdles, after they make a conversation, they leave the house of the Merdles together:

Then leaning on Mr. Merdle's arm, did Mr. Dorrit descend the staircase, seeing the worshippers on the steps, and feeling that the light of Mr. Merdle shone by reflection in himself. Then the carriage, and the ride into the City; and the people who looked at them; and the hats that flew off grey heads; and the general bowing and crouching before this wonderful mortal the like of which prostration of spirit was not to be seen – no, by Heaven, no! It may be worth thinking of by Fawners of all denominations – in Westminster Abbey and Saint Paul's Cathedral put together, on any Sunday in the year. (LD 425)

This scene is the pivotal moment of the novel, because it illustrates the split between the two classes. When both masters climb down the staircase, the working class people – in Dickens' words "worshippers" (LD 425) – bow respectfully before them. This event in the novel can be taken as the ultimate manifestation of class distinction. Therefore, it can be deduced that Dickens is not exempt from class distinction, and all these events taking place in the 1850s become the core of *Little Dorrit* along with his personal observations and experience.

Little Dorrit was written between the years 1855 and 1857. However, it is set in the 1820s as the novel explicitly indicates the date of the setting through John Chivery's words:

Here lie the mortal remains Of [*sic*] JOHN CHIVERY, Never anything worth mentioning, Who died about the end of the year one thousand eight hundred and twenty-six, Of a broken heart, Requesting with his last breath that the word AMY might be inscribed over his ashes, which was accordingly directed to be done, By his afflicted Parents. (*LD* 153)

In this respect, Dickens' narrative can be called anachronistic; in other words, it looks back into the past to shed light on the concerns of the present. Although the novel is set earlier in time, as in *The Pickwick Papers*, it reflects the ills of Victorian society in the 1850s. A similar argument is presented by Humpry House, who contends that "[Dickens'] popularity as a moralist was thus enhanced by his habitual retrospection: his ante-dated plots took some of the sting out of his satire for those who merely wanted entertainment, and encouraged the mild exercise of historical comparison for those who cared for profit and instruction" (42). Although House finds a link between Dickens' retrospection and its entertainment value for the readers, Dickens himself explains his inclination to returning to the past in his own words as follows: "If ever I destroy myself, it will be in the bitterness of hearing those infernal and damnably good old times, extolled" (qtd. in Philpotts 201). While Dickens' retrospection is predicated on his intent on entertaining the reader by House, Dickens explains this with his nostalgia for the good old days.

Little Dorrit, which starts at Marseilles, "a villainous prison," located in "southern France" (*LD* 2-3) and continues with the Marshalsea Prison, focuses on the experiences of the Dorrit family with and without fortune, and of the people around them. The novel is divided into two books according to changes that the Dorrit family undergo: "Poverty," the name of the first book, deals with William Dorrit and his family's life in the Marshalsea, "a debtors' prison," and "Riches," the name of the second book, focuses on the life of the Dorrit family upon becoming free and prosperous. The first book takes place mostly in the Marshalsea Prison, which becomes home for Mr. Dorrit, who, like Dickens' father, was detained there for his debts for twenty three years. While Amy's brother, Edward or Tip, and her sister, Fanny, live outside, Amy Dorrit, the youngest daughter of his three children, was

born and raised in the prison. To make a living, Amy works as a seamstress in Mrs. Clennam's house, in which she meets her son, Arthur Clennam, "a grave dark man of forty" (*LD* 13). Mr. Clennam, who has been to China for many years, comes to London upon his father's death with the aim of finding out what "darkened my father's last hours with remorse" (*LD* 35). When Arthur comes home to search for whether his father "had unhappily wronged any one, and made no reparation" (*LD* 35), he takes interest in Little Dorrit, as he calls her, and he is suspicious of whether his family has any connection with her father's imprisonment.

His search for truth takes him to the Circumlocution Office, which is a fictitious government department, run by the family of Barnacles with its motto "how not to do it." Through the Office's policy of "how not to do it," Dickens shows how the institutions in the country work and criticises how things are delayed by not doing anything. The Circumlocution Office

was (as everybody knows without being told) the most important Department under Government. No public business of any kind could possibly be done at any time without the acquiescence of the Circumlocution Office. Its finger was in the largest public pie, and in the smallest public tart. It was equally impossible to do the plainest right and to undo the plainest wrong without the express authority of the Circumlocution Office. If another Gunpowder Plot had been discovered half an hour before the lighting of the match, nobody would have been justified in saving the parliament until there had been half a score of boards, half a bushel of minutes, several sacks of official memoranda, and a family-vault full of ungrammatical correspondence, on the part of the Circumlocution Office. (*LD* 72)

The Circumlocution Office, by which Dickens satirizes the bureaucratic slobbishness of government institutions, is run to obstruct efficiency under the pretence of being efficient (Barrett 209). When people go there, their work is delayed due to the officials' loitering the work. Dickens depicts how things work in the Office as follows:

Then you'll memorialise that Department (according to regular forms which you'll find out) for leave to memorialise this Department. If you get it (which you may after a time), that memorial must be entered in that Department, sent to be registered in this Department, sent back to be signed by that Department, sent back to be countersigned by this Department, and then it will begin to be regularly before that Department. You'll find out when the business passes through each of these stages by asking at both Departments till they tell you. (*LD* 81)

It can be deduced from the description of the Circumlocution Office that Dickens gives an ideal world in reverse. By creating a fictitious department with its many faults and deficiencies, he reflects a world which must be ideal in his time. Thus, the Circumlocution Office is a foil that serves to reveal what Dickens sees as the ideal governmental office.

The second part of the novel starts with the now well-to-do Dorrit family's travel to Europe and continues with Arthur Clennam's gradual physical and mental decline. After coming across his childhood sweetheart, Flora Finching, in the first book, for instance, Arthur gets disillusioned: "Flora, whom he had left a lily, had become a peony; but that was not much. Flora, who had seemed enchanting in all she said and thought, was diffuse and silly. That was much. Flora, who had been spoiled and artless long ago, was determined to be spoilt and artless now. That was a fatal blow" (*LD* 104). Arthur is upset with the change he has observed. What he sees in Flora does not live up to his expectations. She does not look the same Flora as he loved when he was very young.

After this disappointment, in the second book, when he learns that Pet Meagles, with whom he meets on his journey for home and falls in love, has gotten married to Henry Gowan, in Dickens' words, "the greatest rascal" and "a scoundrel" (qtd. in Forster 247), he feels too old to be married, becomes introverted, and does not want to get married any more. What is more, he is imprisoned in the Marshalsea after his investments in Merdle's business are bankrupted upon Mr. Merdle's suicide. This event harms not only Arthur but also the Dorrit family. Meeting the Merdles family on their travel in Europe, marrying his daughter Fanny to his stepson, and investing all his fortune in Merdle's Bank, Mr. Dorrit is ruined upon Mr. Merdle's suicide; and he loses all his money and dies. While Mr. Clennam is detained in prison, it is revealed that Mrs. Clennam is not Arthur's real mother and the inheritance which belongs to Arthur's real mother is inherited from Arthur's father's uncle to her. However, in case of her death, to Amy's uncle, who is the caretaker of Arthur's real mother; and in case of his being childless, to his youngest niece, who is Amy Dorrit. Although Amy has the right to get the inheritance from Arthur's father, Mrs. Clennam prevents her to obtain the money by hiding this reality from everybody.

Another thing which is revealed is the love of Amy for Arthur, who gets aware of his own love for her as well. The novel concludes with his release from the prison by his partner's paying off his debts and his subsequent marriage to Amy: "They went quietly down into the roaring streets, inseparable and blessed; and as they passed along in sunshine and shade, the noisy and the eager, and the arrogant and the froward and the vain, fretted and chafed, and made their usual uproar" (*LD* 569). Although the novel ends with their marriage, the last quotation, according to T. N. Grove, implies that "the married couple must try to make a happy existence in the still-present larger prison of London, the London Dickens saw too full of many dragons like the Barnacles" (755). What he means is that both Amy and Arthur, who are experienced at being in prison for a time, enter into a bigger prison, which consists of many dangers. From Grove's implication, it could be deduced that Dickens does not seem highly optimistic about the future of the country. With its complex plot, character galore, its gloomy atmosphere throughout the whole novel, *Little Dorrit* comes to an end with the disappearance of some of the characters, the deaths of some, and the marriage of Amy and Arthur Clennam.

The relationships among the characters in *Little Dorrit* are explained by the master and the servant opposition which, according to Alistair M. Duckworth, "runs through the novel," in which "the victim who persists in his victimization may be the source of his own torment" (110). While Mr. Dorrit, Miss Wade and Rigaud represent masters, Amy Dorrit, Tattycoram and Cavelletto represent servants in the text. However, their mastery is in flux and it changes from character to character. Dickens gives various representations of the masters in various forms as Duckworth maintains. Mr. Dorrit's misunderstanding his servants' attitudes towards him after being well-off, Miss Wade's self-torment with her misinterpretations of people and events, and Rigaud's selling people around him so as not to be governed by them epitomise Duckworth's claim of the master's dual role. While the masters Mr. Dorrit, Miss Wade, and Rigaud try to dominate and subordinate their servants, they descend to their servants' status. Therefore, while their servants maintain their inferior status and seem to be content with this, the masters are not able to keep their superior position. Avrom Fleishman concurs with Duckworth and claims that "money and power," which govern the fictionalised society of the novel determine the position of the characters: "superiority and inferiority, dominance and obligation" (575). In

accordance with Fleishman's claim, it can be stated that power is what puts Mr. Dorrit, Miss Wade, and Rigaud in the position of mastery. On the other hand, lack of power puts Amy, Tattycoram, and Cavelletto in the position of servility. Hence, in the novel, Charles Dickens deals with the juxtaposition of these two different classes.

Since Dickens focuses on such a juxtaposition, *Little Dorrit* is an appropriate text to be examined in terms of Hegelian Dialectic. In the case of the relationship between Mr. Dorrit and Amy, Miss Wade and Tattycoram, and Rigaud and Cavelletto from a Hegelian standpoint, the "master" characters cannot attain a full self-consciousness; therefore, they assume the role of the "servant" as well. Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic rests on the desire of two beings to be recognised as self-consciousness by the other. The master undertakes the role of "for-self" (Hegel 115) by being independent while the servant assumes the status of "in self" (Hegel 117) by accepting the object of his master and becomes dependent. The core of this relationship between the master and the servant constitutes the willingness of the servant, which means that unless the servant is willing to obey the master, the master cannot use him for his own interests. In this relationship, the master does not recognise the servant as a self-consciousness. The servant's performance, on the other hand, is called a "servile consciousness" (Hegel 117). However, what the master desires is not this kind of recognition since this kind of recognition is "one-sided and unequal" (Hegel 116). He desires to be recognised by a being who is equal to him since the master knows that the servant's recognition is coercive. The master is also cognizant of the fact that, in the course of the relationship, the master who is dependent on the labour of the servant has no longer the self-consciousness of a master. He loses his mastery over the servant. His dependency over the servant makes him realise his inferiority to the servant and hence, the master becomes the servant of the servant, whereas the servant becomes the master of the master.

The relationship between Mr. William Dorrit and Amy Dorrit represents the master and the servant opposition which exists between the father and the daughter. Confined for more than twenty years in the Marshalsea Prison, which "Any one can go In" [*sic*], yet "not every one who can go out" (*LD* 56), Mr. Dorrit is not only Amy's father but also the father of the prisoners. Therefore, he assumes the title "the Father of the Marshalsea" (*LD* 46) in order to be recognised as a figure of authority by the inmates in the prison. This title is of such significance for him that "if any

impostor had arisen to claim it, he would have shed tears in resentment of the attempt to deprive him of his rights” (*LD* 46). This title renders authority to him and warrants a higher position among the prisoners. For this reason, he accepts all the gifts especially money from the people as a token of their tribute since he thinks he deserves such respect from people, and he makes others feel obliged to pay their homage. He demands and desires to be considered as a leader. If any visitor forgets to present him any gifts or money, he reminds them of this directly. When Plornish, for instance, gives him some halfpence, he is so disturbed by the amount of money and expresses his disturbance by saying that “How dare you!” (*LD* 47) since he finds the money little hence, unworthy of him. Welcoming his visitors with the “air of benignity and patronage in his manner” (*LD* 57), Mr. Dorrit hints at his superiority in prison. He thinks that being imprisoned in the Marshalsea for over twenty years grants him special privileges and that he should not be treated like other prisoners but be given special treatment. For this reason, he insists on being taken as the head of the prison and establishes dominance over his fellow prisoners and the turnkeys as well. Such a character as Mr. Dorrit represents Hegel's conceptualization of master, whose desire is to be recognised by his servants. After being recognised as the leader of the servants, he becomes dependent upon their service.

The same dominance is evident in Mr. Dorrit's relationship with his daughter: “I have impressed upon Amy during many years, that I must have my meals (for instance) punctually” (*LD* 154). When he depicts his days in the prison to his brother, Frederick, William Dorrit boastfully tells him how he shapes her with his influence and dominance over her while upbringing her in the prison. This explains why Amy comes to the prison immediately after work. Amy works in Arthur's house as a seamstress and when her employer gives her food, she does not eat it; instead, she takes it to the prison for her father to eat it. Despite Amy's servitude, he “had never once thought of HER dress, her shoes, her need of anything” (*LD* 159). Instead of thinking of her needs, he uses her for his own ends. While Amy serves him in the prison, he does not care for her feelings. His mastery is felt not only on his daughter but also on the others who are willing to obey him.

His bossiness is evident in his attitude towards Old Nandy, Mrs. Plornishes' father and a fellow in the Workhouse. When Amy brings him to the Marshalsea to see “the patronage of the Father of that national institution” (*LD* 253), Mr. Dorrit

feels so restless to see him with his daughter, and warns Amy about his position in the prison: "I have done what I could to keep you select here; I have done what I could to retain you a position here. I may have succeeded; I may not. You may know it; you may not. I give no opinion. I have endured everything here but humiliation. That I have happily been spared - until this day" (*LD* 256). As the master of the prison, he sets up a position in the prison and his position is recognised by the turnkeys there, and; therefore, he does not want this to be hurt at all. He does not want to be seen with an inmate from the workhouse since he tries to maintain "his shabby pretense of genteel superiority" (Johnson 899). After receiving Nandy's visit, he humiliates him at every moment to show his dominance also over him:

"Not ready for more ham yet, Nandy? Why, how slow you are! (His last teeth," he explained to the company, "are going, poor old boy?")

At another time, he said, "No shrimps, Nandy?" and on his not instantly replying, observed, "His hearing is becoming very defective. He'll be deaf directly."

At another time, he asked him, "Do you walk much, Nandy, about the yard within the walls of that place of yours?"

"No, sir, no. I haven't any great liking for that."

"No, to be sure," he assented. "Very natural." Then he privately informed the circle, "Legs going."

Once he asked the pensioner, in that general clemency which asked him anything to keep him afloat, how old his younger grandchild was.

"John Edward," said the pensioner, slowly laying down his knife and fork to consider. "How old, sir? Let me think now." The Father of the Marshalsea tapped his forehead. "Memory weak." (*LD* 259)

Although Nandy is a few years younger than him, Mr. Dorrit treats him as if Nandy is an old man and therefore does not miss any opportunity to look down upon his infirmities. Since Nandy stays in the workhouse, Mr. Dorrit treats him as he treats his other servants.

As the Father of the Marshalsea, Mr. Dorrit fulfils his desire to gain recognition of the people around him through the servitude of his servants around him. Whether inside or outside the prison he still sees them his servants. Just as he gets the news of his freedom from the prison and of his fortune, he looks down upon the people in the prison this time: "Poor creatures!" (*LD* 290). He immediately

forgets his old days in the prison when he gets rich and leaves his ward friends behind. When discharged from the prison, he achieves economic prosperity instantaneously. He keeps his mastery over people with the power of his fortune this time. He forgets Amy's previous sacrifices and Mr. Clennam's attempts to have Tip released from prison:

There were circumstances attending my-ha-slight knowledge of Mr. Clennam (it was very slight), which, [...], would render it highly indelicate in Mr. Clennam to-ha-to seek to renew communication with me or with any member of my family under existing circumstances. If Mr. Clennam has sufficient delicacy to perceive the impropriety of any such attempt, I am bound as a responsible gentleman to-ha-defer to that delicacy on his part. If, on the other hand, Mr. Clennam has not that delicacy, I cannot for a moment-ha-hold any correspondence with so-hum-coarse a mind. In either case, it would appear that Mr. Clennam is put altogether out of the question, and that we have nothing to do with him or he with us. (*LD* 314)

He does not appreciate people's favours any more as he is freed from captivity. As he gains wealth, he thinks that he does not need people's favours.

Once dependent upon the servitude of people in the Marshalsea Prison, especially of Amy, Mr. Dorrit is enslaved with the power of his fortune and his fears this time. When he was in prison, he was the master of the prisoners. Therefore, when he gets out of prison, he wants to maintain his mastery position. However, this time he has other problems. He begins to lose his power as a master. This could be accounted for his inner struggle between his fears and his invisible mastery. Although he has fortune, he fears whether people around him learn his background. For this reason, in order to maintain his position in the genteel society and to gain the recognition of the people in this society, he desires to raise his fortune, so he invests his money into Mr. Merdle's bank. Meanwhile, he lives with his fears and he is scared of whether his servants know his former incarceration and talk about it behind him. Hence, when, once, his servant pauses upon his order, Mr. Dorrit, "seeing the whole Marshalsea and all its testimonials in the pause" (*LD* 413), shouts and curses him though the servant does not mean any hints by pausing to fulfill Dorrit's order. He cannot tolerate the disobedience of his servants. Mr. Dorrit does not even want Amy's service to him, which Amy performed in the Marshalsea since this reminds him of the old days in the prison. When Mr. Merdle commits suicide, he loses his

fortune and then his power in society. Losing his privileged position, Mr. Dorrit dies. His rise and fall is depicted by Edwin B. Barrett as follows:

[Mr. Dorrit] swells and swells in pride and folly, worsens after his contact with Merdle, sickens as he crosses Europe, deliriously constructs castles in the infected air as he goes, and then is brought down to degradation at Mrs. Merdle's very table when, [...], he addresses the company in his most ornate rhetoric as though they were all Marshalsea bankrupts being introduced to him, the Father of the place, and dies. (210)

It could be stated that Mr. Dorrit's mastery is fragile because it is dependent on other people's recognition of his mastery. He does not keep the system that he sets up in the prison although he owns fortune. Besides, there are many masters who exist outside and who are superior to him. All these exemplify that he is a master not because he is innately in possession of mastery but because other people are willing to accept him as a master. Therefore, he uses the people around him to maintain his mastery in the prison.

Mr. Dorrit's mastery and his desire to maintain his mastery are most evident in his relationship with his youngest child, Amy, born in prison. Amy, nicknamed "the Child of the Marshalsea" by the prisoners, "Little mother" by Maggy, "little fool" by her sister, and "Little Dorrit" by Mr. Arthur Clennam, is "the servant of the servants, the last and the least" (Fleishman 580). She is the only one in the family who works for Mr. Dorrit. As her uncle admits, Mr. Dorrit "would have been quite lost without Amy" (*LD* 66). Despite being the youngest, she acts like an elder sister for her siblings. She takes her sister to dancing school so that she can have a dance education. She tries to save her brother from prison. She takes care of her father without any help from her siblings. Although her service and her sacrifices have been of little value for her father and her siblings, she willingly accepts the role of the servant until her father's death. Amy is imprisoned not only for Mr. Dorrit but also for the other members of the family. Nevertheless, her siblings and even her father all take her for granted, which is noticed by Arthur Clennam:

Arthur fancied that he heard in these praises a certain tone of custom, which he had heard from the father last night with an inward protest and feeling of antagonism. It was not that they stinted her praises, or were insensible to what she did for them; but that they were lazily habituated to her, as they were to all the rest of their condition. He fancied that although they had before them, every day, the means of

comparison between her and one another and themselves, they regarded her as being in her necessary place; as holding a position towards them all which belonged to her, like her name or her age. He fancied that they viewed her, not as having risen away from the prison atmosphere, but as appertaining to it; as being vaguely what they had a right to expect, and nothing more. (*LD* 66)

In this regard, Frederick Dorrit, Amy's uncle, similarly thinks that the Dorrits do not appreciate her sacrifices. Therefore, he reacts when they criticise her inability to adapt to their new life after they reach prosperity. When Mr. Dorrit is freed from prison, the Dorrit family move up to a new class, which changes all but Amy. She does not want to make any changes in her life as she admits, in her letter to Mr. Clennam, that she "[has] never dreamed of the change in [their] fortunes itself" (*LD* 381). Therefore, she cannot get accustomed to the new life. She longs for the old days when her father needs her service. Hence, she finds it difficult to adapt to the new life. The Chivery family, the turnkeys of the prison, also notice Amy's absolute servility to her family, and express their opinions to Mr. Clennam and say that "she is doomed to be a constant slave to them" (*LD* 178). When Amy turns John Chivery's proposal down by saying that "No, John, I cannot have you, I cannot have any husband, it is not my intentions ever to become a wife, it is my intentions to be always a sacrifice, farewell, find another worthy of you, and forget me!" (*LD* 178), the Chivery family think that all the Dorrit family are against John and especially Mr. Dorrit does not want to lose her as she is his servant; therefore, Amy is a constant slave to them.

However, in the case of young John Chivery's proposal to Amy, contrary to what the Chivery family think, Mr. Dorrit tries to persuade Amy to accept the proposal since he wants to maintain his status in the prison. For him, to decline this proposal means losing "the support and recognition of Chivery and his brother officers," which might cause him to "starve to death here" (*LD* 156). However, for the first and the last time, after years of her acquiescence, she goes against her father's wishes and disobeys him. Although Amy is an innate slave, her love for Mr. Clennam prevents her to abide by her father's wish and she gets out of her slavery mode in an instant.

Contrary to Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic, in which the servant carries out the demands of the master and recognises him as a master for fear of death, Amy

keeps her servile attachment to her family with her “unrequited devotion” (Smith 36) to them. Although labour, as Alexandre Kojève claims, “forms, transforms the World, humanizes it by making it more adapted to Man, transforms, forms, educates man, humanizes him by bringing him into greater conformity with the idea that he has of himself” (52), Amy’s position is not changed. Her subordination to her master does not come to an end. In this respect, her master, Mr. Dorrit, who is a passive consumer, becomes dependent upon her services but he does not actively demand servility from Amy. He supposes that being the Father of the Marshalsea Prison gives him the privilege of being the master of his fellow prisoners. As a matter of fact, by not working, he just consumes and places himself in the position of the servant of the master, who is his daughter. Although he knows that his servant, Amy, is active and productive by working as a seamstress, he feigns that he does not know it so as to maintain his privileged position. He does not want to be seen as dependent upon his servant. Hence, not to lose his power over her, he implies that he is the one who makes sacrifices for her and says that “whatever I have done for your sake, my dear child, I have done freely and without murmuring” (*LD* 160). In this way, he “erects himself as a martyr of self-sacrifice, a servant to his family” (Fleishman 579). As a matter of fact, he uses people around him, particularly Amy, as his servants.

In his analysis of Mr. Dorrit, Avrom Fleishman claims that “not only is he a gentleman, a member of the master-class, but they, his fellow-prisoners, are servants, patronized and protected by their master, the lowliest debtor of them all” (579). Mr. Dorrit is placed to the position of mastery since he protects his servants and dominates them. However, when he realises that he is dependent upon the service of the servant, he accepts his own servitude: “What does it matter whether I eat or starve? What does it matter whether such a blighted life as mine comes to an end, now, next week, or next year? What am I worth to any one? A poor prisoner, fed on alms and broken victuals; a squalid, disgraced wretch?” (*LD* 157). Similarly, Peter Smith concedes that all the people surrounding Mr. Dorrit are his victims and they are all willing victims (21). In return for their being willing victims, Mr. Dorrit pretends not to know what they do in their outside life. Although his brother and his children work outside, he does not seem to be disturbed by not being informed by them.

Nevertheless, Amy's servitude does not end with her father's death. She transfers her need to serve to Arthur Clennam this time when he is incarcerated in the Marshalsea Prison since he, like Mr. Dorrit, goes bankrupt due to a failed business venture of Mr. Merdle. As Linda Lewis explains, in this case, Amy "comforts and cradles her future husband in the same manner when he is similarly dejected and ill and incarcerated in the same room previously assigned to the late William Dorrit" (180). Immediately after she learns his situation, she goes to the Marshalsea to visit him, and she "draw[s] an arm softly round his neck, [lays] his head upon her bosom, put[s] a hand upon his head, and rest[s] her cheek upon that hand, nurse[s] him as lovingly, and GOD knows as innocently, as she had nursed her father in that room when she had been but a baby, needing all the care from others that she took of them" (*LD* 521). She wants him to let her stay with him there and serve him as she has nursed her father in prison. She begs him to accept her money to pay off his debts so that he can be freed: "Will you let me lend you all I have? Will you let me give it to you? Will you let me show you that I have never forgotten, that I never can forget, your protection of me whereas this was my home? [...] make me of all the world the happiest, by saying Yes" (*LD* 523). She desires to serve him as she did to her father and in this way she tries to maintain her subordination. Poverty and richness, freedom and bondage, which exist in Little Dorrit's life, do not transform her from being a servant to a master and do not change her servility since she is a willing servant. Amy continues her servitude even with Arthur by marrying him. In her own words, her wish to be his servant can be seen in the following quotation: "I am proud in having been resigned by you, I am happy in being with you in this prison. [...] I am yours anywhere, everywhere! [...] I would rather pass my life here with you, and go out daily, working for our bread, than I would have the greatest fortune that ever was told, and be the greatest lady that ever was honoured" (*LD* 563). Her marriage to Arthur can be taken as a sign of a continuance of her servitude because she ceases to be Dorrit's daughter but this time she is the wife of Arthur. Therefore, she still does not have identity of her own other than being a subservient position. However, she is content with her position beside Mr. Clennam. In her analysis of Amy, Hilary Schor emphasizes that, becoming Mrs. Clennam, she "disappears [...] into the nothingness of her husband's name" (147) and remains entirely subservient to her masters. As Avrom Fleishman depicts her servility, Little Dorrit is "the perfect servant, who loves those she serves, and indeed serves them

only because she loves them” (581). Serving her father and Mr. Clennam in all conditions without questioning accounts for her willingness to be a servant.

In accordance with the Hegelian Master and Servant Dialectic, while Mr. Dorrit demands recognition from the inmates in the prison, his visitors, and his family to be recognised as a master, Amy does not have such a concern and she is content with her status of servility. As for Mr. Dorrit, who subjugates his servants, his position of mastery is reverted to the position of servitude in the case of losing his power. He becomes aware of his dependence upon his servants. When he is in Marshalsea Prison, he has dominance over Amy and the prisoners there. However, when he is at large, he is enslaved by his fears of losing his mastery position, his power and fortune. His fragility in his status as a master results in his losing mastery and losing his life. Amy, on the other hand, accepts her position and does not make any attempts to change it. She submits to the superiority of her “masters”: initially of her father and then of her lover. Since she is an innate servant, she willingly accepts the servant of her second master.

Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic is also evident in the relationship between Miss Wade and Tattycoram. Miss Wade, “a handsome young Englishwoman, travelling quite alone [with] a proud observant face” (*LD* 17), is introduced to the novel in the second chapter with the fellow travellers. Miss Wade and the travellers are kept in quarantine on their voyage with an unknown reason on the way to London. On the same journey, among the travellers is Tattycoram included to the novel. Tattycoram, whose real name is Harriet Beadle, is adopted by the Meagles family so as to be “a little maid to Pet” (*LD* 14), their only child alive, upon the death of one of their twin daughters. As Mr. Meagles clarifies, the name “Harriet Beadle” changes into “Hattey” then “Tatty,” and then they begin to call her “Tattycoram.” The Meagles family first alter her name without asking her and then determine her position in the family. She becomes the servant of Pet Meagles. In this way, Tattycoram's servitude starts, and it becomes even more pronounced. As Peter Smith holds, although Tattycoram is adopted as a replacement for their dead daughter, the way the Meagles treat her as a servant results in her vulnerability to the advances of Miss Wade (20). Although she confesses that “[the Meagles] are nothing but good to me” (*LD* 21) and that she “love[s] them dearly” (*LD* 21), she leaves them. Though she thinks that “no people could ever be kinder to a thankless creature

than they always are to me” (*LD* 21), she accepts Miss Wade’s protection against the Meagles. Since Miss Wade comes from a similar background to Tattycoram, Miss Wade provokes her to leave them in order to sever her bondage with them.

As a matter of fact, Miss Wade’s background is full of disappointments. Growing up as an orphan, she earns her living as a governess; however, she is not appreciated by the people around her. Moreover, an inferior position is deemed appropriate for her by them. However, she believes that she deserves a better station in life. When Miss Wade comes across Tattycoram, in her words, in whose “position there was a singular likeness to my own, and in whose character I was interested and pleased to see much of the rising against swollen patronage and selfishness, calling themselves kindness, protection, benevolence, and other fine names, which I have described as inherent in my nature” (*LD* 462), she identifies herself with Tattycoram. Thinking that Tattycoram has experienced similar abasement by the Meagles, Miss Wade tries “to release the girl from her bondage and sense of injustice” (*LD* 462). However, instead of freeing Tattycoram from her bondage, Miss Wade subjugates Tattycoram under her power and makes her servant. Tattycoram vents out Wade’s mastery over her, with her own words: “You are reproaching me, underhanded, with having nobody but you to look to. And because I have nobody but you to look to, you think you are to make me do, or not do, everything you please, and are to put any affront upon me. You are as bad as they were, every bit. But I will not be quite tamed, and made submissive” (*LD* 455). It can be understood from her confession that Tattycoram is aware of Miss Wade’s dominance over her.

When Fleishman analyses the relationship between Miss Wade and Tattycoram, he asserts that, out of the servant characters, Tattycoram is the one whose rebellion is “the most outspoken” (576). She shows her rebellion to both the Meagles and Miss Wade. Initially, she is disturbed by the mastery of the Meagles; therefore, she deserts them. Then, she becomes aware of the bondage of Miss Wade. When she notices that Wade’s mastery over her is much more disturbing than that of the Meagles, Tattycoram, similar to Amy, prefers to maintain her position of servility. Her return to the Meagles with her repentance expressing it with her own words, “Pardon, dear Master; take me back, dear Mistress” (558), shows that she is regretful and that she wants to maintain her status as a servant:

Oh! I have been so wretched, always so unhappy, and so repentant! I was afraid of her from the first time I saw her. I knew she had got a power over me through understanding what was bad in me so well. It was a madness in me, and she could raise it whenever she liked. I used to think, when I got into that state, that people were all against me because of my first beginning; and the kinder they were to me, the worse fault I found in them. I made it out that they triumphed above me, and that they wanted to make me envy them, when I know – when I even knew then – that they never thought of such a thing. [...] I am bad enough, but not so bad as I was, indeed. I have had Miss Wade before me all this time, as if it was my own self grown ripe-turning everything the wrong way, and twisting all good into evil. I have had before me all this time, finding no pleasure in anything but keeping me as miserable, suspicious, and tormenting as herself. Not that she had much to do, to do that, for I was as bad as bad could be. I only mean to say, that, after what I have gone through, I hope I shall never be quite so bad again, and that I shall get better by very slow degrees. I'll try very hard. I won't stop at five-and-twenty, sir, I'll count five-and-twenty hundred, five-and-twenty thousand! (*LD* 559)

It could be understood from the quotation that Tattycoram is initially deceived with Miss Wade's power over her. After seeing her dominance over her, Tattycoram would rather stay with the Meagles and tolerate their humiliation than live with Miss Wade. Therefore, the relationship between Miss Wade and Tattycoram is based on the mastery of Miss Wade, which is "more domineering" than of Mr. Meagles (Fleishman 577). However, when she apologizes to Mr. Meagles, he expresses what is expected from her, which is to show "resignation" (Smith 29) like Amy: "[Little Dorrit's] young life has been one of active resignation, goodness, and noble service. [...] Duty, Tattycoram. Begin it early, and do it well" (*LD* 560). Unlike Amy, Tattycoram does not know submission. It is understood from Mr. Meagles' conversation with her that she is welcomed by the family only if she learns submission like Amy. She is expected to obey the orders of her masters and to accept her position. However, after Tattycoram returns and accepts that "there is no more chance that she will ever be anything but his servant" (Smith 30), she disappears from the novel.

As for Miss Wade, although she, as a master, longs for the satisfaction of her desire to gain recognition through the servitude of her servant, Tattycoram, after each disappointment, she accepts her "dependent and inferior position" (*LD* 460). From her confession regarding her background, her paranoid misinterpretations of people

and events entering her life are deduced (Duckworth 111). She misunderstands people's approach towards her. Although people have a positive approach to her, she thinks that they deem her inferior. Her sense of alienation and exclusion is based on her childhood experience. When she was a child, she lived with nine girls in the same house and she was the only orphan among them. She misinterpreted the girls' attempts of reconciliation after each quarrel and perceived that their conciliating attitude was out of their sense of superiority. Then she began to work as a governess in a family with two children. This time she misunderstood the mother's delicate behaviour towards her and she regarded this as a sign of the mother's way of showing her patronage. All these experiences propel her to exhibit a mastery character over the weak ones since she thinks that she is crushed by people's insults. However, in Fleishman's analysis of Wade, "the more she claims equality with the masters by spurning them, the more she proves her inferiority, her inability to live a normal life among them" (578). From her last failure, Miss Wade, "somebody's child-anybody's, nobody's" (LD 371) disappears from the novel with Tattycoram.

When the relationship between Miss Wade and Tattycoram is explained in accordance with the Hegelian Master and Servant Dialectic, on the one hand, there is the servant Tattycoram, who desires to be recognised by her masters, initially the Meagles and then Miss Wade. After realising that Miss Wade's dominance over her is much more disturbing than that of the Meagles, she prefers to remain her servility to the Meagles. On the other hand, there is the master of Tattycoram, Miss Wade, who has no parents, no property, and even no first name. She satisfies her desire of recognition by making Tattycoram dependent on her; however, by mastering her, she loses her position and proves her inferiority. Her life is characterized by self-tormenting and by subjugating others whose lives share similar features with her.

The final relationship to be analysed in accordance with Hegelian Master and Servant Dialectic is the relationship between Rigaud (a.k.a. Lagnier or Blandois) and Cavelletto (a.k.a. John Baptist). *Little Dorrit* commences with the introduction of these two prisoners at Marseilles. One of them, Cavelletto, is mistakenly suspected of smuggling, and the other, Rigaud, is accused of the murder of his wife although it is not proven. By looking at their dialogue between them, it can be deduced that the very beginning of the novel is marked with a distinctive master and servant relationship between Rigaud and Cavelletto. On the one hand, there is John Baptist

(or Cavelletto), in Rigaud's words, a "pig," who is submissive to all the orders of "my master" (LD 4-5). There is, on the other hand, Rigaud, who does not "submit" but "govern[s]" (LD 9). While Mr. Baptist (or Cavelletto) exists in society as a well-intentioned man, Rigaud (or Blandois) shows wicked behaviour in society with his motto, which is "society sells itself and sells me: and I sell Society" (LD 517). In his analysis of Cavelletto and Rigaud, Edgar Johnson claims that it is not Rigaud who is responsible for his evils but the society in which he lives is held accountable for his diabolical actions (886). However, in the novel Rigaud is depicted by a French lady at the hotel of the Break Day who does not think about Rigaud similarly:

And I tell you this, my friend, that there are people (men and women both, unfortunately) who have no good in them – none. That there are people whom it is necessary to detest without compromise. That there are people who must be dealt with as enemies of the human race. That there are people who have no human heart, and who must be crushed like savage beasts and cleared out of the way. (LD 89)

When he is released from prison, Rigaud goes into the hotel owned and run by the French lady. The rumour about his release and his crime spreads to the hotel as well. For this reason, the French lady speaks out against him. Through this portrayal of Rigaud by the French lady, Dickens gives a negative description of the villain. Paul D. Herring points out that Rigaud's freedom aims at reflecting one of Dickens' main issue, which is: "the real villains are at large while the innocent suffer" (29). By stating this, Herring calls the attention to the position of the country. The Victorian Britain in which the novel was written is marked with the inequalities between the middle class and the working class. Dickens illustrates this clash by creating master and servant characters in *Little Dorrit*.

In his analysis of Rigaud in "*Little Dorrit* and the Question of Closure," Alistair M. Duckworth claims that Rigaud is "based on the stereotype of the melodramatic villain who is to be booed and hissed every time he appears on stage" (123). Dickens creates such a bad character in the novel that draws an immense reaction of the people. Rigaud is despised not only by the characters in the novel but also the readers. Like Miss Wade, Rigaud puts the blame of what he has experienced in life on society and the people, but never on himself. In the course of the novel, the more he tries to ascend to mastery, the more he descends into servility. Like Miss Wade, he is controlled by his greed and hatred, which causes his descent into

servility. He exacts revenge on society by such corrupt actions as spying and blackmailing people. Firstly, he murders his wife since she does not let him dominate her and use her money. His murder and his blackmailing Mrs. Clennam upon learning her secrets regarding Arthur's real mother and the inheritance bequeathed by her husband to Amy Dorrit all attest to his villainous character. He manipulates weaker people around him. He fulfills his desire of mastery by coercion and assimilates his servants by threat of death. It could be asserted that Rigaud's mastery is the result of his evil actions rather than an innate quality that he possesses.

Blandois, you shall turn the tables on society, my little child. Haha! Holy blue, you have begun well, Blandois. At a pinch, an excellent master in English or French; a man for the bosom of families! You have a quick perception, you have humour, you have ease, you have insinuating manners, you have a good appearance; in effect, you are a gentleman! A gentleman you shall live, my small boy, and a gentleman you shall die. You shall win, however the game goes. They shall all confess your merit, Blandois. You shall subdue the society which has grievously wronged you, to your own high spirit. Death of my soul! You are high spirited by right and by nature, my Blandois! (LD 244)

However, as the novel progresses, while he expresses how Cavelletto is different from him in terms of subjugation to society, Rigaud accepts his failure. He is aware of his descent into servitude by deceiving society. Nevertheless, in the early part of the novel, this is not so evident: "A gentleman I am! And a gentleman I'll live, and a gentleman I'll die! It's my intent to be a gentleman. It's my game. [...] I win, however the game goes" (LD 8). From this, it can be inferred that Rigaud, at the beginning of the novel, desires to be recognised by another self-consciousness and to deprive him of his independence.

The only man he enslaves initially, after his deceased wife, is Cavelletto. Although both are incarcerated in the same cell of the prison, they lead utterly different lives there. Even the jailer admits the differences between the two prisoners by saying to Cavelletto: "the master wins, [...] and you lose. [...] You get husky bread and sour drink by it; and he gets sausage of Lyons, veal in savoury jelly, white bread, strachino cheese, and good wine by it" (LD 5). While the servant Cavelletto obeys his orders submissively "on his knees" (LD 4), Rigaud is not seen to do any labour: "Have I ever done anything here? Ever touched the broom, or spread the mats, or rolled them up, or found the draughts, or collected the dominoes, or put my

hand to any kind of work?" (*LD* 7) Although both of them are prisoners, they do not represent the same thing. While Rigaud is the master, Cavelletto is the servant. While Rigaud is the representative of evil, Cavelletto is of naivety. While the servant Cavelletto works for his master, the master Rigaud makes fun of his life. Both of them seem to be content with their status until both are freed.

According to Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic, the fulfilment of both entities' desires enjoys an indispensable role. While the servant's desire is to survive, the master longs for the satisfaction of his desires via the servitude of the servant. The fear of death, which is the core of the relationship between the master and the servant, saves the servant's life in the life and death struggle. By submitting to the superiority of the master, the servant escapes from death. Through the threat of death, the master assimilates the servant. If the relationship between Rigaud and Cavelletto is expounded, the servitude of Cavelletto can be explained by his fear of his master. Rigaud's attempts to capture him do not meet with any resistance from Cavelletto. For fear of his master, Cavelletto is seen to recognise him as his master and obey his orders. Hence, he "give[s] up his claim to recognition and become[s] an object for the master; that is, he becomes a slave" (Williams 61). He does not desire to be recognised by his master. What he desires is the desire of his master. However, unlike Amy, Cavelletto serves his master for fear of him. He stays in the same cell with Rigaud at Marseilles. In order to survive, he puts up with his master's humiliation and dominance over him. As the novel proceeds, when both are released, it is seen that Cavelletto does not maintain his submission. When they encounter outside the prison, Cavelletto just runs away "from his patron" (*LD* 93), which is his only act of rebellion. Fleeing his patron, he comes across another master, who, this time, is Mr. Clennam. According to Mr. Clennam; however, Mr. Clennam is "rather his adviser than his proprietor" (*LD* 399). After Cavelletto's injury, Mr. Clennam takes care of him and finds him an accommodation in the Bleeding Heart Yard. He employs him in his factory to "keep the keys of the Factory" (*LD* 398). In return for his aids, Cavelletto is demanded to find Rigaud and bring him to the Marshalsea, where Mr. Clennam is imprisoned. Cavelletto typifies an excellent submissive servant since, when Mr. Clennam asks him to fetch Rigaud, he catches Rigaud so as to expose his bondage to his current master, Mr. Clennam. In his analysis of Cavelletto, Avrom Fleishman conveys that when Cavelletto fetches him to the prison

and when Rigaud anticipates his servitude to keep, Cavelletto is “unwilling to cooperate with evil but powerless to resist it” (577). With his old habit of submission, while he is complied with his present master’s orders, Cavelletto cannot show any resistance to the orders of his previous master as well. Hence, Fleishman depicts him as “the perfect type of the unrebelling servant” (577). The only time that he shows his rebellion is the time when they encounter at a French inn. Cavelletto does not submit to Rigaud's demands and runs away without being noticed by him. *Little Dorrit* closes the narrative on Rigaud and Cavelletto rather abruptly when Rigaud is caught by his servant, Cavelletto. After Rigaud is caught, all the realities regarding Arthur's family are revealed. When Rigaud is burned at Clennam’s house, his servant, Cavelletto disappears from the novel as Tattycoram does.

When Hegel's Dialectic is applied to the relationship between Rigaud and Cavelletto, it can be concluded that by carrying out the demands of his master, Cavelletto is abased himself with Rigaud’s power over him. When he is in captivity, Cavelletto preserves his servitude to his master. However, when he is at large, Cavelletto is not controlled by his master. This time he finds another master, who is Mr. Clennam. He cannot abstain from being dominated by any master. As for Rigaud, his mastery depends on the servitude of Cavelletto. When Cavelletto is not submissive, he loses his superiority and vanishes from the novel.

In conclusion, in *Little Dorrit*, various characters represent various facets of the “masters” while others represent the servile “servants.” The variety with which both the master and the servant are represented makes *Little Dorrit* an important text to discuss Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic. In the novel the positions of the master and the servant are reversed. In other words, while the master, once independent, becomes completely dependent on the servant, the servant, once dependent, transforms his/her position to independency. In *Little Dorrit*, the master characters studied in this thesis – Mr. Dorrit, Miss Wade and Rigaud – are dependent upon the servants around them to sustain their mastery. However, by losing their power, they lose their position as well. The servant characters, on the other hand, are willing to serve their masters and prolong their subjugation.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has focused on the mutual recognition of the “master” and the “servant” between the characters in *The Pickwick Papers*, and the rebellion of the “servant” and the dual role of the “master” in *Little Dorrit* in light of Hegel’s Master and Servant Dialectic. The themes of both novels would allow a thorough study on Hegel’s Dialectic as they exemplify various manifestations of the Master and Servant Dialectic. Moreover, the periods in which the novels are written would render this study possible, because the many changes in the social, economic, and political structure experienced in Victorian Britain are reflected in the novels of the time in terms of the relationship between the individual and society, a relationship that is indispensably related to the Dialectic.

Victorian Age (1837-1901), the period in which Charles Dickens lived and produced his works, starts with the accession of an eighteen-year-old Queen Victoria to the throne and comes to an end with her death. It is an age in which many skeins of contradictions take place; therefore, the Victorian Age is depicted in contradictory terms like “exploitation and class division, sexual repression, hypocrisy, values of hard work and self-help, moral certainties about family life, and a wide variety of arrangements intended to solve public problems” (S. Mitchell xiii), and so on. The Victorian Age witnesses not only innovations and reforms in technology, science, economy, and politics, but it also sees the exploitation of labour, a strict class division, and ineptitude of the state in governmental concerns. Whilst Britain expands its territorial dominion around the world and becomes a great empire, the division between classes becomes more pronounced. The polarisation is markedly evident in the suffering of the working class. The gap between the working class and the others grows so much that it is almost as if two different nations reside in one country.

The tremendous social change also finds voice in the literary production of the time. Charles Dickens (1812-1870) is one of the most well-known men of letters who depicts the suffering of the working class in this changing world. The social turmoil in the country and its effects on people become one of the focal points in his writing. As a keen observer, Dickens turns his observations into vivid fictional worlds which are nurtured by the realities of his own time. Since “his education was neglected or he was sent to work while his parents and siblings lived in debtors’

prison” (Patten 17), he is not oblivious to the world in which he lives. He knows the lives of the working class, of the orphans, and of the prisoners, and he is aware of the division between the middle class and the working class emerging as a consequence of the effects of industrialisation. He can be said to be a true representative of his time; he becomes the voice of the ignored people such as the orphans, the working children, the women, and the working class people.

Like Dickens, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), whose theory this thesis is based on, is one of the representative voices of his time. His Master and Servant Dialectic is based upon the struggle between two self-conscious beings, each of whom desires recognition from the other. Out of this struggle, Master and Servant Dialectic emerges. In Hegel's words, while the “lord” or the “master” is “the independent consciousness whose essential nature is to be for itself,” the “bondsman,” or the “servant,” is “the dependent consciousness whose essential nature is simply to live or to be for another” (Hegel 189). In the Dialectic, when two beings confront one another to win the recognition of the other, each of them “seeks the death of the other” (Hegel 113). In order to survive one of them has to be submissive and has to accept subjugation. Hegel's Dialectic involves the ongoing struggle between the “master” and the “servant” as exemplified in Dickens’ *Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit* in this thesis. The master and the servant characters in both novels represent the characteristics of Hegel's lord and bondsman. In both novels the master characters represent the middle class and the servant characters represent the working class. The conflict between the middle class and the working class, in other words, between the master and the servant is depicted in *The Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit*.

Although *The Pickwick Papers* (1836-37) was written in the Early Victorian Age, in which the social and political turmoil takes place, the time Charles Dickens wrote *Little Dorrit* (1855-7) coincides with the Mid-Victorian Age, in which “England enjoyed domestic stability, progress, and growing prosperity” (S. Mitchell 51). As the country undergoes immense changes due to the Industrial Revolution, the working class cannot but be affected by this transition. While the country develops economically, too much injustice to the working class and “great working-class distress” (Briggs 12), and too much distrust towards the state stamp their effects onto the period. Hence, a huge gap emerges between the middle class and the working

class. Dickens reflects this class distinction in his novels especially in *The Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit*.

Although *The Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit* are written in completely different time periods, they bear certain similarities in terms of their reflecting Dickens' criticism on the adverse effects of the Industrial Revolution and their portraying Dickens' creation of the fictional institutions that corrupt the system of the country. *The Pickwick Papers* is set in the years between 1827 and 1831. Similarly, *Little Dorrit* is set in 1820s. Both novels are retrospective. The reason why Dickens is anachronistic in both of these novels is that the conditions of the working class face in the 1820s are better than of the 1830s and 1850s. In the Early Victorian Age the dominant labour force lies in agriculture whereas in the Mid-Victorian Age "the number of agricultural workers shrank and the number in industry and other occupations expanded" (S. Mitchell 101). The class distinction between the master and the servant class is not so distinct in the 1820s since the adverse effects of industrialisation are not felt as much as in the 1850s.

Another similarity between the novels is Dickens' way of mirroring the defects of the institutions in the country. By creating the scene at the Eatanswill election and the trial of Pickwick vs. Mrs. Bardell in *The Pickwick Papers*, for instance, Dickens conveys the corruption of the judicial system. In *Little Dorrit*, the fictitious institution called the Circumlocution Office typifies the conditions of the governmental institutions in the country. These fictional scenes and institutions exemplify degeneration in the institutions of the country especially in the judicial system. Through them, Dickens draws the attention of the reader to the defects of the country, which explains the huge gap between the master and the servant class.

The Pickwick Papers and *Little Dorrit* differ from each other in terms of their styles and themes. These differences are accounted for the changing circumstances in the country. *Little Dorrit* is written in a period in which urbanisation and industrialisation increase whereas distress among the working class abounds in the country. *Little Dorrit* is written during the time of the Crimean War, which results in the deaths of many soldiers. The failure of the War is connected with the inefficiency of the British state. Hence, Dickens criticises maladministration of the state during the War time in the novel. The problems of the working class and the dissatisfaction

of the British people with the state find a place in *Little Dorrit*. Therefore, compared to *The Pickwick Papers*, which consists of elements of comedy, *Little Dorrit* has a more bleak tone. The gloomy atmosphere *Little Dorrit* takes place and the themes predominantly related to prison make the novel have a darker tone. This could be the consequences of the conditions of the country at the time of the novel's publication. With this novel, Dickens highlights the social and the political ills of the country. Martin Price emphasizes the differences between the Dickens who wrote *The Pickwick Papers* and the Dickens who wrote *Little Dorrit*, and he states that "the young Dickens aspired to a respectable middle-class radicalism attacking particular social evils, and ended as a middle-aged revolutionary with a peculiar hostility to the middle class" (18). Hence, it could be maintained that Dickens mirrors the social ills of the country and the adverse conditions of the working class with comic elements in *The Pickwick Papers*. He portrays the social and political ills of the country and harsher conditions of the working class with a bleak tone in *Little Dorrit*.

Another difference between the novels lies in their employ of Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic, which constitutes the core of the analytical discussion of this thesis. In *The Pickwick Papers*, the relationship between the characters is explained with mutual recognition, in which both the master and the servant are pleased with their status. In *Little Dorrit*, on the other hand, the master characters exhibit different forms of mastery different from *The Pickwick Papers*. The master characters are the representative mastery of Hegel's Dialectic when they are with weaker characters. However, they lose their mastery feature when they come face to face with more powerful masters than themselves, and then disappear from the novel.

The relationship between Mr. Pickwick and Sam Weller is analysed in *The Pickwick Papers* in this thesis in accordance with Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic. It is asserted that this kind of relationship is based on mutual recognition, according to which, neither Pickwick nor Sam represents the expected behaviours of their status. In other words, Pickwick does not exhibit mastery attitude to his servant and Sam, on the other hand, is not wholly a servant, either. Sam has a significant place in Pickwick's life. His contribution to Pickwick's transformation is undeniable. Since Sam belongs to the working class, he has more experiences related to the conditions of the world: "Sam Weller is no innocent; he has known what it is like to be destitute and homeless, sleeping under the arches of Waterloo Bridge, and he does

not expect this world to be just or its inhabitants noble” (Auden 74). Sam’s mission in his life can be likened to Don Quixote’s Sancho Panza’s or King Lear’s Fool’s, who has the mission of the voice of reason and conscience. Similarly, Sam does not treat his master like other servants do. He sometimes humiliates Pickwick and sometimes orders him. In Pickwick's transformation, Sam is seen to show his master the real face of the world, with which Pickwick is not familiar. Both of them recognise one another’s position mutually with content. They do not make any attempts to change it. While Pickwick, who is in the position of the master, accepts Sam’s leading and counselling him in this process, Sam, in the position of the servant, is ready to perform his duty as the master of his master without showing any resentment by Pickwick's calling him “servant.” Both of them do not show any resentment when each interferes in each other’s status. In other words, they mutually recognise each other’s status.

On the other hand, when the relationships between the characters in *Little Dorrit* are taken into consideration, various forms of mastery and servitude are seen. The master characters, Mr. Dorrit, Miss Wade, and Rigaud are not the representative of Hegel's master completely since Hegel's master “cannot become adequately conscious of himself as a self-conscious individual in the recognition of the bondsman, because treating him as a thing, he does not explicitly recognise the bondsman as a self-consciousness” (Redding 107). However, the master characters in the novel assume the role of the servants of their servants.

Mr. Dorrit, for instance, has a complete domination over his prison fellows and his youngest daughter, Amy, while he is confined. He is recognised as the master and considered as the Father of the Marshalsea Prison by them. However, he loses his mastery position as soon as he gets out of prison. In accordance with Hegel's Dialectic, the master desires to be recognised as the master by his peers. However, in the case of Mr. Dorrit, this does not seem possible. Outside prison, there are many masters who do not recognise his mastery. He does have financial security as a free member of the empire, but it does not help him. He does not maintain his mastery position since he is not recognised as the master any more since he does not have the power that he has in prison. Outside prison, not all the people are subjugated as his peers have been in prison. In the course of the novel, Mr. Dorrit loses his fortune and so does his life eventually.

Miss Wade's mastery is another representation of Hegel's master in *Little Dorrit*. She governs and dominates Tattycoram, the only servant Miss Wade enslaves in the novel. As she is an orphan and a governess, people humiliate her. Without a full name and a family, Miss Wade is seen to be tormenting herself with people's attitudes towards her: "The self-torture of Miss Wade [...] is the classic manoeuvre of the child who is unloved, or believes herself to be unloved; she refuses to be lovable, she elects to be hateful" (Trilling 77). When she comes across with Tattycoram, she witnesses the Meagles family's treatment and she is disturbed by this. She persuades Tattycoram to leave the Meagles family and to live with her. However, her relation with Tattycoram turns into a master and servant relationship. Miss Wade subjugates her so much that Tattycoram leaves her and prefers to be the servant of the Meagles family rather than the servant of Miss Wade. As with Mr. Dorrit, Miss Wade disappears from the novel after she loses her mastery over her servant. It can be argued that their mastery is the only thing that makes them be a being in society. Upon losing this power, they both vanish from the novel.

Rigaud's representation of Hegel's mastery is the last one analysed in this thesis. Similar to Miss Wade, Rigaud is hostile to society: "society sells itself and sells me: and I sell Society" (LD 517). Like her, Rigaud thinks that he is the victim of society. Therefore, in order to show his mastery, he enslaves weaker characters around him. At the beginning of the novel, he is detained in prison and he dominates his comrade, Cavelletto as his servant. He makes orders and expects Cavelletto to obey him. When he is at large, Rigaud struggles for recognition of the servants. Therefore, he maintains his mastery over people by causing fear in them and in this way he is recognised as their masters.

The servant characters Amy, Tattycoram, and Cavelletto show their servitude to their masters in different ways. While Amy is a submissive servant, who serves her masters willingly, Cavelletto is seen as a willing servant in confinement, yet when he is freed, he does not obey his master's orders. Of all the servant characters, Tattycoram is the one whose rebellion is "the most outspoken" (Fleishman 576). Amy is seen as a willing servant during the whole novel. According to Hegel's Dialectic, the servant obeys the master's orders out of fear of death. He will either submit to the master or lose his life. In Amy's case, her relationship with her two masters is not based on fear of death. Since she is a submissive character, she serves

her father, her first master, until his death. After that, she begins to serve Mr. Clennam, her second master. Her marriage to Mr. Clennam is the continuation of her permanent servitude to him. Although her masters are dependent upon her service, Amy does not use this situation for her benefits. Since she seems to be content with her status, she recognises the people who are more powerful than her as her masters. This accounts for her innate quality that makes her a servant.

In accordance with Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic, Tattycoram's desire to be recognised by her masters, the Meagles family initially and then Miss Wade, is highly distinct in the novel. After encountering Miss Wade, Tattycoram breaks her bond with her first master, the Meagles family, by accepting the shelter that Miss Wade provides for her. However, when she becomes aware of Miss Wade's dominion over her much more than the Meagles' mastery over her, she goes back to the Meagles family and maintains her servitude to them. The relationship between Tattycoram and the Meagles family can be accounted for the mutual recognition. In other words, Tattycoram recognises them as her masters whereas the Meagles family recognise her as their servant.

As for Cavelletto, what makes him the servant of his master is the fear of Rigaud. When confined in prison, Cavelletto fits the description of the servant of Hegel's Dialectic. While he is in the prison, he does whatever his master asks him to do. However, when he is out of the prison, Cavelletto does not maintain his servitude. He becomes the servant of Mr. Clennam who provides him with food and shelter. In return for them, Cavelletto helps Mr. Clennam find Rigaud. When his mission is over, he disappears from the novel.

To conclude, Charles Dickens, giving a detailed picture of the Victorian Age in the 1830s and the 1850s in *The Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit*, depicts the relationships between the characters in accordance with Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic. It is clear that *The Pickwick Papers* is similar to *Little Dorrit* in certain ways. The similarity between the two novels lies in Dickens' criticism of the period during which the novels are set and written. He makes his criticism by creating fictional institutions. *The Pickwick Papers*, on the other hand, differs from *Little Dorrit* in many ways. The difference between these two novels is Dickens' way of giving his criticism. While he uses comic elements in *The Pickwick Papers*, he has a

more bleak tone in *Little Dorrit*. Dickens with his different styles and themes in these novels maintains that the periods of the novels written are different and so is the writer. While he employs a comedic tone in the previous novel, he has a more serious outlook in the latter one.

In the light of all these issues analysed in this thesis, it is stated that Dickens and Hegel come together with regard to the “master” and the “servant” relationship of the characters in *The Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit*. Examining *The Pickwick Papers* and *Little Dorrit* in relation to Hegel's Master and Servant Dialectic shows that the relationships between the characters in both novels have a parallel with the main issue of the Dialectic. While the relationships between the characters particularly between Mr. Pickwick and Sam Weller, in *The Pickwick Papers*, is based on a mutual recognition, the masters and the servants in *Little Dorrit* have a dual role, which means that the masters are the pseudo masters and the servants are the pseudo servants. They both have dual roles.

The selected novels of Charles Dickens provide two highly similar and yet also highly different ways of reading Victorian novels as examples of Hegelian Master and Servant Dialectic. Although they both portray hierarchical relationships, this hierarchy is not completely similar. Mutual recognition in one becomes dual mastery in the other. This basic difference makes it possible to understand and explore Hegelian Dialectic in its multiple manifestations.

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources:

Dickens, Charles. *Little Dorrit*. New York: General, 2010. Print.

---, *The Pickwick Papers*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 2000. Print.

Secondary Sources:

Allen, Richard. "The Realist Novel and the Publishing Market." *Approaching Literature: The Realist Novel*. Ed. Dennis Walder. London: Routledge, 1995. 127-132. Print.

Allen, Walter. *The English Novel: A Short Critical History*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1954. Print.

Auden, W.H. "Dingley Dell & the Fleet." *Dickens: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Martin Price. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967. 68-82. Print.

Axton, William. "Unity and Coherence in *The Pickwick Papers*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 5.4 (Autumn, 1965): 663-76. JSTOR. Web. 28 Dec. 2016.

Baer, Florence E. "Wellerisms in *The Pickwick Papers*." *Folklore* 94.2 (1983): 173-83. JSTOR. Web. 28 December 2016.

Balkaya, Mehmet Akif. *The Industrial Novels: Charlotte Bronte's Shirley, Charles Dickens' Hard Times and Elizabeth Gaskell's North and South*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, 2015. Print.

Barrett, Edwin B. "*Little Dorrit* and the Disease of Modern Life." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 25.2 (Sept., 1970): 199-215. JSTOR. Web. 07 July 2015.

Beiser, Frederick C., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel and Nineteenth-Century Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008. Print.

Birch, A. H. *The British System of Government*. 8th ed. London: George Allen and

- Unwin, 1990. Print.
- Bodei, Remo. "The Roots of Hegel's "Master-Slave Relationship."" Trans. Dino Bressan. *Journal of Critical Horizons* 8.1 (2007): 33-46. Web. 17 April 2015.
- Briggs, Asa. *Victorian People: A Reassessment of Persons and Themes 1851-67*. Harmondsworth: U of Chicago P, 1955. Print.
- Bumin, Tülin. *Hegel Bilinç Problemi, Köle-Efendi Diyalektiği, Praksis Felsefesi*. İstanbul: Pasifik, 2010. Print.
- Chavez, Julia McCord. "The Gothic Heart of Victorian Serial Fiction." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 50.4 (Autumn, 2010): 791-810. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 January 2017.
- Chesterton, G.K. Introduction to the Works of Charles Dickens. *The Pickwick Papers*. Ed. John Douglas East. London: Gramercy Park, 2011. 1-13. Print.
- Childers, Joseph W. "Industrial Culture and the Victorian Novel." *The Cambridge Companion to The Victorian Novel*. Ed. Deirdre David. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 77-96. Print.
- Cunningham, Hugh. "Dickens as a Reformer." *A Companion to Charles Dickens*. Ed. David Paroissien. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008. 159-73. Print.
- Daiches, David. *A Critical History of English Literature, Volume 4: The Romantics to the Present Day*. Vol. 4. New Delhi: Ronald, 1969. Print.
- Dickens, Charles. *A Tale of Two Cities*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1993. Print.
- Disraeli, Benjamin. *Sybil; or, The Two Nations*. Vol. I. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2017. Print.
- Duckworth, Alistair M. "Little Dorrit and the Question of Closure." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. 33.1. (June, 1978): 110-30. *JSTOR*. Web. 07 July 2015.

- Engels, Friedrich. *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. Ed. David McLellan. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. Print.
- Fielding, K.J. "Charles Dickens." *A Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Eds. William Baker and Kenneth Womack. London: Greenwood, 2002. 275-82. Print.
- Finn, Stephen J. *Hobbes: A Guide for the Perplexed*. London and New York: Continuum, 2007. Print.
- Fleishman, Avrom. "Master and Servant in *Little Dorrit*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 14.4 (Autumn, 1974): 575-86. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 July 2015.
- Forster, John. *The Life of Charles Dickens*. 2 vols. New York: Chapman & Hall, 192?. Print.
- Fox, Ralph. *The Novel and the People*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1979. Print.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Hegel's Dialectic: Five Hermeneutical Studies*. Trans. P. Christopher Smith. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1976. Print.
- Genca, Papatya Alkan. "Postmodern Realism in Jeanette Winterson's *Sexing The Cherry*, Alasdair Gray's *Poor Things*, and Peter Ackroyd's *The Plato Papers*." Diss. Hacettepe U, 2011. Print.
- Glancy, Ruth F. *Student Companion to Charles Dickens*. Westport: Greenwood, 1999. Print.
- Gregg, Pauline. *A Social and Economic History of Britain: 1760-1963*. 4th ed., Rev. ed. London: George G. Harrap&Co., 1964. Print.
- Grove, T. N. "The Psychological Prison of Arthur Clennman in Dickens's *Little Dorrit*." *The Modern Language Review* 68.4 (Oct., 1973): 750-55. *JSTOR*.

Web. 21 July 2015.

Gunn, Richard. "Notes on Master and Slave in Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*."

www.richard-gunn.com/.../10_notes_on_master_and_slave.pdf. (Feb., 2016):

1-13. Web. 20 May 2016.

Hartley, Jenny, ed. *The Selected Letters of Charles Dickens*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012. Print.

Hawes, Donald. *Charles Dickens*. London and New York: Continuum, 2007. Print.

Hegel, G. W. F. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Trans. A. V. Miller. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1977. Print.

Herbert, Christopher. "Converging Worlds in *Pickwick Papers*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. 27.1 (June, 1972): 1-20. *JSTOR*. Web. 28 December 2016.

Herring, Paul D. "Dickens' Monthly Number Plans for '*Little Dorrit*'." *Modern Philology* 64.1 (Aug., 1966): 22-63. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 November 2015.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Ed. Richard Tuck. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. Print.

House, Humphry. *The Dickens World*. London: Oxford UP, 1960. Print.

Ingham, Patricia. *The Language of Gender and Class: Transformation in the Victorian Novel*. London: Routledge, 1996. Print.

Johnson, Edgar. *Charles Dickens: His Tragedy and Triumph*. 2 vols. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1952. Print.

Jordan, John O., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.

Kettle, Arnold. *An Introduction to the English Novel 1*. London: Hutchinson, 1967. Print.

Kincaid, James R. "The Education of Mr. Pickwick." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*

24.2 (Sep., 1969): 127-141. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 January 2017.

Kojève, Alexandre. *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel: Lectures on the*

Phenomenology of Spirit. Assembled Raymond Queneau. Ed. Allan Bloom.

Trans. James H. Nichols, Jr. Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP, 1969. Print.

Lauer, Quentin. *A Reading of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*. New York: Fordham

UP, 2002. Print.

Lewis, Linda M. *Dickens, His Parables, and His Reader*. Colombia and London: U

of Missouri, 2011. Print.

Lucas, John. *The Melancholy Man: A Study of Dickens's Novels*. Brighton, Sussex:

Harvester, 1980. Print.

Mackenzie, R. Shelton. *Life of Charles Dickens*. Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson &

Brothers, 1870. Print.

Marx, Karl. *Das Capital*. Ed. Friedrich Engels. Vol. 1. London: Penguin, 1992. Print.

---, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. New York: Prometheus, 1988.

Print.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto*. Ed. Frederic L.

Bender. New York and London: Norton, 1988. Print.

---, *The German Ideology Including Theses on Feuerbach and Introduction to the*

Critique of Political Economy. New York: Prometheus, 1998. Print.

Matarrese, Craig B. *Starting with Hegel*. London and New York: Continuum, 2010.

Print.

McLellan, David. *Karl Marx: Interviews and Recollections*. London: MacMillan,

1981. Print.

- Mengham, Rod. *Charles Dickens*. London: Northcote, 2001. Print.
- Mills, Jon. *The Unconscious Abyss: Hegel's Anticipation of Psychoanalysis*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2002. Print.
- Mitchell, Leslie. "Dickens and Government Ineptitude Abroad, 1854-1865." *A Companion to Charles Dickens*. Ed. David Paroissien. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008. 228-39. Print.
- Mitchell, Sally. *Daily Life in Victorian England*. London: Greenwood P, 1996. Print.
- Morss, Susan Buck. *Hegel, Haiti, and Universal History*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2009. Print.
- Müller, Wolfgang G. "Mr. Pickwick- A New Quixote? Charles Dickens's First Novel in the Tradition of Cervantes." *Texts, Contexts and Intertextuality: Dickens as a Reader*. Eds. Norbert Lennartz and Dieter Koch. London: V&R, 2014. 67-84. Print.
- Nelson, James G. "The Victorian Social Problem Novel." *A Companion to The Victorian Novel*. Eds. William Baker and Kenneth Womack. Westport: Greenwood, 2002. 191-207. Print.
- Oakeshott, Michael. *Hobbes on Civil Association*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2000. Print.
- "Original." *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*. 12th ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.
- Orwell, George. *A Collection of Essays*. New York: Doubleday&Company, 1954. Print.
- Patten, Robert L. "From Sketches to Nickleby." *The Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens*. Ed. John O. Jordan. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. 16-

33. Print.

Philpotts, Trey. "Dickens and Technology." *A Companion to Charles Dickens*. Ed.

David Paroissien. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008. 199-215. Print.

Pinkard, Terry. *Hegel: A Biography*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.

Price, Martin, ed. *Dickens: A Collection of Critical Essays*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967. Print

Price, Richard. *British Society 1680-1880: Dynamism, Containment and Change*.

Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.

Quiller, Arthur. *Charles Dickens and Other Victorians*. London: Cambridge UP, 1925. Print.

Redding, Paul. "The Independence and Dependence of Self-Consciousness: The

Dialectic of Lord and Bondsman in Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*." *The*

Cambridge Companion to Hegel and 19th Century Philosophy. Ed. Frederick C. Beiser. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008. 94-110. Print.

Rogers, Philip. "Mr. Pickwick's Innocence." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. 27.1 (June, 1972): 21-37. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 January 2017.

Rowe, Nina. "Other." *Studies in Iconography* 33 (2012): 131-44. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 April 2016.

Schor, Hilary. "Novels of the 1850s: *Hard Times*, *Little Dorrit*, and *A Tale of Cities*." *The Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens*. Ed. John O. Jordan. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. 64-77. Print.

Schramm, Jan-Melissa. "Dickens and the Law." *A Companion to Charles Dickens*. Ed. David Paroissien. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008. 277-93. Print.

Seaman, L.C.B. *Victorian England: Aspects of English and Imperial History 1837-*

1901. London and New York: Routledge, 1991. Print.
- Shaw, George Bernard. "Introduction to *Great Expectations*." *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Charles Dickens*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea, 2006. 59-70. Print.
- Slater, Michael. *Charles Dickens*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. Print.
- Smith, Peter. "Little Dorrit: New Values for Old Terms." *Public and Private Value Studies in the Nineteenth-Century Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984. Print.
- Stern, Robert. *Hegel and the Phenomenology of Spirit*. New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.
- Taylor, Charles. *Hegel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1975. Print.
- Taylor, Jonathan. *Mastery and Slavery in Victorian Writing*. New York: MacMillan, 2003. Print.
- Trilling, Lionel. "Little Dorrit." *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Charles Dickens*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea, 2006. 71-82. Print.
- Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. London and New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.
- Verene, Donald Philip. *Hegel's Absolute: An Introduction to Reading The Phenomenology of Spirit*. New York: State U of New York P, 2007. Print.
- Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel*. London: U of California P, 1957. Print.
- Williams, Robert R. *Hegel's Ethics of Recognition*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: U of California P, 1997. Print.
- Wood, Allen W. "Hegel and Marxism." *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel*. Ed. Frederick C. Beiser. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 414-44. Print.