

The
5/1/07

UNIVERSITY OF STIRLING

CHARLES BENJAMIN

Department of English Studies

Supervisor: Professor Robert Miles

Abstract of thesis entitled *Dickens and Freud: A Mutual Encounter With the Double*

Submitted for the degree of PhD.

Date of Submission: July 2005

05/07

ProQuest Number: 13917104

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 13917104

Published by ProQuest LLC (2019). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Contents

Acknowledgements	I
Abstract of Thesis	II-VI
List of Title Abbreviations	VII
Chapter One: Uncovering the Links between Dickens and Freud	1-70
Chapter Two: A Gothic History of the Divided Sign	71-136
Chapter Three: Freud's Memories of Dora	137-189
Chapter Four: Fear of the Maternal Wolf	190-233
Conclusion	234
Bibliography	235-249

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank, first and foremost my family and friends for their financial and moral support. My special thanks must go my supervisor Professor Robert Miles for his support. I would also like to thank to Professor Grahame Smith, for a number of books which he gave me, which proved invaluable. Professor John Carey read through a very early draft of the first chapter of the thesis, and I would like to thank him for the advice he gave. My thanks must also go to Professor John Drakakis, Professor Rory Watson, Dr Vance Adair, Dr. Bill Barnes-Gutteridge, Dr Alison Jasper and other members of staff at the University of Stirling. I would also like to thank Professor Jeremy Tambling, Professor David Paroissien, and Dr. Natalie McKnight who I met at the Seventh and Ninth Dickens Symposiums. I would also like to thank Dr Nick Groom for his willingness to speak at the Post Graduate Conference 'Beginnings', and his graciousness when the choice of conference speakers was changed. I would like to thank Dr Dany Nobus, for his help with a specific question, his interest in the thesis, and for his offer to externally examine the thesis. I would like to thank Professor Gerhard Fichtner at the University of Tübingen, Germany, Keith Davies, Head Librarian at the Freud Museum, London, for their help with a specific question, and the many contributors to Professor Patrick McCarthy's internet Dickens Forum. Finally, I would like to thank Professor Angela Smith and Professor Andrew Smith for examining the thesis.

Abstract

Up to this point, the relationship between the Charles Dickens and Sigmund Freud has been largely restricted to the application of Freud's psychoanalytic theory to Dickens' writing. Where it has extended beyond this, critics have made fleeting references to Freud's reading of Dickens' *David Copperfield*, his identification with the hero of the novel, David, and his comparison of his father, Jacob Freud, to the father-figure Mr. Wilkins Micawber, whom Dickens modeled after his father, John Dickens. This thesis initially set out to examine the relationship between Dickens and Freud in greater depth. In so doing, what this thesis has achieved beyond its initial aim, is to demonstrate that Freud's identification with Dickens, and Dickens' semi-autobiographical character David Copperfield can in part be traced back to their very similar childhood experiences of family poverty, of psychologically escaping from this poverty through literature, of finding it difficult to identify with their financially unsuccessful fathers, of being rejected by their mothers, Freud when he was three years old, and Dickens when he was twelve years old, and yet simultaneously identifying more strongly with their mothers.

The thesis demonstrates that this familial relationship was reflected in Dickens' and Freud's unconscious minds as a weak castration threat posed by the father, which led to the repression rather than destruction of the Oedipus complex. Moreover, within their respective unconscious minds, the mother as object of desire was paralleled by the mother as castration threat, and the mother as super ego. This manifests in Dickens' and Freud's respective writing as the need to reconstruct an idealised double of the mother who cannot reject them. In so doing, they counter the real memory of being rejected by their mothers. At the same time, the thesis demonstrates how Dickens and Freud

repeatedly, and thus futilely, use their writing to reconstruct the castration threat which ideally should bring about the end of the Oedipus complex.

As something of a secondary consequence, but important in illustrating this conflict between the need to fulfill and the need to destroy the Oedipus complex, the thesis also demonstrates that there are striking similarities between LG Moberly's 'Inexplicable' and Charles Dickens' *David Copperfield*, similarities which are the possible cause of the uncanny feeling that Freud is left with after having read Moberly's short story. The thesis also demonstrates that in the writing of Dickens and Freud, there can be found a specific form of double originating in the Oedipus complex and the child's perceptual splitting of the mother into comforter and object of desire, the mother into castration threat and object of desire, and the father into protector and castrator. From this, it is argued that all forms of doubling can be traced back to the Oedipus complex and castration complex. This was something to which Sigmund Freud and later Diane F. Sadoff in an echo of Freud, have only alluded to, but never explored. In broader terms, this thesis contributes to the debate on the relationship between literature and psychoanalysis, and in particular the part that Charles Dickens and Wilkie Collins played in the early development of psychoanalysis, the understanding of the double and the uncanny.

Chapter one begins by examining the relationship between Dickens and Freud, showing that this relationship is based upon two things: firstly, Dickens' anticipation of psychoanalysis through his fascination with mesmerism, the human mind, the 'unheimlich' or uncanny, the German 'doppelganger' which Dickens calls the 'double', and the child's relationship to its mother and father and what Freud would later call the Oedipus complex. Secondly, their relationship is based upon Freud's reading of a number

of Dickens' novels, which the thesis identifies, his identification with Dickens, and Dickens' semi-autobiographical hero David Copperfield. However, Freud's reading of Dickens is countered by his subsequent forgetting of Dickens. In a different context, Freud theorises that forgetting can function as a means of repressing memories and feelings associated with the name or memory being forgotten. Through the comparative analysis of Dickens' *David Copperfield*, and L G Moberly's 'Inexplicable' which has many demonstrable similarities to *David Copperfield*, something not commented on by critics so far, it is argued that what Freud represses, through his forgetting of *David Copperfield* and his partial forgetting of 'Inexplicable', is the knowledge that like David Copperfield in relation to Dora, Freud had attempted to create in his fiancée, Martha Bernays, an idealised Dora-like double of his mother.

While Diane F. Sadoff argues that Dickens' writing is dominated by images of castration and patriarchal authority, chapter two considers a novel not looked at by Sadoff, but which is arguably Dickens' most patriarchal novel of all, the Gothic-historical novel *Barnaby Rudge*, and shows that even at its most violent and destructive, the castration threat is unable to destroy the Oedipus complex. Even in the most patriarchal of novels, it is the mother who remains at the centre of the narrative. The chapter moves into a comparison of Dickens' Gothic-historical novel with Freud's historically Gothic text, 'A Seventeenth Century Demonological Neurosis', as texts concerned with the empty signifier, which is traced back to the problem faced by the Roman Catholic Church in the seventeenth century, of people venerating religious images rather than the person or concept to which the image referred. It is argued that initially, this emptiness of the signifier contributes to the formation of what would retrospectively be called the Gothic

genre, but later, also allows the old abandoned meanings, to be replaced by a new psychoanalytic interpretation, which we see Dickens in the nineteenth century embarking upon, and Freud in the twentieth century establishing. This study of the Gothic empty signifier is important to the thesis' examination of the empty signifiers employed by Freud, namely the pseudonyms he ascribed his patients, including his most famous patient, Dora.

Chapter three examines Dickens' *David Copperfield*, specifically the character Dora, and compares her with Freud's patient, Ida Bauer, whom he named 'Dora', arguing that while Freud considers the possible origins of the name 'Dora' in *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, he forgets that the name is that of a character in his favourite Dickens novel, one which he and his fiancée, Martha Bernays, had read while courting. It is pointed out, however, that in another essay within the same text, Freud theorises that forgetting names can function as means of repressing feelings and thoughts associated with the name. In these terms, it is argued that Freud forgets the origin of the name 'Dora' as a means of repressing the knowledge that he unconsciously attempts to transform his patient Ida Bauer into another version of Dickens' Dora, who as a character, is demonstrably a substitute mother-figure. By forgetting the origin of 'Dora', the name becomes an empty signifier, which Freud is then able to re-substantiate, by associating the name with his wife, his patient, and his mother, and in so doing, create a signifying double of his mother.

Chapter four draws attention to the indirect reference made to the patriarchy of *Barnaby Rudge*, in Dickens' later novel *Little Dorrit*, and through a comparison of this novel with Freud's case history *The Wolfman*, examines the extent to which the mother as

castration threat, and mother as object of desire manifest in their respective writing, in the form of the double rooted in the Oedipus complex, centered in both texts upon the figure of the Wolf. The chapter argues that just as Dickens draws an implicit parallel between Mrs Clennam, Arthur's step-mother, and the Capitoline she-wolf who adopts Romulus and Remus, the twin founders of Rome, so the wolf that Freud's patient, Sergei Pankejev, fears, represents not his father, as Freud theorises, but his Governess, the substitute mother. This latter theory is considered, but later abandoned by Freud, and arguably happens as a result of his repressed Oedipus complex. He rejects the theory of the substitute mother as wolf, just as his mother had rejected him as a child leaving him to be looked after by a substitute mother. The thesis concludes by suggesting that through their similar childhood experiences, through Freud's identification with Dickens, through the repressed Oedipus complex that manifests in the respective writing of Dickens and Freud as a need to reconstruct an idealised version of their mothers, and at the same time, the need to reconstruct the castration threat in the form of the threatening mother, there is at play a kind of doubling between Dickens and Freud rooted in the Oedipus complex.

List of Title Abbreviations

Barnaby Rudge (BR)

Bleak House (BH)

Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens (CCDC)

David Copperfield (DC)

Hard Times (HT)

Little Dorrit (LD)

Oliver Twist (OT)

The Interpretation of Dreams (TID)

CHAPTER ONE

Uncovering the Links Between Dickens and Freud

We find with literary critics such as Nicholas Royle, Jeremy Tambling, Audrey Jaffe, and David E. Musselwhite, a certain fascination with how the writing of Sigmund Freud can illuminate our understanding of Charles Dickens' writing¹. This fascination arises in part from the status of both writers as iconic representatives of their respective centuries, Dickens one of the most popular novelists of the nineteenth century, and Freud one of the most important thinkers of the twentieth century. More importantly, it arises out of a use of psychoanalytic theory in the analysis of literature established by Freud, Otto Rank and the other Freudians. With Freud's financial and intellectual support, Otto Rank became the first person to engage in the institutionally recognized use of psychoanalytic theory in the analysis of literature, when he wrote his PhD thesis on the *Lowengrin Saga* at the University of Vienna, in 1912.

The foundations for this achievement lay in Freud's Wednesday Society, the precursor to the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, which ran between 1902 and 1907. At the weekly meeting, attended by Otto Rank, Carl Jung, Sandor Ferenczi and others, real patients, of whom there were relatively few owing to the infancy of psychoanalysis, would sometimes be substituted by literary characters, and treated as the symptoms of a neurosis that could be traced back to the author. As Edith Kurzweil

says, ‘Post mortem psychoanalyses of Leonardo, Shakespeare, Kleist, Dostoevsky, Swift, Poe, and others were taken as seriously as the cases of analytic patients’ⁱⁱ. While it is uncertain as to whether these other writers included Charles Dickens, critics such as Steven Marcus, Mark Spilka, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick and Louis Breger have commented upon Freud’s admiration of Dickens’ novel *David Copperfield*ⁱⁱⁱ. Indeed, Marcus and Breger make the point, separately, that Freud had on occasion compared his father, Jacob Freud, to the kindly but ineffectual father figure Mr Micawber in *David Copperfield*, ironically a character Dickens modelled on his own father John Dickens.

Other critics have pointed to Dickens as a precursor of Freud, whose writing anticipated Freudian psychoanalytic theory. H. M. Daleski makes the point that Dickens’ equation of the dust heaps with money in *Our Mutual Friend* ‘foreshadows’ Freud’s theory, in *On Sexuality*, that the child’s first gift, that of excrement, is unconsciously equated in dreams with money and gold^{iv}. Harvey Peter Sucksmith points to certain Dickens characters whose psychological characteristics anticipate Freud’s later definitive theories on those same psychological characteristics. Mrs Joe in *Great Expectations* and Mrs MacStinger in *Dombey and Son*, for example, exhibit psychological traits, which Freud would later define as ‘anal sadism’^v. Current psychological theory defines this as a ‘stage in psychosexual development assumed by some psychoanalysts to be part of the Anal stage but distinguishable as a distinct component by a focus upon *anal eroticism* and sadistic impulses towards the parents, who are the agents of toilet training’^{vi}. Sucksmith also points to the multiple sources of ‘perverse’ sexual pleasure found by Quilp and Jenny Wren in *Our Mutual Friend*, which fits with Freud’s theory on the ‘polymorphous perverse’ phase of child psychosexual development. This is defined as ‘the sexual nature of a young child,

who is viewed as deriving sexual pleasure in a variety of erotic forms [...] which would be regarded (at least they were in Freud's time) as sexual perversions in an adult' (Reber: 547). Sucksmith later points to the similarity between Dickens' means of arriving at the title of *Hard Times*, through random word associations, and Freud's use of 'free association' as a means of reaching the repressed contents of the patient's unconscious mind.

As Patrick Mahony discusses, however, Freud seems rather to have unconsciously taken 'free association' from Ludwig Börne's essay on creative writing. Börne writes:

Take a few sheets of paper and for three days on end, write down, without fabrication or hypocrisy, anything that comes into your head. Write down what you think of yourself, of your wife, of the Turkish War, of Goethe, of Fonk's trial, of the Last Judgement, of your superiors – and when these three days have passed you will be quite out of your senses with astonishment at the new and unheard of thoughts you have had. This is the art of becoming an original writer in three days (Mahony: 160, 161).

Yet, initially Freud repressed all memory of Ludwig Börne's essay. Mahony says of this repression,

Apparently the young Freud took Börne's advice, yet some time afterwards the essay and the ensuing experience went out of his memory. When in 1919 his attention was drawn to that essay, he recognised that he had cryptonesically omitted to see its influence on his discovery, or rediscovery of free association [...] Ludwig Börne's influence even extended to the very modality of Freud's self-analysis. It has not at all been appreciated that he

conducted his self-analysis predominantly in writing – his self-analysis was literally a writing cure (Mahony: 160, 161).

While Freud probably took free association from Börne's essay, and not Dickens' *Hard Times*, Freud's 'cryptonesic forgetting' of Borne's essay, is paralleled by his forgetting of those Dickens novels and short stories that he had read.

In David E. Musselwhite's consideration of the predominance of the Oedipus complex within the different family structures of *The Old Curiosity Shop*, he exclaims, 'It is very disconcerting: how on earth had Dickens managed to have read Freud at such a date?'^{vii} He goes on, however, to say 'But that, surely, is to put the wrong question. Instead of pondering the enigma as to how Dickens could have read Freud we should be considering, rather, to what extent Freud was familiar with Dickens' (Musselwhite: 193). While Musselwhite does not specifically answer this question, the answer is that Freud had owned copies of and read *David Copperfield*, *Little Dorrit*, *Bleak House*, *Pickwick Papers*, *Hard Times*, 'The Battle of Life', and 'Chimes.'^{viii} However, as will be discussed in Chapter three, Freud also makes what could be a reference to *Oliver Twist* when he uses the expression 'dumb show' to describe a repetitious action performed by his patient Sergei Konstantinovitch Pankejev, the Wolfman, an expression also used by Dickens to describe an action performed by the villainous Bill Sikes in *Oliver Twist*, although the expression is also used in Dickens' *Bleak House*, and in William Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, which Freud had also owned copies of and read.

Freud's connection with Dickens, less directly, also occurs through the fact that Freud's protégé and colleague Otto Rosenfeld had adopted the name 'Rank', taking it

from Henryk Ibsen's play *A Doll's House*, which Ibsen acknowledged as being influenced by Charles Dickens' *Our Mutual Friend*, and in particular the character Jenny Wren, a crippled doll's clothes mender.^{ix} Freud might also have been reminded of Dickens through the name 'Dora', the name of David Copperfield's first wife, and the name which Freud gave, as a pseudonym, to his first ever psychoanalytic patient Ida Bauer. Yet, when Freud considers the possible origin of the name 'Dora', in *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, he makes no mention of Dickens, despite the fact that, as Steven Marcus notes, in reading *David Copperfield* Freud 'had early on identified with the young David himself' (Marcus: 155). It is unclear whether Marcus means that Freud had read Dickens at an early age, or that in reading Dickens, Freud had quickly identified with David. Nevertheless, the impression that Dickens' novel made upon Freud is demonstrated by the fact that when Freud was courting his fiancée Martha Bernays, in 1883, the first gift he gave her was a copy of *David Copperfield*. They would write extensively to one another during their time apart, and read, in tandem, Dickens' *David Copperfield*, along with other novels and short stories.

Freud again refers to Dickens when he recommends to his fiancée two of Dickens' short stories. In a letter written on January 16, 1884, to his 'Marty', as he would call Martha, he wrote to her about her proposed reading club, saying,

"The Chimes" is charming, movingly beautiful, quite difficult in the beginning. "The Battle of Life" would be easier and more suitable for all of you. But you know this already in part (*Letters of Sigmund Freud*: 88).

In his attempt to cultivate a scientific and cultural credibility for psychoanalysis, Freud distanced his psychoanalysis from Dickens' writing, while associating it with

the work of writers such as L.G. Moberly, (although Freud does not name her), Oscar Wilde, Fyodor Dostoevsky, ETA Hoffmann, Johann Von Goethe, William Shakespeare, Leonardo da Vinci, and Sophocles. One possible explanation for this is that as a writer fascinated by the mind, Dickens comes too close to the conclusions that Freud wishes to reach himself scientifically. Freud can comfortably refer to Sophocles, Shakespeare and others, because while they had an insight into the human mind, it was such a non-scientific, literary insight, that Freud's own status as the progenitor of a scientific method called psychoanalysis was unthreatened. Charles Dickens and Wilkie Collins are problematic for Freud, because they reach beyond the bounds of the literary, and enter into the scientific, and proto- psychoanalytic, in their attempt to understand the human mind.

One of the most important ways in which Dickens, and his friend Wilkie Collins, anticipated Freud was in their fascination with animal magnetism, also known as mesmerism, after its inventor Franz Anton Mesmer. Mesmerism would later be called hypnosis, and would be used by Freud in the earliest days of his psychoanalytic practice, before he abandoned it in favour of the 'talking cure' developed by his mentor Joseph Breuer. For Freud to acknowledge Dickens, would have been to acknowledge that some of the ideas central to psychoanalysis had their origin in Dickens', and to a lesser extent, Collins' populist nineteenth century writing. As Ned Lukacher argues, in his examination of Dickens' writing as a form of self-analysis, we can 'situate the prehistory of psychoanalysis in the Dickensian text'^x. Dickens encountered mesmerism through the advertisements that circulated London in the 1830s. Fred Kaplan points to typical Victorian advertisements, which promoted mesmerism as a cure for physical and psychological ailments:

Treatment of Acute and Chronic Diseases by Animal Magnetism at No. 20 Wigmore Street, Cavendish Square. Experimental Séances, for the treatment of Chronic and Nervous Affections, are conducted by Baron Dupotet De Sennevoy, every day (Sundays excepted) from half-past One to Three o'clock. Entrée 2s.6d.^{xi}

Baron Dupotet De Sennevoy was a colleague of Professor John Elliotson of the University of London, and it was Elliotson's demonstration of the 'curative powers of mesmerism' that brought Dickens into direct contact with mesmerism^{xii}. Peter Ackroyd writes that mesmerism in the eighteenth and nineteenth century had a very different scientific definition and cultural significance from today. 'The theory', Ackroyd tells us,

was intimately related to the belief in "animal magnetism"; the belief, in other words, that the powers of the human body could be conducted and controlled by an invisible fluid, and that by careful management of this mesmeric fluid the sick human subject could be cured or revived. (Ackroyd: 258)

The terms 'mesmerism' and 'animal magnetism' remained popular for some time. In *Boag's Dictionary* (1848), mesmerism was defined as 'animal magnetism or a mere pretence to that effect, introduced by one Mesmer'. Notably, psychology was defined as a 'discourse or treatise on the human soul; the doctrine of the nature and properties of the soul'^{xiii}. Dickens used mesmerism, psychologically, to heal his friends, but more dramatically, seems to have used his mesmeric skills during the public reading of his novels. As Ackroyd tells us,

In mesmeric demonstrations great importance was attached to the eyes of the mesmeriser...and Dickens himself always emphasised the force and power of his own "Visual Ray". "(Keep your eye on me)..." he once commanded Forster in a letter, as he narrated a story to him, and in later life when he gave his public readings he always insisted that the audience should be able to see his face. When they did not respond he sometimes complained that they were not "magnetic", which suggests that Dickens deliberately (and generally successfully) managed to induce in his audiences a highly suggestible state which was in some ways close to that of the mesmeric trance. (Ackroyd: 259)

Added to this, there are a number of references to mesmerism in Dickens' novels. In *Great Expectations*, for example, the lawyer Mr. Jaggers carries with him at all times, a type of German pocket watch called a 'Gold Repeater', which Dickens himself had been presented with as a gift several years earlier, and which he had promised to mention in his next novel. Mr. Jaggers invites Pip, Herbert Pocket, Startop and Bentley Drummle to dinner. During the consumption of after dinner cheese, Drummle obnoxiously declares to Mr. Jaggers his preference for the room over the other guests, and when the conversation turns to rowing, declares his superiority in skill and strength in rowing, over the other guests. Seemingly in response to Drummle's rudeness, the host exerts an almost mesmeric control over Drummle's and then the others' behaviour. With an indirect reference to Mr. Jaggers' watch, Pip tells us,

By some invisible agency, my guardian wound him up to a pitch little short of ferocity about this trifle; and he fell to baring and spanning his

arm to show how muscular it was, and we all fell to baring and spanning our arms in a ridiculous manner. (GE: 211)

The 'invisible agency' is arguably Franz Anton Mesmer's magnetic fluid, which connected all things in the universe. Mr. Jaggers cryptically alludes to his magnetic abilities whilst neurotically washing his hands and face and simultaneously talks to Pip about his fellow guest, Drummle, whom he warns Pip to keep his distance from. Mr Jaggers says,

'Keep as clear of him as you can. But I like the fellow, Pip; he is one of the true sort. Why if I was a fortune – teller --'. Looking out of the towel, he caught my eye. 'But I am not a fortune-teller,' he said, letting his head drop into a festoon of towel, and towelling away at his two ears. 'You know what I am, don't you? Good night, Pip'. (GE: 215)

Mr Jaggers, as well as being a lawyer, would seem to be a mesmerist.

Wilkie Collins wrote a number of case studies of animal magnetism, published as a series of seven letters entitled 'Magnetic Evenings at Home'. Collins acted as an objective 'reporter' of the events witnessed by himself and others, but kept hidden the names of the central people involved. In effect, he wrote a scientific case history in the style of the *roman à clef*, 'a "novel with a key", in which real people appear under fictitious names, lightly disguised but still recognisable'^{xiv}. In Collins' account, a mysterious Count P- performed the magnetism, principally upon a young woman referred to only as Madamemoiselle V-. Despite his skill, however, Count P- tells his audience, with much foresight into the direction that animal magnetism would take as

a science, that what he practises is a new science, and a means of curing psychological ailments. The Count says,

I must repeat that I am only a student in the science; that we are all groping in the darkness of a mystery which is still unrevealed. The relation between cause and effect is not yet traced out in Animal Magnetism. With regard to the practical purpose to which it may be directed, I think it might be used as a curative agent in more forms of disease—especially nervous diseases—than I can well reckon up. Without entering into particulars, one great boon I know it can confer on humanity—it can produce sleep; a sleep from which every one awakens refreshed. Think of the disorders fatally aggravated by want of sleep, or inefficiently relieved by the short, unhealthy sleep produced by opiates. Think of what might be effected in the earliest stages of insanity, by procuring for the patient a long sleep, that could be made to last, if necessary for days together.^{xv}

Five years later, in 1857, Dickens and Wilkie Collins both performed in a play, written many years earlier, called *Animal Magnetism*, by Elizabeth Inchbald (1753-1821), with Dickens playing the role of Doctor Mesmer (*The Leader*: 3).

Twenty-eight years later, mesmerism or animal magnetism would be called ‘hypnosis’ after the ancient Greek god of sleep, Hypnos, and would be introduced by Jean Martin Charcot to Sigmund Freud, as a means of curing psychological ailments, as once envisioned by Wilkie Collins’ Count P-. Freud also came into contact with hypnosis through the writing of the French physician Hippolyte Bernheim, and translated Bernheim’s *On Suggestion and its Applications to Therapy*, from French into German, later visiting Bernheim in Nancy (Breger: 100). Fifteen years later still, Freud would begin using hypnotism in the treatment of hysteria. Freud would later

abandon this, however, in favour of what his mentor Joseph Breuer had already been practising, ‘the talking cure’, as Breuer’s patient Bertha Pappenheim called it, which Freud would develop into psychoanalysis.

Freud’s attempt to forget the contribution that Charles Dickens and Wilkie Collins had made to the development of psychoanalysis is contrasted by the fact that Freud did acknowledge that psychoanalysis had not begun with him, but with his mentor Joseph Breuer. Freud writes,

If it is a merit to have brought psycho-analysis into being, that merit is not mine. I had no share in its earliest beginnings. I was a student and working for my final examinations at the time when another Viennese physician, Dr. Josef Breuer, first – in 1880-2 - made use of this procedure on a girl who was suffering from hysteria. (Breger: 100)

Yet, as Louis Breger points out, Freud would later play down the contribution that Breuer had made to the development of psychoanalysis. Similarly, as Nicholas Royle observes, Freud plays down the importance of Ernst Jentsch’s essay ‘On the Psychology of the Uncanny’ (1907) in his essay ‘The Uncanny’ (1919)^{xvi}. By forgetting these different beginnings of psychoanalysis, Freud arguably sought to position himself as the Father of Psychoanalysis.

In *Primal Scenes: Literature, Philosophy, Psychoanalysis*, Ned Lukacher argues that despite the fact that Freud does not discuss Dickens’ work, in his psychoanalytic writing, Dickens paradoxically enters into Freud’s writing through this forgetting. Lukacher points to Walter Benjamin’s process of ‘Eingedenken’, a state somewhere between consciousness and unconsciousness, and what Martin Heidegger calls ‘Andenken’ or ‘commemoration’ as the means by which Dickens subtly enters into

Freud's writing^{xvii}. When Freud analyses the patient Ernst Lanzer, whom he would call 'The Rat Man', his conviction that the childhood incident in which Lanzer bites his nurse's hand is the patient's primal scene, Lukacher argues, is driven by Freud's 'unconscious memory of *Copperfield*', for in Dickens' novel, David similarly bites the hand of his stepfather Mr Murdstone (Lukacher: 335). Lukacher argues that it is through Freud's reading and forgetting of Dickens, and the novel *David Copperfield* that 'Dickens' relentless urge to reconstruct and elaborate his primal scene makes his work the primal scene of psychoanalysis itself' (Lukacher: 276). The primal scene can be defined as the imaginary or remembered scene central to the formation of one's psycho-sexual identity, which stands in place of the real but impossible-to-witness primal scene of one's own conception.

Lukacher argues that Dickens' writing, as an attempt to reconstruct his primal scene through his experiences of the streets of Victorian London, can be compared to Walter Benjamin's twentieth century experiences and representations of the streets of Berlin and Paris. Lukacher says,

"Passages" was Walter Benjamin's favourite expression for describing the historian's effort to uncover the relation between past and present. To construct an interpretive "passage" was for Benjamin to reveal the relation of past to present in such a way as to transform the present - which is to say that for him the interpretive act was invariably a mode of political intervention. The recovery of historical origins was thus simultaneously the revelation of some heretofore concealed element of the present, because origin for Benjamin was whatever of the past inheres in the present. (Lukacher: 177)

Lukacher suggests that Dickens similarly uses his writing as a means of uncovering the past within the present, of restaging his childhood 'primal scene', and that by the same token, Dickens' writing is the nineteenth century past, hidden in the twentieth century present of Freud's writing (which from 1939 to our twenty-first century perspective is also part of the past).

One problem with Ned Lukacher's approach to bringing the Dickens and Freud text together is his reliance upon James Strachey's translation of Freud. In key respects, Strachey not only translated, but also rewrote what Freud had written, using a more Victorian, and scientific discourse. Stanley J. Coen discusses this, with reference to the critics Samuel Weber, Darius Gray Ornston, Bruno Bettelheim, and Patrick Mahony, all of whom 'point out biases and distortions in Strachey's English translation, which have significantly influenced readers'^{xviii}. Patrick Mahony, in particular, argues that in Strachey's translation, 'More vividly engaging terms are cleaned up into staid Victorian prose' (Coen: 145, 146). At the same time, Ornston,

states that Freud wrote with a vividness of feeling that conveys intensely what the patient and analyst each felt, as well as what the reader is to feel. Strachey's translation tends to fortify analyst and reader against such feelings, to separate artificially the patient from the analyst and the reader'.
(Coen: 146)

In contrast to this, Mahony makes the point that 'Strachey possesses an open-mindedness grounded not in emotions, but in science and reason' (Mahony: 4). Louis Breger acknowledges that,

It is generally agreed that Strachey tends to scientize Freud, making his colloquial, poetic, and evocative German into a more distanced, impersonal, and seemingly precise English. For example, Strachey translates the word for slips or mistakes, central to *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, as “parapraxis” when the English “blunder” or “faulty action” would have been more accurate. He uses Latinisms “id” and “ego” when the everyday “it” and “I” would have better captured Freud’s German. (Breger: 378)

Echoing this, Coen writes that

Ornston (1985) [...] objects to Strachey’s neglect of Freud’s view that the unconscious can only be described in approximations but never directly known. “*Beschreibende Psychologie*” (describing psychology) (Freud 1900: 531, 582, 593) is a fine way to characterize Freud’s strategy of describing a concept in multiple, vivid ways so that the reader can visualize and grasp it. (Coen: 146)

That Freud would use vivid descriptions of a concept that would allow the reader to ‘visualize and grasp it’ is indeed the means by which Freud would access his own memories, particularly when writing up his case histories. Mahony tells us that, ‘Rather than experiencing the pastness of past events, Freud could, in a manner reminiscent of hallucination though qualitatively different and controlled, summon happenings to mind and experience them re-enacted in the present’ (Mahony: 126). The difference between Freud’s writing and James Strachey’s translation is great enough for the latter to be arguably considered a re-reading of the Freud text, and as such a text in its own right written by Strachey and based on the writing of Freud.

This is not to say that Dickens does not enter into Freud's writing, but rather that Strachey's translation of Freud's writing is so different from the original, that one cannot safely make the argument about Dickens' influence upon Freud based on the Strachey translations, without at least acknowledging the differences Strachey's translation introduced, and the fact that Strachey was also familiar with Dickens' writing.

James Strachey (1887-1967) was part of the Bloomsbury Group that included his intimate friend and unrequited lover Rupert Brooke, his brother Lytton Strachey, and the writer Virginia Woolf. In a letter he received from Rupert Brooke, Brooke writes 'Dear Strachey, Many thanks for your telegram. I fear I am somewhat late in acknowledging it. I hope you passed that exam in "English Literature" as exemplified by Walter Scott (or was it Dickens?)'^{xix} Echoing Ned Lukacher, John Bowen points to Dickens' subtle but pervasive influence upon writers of the early twentieth century, many of whom, but not all, would be called Modernists, writing,

The exfoliation of Dickens' works into what is called modernity – into Joyce and Van Gogh, T. S. Eliot and Kafka, Nabokov and Adorno, Beckett, Marx, Freud, and countless other readings, adaptations, plagiarisms, and expropriations – multiply and disseminate the texts, the debt, and the name in an interminable mourning and bond.^{xx}

Among these 'countless other readings adaptations, plagiarisms, and expropriations' we could include James Strachey's translations of Freud. The fact that Strachey refers to Walter Scott by his full name, but contrastingly refers only to 'Dickens', suggests that he is more familiar with Dickens as a writer. Where Ned Lukacher sees Dickens

entering into the writing of Freud through the process of 'Eingedenken' or 'Andenken', we could simultaneously be witness to Dickens entering into the significantly different translation of Freud's writing by James Strachey.

However, even if we use the original Freud text, we then encounter a problem applicable to the interpretation of all writing, the question of intended meaning. The presence of unconscious forces behind the creative or intellectual process circumvents the question of what might or might not have been consciously intended by the author, for in this sense, the author may have been unconscious of what he or she was writing, or the way in which it was written. If Freud forgets Dickens, he does so in a broad cultural sense, in which the influence of Dickens is as pervasive as it is unnoticed. At the same time, by forgetting Dickens, he effaces one of those influences upon his writing which come uncomfortably close to the psychoanalysis he wishes to be recognised as the discoverer of. More importantly, however, Freud forgets Dickens for unconscious psychological reasons.

In Dianne F. Sadoff's study of the intertextual points of contact between the Dickensian and Freudian text, she examines Dickens' *David Copperfield*, *A Child's History of England*, *Great Expectations*, and *Oliver Twist*, in relation to Freud's essay 'The Uncanny', with a central focus on castration, narcissistic and Oedipal desire, patriarchy and the uncanny^{xxi}. She argues that the uncanny moments in the Dickensian text, and in Freud's 'The Uncanny', manifest in repeated images of hanging and beheading, themselves representative of the castration threat. In often being correlated with 'family secrets, histories, or stories', these representations of castration represent the return of repressed childhood experiences, fears, and desires. She argues that 'these uncanny eruptions into the text which desires mastery function to fulfil wishes and to punish paternal figures of prohibition' (Sadoff: 207). Sadoff suggests that what

Freud writes is shaped in part by repressed desire, and in part by the need to retaliate against the prohibiting, repressing threat of castration posed by the phantasised castratory father. This retaliation takes the form of a reciprocal symbolic threat or act of castration, which manifests in both the imagery and language used by Dickens. Sadoff later argues that in *Great Expectations*, together with *Oliver Twist* and *David Copperfield*, the mother figure becomes phallicized as a means of symbolically reversing the child's unconsciously imagined castration of the mother by the father, and the subsequently imagined threat of castration towards the son who phantasises this to be the father's punishment for the son's desire for the mother.

With the Oedipus complex composed of two conflicting emotions, the desire for the mother, and the fearful phantasy of the father's castratory punishment that will destroy that desire, Diane F. Sadoff focuses on the latter. In contrast to this, Carolyn Dever argues that the 'absent mother' is central to Dickens' writing, and to the Victorian novel as a whole. She writes,

The ideal mother is the ghost that haunts the Victorian novel. Paradoxically, the world of Victorian fiction, so preoccupied with women's power in the context of the domestic sphere, only rarely embodies that power in the figure of the mother. Instead, Victorian novels almost invariably feature protagonists whose mothers are dead or lost, swept away by menacing and often mysterious outside forces. The maternal ideal in fiction thus takes its shape and its power in the context of almost complete maternal absence, and I would argue through the necessary vehicle of such a void.^{xxii}

However, what we arguably find in Dickens' and Freud's writing is neither a dominance of castration anxiety over the Oedipus complex, nor dominance of the

idealised but absent mother. Rather, Dickens' and Freud's respective trauma at being abandoned by their mothers, compounded by a repressed Oedipus complex that could not be destroyed by the weak castration threat posed by John Dickens and Jacob Freud respectively, is the driving force that leads Dickens and Freud to reconstruct in their writing maternal figures who are very 'present'. These reconstructed mothers are either phallicised mothers who represent the symbolic threat of castration, or they represent an idealised Oedipal substitute. It is the mother who dominates the Dickensian and Freudian text, both as castration threat and object of desire, and not through the representation of her absence or abandonment of the child protagonist, as Dever suggests, but through her presence within the text as a means of compensating for her real absence and abandonment of Dickens and Freud respectively as children.

Neither Dickens nor Freud, respectively, experienced the standard model of the Oedipus complex. Freud argues that the model of the Oedipus and castration complex he had constructed was not universal, but would vary in intensity, and indeed could be reversed, from individual to individual. Freud's provision is all the more pertinent because we find, in comparing the childhoods of Dickens and Freud, that they did not experience Oedipus and castration complexes that conformed to the model defined by Freud. Both Dickens and Freud had weak fathers who did not pose a great enough psychological threat that could lead to the destruction of the Oedipus complex. At the same time, they were both rejected by their mothers at a young age, Dickens when he was twelve years old, and Freud when he was two years old, with the effect that the Oedipus complex was repressed rather than destroyed in both writers. It is arguably the mother-figure as oedipal object of desire that dominates the threat of castration, in the writing of Dickens and Freud. In other words, the threat of symbolic castration

that Sadoff identifies, is there to be seen, but is secondary to, and at times is confused with, the child's desire for the mother.

This Oedipus complex became repressed, rather than destroyed. Just as rivalry with the father gives way to identification, in the standard model of the Oedipus complex, so for Dickens and Freud, desire for the mother, as well as fear of castration by the mother, which in both cases took the form of the mother's rejection of the young Dickens and Freud respectively, and in Freud's case at least, his mother's volatile and domineering personality, became merged with their identification with their mothers, an identification that was stronger than their respective identifications with their fathers. Thus, even where we encounter phallicized mother-figures, such as Miss Havisham and Mrs Joe in *Great Expectations*, or Mrs Clennam in *Little Dorrit*, these are not maternal figures that have been phallicized as an unconscious means of denying the initial castration by the prohibiting father. In Dickens' and Freud's respective childhoods, that father, be it John Dickens or Jacob Freud, was subservient to the wife, Elizabeth Dickens and Amalia Nathanson Freud respectively.

Dickens does create brutally masculine characters such as Bill Sikes in *Oliver Twist*. Yet, Bill Sikes' brutality and masculinity is off-set by the pantomime villainy of Fagin, the 'Old Devil', who with mock-maternal language and tone of voice, addresses Oliver and others as 'my dear' (OT: 105). In *David Copperfield* the brutal patriarchy of Mr Murdstone is paralleled by the symbolic threat posed by the crocodiles in the book which David reads to and later gives to Peggotty, transforming her into a phallicized Matriarch. In *Great Expectations* the brutal patriarch Magwitch not only combines the masculine and feminine in his name, which is a conflation of 'Magus', a sorcerer, and 'witch' most often a female sorcerer, but the initial threat that he poses Pip, which later gives way to his becoming Pip's secret benefactor, is

contrasted by the far more insidious psychological threat posed by the phallicised Miss Havisham, and the physical threat posed by the phallicised Mrs Joe, with her tallow cane which she calls 'Tickler' and which Pip tells us 'was a wax-ended piece of cane, worn smooth by collision with my tickled frame' (GE: 9).

The only novel which focuses almost exclusively on castration and the Patriarch, to the exclusion of the mother, although Barnaby's mother does play a part, is *Barnaby Rudge* (1841). Yet as is discussed in Chapter four, the novel is centred upon the Maypole Inn, which like the Last Patriarch in *Little Dorrit* (1857), is signified by an 'Inn signpost without any Inn' (LD: 151). The connection Dickens seems to establish between the two novels, suggests that the numerous patriarchal figures in *Barnaby Rudge*, John Willet, Sir John Chester, Gabriel Varden, Geoffrey Haredale, the deceased Reuben Haredale, Lord George Gordon, and the villainous Rudge, can be thought of as 'Last Patriarchs', but simultaneously, can be thought of as Inn signposts without any Inn. The Last Patriarch, in effect, is an empty signifier, an empty threat that fails to destroy the Oedipal desire for the mother, thereby allowing the mother as castrator and object of desire to dominate.

The fact that these Last Patriarchs appear so early in Dickens' writing, corresponds with the fact that so many of Dickens' subsequent novels focus on the mother, including *Little Dorrit* where we encounter the Last Patriarch. The phallicized mother that Dickens often depicts in his novels, and which, as is shown in Chapter three, Freud adopts the role of in *The Wolfman*, is not the antidote to the threat of castration. The phallicized mother is the threat of castration, the figure who reflecting Diane F. Sadoff's observation about the split mother, is paralleled by the figure of the idealised young mother. Dickens and Freud seek to reconstruct in their writing their conflicting fear of the mother as castration threat, and the desire for an idealised passive mother

who is incapable of rejecting, or symbolically castrating, them, and in so doing, find some resolution to the oedipal conflict.

The Oedipus complex is defined as a stage in the male or female child's development that comes after the 'anal stage' and 'genital stage' and precedes the 'latency period', involving the infant boy or girl's respective heterosexual choice of the mother or father as the first object of love (reversed in the case of the homosexual child). This is coupled with feelings of jealousy and hostility toward the respective parent whom the child perceives to be a sexual rival. Post Freudian psychoanalysts introduced the term Electra complex after Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, written in the late fifth or early sixth century BC, to describe the analogous complex in girls. However, Freud himself did not use this term, and most current psychoanalysts use the term 'Oedipus complex' to refer to both boys and girls. The child's awareness of the anatomical difference between boys and girls leads the child unconsciously and thus somewhat irrationally, to believe that the lack of a penis in girls is brought about by the father's castratory punishment of the child's incestuous desire.

In boys, the fear is that the father will castrate him. Conversely girls unconsciously feel a sense of guilt or shame at having already been castrated. This unconscious phantasy of castratory punishment destroys their respective desires for the mother or father. At the same time, girls feel an unconscious envy of the penis that they lack. While Freud described this as 'penis envy', the envy is not for the penis, a copulatory and urinary organ, but rather as Jacques Lacan argues, for the phallus, a symbol of power. Freud tells us that the object-cathexis, the concentration of mental energies upon the object of desire, is then abandoned in favour of identification with the father or mother, which is paradoxically homosexual in terms of object choice. Conversely,

the homosexual child will identify with the parent who represents a heterosexual object choice.

At the same time, the imago of the prohibitive father and / or parents is introjected into the child's ego, giving rise to the super-ego, which continues to curtail the child's incestuous desire, and the return of the libidinal object-cathexis. Desires associated with the Oedipus complex are 'in part desexualized and sublimated (a thing which happens with every transformation into an identification) and in part inhibited in their aim and changed into impulses of affection'^{xixiii}. Yet as Freud goes on to theorize, this not only signals the beginning of the child's latency period, but the complete destruction of the Oedipus complex. Freud writes,

The process we have described is more than a repression. It is equivalent, if it is ideally carried out, to a destruction and an abolition of the complex. We may plausibly assume that we have here come upon the borderline – never a very sharply drawn one – between the normal and the pathological. If the ego has not achieved much more than a repression of the complex, the latter persists in an unconscious state in the id and will later manifest its pathogenic effect. (*On Sexuality*: 319)

Freud suggests that while the Oedipus complex is ideally destroyed by the threat of castration, this threat, manifested in the super-ego, remains repressed within the unconscious. Where the threat is not strong enough or is absent, the ego merely represses the Oedipus complex within the id, resulting in a psychically violent conflict between the id and the superego, and a psychological or psychosomatic illness. However, Freud writes, 'I do not wish to assert that the Oedipus complex exhausts the relation of children to their parents: it can easily be far more complicated'. He adds

that ‘The Oedipus complex can, moreover, be developed to a greater or less strength, it can even be reversed’, but nevertheless ‘is a regular and very important factor in a child’s mental life, and there is more danger of our under-estimating rather than over-estimating its influence and that of the developments which proceed from it’^{xxiv}.

The respective childhoods of Dickens and Freud demonstrate the fact that the Oedipus complex is not a universal but a particular experience that varies with each individual, and that their respective childhood oedipal and castration fantasies fall into that area acknowledged by Freud as being ‘far more complicated’ (*Introductory Lectures*: 244). Both Dickens and Freud had fathers who held little authority either with their families, or in relation to their sons. Both fathers were financially unsuccessful, meaning that the young Dickens and the young Freud both experienced genuine poverty in their childhoods. At an unconscious level, from Freud’s and Dickens’ perspective, Jacob Freud and John Dickens were weak, both as role models upon whom their sons could model themselves, and as fathers who posed a symbolic threat of castration in response to the son’s emerging Oedipus complex, within the child’s unconscious imagination. As children, they both escaped from the poverty around them by escaping into their imaginations through books, ironically reversing that poverty later in life, by writing books, while allowing them to find heroic father-substitutes with whom they could identify.

Malcolm Andrews makes the point that in Dickens’ autobiographical novel *David Copperfield*, David consoles himself ‘for his miseries at the hands of the Murdstones by immersing himself in the novels of Smollett and Fielding and impersonating their fictional heroes: “I have been Tom Jones (a child’s Tom Jones, a harmless creature) for a week together”’^{xxv}. Similarly, Louis Breger tells us, ‘Sigmund was deeply troubled by Jacob’s weakness and failure; he loved him but could not take him as a

model and began, very early, to identify with powerful, dominating men – Hannibal, Oedipus, Alexander the Great, Napoléon, Moses – a pattern that continued throughout his life’ (Breger: 27). For Dickens, however, the poverty experienced was so great that the books into which he could escape, and the heroes with whom he could identify, were themselves under threat, for Dickens would often have to take family possessions to the pawnshop. As Peter Ackroyd says,

Dickens was no stranger to these places, nor was he a stranger to a little drunken bookseller in the Hampstead Road where by degrees he pawned his father’s small library of books. But he never did pawn Goldsmith’s *Bee*, his schoolmaster’s final gift to him, and in the retention of that little volume one senses the last remaining hope of the boy himself; to have given up that book would have been to have given up all his past and the hopes that were part of it. (Ackroyd: 71)

Ackroyd argues that Dickens’ feelings towards his father involved ‘something at once more violent and less easy to understand. There were times in later life when John Dickens became for him a creature of nightmare, forever weighing upon his life, but long before that time it is clear that the image of his father haunted him in some generalised and unspecified way’ (Ackroyd: 13). Ackroyd hints at, but never elaborates upon what this generalized and unspecified haunting might be. In a sense, this ‘haunting’ is only generalized and unspecified, because Ackroyd does not explore the possible psychoanalytic explanation, or any other form of explanation.

It is possible that Dickens was not haunted by his father because of the symbolic threat of castration he posed, but because his father was weak, and posed little or no threat. As players within the oedipal drama, Jacob and John’s comparable weakness,

in the eyes of Dickens and Freud, would have led to the repression rather than destruction of the Oedipus complex. This is not to suggest that Jacob Freud and John Dickens posed no threat in Freud's and Dickens' respective unconscious minds, but that they did not pose a great enough threat, leading Dickens and Freud to create their own protective and castratory father-figures in their writing. Yet, this weakness of the father meant that the Oedipus complex could flourish, with nothing to stop it, leading Dickens and Freud to also create mother-substitutes in their writing.

Peter Ackroyd tells us that Dickens' 'relationship to his mother was central to his life, but it was necessarily a complex one established upon guilt and rejection but combined with a kind of hopeless love.'^{xxvi} Demonstrating this relationship, and the 'hopeless' love, Ackroyd tells us,

He was fond of dancing, too, but he did not like to see his mother dance; he is said "...to have regarded her performances with disfavour". And here also we trace the strange alchemy of the mother-son relationship, the son despising in his mother what is implicit within himself, just as in his fiction he sees her as a stranger without realising that he is also looking upon his own face.
(Ackroyd: 7)

Ackroyd's expression 'strange alchemy of the mother-son relationship' reflects his general avoidance of psychoanalytic theory, and in this case Freud's theory of the Oedipus complex, relying instead on an almost medieval mystification of the mother-son relationship. Yet, the important point is made that coupled with Dickens' desire for his mother, he identified with her, again countering the standard model of the Oedipus complex. Faced with a father with whom he could not fully identify, yet

inheriting his father's appearance, but his mother's creative and intellectual abilities, Dickens simultaneously identified with the mother he also desired.

In contrast to Diane F Sadoff's perspective, in which the Dickens and Freud text is punctuated with uncanny moments in which the castration complex and desire for revenge against the father return, much more prominent is the return of a repressed Oedipus complex, which manifests as the unconscious desire to reconstruct an ideal double of the mother. As Peter Ackroyd says, 'All the maternal figures in his novels are in fact ways of reinstating someone else in her place. He did not want to see her too clearly. He did not want to get too close to her' (Ackroyd: 6). Yet, it is arguably because he does want to get close to her, and does want to clearly see her, that he reconstructs a passive, idealised substitute of her through his writing. He fleetingly satisfies his oedipal desires, when he depicts her as the young woman of his childhood. Where Dickens and Freud do exhibit a return of a repressed castration anxiety, in particular in the separation of the individual into original and copy, and as is explored in chapter two, the separation of signified original mental concept and signifying word / image, it is paradoxically this castratory splitting of the individual sign into signified and signifier, that gives rise to the oedipal substitute. The castratory impulse that should destroy the Oedipus complex, gives rise to the idealised Oedipal double of the real mother, that allows Dickens and Freud to respectively fulfil that desire.

In contrast to Dickens' exploration of his feelings towards his mother and father, Freud would ignore, or forget those things, which reminded him of his feelings about his mother and father. Nicholas Royle points out that Freud's reading of ETA Hoffmann's 'The Sandman' pays little or no attention to the automaton Olympia, with whom Nathaniel, the central character falls in love. As Royle argues,

Freud's reading of 'The Sandman' is a violent attempt to reduce or eliminate the significance of Jentsch's work on the uncanny, and in particular the importance of the figures of the doll and the automaton for an understanding of the uncanny. It is also a violent attempt to reduce or eliminate the place and importance of women. As Jane Marie Todd has argued, in an essay entitled "The Veiled Woman in Freud's 'Das Unheimlich'", 'in disregarding the theme of the doll Olympia, Freud failed to see that the question of woman is inextricably connected to Nathaniel's fear of castration. (Royle, *The Uncanny*: 41)

However, it could be argued that Freud did not fail to see the connection between Nathaniel's castration complex, and his desire for the automaton Olympia, who arguably represents, like Dora, a passive Oedipal substitute for the mother. Freud, rather, unconsciously chose not to see this connection, just as he chose not to see the similarity between Dickens' character Dora whom David chooses as a replacement for his mother Clara, and Hoffmann's character Olympia whom Nathaniel chooses as a replacement for his fiancée Clara, or the similarity between LG Moberly's 'Inexplicable' and Dickens' *David Copperfield*. To consider these substitute mothers, would have been to remind Freud of the mother he unconsciously desired. At the same time, just as Dickens had recreated his mother in his novels, so Freud would have been reminded by Dickens' Dora and Hoffmann's Olympia, of the mother he sought to recreate in his fiancée Martha Bernays during their largely epistolary courtship, and later his patient Ida Bauer, whom he called 'Dora'.

Just as Dickens and Freud had similarly found it hard to identify with their fathers, whom they perceived to be loving, but unsuccessful, and not the ideal father-figure that they needed, so Dickens and Freud had both been rejected by their mothers.

Dickens, aged two years old, was faced with the rivalry of a newborn brother, Alfred Allen Dickens, who at 6 months old, died from hydrocephalus or 'water on the brain'. Peter Ackroyd says, in what is both an indirect criticism of but also acceptance of psychoanalytic theory,

Those who profess to understand the nature of infant consciousness might suggest that the emergence of another male child when Dickens himself was just a little over two years old would have inspired anxiety and resentment in the sibling breast – that he would have felt, as Dickens put it in another context, “an alien from my mother’s heart.” Would he have been denied the pampering which he might have desired, and would he then have felt rejected by his mother? It is difficult to be sure; certainly the idea of maternal rejection is a very strong thread both in his fiction and in his own reminiscences.^{xxvii}

This would have been made all the worse by her second rejection of Dickens. The Dickens family’s increasing poverty meant that the young Charles Dickens was forced to end his schooling and leave home at the age of eleven. John Dickens’ cousin, James Lamert, had purchased Warren’s Blacking Factory, and wanted John to take the position of manager. James Lamert, with Elizabeth Dickens’ support, suggested that the eleven-year-old Charles Dickens work in the factory, until John Dickens’ fortunes improved, which he did, beginning on Monday 9th of February 1824, two days before his twelfth birthday. Two weeks after this, Dickens’ father was arrested for the non-payment of debts, and spent three months in the Marshalsea prison, where the rest of the Dickens family, minus Charles, went to live as well. Following his release, it was John Dickens who took Charles Dickens out of the factory, and allowed him to go back to school. It was possibly Dickens’ ‘hopeless’

love for his mother, and the ‘strange alchemy’ of their relationship, that ironically led her to reject him. Ackroyd’s mystification of the mother-son relationship reflects his general avoidance of psychoanalytic theory, and here in particular, his avoidance of Freud’s theory of the Oedipus complex.

Like Dickens, Freud had lost a sibling at an early age. When Freud was two years old, his eleven month old brother, Julius, died. Louis Breger writes,

The death of his baby brother Julius, and the loss of his mother’s attention and care, were the sources of the infant Freud’s own anxiety and grief. [...] He was able to reconstruct his feelings of guilt in relation to the death of Julius because, like almost every young child who is replaced by a new infant, he had wished to get rid of his rival, and it was this guilt that he emphasized in his later accounts of these events [...] But he was never able to see his own reactions to the loss of Amalia to new babies, the sense that she had betrayed him, and the yearning for her love. (Breger: 12)

Freud was looked after by his Roman Catholic Czech nanny whose name was either Monika Zajic or Resi Willek, and who ‘told him pious stories, took him to church, and shaped his early education and sense of himself’ (Breger: 14). However, one of the earliest mother substitutes that Freud constructed in his imagination was the mother of a friend. When Freud was sixteen years old, he admired from a distance, the 11-year-old Gisela Fluss, a family friend. However, his true feelings were for her mother. Freud wrote to his friend Eduard Silberstein,

I am full of admiration for this woman whom none of her children can fully match. Would you believe that this woman from a middle-class background,

who once lived in fairly straitened circumstances, has acquired education of which a nineteen-year old salon-bred young thing need not be ashamed? She has read a great deal, including the classics, and what she has not read she is conversant with. (Breger: p. 36)

Breger suggests that he saw in Frau Fluss, ‘the ideal mother, one who was not volatile and given to anger, one who could share his deepest intellectual and literary interests’ (Breger: p. 37). The implication of what Breger observes, is that Freud’s mother was ‘volatile and given to anger’, and this, together with the weakened castration threat, and thus repressed rather than destroyed Oedipus complex, led Freud to construct in his life and writing, idealised doubles of his mother, and to representations of the mother in the role of the father-as-castration threat. Moreover, this non-standard Oedipus complex and castration complex gives rise to the psychological and thematic similarities between Freud’s and Dickens’ writing.

We find that in much of Freud’s writing, the most potent form of repression at his disposal is that of forgetting, contrasting with his reputedly excellent memory and ability to recall past events as though reliving them. Freud represses his Oedipus complex, as we see in his reading of ETA Hoffmann’s ‘The Sandman’ by forgetting that there is a character called Olympia. This use of forgetting as a form of repression is also evident in Freud’s forgetting of the details of a short story he once read that gave him an uncanny feeling, and which he discusses in a footnote in ‘The Uncanny’.

What we find, upon examining the story, entitled ‘Inexplicable’ published in the English *Strand Magazine* in 1917, and written by Lucy Gertrude Moberly, who lived from fl.1885-1930^{xxviii} is that it bears a striking similarity to Charles Dickens’ *David Copperfield*, something else which Freud either simply does not recognize, or again unconsciously chooses to forget. There may have been practical and patriotic reasons

for Freud's reticence about the exact origin of the story. His unwillingness to reveal the fact that the story was from the post-1914 England with whom Germany, the Austro-Hungarian Empire and her allies were at war, as opposed to pre-1914 England, may have been an attempt to avoid drawing attention to the fact that he had English relatives. Freud's older half brothers Philip and Emanuel, Emanuel's wife Marie, and her children John and Pauline, moved to Manchester in 1859 owing to financial difficulties facing the Freud family (Breger: 16). Freud would visit Philip and Emanuel in 1875.

Although Emanuel died in 1911, and Philip died in 1914, to draw attention to his familial connection with England, would have been to run counter to the fervent nationalism that even pacifists and socialists, including Freud, began to express in Austria-Hungary, as war gripped Europe. As Louis Breger says,

In Vienna, the British ambassador observed "a frenzy of delight, vast crowds parading the streets and singing patriotic songs till the small hours of the morning." Newspaper editors wrote of a new "Austrianness, a new Hungarianness", as divisiveness in the Hapsburg Empire was replaced with a spirit of commonality. (Breger: 234)

In a letter to Karl Abraham, Freud wrote,

For the first time in thirty years I feel myself to be an Austrian and feel like giving this not very hopeful Empire another chance. Morale everywhere is excellent. Also, the liberating effect of courageous action and the secure prop of Germany contributes a great deal to this. (Breger: 234).

Ernest Jones observed that Freud's response to the war was 'one of youthful enthusiasm, apparently a re-awakening of the military ardors of his boyhood...he was quite carried away, could not think of any work, and spent his time discussing the events of the day with his brother Alexander. As he put it: 'All my libido is given to Austro-Hungary'' (Breger: 234). Freud thus seems to repress any loyalties he might have had for England and his English relatives. Yet, nevertheless he is divided. Just as Nicholas Royle suggests that the 'uncanny is not what Freud (or anyone) thinks. It has to do with a sense of ourselves as double, split, at odds with ourselves' (Royle: 6), so Freud is divided between his loyalties to Austria and his loyalties to England, finding himself caught not only in 'the isolation of the Great War' (Freud, *The Uncanny*: 151), with Europe divided down the middle, but in an uncanny state of division, 'at odds with himself' as Nicholas Royle puts it.

Before proceeding any further, in considering why Freud should have been left with an uncanny feeling at reading LG Moberly's story, we need to understand what Freud meant by the term 'uncanny'. While this in one sense begins with Freud's 1919 essay 'The Uncanny' ('Das Unheimlich'), it is important to note that Freud had used and encountered the term 'uncanny' before turning his attention to its definition. Prior to Freud's writing of 'The Uncanny', there are a number of occasions in which Freud experiences an uncanny feeling; occasions in which he encounters and uses himself the German word 'unheimlich'; and at least one occasion when he encounters the English word 'uncanny'. This suggests that while Freud felt suddenly compelled to write 'The Uncanny', the uncanny as a subject had been of an underlying interest and concern to him for many years. In 1885, Freud moved to Paris to work under Jean-Martin Charcot. He found the city of Paris to be 'magic' yet he also described it as "a

vast overdressed Sphinx who gobbles up every foreigner unable to solve her riddles”.

He wrote of the Parisians saying they,

strike me as uncanny; the people seem to me of a different species from ourselves; I feel they are all possessed of a thousand demons...I don't think they know the meaning of shame or fear; the women no less than the men crowd round nudities as much as they do round corpses in the morgue.

(Breger: 74).

This description of the Parisians as being ‘a different species from ourselves’ is reminiscent of *David Copperfield*, which Freud had read only recently before his journey to Paris. In Dickens’ novel, David describes Mr Omer, the funeral director, and his employees saying, ‘I was more afraid of them, as if I were cast away among creatures with whom I had no community of nature’ (DC: 122). Twenty-one years later, in 1906, Freud read Ernst Jentsch’s ‘On the Psychology of the Uncanny’^{xxix}. In a 1907 supplement to *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* Freud used the word ‘uncanny’ when discussing déjà vu, writing,

Also in the category of the amazing and uncanny is the curious sensation felt so often, and in so many situations, of having had an experience already, or having been in the same place before, although one can never succeed in remembering what seems to have been that earlier occasion.^{xxx}

At this point, Freud’s use of the term ‘uncanny’ is at least partly informed by Ernst Jentsch’s essay, with Freud’s discussion of déjà vu functioning as a supplement. Ironically, however, Jentsch provides only a ‘working definition’ of the uncanny (Jentsch: 8). He writes,

No attempt will here be made to define the essence of the uncanny. Such a conceptual explanation would have very little value. The main reason for this is that the same impression does not necessarily exert an uncanny effect on everybody. Moreover, the same perception on the part of the same individual does not necessarily develop into the “uncanny” every time, or at least not every time in the same way. (Ibid.)

Instead, Jentsch focuses on the psychological causes that lead the individual to experience the uncanny, which he identifies as a degree of psychological ‘uncertainty’ (Jentsch: 9). Jentsch distinguishes between the grouped concepts of the ‘new/foreign/hostile’ out of which ‘the emergence of sensations of uncertainty is quite natural, and one’s lack of orientation will then easily take on the shading of the uncanny’, and the grouped concepts of the ‘old/known/familiar.’ In this case, disorientation, and by implication the uncanny, ‘remain concealed for as long as the confusion of “known/self-evident” does not enter the consciousness of the individual’ (Jentsch: 9). In other words, the familiar only remains so, so long as the individual’s attention is not drawn to its familiarity, for in so doing, it takes on a degree of unfamiliarity.

Nine years after reading Ernst Jentsch’s essay, Freud’s wrote the case history of *The Wolfman*, in the winter of 1914-1915, in which his patient, Sergei Konstantinovitch Pankejev, uses the word ‘uncanny’. Pankejev, better known by the pseudonym ‘Wolfman’, given to him by Freud, suffered from a number of animal phobias, the most prominent of which was of wolves, but also included horses and butterflies. Of this latter fear, Freud writes, ‘Many months later, in an entirely different context, the patient remarked that it was the way the butterfly’s wings

opened and closed once it had settled that had given him such an uncanny feeling'^{xxxii}. Two years later, Freud read Lucy Gertrude Moberly's 'Inexplicable', a short story in which the English word 'uncanny' is used almost in the same sense that the German 'unheimlich' is used. Two years later, again, in 1919, Freud writes 'The Uncanny' in which he describes being left with an uncanny feeling after reading Moberly's story. Yet, paradoxically, there is an element of psychological uncertainty as to whether his experience of the uncanny was closer to Ernst Jentsch's definition, or his own.

With acknowledgment to the contribution of Dr. Theodore Reik to the definition of the term 'unheimlich', and Ernst Jentsch's essay, Freud begins 'The Uncanny' by providing us with the different meanings of the term 'unheimlich' in Latin, Greek, French, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Arabic, and Hebrew, but with a central focus on the German language form. Freud tells us the unheimlich is defined as 'Uncomfortable, uneasy, gloomy, dismal, uncanny, ghastly; (of a house) haunted; (of a man) a repulsive fellow'. Freud also uses Daniel Sanders' definition of the German 'heimlich', defined as 'belonging to the house, not strange, familiar, tame, intimate, friendly, etc'^{xxxii}. The negative form has added to it the prefix 'un' (Old English and Germanic related to the Latin 'in') meaning 'not: denoting the absence of a quality or state' (*OED*). Thus, 'unheimlich' can be defined as 'not belonging to the house, strange, unfamiliar, wild, alien, unfriendly, etc.'. Yet, as Freud writes, 'For us the most interesting fact to emerge from this long excerpt is that among the various shades of meaning [...] there is one in which it merges with its formal antonym, *unheimlich*, so that what is called *heimlich* becomes *unheimlich*' (Freud, *The Uncanny*: 132). Freud refers again to Daniel Sanders' extensive list of the many common uses of the word 'unheimlich', and in particular to a dialogic example that demonstrates the colloquial use of heimlich to mean both familiar and unfamiliar.

Freud goes on to say however, that the relationship between the *heimlich* as ‘relating to what is familiar and comfortable’ and the *unheimlich* as relating to ‘what is concealed and kept hidden’ is not explained, saying ‘Sanders suggests no genetic connection between the two senses’ (Freud, *The Uncanny*: 132). Freud writes that F. W. Von Schelling argues ‘the term “uncanny” (*unheimlich*) applies to everything that was intended to remain secret, hidden away, and has come into the open’ (Ibid.). In more psychoanalytic terms, the uncanny represents the return to consciousness of what was once repressed. In this respect, Freud does attempt to define the essence of the uncanny, but in such a way that individual psychology determines the extent to which the uncanny feeling is experienced. Given that this thesis takes a Freudian psychoanalytic perspective, it is assumed that Freud’s uncanny feeling after reading LG Moberly’s story arises out of a return of repressed psychical material.

LG Moberly’s story is narrated by a young woman called May, recently married to a man called Hugh, and they, along with their servants, move into a new house, with an adjacent cottage, but are haunted by the ghosts of alligators and crocodiles. Only when they both realize that the slithering sensation is caused by ghostly crocodiles, and not the cat, do they openly express genuine fear, and run out of the house. Hugh burns the table, and the ghostly reptiles disappear forever. Freud writes ‘It was a quite naïve story, but its effect was extraordinarily uncanny’ (Freud, *The Uncanny*: 151). Freud, however, does not elaborate on what the ‘extraordinarily uncanny’ feeling was, despite the fact that he recalls reading this story in his essay on the subject of the uncanny itself. Freud might have experienced an uncanny feeling in reading a text in which the first person narrator is female, requiring Freud to identify with a woman. The female narrator, at the same time, is married to a man called Hugh, which phonetically is similar to ‘you’. Just as Nicholas Royle suggests that the

uncanny ‘has to do with a sense of ourselves as double, split, at odds with ourselves’, so the text not only requires Freud to become a different ‘I’ through the otherness of the first person narrator, but this narrative ‘I’ then exercises a narrative control over ‘Hugh’ or ‘You’, splitting the reader between the narrative ‘I’ and the character ‘Hugh’ (‘You’) (Royle: 6). Moreover, we see the author playing with the reader’s sense of gender identity. The male reader becomes a female narrative ‘I’, while the female reader becomes the male ‘You’ or ‘Hugh’. We can see the strange effect this might have upon the reader, and in particular, Freud, when the narrator visits the haunted house as a prospective buyer. May says, ‘But I made up my mind that much as I liked the house, I would have every drain carefully inspected again before I urged Hugh to take it’ (Moberly: 185). That Freud in particular would have found assuming the role of a woman through the first person narrative voice strange is supported by Madelon Sprengnether’s observation that in the case history of *Dora*, Freud’s ‘identification with the master rather than the nurse or governess – all point to the source of this anxiety as female identification.’^{xxxiii} Freud’s sense of self, nationalism, and masculinity, which at a time of war seems to have increased, is undermined by his entering into the narrative ‘I’ of an English woman.

Freud may have also found uncanny, the coincidence of Moberly writing a story about a haunted house, in which the English word ‘uncanny’ is used in almost the same sense that the German word ‘unheimlich’ is used, to mean the unhomely, and unfamiliar. Having tripped over one of the slithering crocodile ghosts for a second time, Hugh says, “‘I suppose it’s that confounded cat of ours’”. From May’s perspective, however, ‘his voice sounded so cheery and normal through the cloud of uncanny, shuddering sensations that were creeping over me’ (Moberly: 191). Moberly brings together the intrusion of the unhomely into the homely, with the word

'uncanny'. Yet like so many details about the story and its author, Freud makes no mention of this similarity between the 'unheimlich' and the 'uncanny'. Perhaps Freud's reinvigorated feelings of nationalism, during the war, stopped him from commenting on this similarity and sense of familiarity between the German unheimlich and English uncanny, the respective languages of countries at war with one another. Ironically pointing to the readers metaphorically diminished senses, resulting from the fact that Freud 'leaves us in the dark' (Royle: 134) about much of the story, Nicholas Royle suggests, 'We could go on sniffing out the (un) canny nooks and crannies of Freud's "secret story" indefinitely' (Royle: 139). But, this does not mean we should stop. If, as Royle suggests, 'there are unconscious reasons for not recalling the text in greater detail' (Royle: 134), the question remains, what is it that is repressed only to return within Freud, upon his reading of the English story about marriage and ghostly crocodiles?

Royle points out that in our attempt to identify what Freud found uncanny about Moberly's story, 'It is evident that the 'ghostly crocodiles' are a factor: the large reptiles apparently emerging from the carved table figure a powerful example of animism, of the inanimate becoming animate, of what is lifeless acquiring life' (Royle: 139). However, Royle does not specify whether he means Freud's identification of the uncanniness of Moberly's story, or that of the implied reader. One can perhaps more safely argue that the implied reader's attention would be drawn to the crocodiles, and from that make the argument that Freud too would have found the ghostly reptiles uncanny. The crocodiles represent both the psychological empowerment of May, who initially is quite taken with the carved wooden table, and the castration threat posed to Hugh, who at one point trips over one of the ghostly crocodiles and sprains his ankle, but fears that his neck might have been broken,

unconsciously expressing his fear of castration. Freud, on the one hand, becomes the woman May, through his identification with the narrative 'I', a phallicized woman, and yet is simultaneously castrated by the crocodile, when 'Hugh', 'You', trip(s) over one of the ghostly reptiles, becoming temporarily disabled and bed ridden. Freud, in a sense, is split into two by the castratory crocodiles, divided into Freud the feminised narrative 'I', and 'Hugh', the masculine but also emasculated and castrated 'you' or reader of the story.

The uncanniness of Moberly's crocodiles arises, arguably, out of the similarities between Moberly's 1917 story, and Charles Dickens' *David Copperfield*, which Freud and his fiancée Martha Bernays had read between 1882 and 1885, when Freud gave her a copy of the novel as his first ever gift to her. Just as the crocodiles terrorize May, Hugh, Jack Wilding, and the servants, within the family house, so in *David Copperfield*, cockerels and geese almost haunt the exterior of the family house, and terrorize David. While, in Moberly's short story, the threat comes from within the house, in Dickens' novel, the threat comes from both outside the house, with the cockerel and the geese looking in on David, and from within David, by virtue of being inside his mind, when he dreams at night of the cockerel and geese, and compares them to lions.

Much later, David becomes aware of strange feelings in himself when he talks with Mr Omer, and his employees, who arrange the funeral of David's mother. David compares this strange feeling, once again, to being surrounded by strange animals, saying,

I do not think I have ever experienced so strange a feeling in my life (I am wiser now, perhaps) as that of being with them, remembering how they had

been employed, and seeing them enjoy the ride. I was not angry with them; I was more afraid of them, as if I were cast away among creatures with whom I had no community of nature. (DC: 122)

Just as Freud echoes this expression in his description of the Parisians, when he moves to Paris to work under Jean Martin Charcot in 1885, so this is later echoed in Moberly's short story of 1917, when Mrs Jenkins, the servant, says of the crocodiles, before leaving the haunted house,

'Cats is cats, and dogs is dogs, and troubles they both may be, and I'm not denyin' they are, still they're what you might call human' Mrs Jenkins said gently, but I noticed that for all her grandiloquence she was shaking from head to foot. 'The animals what come slithering in and out o' the scullery and kitchen – they ain't human'. (Moberly: 193)

Both Dickens and Moberly position the uncanny as something that exists beyond the human. Yet, even the human world can become otherworldly, reflecting Freud's later observation that the uncanny can also mean its opposite. In David's grief, humour and light heartedness would seem to be a part of the familiar world, from which he has been wrenched following the death of his mother and infant brother. Yet, David is left with a 'strange feeling' provoked by the serious profession of Mr Omer (and employees), and their unbecoming jocularity (DC: 122). Their humour, in the tragic circumstances, is out of place, and unfamiliar. In contrast to this, however, Mr Omer is completely familiar with David, telling him, "I have been acquainted with you a long time, my young Friend." David asks, "Have you sir?" to which Mr Omer replies "All your life, [...] I may say before it. I knew your father before you. He was

five foot nine and a half, and he lays in five and twen-ty foot of ground” (DC: 121). Prior to this, Mr Omer had taken David’s ‘various dimensions, and put them down in a book’, retrospectively creating the impression that this was Mr Omer’s way of getting to know David (DC: 120). Reflecting the fact that David Copperfield has inherited his father’s first and last name, Mr Omer’s apparent familiarity with David, is based on his familiarity with David Copperfield Senior’s dimensions, which he implicitly is able to compare in his book of measurements. The macabre implication is that for Mr Omer, knowing David’s father was as simple as measuring him for a coffin, while creating a sense in which Mr Omer is a friend and companion of the dead. Mr Omer’s familiarity with death is so extreme that he appears to David to be completely unfamiliar. When David asks him how his younger brother is, Mr Omer says, distractedly, ‘He is in his mother’s arms’, and asking David to ignore the ‘Rat-tat-tat’ knocking sound being made, but as if indirectly referring to the dead infant, says, ‘Don’t mind it more than you can help, [...] Yes. The baby’s dead.’ (DC: 121). Mr Omer’s implicit need to be desensitised to death, is perhaps his only way of working as a funeral director. Its effect upon David, however, is an uncanny one.

We can compare this with the uncanny feeling that May has, and which contrasts the light-hearted feeling that Hugh expresses. When Hugh attempts to rationalize having tripped over something again, assuming the ghostly crocodile to simply be the cat, May says, ‘his voice sounded so cheery and normal through the cloud of uncanny, shuddering sensations that were creeping over me’ (Moberly: 191). This imagery is very similar to that used by Dickens to describe the house that David returns to, following the death of his mother. David writes that the house, named ‘The Rookery’ by his father, ‘comes out of the cloud...not new to me, but quite familiar to me, in its earliest remembrance’ (DC: 15). Most striking is the parallel between Moberly’s

crocodiles, and the crocodiles within the natural history book that David, as a child, and as an adult, reads to Peggotty. It is through David's reading of the crocodile narrative that his Oedipus complex and castration anxiety are dramatized in his imagination, and which arguably Freud unconsciously remembers when reading LG Moberly's story about crocodiles.

Moberly's character / narrator has a 'cloud of uncanny, shuddering sensations that were creeping over me' (Moberly: 191). This is comparable to David Copperfield's description of his familiar yet unfamiliar home as being in effect, if not name, uncanny, using a cloud metaphor. Moreover, when David reads to Peggotty about the crocodiles, he tells us, 'I must have read very perspicuously, or the poor soul must have been deeply interested, for I remember she had a cloudy impression, after I had done, that they were a sort of vegetable' (DC: 18). Similarly, Moberly's crocodiles are always accompanied by the smell of rotten vegetation, just as Peggotty has a 'cloudy impression' that the crocodiles were 'a sort of vegetable' (DC: 18). At the same time, Moberly and Dickens refer to alligators as well as crocodiles. While Moberly uses 'alligator' and 'crocodile' indiscriminately to signify a large reptile, Dickens differentiates between the creatures, with David saying, 'We had exhausted the crocodiles, and begun with the alligators when the garden bell rang' (DC: 19). We can also compare the fact that while Dickens' alligators and crocodiles are inscribed in words and pictures within a book, Moberly's alligators and crocodiles are carved into the wooden table. Dickens' crocodiles, however, are brought to life through David and Peggotty's imaginations, but kept within the confines of their minds, although the effect the crocodiles have upon Peggotty does manifest itself externally in her behaviour. Moberly's crocodiles, however, periodically reside upon and within the table, but exist independently of the people who perceive them.

In both Dickens's novel, and Moberly's short story, the crocodile represents on the one hand, the phallic empowerment of a woman, and on the other hand, the symbolic threat of castration. The phallicization of the woman, however, serves two purposes, representing a counter to the threat of castration, by reversing the original castration perceived by the child to have given rise to the lack of a penis in the mother or female sibling, and at the same time, the empowerment of women in relation to men. The threat that the crocodiles represent, is a threat to Hugh's and Jack's masculinity in a changing world that gives women equal, and thus threatening, status. In Moberly's story, May's empowerment takes the form of her rationality in the face of the otherwise irrational perception of crocodile ghosts, contrasting the hysteria of Hugh, and their guest Jack. In Dickens' novel, however, the crocodiles are much more overtly sexually symbolic, in their function as phallic symbols that gratify the sexual fantasies of Peggotty.

David recalls that,

I couldn't quite understand why Peggotty looked so queer, or why she was so ready to go back to the crocodiles. However, we returned to those monsters, with fresh wakefulness on my part, and we left their eggs in the sand for the sun to hatch; and we ran away from them, and baffled them by constantly turning, which they were unable to do quickly, on account of their unwieldy make: and we went into the water after them, as natives, and put sharp pieces of timber down their throats; and in short we ran the whole crocodile gauntlet. *I* did at least; but I had my doubts of Peggotty, who was thoughtfully sticking her needle into various parts of her face and arms all the time. We had exhausted the crocodiles, and begun with the alligators when the garden bell rang. (DC: 19)

There occurs a telepathic moment between David and Peggotty in which the sense of 'queerness' is both the result of David's perception of Peggotty, and the result of a facial expression in Peggotty that signifies her queer state of mind and perception. The queerness, which in this context is used to mean strange and unfamiliar, and thus can be equated with 'uncanniness', stems from David and Peggotty's shared imagining of the crocodiles, creating a sense of familiarity between them, and at the same time a sense of unfamiliarity arising from their differing emotional responses to the crocodiles.

For Peggotty, at an unconscious level, the crocodiles are phallic symbols, which allow her to indulge her sexual fantasies. We do not know what Peggotty saw in her imagination, but David imagines them both entering the water, like natives, referring either to Africans, or Australian Aboriginals, (crocodiles being found in Africa and Australia), to fight the reptiles and put sharp pieces of wood down their throats. Yet, the crocodiles are not killed. David writes 'We had exhausted the crocodiles, and begun with the alligators' (DC: 19) conveying two meanings through its play on the literal and metaphorical meaning of the word 'exhausted'. Read metaphorically, David uses the expression 'to exhaust something' in its more conventional sense, to discuss a subject until nothing more can be said. If we read what David says literally, however, he literally exhausts the crocodiles by wrestling with them, and having exhausted them, moves onto the alligators.

While David wrestles with the crocodiles, he is uncertain as to whether Peggotty shares his particular fantasy. David indulges in a violent fantasy of Oedipal struggle with and victory over his father. At the same time, his wrestle with the crocodiles is symbolically a sexual struggle with his mother, given that the crocodiles are female,

indicated by their having laid eggs in the sand. Peggotty, however, indulges in a non-Oedipal sexual fantasy. Her repetitious, masturbatory action of sticking the phallic needle into parts of herself, suggests that she indulges in fantasies about semi-naked 'natives' wrestling with phallically shaped crocodiles. While Dickens is careful to have this penetrative action take place in relation to Peggotty's upper body, thereby avoiding an image too explicit for the Victorian reader, the implication is clear that the needle piercing her face and arms is paradoxically a tangible signifier of the crocodile, which, in turn, represents the fantasised penis, which symbolically penetrates her. While David 'exhausted the crocodiles' (DC: 19) in a violent sense, Peggotty's stabbing gesture suggests to us that the crocodiles or natives, exhaust her, in a sexual sense. Later, we find out that Peggotty keeps the 'Crocodile Book' (DC: 110) in her pocket, and David, reading from it to her many years later in memory of past times, wonders 'whether she had kept it there ever since' (DC: 110). This empowers Peggotty, by freeing her from David, allowing her to read the crocodile book whenever she desires, and in a sense is symbolically phallicized by her possession of a crocodile within her dress pocket.

In contrast to the empowerment that the crocodiles give Peggotty, as well as the sexual pleasure, David unconsciously perceives the crocodiles to be symbolic representations of the father as castration threat, whom David heroically defeats. Just as Freud defines the hero as 'someone who has the courage to rebel against his father and has in the end victoriously overcome him' (*The Origins*: 248), so David's speculation, in the opening chapter, as to whether he will become the hero of 'his' story, is answered in his fantasised struggle with the crocodiles. Yet, reflecting the fact that Dickens' mother was the dominant parent in his life, and the fact that his father was a weak and unsuccessful man who Dickens found it easier to parody than

identify with, the crocodiles represent a condensation of the weak father and strong mother, as both symbolic castration threat, and object of desire. This is reflected in the fact that we are told that the crocodiles have just laid their eggs in the sand.

Arguably, David is the Oedipal hero, who struggles against his father, and takes his father's place, at his mother's side. The ease with which David defeats the crocodiles, as representative of the father, reflects the fact that his father had died, in a sense conceding defeat, before David was born. The defeated father is pitied, rather than feared, by David, as we see in his anthropomorphic treatment of his father's gravestone. David writes of the 'indefinable compassion I used to feel for it lying out alone there in the dark night, when our little parlour was warm and bright with fire and candle, and the doors of our house were – almost cruelly, it seemed to me sometimes – bolted and locked against it' (DC: 4). David does not revel in his victory, but feels compassion for his defeated father. The absence of his father, however, has the effect of leaving David's Oedipus complex unchecked, which uncannily returns to him, and to which he uncannily returns, as an adult, already demonstrated in the crocodile fantasy.

In a scene that prefigures Freud's definition of the Oedipus complex and the uncanny, home and mother are familiar and yet unfamiliar to David, when he returns home for the Christmas holiday. Echoing Dickens' own childhood experience of being sent away from home, only for his father to be imprisoned, as if fate was cruelly thwarting his Oedipal desire to take his father's place, David considers,

what a strange feeling it was to be going home when it was not home, and to find that every object I looked at, reminded me of the happy old home, which was like a dream I could never dream again! The days when my mother and I

and Peggotty were all in all to one another, and there was no one to come between us. (DC: 103)

David returns to the familiar yet unfamiliar home, once the locus of his oedipal desires, saying,

God knows how infantine the memory may have been, that was awakened within me by the sound of my mother's voice in the old parlour, when I set foot in the hall. She was singing in a low tone. I think I must have lain in her arms, and heard her singing so to me when I was but a baby. The strain was new to me, and yet it was so old that it filled my heart brimful; like a friend come back from a long absence. (DC: 104)

This uncanny return of the memory of his mother's song, which he had so long repressed, culminates in the fulfilment of his Oedipal desires. David returns to this familiar yet unfamiliar home, to find his mother suckling her new baby on her exposed right breast, as can be seen in Hablot K. Browne's illustration 'Changes at Home' (DC: 105), but upon hearing David's approach, they meet half way in the parlour, with the baby still suckling. His mother,

kneeled down upon the ground and kissed me, and laid my head down on her bosom near the little creature that was nestling there, and put its hand up to my lips...Then she kissed me more and more, and clasped me round the neck. This she was doing when Peggotty came running in, and bounced down on the ground beside us, and went mad about us both for a quarter of an hour. (DC: 104)

In an almost physically telepathic sense, the infant suckles on the breast, while touching David's lips, as if, like the flow of an electric current from one body to another, David's lips are able to once again touch his mother's breast. The sense in which this represents the fulfilment of Oedipal desires, is added to by the ambiguity surrounding the identity of who initiates this telepathic connection, for it could be either the child or the mother who 'put its hand up to my lips' (Ibid.). The fulfilment of his Oedipal desires leads David to proclaim, 'I wish I had died. I wish I had died then, with that feeling in my heart! I should have been more fit for Heaven than I ever have been since' (DC: 104).

Much later, as if aware of the dangerous incestuous feeling in his heart, he says,

The man who reviews his own life, as I do mine, in going on here, from page to page, had need to have been a good man indeed, if he would be spared the sharp consciousness of many talents neglected, many opportunities wasted, many erratic and perverted feelings constantly at war within his breast, and defeating him. (DC: 573)

The 'many perverted feelings constantly at war within his breast' represent in nature, if not name, his Oedipus complex. If, then, Freud was reminded by LG Moberly's 'Inexplicable' of Charles Dickens' *David Copperfield*, it is arguable that what gave Freud an uncanny feeling was the unfamiliar English word 'uncanny' being used in the same context and to mean something very similar to the familiar German 'unheimlich'. The effect of this might have been to defamiliarise both words, the former in its otherness as a word belonging to the enemy with whom his country was at war, and the latter in its familiarity as a word belonging to his German mother tongue.

At the same time, David Copperfield's ghostly house, to which he returns and fulfils his Oedipus complex, along with the crocodile story with its sub-textual tale of oedipal struggle against the father and mother as castration threat, and Moberly's haunted house with its threatening phallic crocodiles, arguably reminds Freud of his transformation of Martha Bernays into a Dora-like mother substitute, and the marital home into which they moved, which in its own way was a haunted house. In Freud's recollection of Moberly's story, he forgets that the newly-wed couple move into a 'house', and repeatedly calls it an 'apartment' or 'flat'. Freud describes the newly-wed couple's haunted house as a '*möblierte Wohnung*' or 'furnished apartment' (Royle: 135), which in James Strachey's translation, becomes 'house'^{xxxiv}. In David McLintock's new translation of Freud, however, it is described as a 'flat'^{xxxv}. As Nicholas Royle points out, however,

it is a significant and emphatic point in [Moberly's] story that the house is very much a house (a property so substantial, indeed, that it transpires to have its own "cottage at the end of the garden" (p. 570)), and that it is not furnished [...] In other words, whether through misremembering or misrepresentation, it is more specifically a case of a "haunted house" ("*ein Haus in dem es spukt*" (U, pp. 364/255)) than Freud's summary might seem to suggest. (Royle: 135)

This contrasts strongly, but also echoes, a letter Freud had written to Martha, during their courtship, in 1883. The entire letter that Freud writes is disturbingly humorous in the way he details how Martha will develop under his guidance. Discussing the difficulties in his scientific research, he consoles himself and Martha, saying:

These difficult times will not discourage me so long as we remain healthy and are spared exceptional misfortune. Then we are certain to achieve what we are striving for – a little home into which sorrow may find its way, but never privation, a being together throughout all the vicissitudes of life, a quiet contentment that will prevent us from ever having to ask what is the point of living. I know after all how sweet you are, how you can turn a house into a paradise, how you will share in my interests, how gay yet painstaking you will be. I will let you rule the house as much as you wish, and you will reward me with your sweet love and by rising above all those weaknesses for which women are so often despised. (*The Letters of Sigmund Freud*: 71)

During their courtship, Freud describes the ideal marital home as a ‘Paradise’ of Martha’s making, and yet when they move into their ‘House of Atonement’, it is built on an almost hellish site, in which people had been burned alive in the Ring Theatre only five years earlier. At the same time, Freud banishes any signs of Jewish tradition from the home, despite Martha’s wishes. Arguably, if Freud forgot that Moberly’s newly-wed couple had moved into a house, and not an apartment, as a means of repressing his memory of the apartment within his own House of Atonement, it was because the idealised marital home that he had imagined Martha creating conflicted with his need to exert a kind of authorship over Martha’s identity. As Louis Breger says, Freud ‘effaced Martha’s individuality and made her into the woman who attended to all his outer needs’ (Breger: 96). Unlike Freud’s real mother, Amalia, who had rejected him as a child, and became a capricious, angry, and domineering mother, however, Martha Bernays is transformed into a passive substitute mother, a Dora-like figure who is incapable of spurning his Oedipal desires and need for emotional security, and indeed incapable of domineering over him. Yet, when Freud comes

close to facing his repressed Oedipus complex, he not only finds new ways to repress that complex, through selective interpretations of texts, and apparent lapses in memory, he finds ways of symbolically castrating himself, in his writing, by way of punishing himself for his incestuous desires, thereby attempting to destroy the Oedipus complex, with the added complexity that we often find his mother being portrayed in the role of the threatening father-figure.

In a footnote to his analysis of ETA Hoffmann's 'The Sand Man', in 'The Uncanny', Freud observes that,

In the story of Nathaniel's childhood, his father and Coppelius represent the father-*imago*, which, owing to its ambivalence, is split into two opposing parts; the one threatens him with blinding (castration), while the other, the good father, successfully intercedes for his sight. (Freud, *The Uncanny*: 160)

This reference to the father-*imago* divided into two identities, one good, the other bad, reflects Freud's argument in 'A 17th Century Demonological Neurosis', that the father 'is the individual prototype of both God and the Devil'^{xxxvi}. When Freud reads LG Moberly's 'Inexplicable', and is reminded of Charles Dickens' *David Copperfield*, and consequently of the Oedipus complex that he has sought to repress, his solution is to adopt the role of the castratory father in relation to himself, or to place his mother in the role of the castrator, together with creating an ideal, passive double of her as the object of desire, and symbolically castrate himself.

Nicholas Royle points to the strange fact that in Freud's 'The Uncanny', Freud speaks of himself in the third person. He begins the essay by writing, 'Only rarely does the psychoanalyst feel impelled to engage in aesthetic investigations, even when

aesthetics is not restricted to the theory of beauty, but described as relating to the qualities of our feeling.’^{xxxvii} Royle asks,

But what is happening when someone begins a text by referring to himself in the third person? And what is at stake in this curious reference to being ‘impelled’ to write on a strange subject? [...] Do we believe him? ‘Him’, who? What does believing mean in such a context? (Royle, *The Uncanny*: 7)

In one sense, Freud’s feeling of being impelled to investigate the uncanny is borne out of his natural inclination to impulsively write on something that catches his interest, as opposed to those essays that were commissioned. Patrick Mahony makes the point that ‘Freud distinguished between those works that he had written on impulse from those written on order’^{xxxviii}. Yet, in this instance, Freud is both impelled to investigate the uncanny, and yet distances himself from the experience and subject of the uncanny. By ostensibly speaking of himself from a third-person perspective, Freud objectifies himself. In so doing, he creates a distance between himself and the feeling of being impelled to investigate the uncanny, which he projects onto the psychoanalyst. At the same time, he creates a distance between himself and the feeling of the uncanny, together with the reading of academic and creative literature concerning the uncanny, which he projects onto the writer. Freud writes,

The present writer must plead guilty to exceptional obtuseness in this regard, when great delicacy of feeling would be more appropriate. It is a long time since he experienced or became acquainted with anything that conveyed the impression of the uncanny. He must first put himself in the proper state of

feeling and so put himself in the way of experiencing a sense of the uncanny.

(Freud, *The Uncanny*: 124)

Yet, while the psychoanalyst is impelled to investigate the uncanny, and the writer has not recently experienced a feeling that could be called uncanny, the third person narrator potentially conveys a sense of the uncanny that the reader might experience, in dividing himself into these three identities. However, as Ernst Jentsch points out in ‘On the Psychology of the Uncanny’,

the same impression does not necessarily exert an uncanny effect on everybody. Moreover, the same perception on the part of the same individual does not necessarily develop into the “uncanny” every time, or at least not every time in the same way. (Jentsch: 8)

Thus, while the narrator seems oblivious to the strangeness of dividing himself into three identities, the reader potentially experiences the uncanny in encountering this triplicate Freud.

Freud places himself outside the text, implying that he is aware that writing has the ability to both represent and provoke in the reader the feeling of uncanniness. By splitting himself into ‘the writer’, ‘the psychoanalyst’, and the third-person narrator, Freud creates in the reader ‘the proper state of feeling and so puts [the reader] in the way of experiencing a sense of the uncanny’ (Freud, *The Uncanny*: 124). To use Nicholas Royle’s expression, however, Freud ‘leaves us in the dark’ as to what he might feel at dividing himself into three selves (Royle: 134). Perhaps Freud himself is in the dark as to what is happening when he separates himself from himself. As Royle says, ‘The opening of Freud’s essay presents us with someone who has found himself

in an unfamiliar place or someone who, apparently without quite knowing why, has chosen to venture into such a place' (Royle: 7). Perhaps what we should say, is that Freud's essay opens with one voice that at the point words are committed to paper, and the reader engages with the text, is split into three identities. Only through this symbolic act of self-castration, is the Oedipus complex, which returns through LG Moberly and Charles Dickens, repressed, if not destroyed. Just as the double is used by Dickens and Freud as a means of reconstructing an ideal version of the mother, so doubling is also used by Freud, and as is shown in chapter three by Dickens, as a castratory means of countering the Oedipal desire that gives rise to the double.

Dickens considers the nature of the German *doppelganger*, which he calls 'the double', in quasi-scientific and proto-psychoanalytic terms, in his review of Catherine Crowe's *The Dark Side of Nature*, published in *The Examiner* (26 February 1848). In contrast to the uncanny feeling that Freud is left with, having read the fictional story of ghostly crocodiles, however, Dickens dispassionately reads Crowe's account of a putatively true encounter with a ghost, and looks for scientific, rational explanations for the perception of the phantom, and the double or doppelganger. Dickens argues, in contrast to Crowe's theory that the doppelganger arises from fasting, that the encounter with the double results from an altered state of mind existing somewhere between consciousness and sleep.

In Crowe's narrative, she presents as a real ghost story, the case of Lady Beresford, who, while sleeping in bed, encountered a ghostly apparition of someone long since dead. Lady Beresford asks the ghost to leave behind some sign of its reality. In response, the ghost lifted the curtains of the bed. Unconvinced that people would believe this sign, she asked the ghost for a second sign. The ghost left its autograph in her pocket book. Lady Beresford, still unsure, asked for a third sign and the ghost

gripped her wrist leaving it scarred and shrivelled. Dickens dismissed this physical evidence, and Lady Beresford's testimony, asking rhetorically of her,

Is it greatly straining a point to suppose, that when she suggested the possibility of her doing these other acts in her sleep, she not only knew that she could do them, but was, then and there, actually doing them, with that disturbed, imperfect consciousness of doing them which is not uncommon in cases of somnambulism, or even in common dreams; when the sleeper, lying on his own arm, or throwing off his own bedclothes, makes his own act the act of an imaginary person, and elaborately constructs a story in his sleep, out of which such incidents seem to arise? (Slater: 86, 87)

Nine years later, Dickens would explore the relationship between the dream, the double and somnambulism, through Mrs Flintwinch's dreams in *Little Dorrit* (1857).

Dickens, however, is incorrect in his correlation of the somnambulistic action with dreams, for as Reber and Reber tell us, 'Sleepwalking tends to occur during the deepest stages of NREM [non-rapid eye movement] sleep and not during REM sleep, when most dreaming occurs' (Reber: 695). Dickens goes on, with perhaps unintentional humour, to challenge Catherine Crowe's implicit belief that the double or doppelganger, so commonly found in eighteenth and nineteenth century German literature, can be attributed to fasting, pointing out that the German diet is on the whole very rich. At the same time, Dickens ironically questions why the double should be prominent in Germany but not England, France, India, or Sarawak. He suggests that the abundance of phantoms, which he calls 'Doubles', in Germany, might only occur in rooms where there is an excessively hot stove, arising out of the optical illusion created by the heat from the stove that causes the air to look like

water. Dickens argues most strongly, however, that the double can be attributed to an altered state of mind, arising from an overly excited imagination^{xxxix}.

Like Dickens, Freud distinguishes between the 'real' double, and the double as represented in writing. Freud tells us the double can manifest as 'the appearance of persons who have to be regarded as identical because they look alike' (Freud, *The Uncanny*: 141). The double can also arise out of the 'spontaneous transmission of mental processes from one of these persons to the other - what we would call telepathy - so that the one becomes co-owner of the other's knowledge, emotions and experience' (Freud, *The Uncanny*: 141, 142). Added to this, the double can occur when 'a person may identify himself with another and so become unsure of his true self, or he may substitute the other's self for his own. The self may thus be duplicated, divided and interchanged' (*The Uncanny*: 142). At the same time, the double can occur where there is 'the constant recurrence of the same thing, the repetition of the same facial features, the same characters, the same destinies, the same misdeeds, even the same names, through successive generations' (*The Uncanny*: 142). Freud adds to this the double as superego, and the double as the Id. Freud writes,

I believe that when poets complain that two souls dwell in the human breast, and when popular psychologists talk of the splitting of the human ego, what they have in mind is the division under discussion, belonging to ego-psychology, between the critical authority and the rest of the ego, rather than the opposition, discovered by psychoanalysis, between the ego and whatever is unconscious and repressed. True, the difference is blurred because the derivatives of what has been repressed are foremost among the things that are condemned by self-criticism. (*The Uncanny*: 161 n.)

Like the split between the ego and the superego, and ego and Id, Nicholas Abraham points to a different split within the ego itself, which can occur when the ego is faced with something which it can neither fully introject nor reject. Freud called this process 'Verwerfung' (repudiation), which Jacques Lacan would develop into his theory of 'foreclosure', but which Abraham calls 'Incorporation'. Ned Lukacher tells us, in his elaboration of Abraham's theory,

As a result, the ego installs the object in a place inside itself that is henceforth split off from the self and forgotten. Incorporation, then, involves a profound split within the ego, which forms what is in effect a secondary unconscious, neither properly inside nor outside the ego, neither properly subjective nor objective. The words or images associated with the object are henceforth buried alive in what Abraham calls a "crypt" inside the ego. The forgetfulness to which the crypt is condemned is absolute and irreversible.

(Primal Scenes: 89)

The double, in this context, could represent an externalisation of this object which is neither within nor outwith the ego, or indeed could represent the externalisation of the previously encrypted image associated with the object.

Similar to this, in the sense that the double is viewed as the externalisation of something that resides within the interior of the self, is Otto Rank's definition of the double. Rank defines the double as 'an independent and visible cleavage of the ego (shadow, reflection)', and secondly as 'actual figures of the double who confront each other as real and physical persons of unusual external similarity, and whose paths cross'^{x1}. He suggests, in addition to this, four psychological functions that the double serves. Firstly the double can represent a narcissistic love of the self. At the same

time, the unconscious repressive denial of such an extreme form of self-love can turn into self-hatred. The hatred of the double allows the love of self to prosper, unchecked. Secondly, the double can represent the homosexual love of someone of the same sex. Thirdly, the double can serve as an immortalisation of the ego. Fourthly, however, the double can paradoxically represent the destruction of the ego. The double serves, according to Rank, as an insurance against, and a harbinger of, ‘the complete annihilation of the ego’^{xli}.

However, neither Freud in ‘The Uncanny’, nor Otto Rank in *The Double*, consider the double in relation to the Oedipus complex. Freud does theorise that it is the splitting of the father-imaginal into God and Devil that represents the first symbolic act of ‘castration’ while the subsequent phantasy of castration in effect is a fear of the castratory father’s retaliation. The child, Freud argues, commits this primal murder, as a means of ridding himself of the one obstacle between himself and his mother, only to be unconsciously aware that the murder was unsuccessful, and has simply given rise to a vengeful father, the Devil, who will castrate him in revenge.

As discussed earlier, Freud observes a splitting of the father-imaginal in ETA Hoffmann’s *The Sandman*. Diane F. Sadoff echoes this when she writes, ‘the father is split into threatening castrator and loving savior, and this doubled father itself occurs twice’ (Sadoff: 210). Later, she makes the similar point that ‘In Dickens’ novels, the problematic of sexual difference splits the female – as castration anxiety splits the father – into pristine little women and threatening phallic mothers’ (Sadoff: 214). Yet, Freud does not elaborate upon his observation of the split father in *The Sandman*, and Sadoff does not elaborate upon this, or her observation of the split mother-imaginal in *David Copperfield*. Specifically, they do not consider that the double might originate in the Oedipus complex.

In an attempt to redefine the double, likewise, however, without tracing the double back to the Oedipus complex, David K. Danow considers the literary double in terms of the representation of the physical and the psychological, arguing that the double can exist in three separate states: the physical, the psychological, and somewhere in between the two. Of the physical, Danow argues that,

while sharing certain psychological or physiological similarities with another character, the figure of the double is nonetheless understood to be clearly distinguishable in its own right, affording a sense of its own independent ontology. There is no doubt, in other words, that the character *exists* within the fictional context and there is an equal certainty that a separate, individual mind is functioning independently of all others.^{xiii}

Danow distinguishes between the ‘character’ and the ‘figure’ of the double, and yet argues that the ‘figure of the double’ can have its own sense of independent existence, as though functioning as a physically independent ‘character’. Yet, as Amélie Oksenberg Rorty argues, while the character can be ‘endowed with apparently accidental physical characterizations’, such as the limp in Hephaestus, the Greek god of fire, the ‘figure’ is not individuated by these ‘accidental physical characterizations’ but rather, is simply ‘true to type’ (Rorty: 541). Likewise, one could argue that the double cannot function as a character, and can only ever be a figure. Because of the uncanny feeling that the presence of the double provokes in the character, narrator, or implied reader who has been copied, the double is unable to function as a typical character, even if it is physically and ontologically independent of the original.

Paradoxically, the double is always marked out as being different and other to the original, by virtue of being the same.

Of the double's psychological form, Danow's argument echoes that of Dickens, when he suggests that,

The double may be portrayed as a kind of psychological entity or "mental construct" belonging to another character; that is, it can essentially be explained (away) as being attributable to another character's misapprehension (or active imagination) derived from a seemingly deteriorating mental state. In this case, then, the double displays no existential independence of its own. (Danow: 459)

Of the third form of double identified by Danow, he argues that,

In this case, the question arises of whether we are dealing with a literary spectre, or with flesh, or in some sense, with both. Does this figure appear a separate being or an inhabitant of another character's (or of the reader's) mind? In certain instances such an interloper appears to exhibit an independent existence coupled with independent thought processes, which are nevertheless artfully undermined on particular (perhaps rare) occasions, leaving the disturbing impression that the double is only the figment of another, more finely delineated, character's active imagination. (Danow: 460)

Part of Danow's intention is the redefinition of the double, if not as understood by Charles Dickens, then certainly as understood by Sigmund Freud in 'The Uncanny' and Otto Rank in *The Double*, taken by most literary theorists of the uncanny to be primal if not definitive studies. Yet, given this attempt to redefine the double,

Danow's description of a double that exists 'somewhere in between' the physical and psychological, is curiously ill defined, in the sense that he does not name the state of existence between the physical and psychological. What does Danow mean by the 'literary spectre' made flesh, a figure that is 'a separate being' but also the 'inhabitant of another character's (or of the reader's) mind'?

Arguably, what mediates between the psychological and the physical, both real and represented, is language itself. The double that exists between the psychological and the physical might be thought of in terms of the signifier. In one sense, we see this in the repeatability of the character. In another sense, however, we see this in the distinction between the signified mental concept and the signifying word or image. Just as St Augustine and later John Locke point to the discrepancy between the word or image, and the thing it represents, so the double could represent the signifier that has been dislocated, or perhaps rather was never connected, to the thing it signifies, the signified mental concept and / or the real object. On the other hand, the double could represent an externalisation of the signified mental concept, separated from the signifier and /or the object. As Freud himself says, 'an uncanny effect often arises when [...] a symbol takes on the full function and significance of what it symbolizes'^{xliii}.

While Freud differentiates between the 'real' double, and the literary double, the real double that he encounters in the mirror is as much a signifying construct as the literary double in the sense that both the reflection and the literary representations of Freud, double the 'real' Freud on a signifiatory level. Yet who we encounter as the 'real' Freud describing his encounter with his reflection, is in fact another literary construct, and one that divides himself into the narrative 'I', the 'writer', and the 'psychoanalyst'. In effect, Freud the already divided into three but putatively original

character, encounters his double in a mirror, that on a signifying level, doubles the real mirror that the real Freud had once looked into. This raises the question of whether the double can be a character in its own right, or whether it can only ever be a reflection or copy of the original character, while raising the question of whether or not the character is itself simply another double labelled the original.

We must however, be clear that within the literary text, the term 'character' is a broad term that covers a number of forms of literary identity. In her study of literary identity, Amélie Oksenberg Rorty argues that "'Heroes," "characters," "protagonists," "actors," "agents," "persons," "souls," "selves," "figures," "individuals," are all distinguishable.'^{xliv} Of the different ways in which an identity can be represented in literature (and thus replicated to become a 'double'), Rorty's definition of the character, as Rorty herself suggests, is the type most often found in the writing of Charles Dickens. The 'character', Rorty tells us, is an ancient Greek concept, which had already assimilated 'the hero', and its successor 'the protagonist'. Rorty tells us that,

The fate of heroes is their parentage. To be the child of Athene or of the house of Atreus fixes the major events of one's life, determines one's tasks, and even one's capacities to meet them. Yet, at the same time the hero is known by his deeds: setting himself superhuman tasks, proving himself worthy of divine regard, his achievements are in the end acts of heroism rather than heroic performances [...] As the hero's distance from the gods increases, his heroism comes to be exemplified in his character rather than in sheer glory of his action. (Rorty: 538)

This reflects Freud's definition of the hero. In his study of the Biblical 'figure' Moses, with reference to Otto Rank's *The Myth of the Birth of the Hero*, Freud writes, 'A hero is someone who has the courage to rebel against his father and has in the end victoriously overcome him'^{xlv}. Like Rorty's hero, Freud's hero is defined not by the 'sheer glory' of having defeated his father, but by his 'character', his courage in rebelling against his father, and thus his courage in rebelling against what Rorty calls the 'fate of heroes'. Rorty continues:

Between the hero and the character stands the protagonist: the one who, through successful and bold combat, reveals his true nature, in ancient terms, his lineage. Such protagonists were often foundlings, whose *agones* with forces that might be thought beyond one of such birth revealed their true powers and thus their parentage. (Rorty: 538)

Ironically, just as the hero defies his familial lineage, and his destiny, in order to become a character, and to have character, so the protagonist, seemingly at odds with the path before him, must fight to reveal his right to such a destiny. Rorty seems to suggest that paradoxically the protagonist is a fledgling character attempting to return to his or her role as a fated hero. In *David Copperfield*, the character-narrator David ironically muses with himself and the implied reader, 'Whether I shall turn out to be the hero of my own life, or whether that station will be held by somebody else, these pages must show'^{xlvi}, suggesting that David begins as a protagonist, hankering after the role of the hero only to evolve into a fully fledged character. Rorty says of the character:

In comparison to heroes, characters are set in *bas relief*; they *are* their individual powers and dispositions. That their stories are set by oracles and inheritance is less important to their identification than the traits manifest in the ways they fulfil prophecy and work through their inheritance [...]

Characters are, by nature, defined and delineated. If they change, it is because it is in their character to do so under specific circumstances. Their natures form their responses to experiences, rather than being formed by them. In its origins, the psychological theory of character derives traits and temperaments, dispositionally analysed, from the balance of elements constituting an individual. The psychology of character rests in physiology. Since the elements out of which characters are composed are repeatable and their configurations can be reproduced, a society of characters is in principle a society of repeatable and indeed replaceable individuals. (Rorty: 538)

Characters, as Rorty says, are ‘delineated; their traits are sketched; they are not presumed to be strictly unified. They appear in novels by Dickens, not those of Kafka’ (Rorty: 537, 538). The protagonist David’s desire to become the hero, and in the terms set out by Rorty, in turn defined by a desire to become a character, is arguably a desire, for psychological reasons explored in the second chapter, to become a character within a ‘society of repeatable and indeed replaceable individuals’ (Rorty: 538). David’s desire, arguably, is to become a character, a *repeatable and indeed replaceable individual*. This desire is answered both in the fact that David Copperfield, through the initials of his name, functions as the mirror image of Charles Dickens, and through his marriage to Dora Copperfield whose name also reflects in its initials those of David Copperfield and mirrors those of Charles Dickens. At the same time, Dora is a repetition of David’s mother as she was in the last, broken-spirited,

days of her life. As Steven Marcus says of Dora Copperfield, ‘She is at once a duplication of David’s dead mother and an incompetent and helpless creature, who asks David to call her his “child-wife”^{xlvi}’.

Deidre Shauna Lynch discusses John Locke’s *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, in which Locke philosophically considers the nature of the copy in relation to human reproduction, and the reproduction of identity, by looking at the figure of the changeling. Locke points to the psychological and physical aberrations present in the changeling, that upset the copying of facial identity from one generation to another, and consequently disturb the certainty with which human knowledge ‘is registered in humanity’s names for things’ “real Frame[s] and secret Constitutions”^{xlvi}. Locke demonstrates that there is a discrepancy between the image or word, and the inner identity to which that image or word points, by metamorphosing the changeling’s appearance from human into the bestial and monstrous. Locke writes,

The well-shaped *Changeling* is a Man, has a rational Soul, though it appears not; this is past doubt, say you. Make the Ears a little longer, and more pointed...and then you begin to boggle: Make the Face yet narrower, flatter, and longer, and then you are at a stand: Add still more and more of the likeness of a Brute to it, and let the Head be perfectly that of some other Animal, then presently ‘tis a *Monster*...it hath no rational Soul, and must be destroy’d. Where now (I ask) shall be the just measure; which the utmost Bounds of that Shape, that carries with it a rational Soul? (Lynch: 52)

Locke draws attention to the fact that empirical knowledge has its limitations, and, as Lynch puts it, ‘raises [...] the problem of judging the book by its cover, of appraising

character by face value' (Lynch: 52). Like the almost lycanthropic transformation of the changeling into a monstrous wolf-animal, a transformation of the physical exterior image that masks the interior humanity identity, the signifiers 'Dora', 'Wolfman' and 'Ratman' mask the hidden, inner identity of Freud's patients, Ida Bauer, Sergei Konstantinovitch Pankejev, and Ernst Lanzer. The signifier, like the changeling in relation to the child it copies, is a double that masks the innate nature of the thing or the concept it signifies. Yet the arbitrariness of the signifier creates a sense in which there is no innateness to the object or signified. The signifier is always empty, even when it is ascribed, or gains by association, meaning.

In one sense, then, the divide between signifier and signified, is a universal aspect of language. Dickens and Freud, however, explore this divide, as part of a specific concern with the creation of idealised literary substitutes for the oedipal mother. John Hawkins Miller points to the long perceived division of the 'pure' signifying mother from the 'impure' signified mother. Miller writes,

The medical profession was only too aware of the truth of St. Augustine's observation that we are born *inter faeces et irinam*. This anatomical fact, combined with the religious view of women in childbirth as ritualistically unclean, partially explained why Victorians viewed childbirth as unseemly [...] On the other hand, the state of motherhood – presided over by the image of the Madonna and child – is pure and undefiled [...] These two comments [...] one on the disagreeableness of childbirth and the other on the glory of motherhood, reflect Tertullian's observation about the duality of women – *templum aedificatum super cloacam*, a temple built upon a sewer. (Dever: 19)^{xlix}

Carolyn Dever comments, 'The mother, Miller argues, represents built in conflict between an iconographic ideal – the Madonna – and the insistence of physicalities – the visceral spectacle of childbirth' (Ibid.). With Dickens and Freud, however, the conflict is between the idealised, iconic mother who cannot reject the child, or his Oedipal phantasies, the mother as the castratory mother-figure, and the weak father, neither of whom pose a great enough threat that might otherwise destroy the child's Oedipus complex, and the real mother, who rejects the child and his repressed Oedipal desire. Dickens and Freud use their writing to create doubles of their respective mothers, driven by the need to fulfil a repressed Oedipus complex. In contrast to this, chapter two looks at *Barnaby Rudge*, a deeply patriarchal Gothic-historical novel that is divided at the signifying and signified level, and Freud's 'A Seventeenth Century Demonological Neurosis' a study of a patriarchal historically Gothic text, which forms part of Freud's theory that the father, divided between protector and castratory, is the prototype of God and Satan. Yet, even in these most patriarchal of texts, the desire for a passive double of the mother is still present.

ⁱ Nicholas Royle, 'Our Mutual Friend' in *Dickens Refigured: Bodies, Desires, and other Histories* ed. by John Schad (Manchester: Manchester University Press 1996); Audrey Jaffe, 'David Copperfield and Bleak House: On Dividing the Responsibility of Knowing' in *Bleak House: Contemporary Critical Essays* ed. by Jeremy Tambling (New York: St. Martin's Press 1998); David. E. Musselwhite, *Partings Welded Together: Politics and Desire in the Nineteenth-Century English Novel* (London and New York: Methuen 1987). Further references to these editions are given after quotations in the text.

ⁱⁱ Edith Kurzweil, *The Freudians A Comparative Perspective*, p.176. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text

ⁱⁱⁱ Steven Marcus, *Freud and the Culture of Psychoanalysis* (Boston: Allen & Unwin 1984); Mark Spilka, *Dickens and Kafka: A Mutual Interpretation* (London: Denis Dobson 1963); Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press 1985); Louis Breger, *Freud: Darkness in the Midst of Vision* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 2000). Further references to these editions are given after quotations in the text.

^{iv} H.M. Daleski, *Dickens and the Art of Analogy* (London: Faber and Faber 1970). Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^v Harvey Peter Sucksmith, *The Narrative Art of Charles Dickens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1970). Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{vi} Arthur S. Reber and Emily Reber, *The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology Third Edition* (London: Penguin 2001). Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{vii} David E. Musselwhite, *Partings Welded Together: Politics and Desire in the Nineteenth Century English Novel* (London and New York: Methuen 1987) p. 193. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{viii} Email conversation with Professor Gerhard Fichtner, Director of the Institute for the History of Medicine, University of Tübingen, Germany, and telephone conversation with Keith Davies, Head Librarian at The Freud Museum, London. Both are currently compiling a catalogue of Freud's extensive library, which became dispersed following Freud's flight from Austria in 1938. Many of his books were given away, or left behind, while approximately 1600 were taken with him to London, and are now held in the Freud Museums of Vienna, London, and New York.

^{ix} Henryk Ibsen, *A Doll's House* Rev. ed. by Torgrim Hannäs and Linda Hannäs. (London: J M Dent 1992); Charles Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend* ed. by Adrian Poole (London: Penguin Books 1997) Further references to these editions are given after quotations in the text.

^x Ned Lukacher, *Primal Scenes: Literature, Philosophy, Psychoanalysis* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press 1986) p. 276. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{xi} Fred Kaplan, *Dickens and Mesmerism: the Hidden Springs of Fiction* (New York: Princeton University Press 1975) p.4. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{xii} Peter Ackroyd, *Dickens* (London: Vintage 1999) p.257. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{xiii} Rev. John Boag (ed.) *Boag's Dictionary Vol. II I-Z: A Popular and Complete English Dictionary, Exhibiting the Pronunciation, Etymology and Explanation of Every Word Usually Employed in Science, Literature, and Art* (Glasgow: William Collins 1848).

- ^{xiv} Ian Ousby, *The Cambridge Guide to Literature in English* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999) p. 808. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xv} Wilkie M. Collins, 'Magnetic Evenings at Home' in *The Leader* January-April 1852 Republished by the Wilkie Collins Society July 2000, pp. 5, 6
- ^{xvi} Ernst Jentsch, 'On the Psychology of the Uncanny' in *Angeleki 2:1 home and family* ed. by Sarah Wood (Great Britain: Antony Rowe Limited 1995). Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xvii} Ned Lukacher, *Primal Scenes: Literature, Philosophy, and Psychoanalysis* (London and New York: Methuen 1987) p. 335. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xviii} Stanley J. Coen, *Between Author and Reader: A Psychoanalytic Approach to Writing and Reading* (New York: Columbia University Press 1994) p. 145. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xix} Rupert Brooke, *Friends and Apostles: the Correspondence of Rupert Brooke and James Strachey 1905-1914* ed. by Keith Hale (New Haven; London: Yale University Press 1998) p. 25. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xx} John Bowen, *Other Dickens: Pickwick to Chuzzlewit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2003). Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xxi} Diane F Sadoff, *Locus Suspectus: Narrative, Castration, and the Uncanny*, p.207
- ^{xxii} Carolyn Dever, *Death and the Mother from Dickens to Freud: Victorian Fiction and the Anxiety of Origins* Gen. Ed. Gillian Beers and Catherine Gallagher (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1998) p. xi. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xxiii} Sigmund Freud, *On Sexuality* (London: Penguin Books 1991) p.319. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xxiv} Sigmund Freud, *Introductory Lectures* (London: Penguin Books 1991) pp. 243, 244. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xxv} Charles Dickens, *David Copperfield* (London: Everyman 1993) p. xx. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xxvi} Peter Ackroyd, *Dickens* (London: Vintage 1999) p. 6. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xxvii} Peter Ackroyd, *Dickens* (London: Vintage 1999) p. 18. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xxviii} E-mail conversation with Dr Dany Nobus, Brunel University, May 2004 who referred to *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- ^{xxix} Ernst Jentsch 'On the Psychology of the Uncanny' in *Angelaki: home and family 2:1* ed. by Sarah Wood trans by Roy Sellars (Great Britain: Antony Rowe Limited 1995)
- ^{xxx} Sigmund Freud, *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* (London: Penguin Books 2002) p. 250. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xxxi} Sigmund Freud, *The 'Wolfman' and Other Cases* (London: Penguin Books 2002) p. 289. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xxxii} Sigmund Freud, *Art and Literature* (London: Penguin Books 1991), p.341. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xxxiii} Madelon Sprengnether *The Spectral Mother: Freud, Feminism and Psychoanalysis* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press 1990) p. 52. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xxxiv} Sigmund Freud, 'The Uncanny' in *Art and Literature* (London: Penguin 1990) p.
- ^{xxxv} Sigmund Freud, *The Uncanny* Trans. By David McLintock (London: Penguin 2003) p. 151.
- ^{xxxvi} Sigmund Freud, *Art and Literature* (London: Penguin 1990) p. 401. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xxxvii} Sigmund Freud, 'The Uncanny' in *The Uncanny* (London: Penguin Books 2003) p. 123. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text. In *The Uncanny*, Nicholas Royle refers to the earlier Penguin Freud Library edition of 'The Uncanny' translated by James Strachey.
- ^{xxxviii} Patrick J. Mahony, *Freud as a Writer: Expanded Edition* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press 1987). Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xxxix} Michael Slater (Ed.), *Dickens' Journalism The Amusements of the People and Other Papers: reports, essays, and reviews 1834-1851* p. 85. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ^{xl} Otto Rank, *The Double: A Psychoanalytic Study* trans. and ed. by Harry Tucker, JR. London: Karnac Books 1989) p.12
- ^{xli} Otto Rank, *The Double* p.85

^{xlii} David K. Danow, 'The Enigmatic Faces of the *Doppelganger*' in *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* June / Juin 1996 p. 459.

^{xliii} Sigmund Freud, *The Uncanny* (London: Penguin Books 2003) p. 150. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{xliv} Amélie Oksenberg Rorty 'Characters, Persons, Selves, Individuals' in Michael McKeon (Ed.) *Theory of the Novel: A Historical Approach* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press 2000) p. 537. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{xlv} Sigmund Freud, *The Origins of Religion* (London: Penguin Books 1990) p. 248. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{xlvi} Charles Dickens, *David Copperfield* (London: Everyman 1993) p. 3. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{xlvii} Steven Marcus, *Freud and the Culture of Psychoanalysis: Studies in the Transition from Victorian Humanism to Modernity* (Boston: George Allen & Unwin 1984) n. p. 855. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{xlviii} Deidre Shauna Lynch, *The Economy of Character: Novels, Market Culture, and the Business of Inner Meaning* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press 1998) p. 51. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{xlix} See also John Hawkins Miller, "'Temple and Sewer": Childbirth, Prudery, and Victorian Regina' in *The Victorian Family: Structures and Stresses* Ed. by Anthony S. Wohl (London: Croom Helm 1978).

CHAPTER TWO

A Gothic History of the Divided Sign

The division of the mother into the idealised Madonna figure, and the earthly childbearing woman, and as we see in Dickens and Freud respectively, the mother as object of desire and mother who castrates by way of rejection, parallels the child's unconscious perceptual splitting of the father into the castratory, demonic father, and the real, protective father. This division of the mother and father imago into the ideal and the demonic psychologically underpins the split within the sign. Apart from the perceptual splitting of the signifier from the signified, there is, in the child's unconscious mind, a new maternal and paternal signifier, be it idealised or demonised, that is distinct from the signified mother or father. The signified mother or father can be the real parent who exists independently of the child, or the imago of the parent residing in the child's unconscious mind. In a broad sense, this split within the sign is part of the paradoxical nature of language, in the sense that language can only ever be an arbitrary means of describing the signified object or concept. Yet more specifically, it is this division within the sign, and the arbitrariness of the signifier, which allows Dickens and Freud to recreate in their writing idealised substitute mothers and fathers, through which they can respectively attempt to fulfil and / or resolve their repressed Oedipus complexes.

While more of Dickens and Freud's writing focuses on the substitute mother, it is in Freud's patriarchal historically 'Gothic' essay, 'A Seventeenth Century

Demonological Neurosis', and Dickens' patriarchal Gothic-historical novel, *Barnaby Rudge*, that we find an almost exclusive focus upon patriarchy and the divided sign. We see demonstrated in Freud's essay and Dickens' novel, the castration threat at its most violent and destructive that goes so far as to divide the sign into two. Yet, just as the castration threat, in the childhoods of Dickens and Freud is too weak to destroy the Oedipus complex, and can only lead to its repression, so the castration of the sign paradoxically facilitates the subsequent attempt to fulfil the Oedipus complex through the creation of an idealised double of the mother. Moreover, the Gothic literary genre is rooted in the religious history of the divided sign.

Dickens' *Barnaby Rudge* centres on the anti-Catholic Gordon riots of 1780, led by Lord George Gordon. At the metaphorical heart of this early novel, is John Willet's Maypole Inn, which we find is identified not by the Inn sign, but by a nearby ash tree, paradoxically used as an improvised sign by the illiterate locals. This is later referred to in *Little Dorrit* when Dickens describes Mr Casby, the Last Patriarch, as an 'Inn signpost without any Inn' (LD: 151). Throughout *Barnaby Rudge*, Dickens explores the division between the object and its sign, the conflict between fathers and sons, the psychological conflict between the character's unconscious and conscious mind, the religious conflict between the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant Church, and the two competing genres within the novel, the 'gothic' and the 'historical'. At a psychological level, these different conflicts represent the oedipal struggle between the son and the castratory father that Diane F. Sadoff observes occurring in a selection of Dickens' later novels, but which arguably is at its most violent in this novel. More importantly, like his other early novel, *Oliver Twist* (1837), the conflict between son and father results in a castratory split within the father, giving rise to the protective father and the threatening father. While in *Oliver Twist*, the father-figure is divided

into three, the angelic Mr. Brownlow, the Old Devil Fagin who is both dangerous and protective, and the brutal Bill Sikes, the father-figure, in *Barnaby Rudge*, is divided only into the loving father and threatening father. At the same time, the conflict between son and father, most importantly in the divide between 'Barnaby' Rudge and his murderous father Barnaby 'Rudge', results in an unseen division within the novel's title *Barnaby Rudge*.

While Barnaby's mother, Mary Rudge, flees with her son from Rudge, in effect causing the split in the signifier 'Barnaby Rudge', it is also paradoxically the case that by keeping them apart, she avoids conflict. Their re-unification, like the coming together of England's Protestants and Roman Catholics, will result only in the anarchy and violence of the Gordon Riots. At a religious level, Mary, whose name connotes Mary the mother of Christ, a figure central to Roman Catholicism, represents the problem that medieval Catholicism had with people venerating paintings and sculptures rather than the person or idea behind the icon, a problem that partly drove the split within the Church, giving rise to the Lutheran Protestant Church. At a psychoanalytic level, what we see in the mother's castratory splitting of the son from the father, and the signifier into two, is Dickens' mother as the castration threat that his father could not be.

At the same time, we see in the mother's wish to keep her son away from Rudge, himself a demonic figure of castration, a projection of Dickens' unconscious oedipal desire for his mother, such that the mother wishes to be free of the father and to escape away with her son. This is a reverse projection of Dickens' unconscious wish to be free of his father and to have his mother's undivided attention. In the earlier *Oliver Twist*, Oliver's mother exists only as a painting hanging on Mr. Brownlow's wall, a painting that hints at a maternal bond and Oedipus complex, through the

similarity in facial features between Oliver and his deceased mother, but which is eclipsed by the dominance of various patriarchal figures such as Fagin. In *Barnaby Rudge*, similarly, Mary Rudge exists in a patriarchal world, and hides from her murderous husband, Rudge. In both novels, however, the father figure and the threat of castration oppress, and psychologically repress, but never destroy, the figure of the mother and the son's oedipal desire. The religious conflict of men and the psychological conflict of sons and fathers is, to use John Hawkins Miller's expression, 'presided over by the image of the Madonna', as both the powerless observer and powerful object of that conflict (Dever: 19).

Different theological interpretations of the Bible and the concept of God focus on the separation of the signifying word / image from its object and / or signified concept. In the Jewish understanding of the name and nature of God, his name is ineffable for Jews, and his nature beyond human comprehension. The name of God is 'YHWH' and is spelled this way because of the absence of written vowels in the Ancient Hebrew language. Ironically, while the ancient Israelites came to avoid speaking the name of God, nobody in the modern age actually knows how the name is pronounced, precisely because only the consonants that form the name were ever recorded, the vowels existing only in oral form. The meaning of the name, however, is known. Solomon Nigosian points to the Book of Exodus: 'And God said to Moses: "*Ehyeh-Asher-Ehyeh.*" And He said: "Say to the children of Israel, *Ehyeh* sends me to you"' (Old Testament: Exodus 3:14). Nigosian tells us that *Ehyeh-Asher-Ehyeh*,

is usually translated as "I Am Who I Am", or "I AM What I Am", or "I Will Be What I Will Be". The word *Ehyeh* derives from the Hebrew root word *hayah*, which means 'life', 'being'. The same root is also the antecedent of the word or name, YHWH. (Nigosian: 18, 19)

The reason Jews do not speak God's name, Nigosian tells us, is that 'by naming the undefinable, they diminish His Being and reduce it to [a] human level. Consequently, wherever the word YHWH (normally pronounced Yahweh) occurs, Jews pronounce it *Adonai*, meaning 'the Lord' (Ibid.). By the late fourth and early fifth century AD, however, with Christianity firmly established in Europe through the Holy Roman Empire, St. Augustine began to question the literal / figurative nature of the sign, and the unknowable nature of God, in *On Christian Doctrine* and *The Trinity* by pointing to the paradox of naming the unnameableⁱ. Augustine writes,

God should not be said to be ineffable, for when this is said something is said. Moreover, a contradiction in terms is created, since if that is ineffable which cannot be spoken, then that is not ineffable which can be called ineffable. This contradiction is to be passed over in silence rather than resolved verbally.ⁱⁱ

In other words, one cannot name the unnameable 'unnameable', for one has paradoxically named it, thus denying the unnameable nature of the thing one attempts to define.

This forms part of St. Augustine's attempt to establish a definitive theory of the sign through which the Bible, some of the paradoxes and contradictions existing between the different books of the Bible, and the concept of a single but Trinitarian God can be interpreted. As Vincent B. Leitch says, 'Augustine distinguishes in *On Christian Doctrine* between things and signs: "A sign is a thing which causes us to think of something beyond the impression that the thing itself makes upon the senses."ⁱⁱⁱ. In other words, the sign not only denotes the thing it refers to, but

connotes any number of associated meanings. At the same time, St. Augustine distinguished between ‘natural signs’ ‘such as smoke or the tracks of an animal’ which Leitch tells us ‘signify without intending to’, and ‘conventional signs’, such as words, which ‘are used by living beings to convey things they have sensed or understood’. Augustine goes on to separate the conventional sign into those signs which are literal, and those which are figurative in meaning.

Leitch argues that by making these different distinctions, Augustine ‘can posit a stable one-to-one correspondence between signs and things they signify. The development of an adequate theory of conventional signs, especially the figurative, is one of the goals of Augustinian hermeneutics’ The ability for a sign to carry multiple meanings, however, is ‘a problem Augustine never adequately resolved’. However, by creating an intellectual basis upon which the nature of the sign could be analysed, Augustine is nevertheless able to broach in the final book of *The Trinity* what Leitch describes as ‘a baffling theological concept: how the Godhead can unite three persons - the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit - in one’. Leitch writes that the Biblical explanation for the Holy Trinity ‘can only be shrouded in enigmatic allegory’. For Augustine, however,

The Trinity asserts the stability of the biblical sign to guarantee that the relationship between literal and figurative uses is as stable as the relationship between sign and thing. But Augustinian sign theory requires a mysterious transcendental signified (again Derrida’s term), a prevocalic word that can stand outside of, initiate, and control the process of figurative language [...] Yet because allegory depends on the gap between signs and what they signify, there is always a danger, which Augustine does not fully acknowledge, that interpretation will reveal not a stable and fixed truth but a

free play of signification. Instead he fills the gap opened up between sign and signifier with faith. (Ibid.)

At the same time, however, the exact opposite was also a problem that the Roman Catholic Church was faced with: that of people believing in the signifier as the divine object of worship rather than as a sign that refers to the person or concept to be worshipped. The Catholic Church throughout the medieval period places greater and greater emphasis on the signifier. On the one hand, this took the form of painting depicting the lives, histories, and stories of Christ, Mary, the Apostles, and other Saints in the form of paintings and sculptures, as a way of conveying the message of the Bible to the illiterate, uneducated, poor of memory, and uninspired. In the late thirteenth century AD, John of Genoa wrote *Catholicon*, a dictionary, which explained the importance of religious pictures:

Know that there were three reasons for the institution of images in churches. *First*, for the instruction of simple people because they are instructed by them as if by books. *Second*, so that the mystery of the incarnation and the examples of the Saints may be the more active in our memory through being presented daily to our eyes. *Third*, to excite feelings of devotion, these being aroused more effectively by things seen than by things heard.^{iv}

This was expanded upon in 1492, by the Dominican Fra Michele da Carcano in an orthodox Quattrocento (a text written between 1400-1499). However, Fra Michele raises the problem of idolatry that began to arise among the illiterate, which consequently gave rise to the destruction of many paintings. Fra Michele wrote that there were three reasons for the use of images of the Saints and the Virgin Mary. The

first reason was ‘on account of the ignorance of simple people, so that those who are not able to read the scriptures can yet learn by seeing the sacraments of our salvation and faith in pictures’. Fra Michele recalls the words of St. Gregory the Great who wrote to Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles. Gregory questioned Serenus’ ‘unconsidered zeal’ in ‘destroying the images of the saints on the grounds that they should not be adored’, telling him that while,

we praise you wholeheartedly for not allowing them to be adored [...] it is one thing to adore a painting, but it is quite another to learn from a painted narrative what to adore. What a book is to those who can read, a picture is to the ignorant people who look at it. (*The Renaissance*: 133)

Images of the Saints and the Virgin Mary were introduced as a means of countering ‘our emotional sluggishness; so that men who are not aroused to devotion when they hear about the histories of the Saints may at least be moved when they see them, as if actually present, in pictures’ (Ibid.). Thirdly, ‘Images were introduced because many people cannot retain in their memories what they hear, but they do remember if they see images’ (Ibid.).

Michael Baxendall comments that, ‘Idolatry was a standing preoccupation of theology: it was fully realized that simple people could easily confuse the image of divinity or sanctity with divinity or sanctity itself, and worship it’ (Ibid.). However, in the sixteenth century, the German Augustinian monk Martin Luther thought of an almost divinely inspired solution to the central concern of St. Augustine’s teaching concerning man’s fallen nature. He theorized that if in his fallen state, man has no means of achieving salvation himself he could only find salvation through Jesus Christ. As Andrew Cunningham argues ‘Suddenly there was, for Luther, no role at all

for the mediation of a special priesthood or for the apparatus of the Church, for they were presenting themselves as the essential intermediaries in a relationship which demanded that there be no intermediaries (*The Renaissance: 276*). Thus out of the movement known as the Reformation, the call for reform within the Catholic Church, the Lutheran Protestant Church was born, and with it a fundamental change in response to religious imagery so important to the Roman Catholic tradition. Cunningham writes, however, that,

Almost alone among the reformers, it appears, Luther remained favourable to the use of imagery in church. Some of the reformers of the Swiss cities, for instance, were to pursue a drastic policy of clearing out and breaking all statues, pictures and relics from their local churches, on the grounds that the worship of 'idols' was forbidden by the Commandments. Their fear was that worship of what the image represented actually became worship of the image itself, and hence idolatry. Luther, however, held the view that as we unavoidably form mental images of things that we hear described in words, so it is positively desirable to look at a pictured image which properly represents the 'thing' in question. (*The Renaissance: 277*)

Yet, as Cunningham says, it appears that Luther was 'almost alone among the reformers' in taking this view. From the time of the Reformation onward, those images that had once been full of religious meaning were now, in Protestant Europe at least, including England, at best signifiers that no longer referred to anything, and at worst, idolatrous symbols of Roman Catholic corruption.

By the eighteenth century, the Enlightenment saw a turning away from religion, and a rebirth of classical philosophy, mathematics, science, and architecture. In

literature, there was a rejection of the late medieval romance, such as Cervantes' *Don Quixote* (1605, 1615), and most importantly La Calpranède's *Cassandre* (1644-50) and Madelaine de Scudéry's *Le Grand Cyrus*, in favour of the literally new 'novel', which paradoxically was modelled in part on classical thinking. As E. J. Clery says, the novel 'marked itself off as a new, more credible and progressive genre of fiction for an enlightened age by denigrating "the old," the romance. The classical keystones of this attitude were Aristotle, who in the *Poetics* insisted on probability in the drama, and Horace, whose dictum "*incredulous odi*" ("what I cannot believe disgusts me") from the *Art of Poetry* is a cliché of neoclassical criticism. Only if a fiction is true to life can it become the vehicle of useful instruction or moral improvement' (*Gothic Fictions: 22*).

Yet, as Clery points out, the fact that the French heroic romances seldom involved any supernaturalism, 'but were characterized by artificial diction, numerous coincidences, the promiscuous mixing of history and fiction, absurd idealism, and over-the-top heroics', and yet posed a great enough threat to the novel that they had to be criticised in Charlotte Lennox's satire *The Female Quixote* (1752) suggests that the novel, as Clery puts it 'needed romance as the measure of its own achievements' (*Gothic Fictions: 23*). There was, he argues, 'a dialectical relation between the two, an interdependency' with the effect that the boundary between the novel and the romance often shifted (*Ibid.*). Clery adds, however, that,

natural horror was as far as novelists were prepared to go at this stage: there could be no appeal to the imagination that went beyond rational causes. *The Castle of Otranto* was presented to the public, especially in the preface to the second edition, as an outright challenge to this orthodoxy. Romances had

been called improbable; now Walpole accused modern fiction of being too probable. (*Gothic Fictions*: 23)

Walpole set *Otranto* in thirteenth century Renaissance Italy, and tells of how Prince Manfred of Otranto inherited the realm unlawfully, after his Grandfather murdered the legitimate ruler, Prince Alfonso. A prophecy tells that Manfred and his family line will remain in power as long as successive male heirs are born. Thus, Manfred arranges a marriage between his son, Conrad, and Isabella, daughter of the Marquis of Vicenzo. On the night of the wedding, however, Conrad is killed by the ghost of Alfonso that haunts the castle. Manfred decides that he must have a son through Isabella instead, but she escapes with the help of Theodore, a peasant, with whom Manfred's daughter, Matilda, is in love. Manfred believes that Isabella and Theodore are in love, and learns that Theodore and his daughter have arranged to meet at Prince Alfonso's tomb. Manfred goes there, and stabs who he believes to be Isabella, only to discover that he has killed his daughter. The ghost destroys the castle, and amidst the ruins, Manfred confesses his unlawful claim to the throne, leading the ghost to declare the peasant Theodore, the new Prince of Otranto. Manfred and his wife Hippolita seek redemption by entering into Holy Orders as a monk and nun, respectively.

The most important aspect of *Otranto*, however, is that Walpole wrote it under a pseudonym, and tried to pass it off as having been printed in 1529, with the possibility that it may have been originally written between 1095 and 1243, with Walpole claiming only to be the translator. Walpole argued, as Clery says, that,

the original story was written to reinforce "the empire of superstition" when the growth of learning threatened to dispel it: "such a work as the following would enslave a hundred vulgar minds beyond half the books of controversy

that have been written from the days of Luther to the present day". A factor in the dismissal of ancient romance was the association with Catholic superstition. The disenchanted novel was felt to be the appropriate fictional mode for an enlightened Protestant culture. Hence the outrage of one reviewer when the true authorship of *Otranto* was revealed: "it is, indeed, more than strange that an Author, of a refined and polished genius, should be an advocate for re-establishing the barbarous superstitions of Gothic devilism!" Nearly thirty years later, Radcliffe was to introduce the device of the "explained supernatural" in order to reconcile Protestant incredulity and the taste for ghostly terror. (*Gothic Fiction: 27*)

Walpole, however, made no attempt to rationalize the supernatural, but rather, as Clery suggests, almost parodies medieval Catholicism through 'the church effigy with a nose bleed and the uproarious reaction to every supernatural phenomenon of the benighted servants and peasants contrasted by the scepticism of Manfred and the hero, Theodore. Conversely, 'Father Jerome is represented by and large as a man of integrity, Manfred and Hippolite finish by seeking redemption in holy orders, and the climactic incarnation of the giant ghost shaking the castle to its foundations is undeniably real. Ultimately, therefore, Walpole eschews irony and takes the radical option of reviving discredited beliefs for the entertainment of a modern audience' (*Gothic Fiction: 27*). Without the belief which gives meaning to those symbols of Catholicism, such symbols become empty signifiers. Walpole's story is, as Jerrold E. Hogle puts it, populated 'with spectres who are ghosts of what is *already artificial* [...] they are not just counterfeits but ghosts of counterfeits' (*Gothic Fiction: 15*). Hogle writes:

The Gothic is founded on a quasi-antiquarian use of symbols that are quite obviously signs only of older signs; by the time of the Gothic revival in architecture of the eighteenth century, there had already been “Gothic” revivals, even in the Middle Ages. The earlier signs had themselves been broken off from many of their past connections and now existed more as mere signifiers than as substantial points of reference or human bodies. (Ibid.)

Hogle argues that Walpole’s anti-Catholic use of symbols from Europe’s Catholic past render his ‘references to the distant past distinctly *hollowed-out* ones, allusions to what was largely empty as well as distant for him’ (Ibid.). A consequence of this is that the ‘*neo* - Gothic’ has become ‘filled with antiquated repositories into which modern quandaries can be projected and abjected simultaneously’. More importantly, the term ‘Gothic’, used much more today in relation to literature, than in the eighteenth century, has, Hogle argues, always been something of a counterfeit. The term ‘Gothic’ has always been used to describe things as belonging to, or being reminiscent of what is in fact a hollow, fictitious past. Hogle writes:

It was first used by early Renaissance art historians in Italy to describe pointed-arch and castellated styles of medieval architecture, as well as medieval ways of life in general – but to do so in a pejorative way so as to establish the superiority of more recent neoclassic alternatives, because of which the designs of the immediate past were associated with supposedly barbaric Goths, who had little to do with the actual buildings in question. Consequently, *Gothic* has long been a term used to project modern concerns into a deliberately vague, even fictionalised past. (*Gothic Fiction*: 15, 16)

In Alison Milbank's 'The Victorian Gothic in English novels and stories, 1830-1880', she points to the accession of Victoria to the throne in 1837, as something of a 'Gothic cusp', a term originally used by Robert Miles 'to describe the Renaissance setting of much earlier Gothic writing, as poised between the feudalism of the Middle Ages and the Enlightenment' (*Gothic Fictions*: 147). Milbank argues that a second 'Gothic cusp' arose out of the mixed public feeling towards their new young, female monarch, and its consequent change in the popularity of the Radcliffe tradition of the 'Gothic' heroine fleeing from imprisonment that had begun in the late eighteenth century. Milbank writes,

While loyalists heralded the birth of another Elizabethan age of glory and national achievement, utilitarians questioned the relevance of such an irrational institution, and Chartists and moderates such as writers in *Punch* deprecated the cost of the royal family, as well as its isolation from social reality. Victoria's gender and marriage to an unpopular foreign prince in 1840 compromised her legitimacy in the eyes of some, and this problem combined with working-class unrest and political agitation for representation. (*Gothic Fiction*: 145)

This social divide in opinion concerning the new monarch translated into a branching into two of the Radcliffe tradition, with 'the trope of the liberated heroine' and 'the trope of release from the prison of the past' becoming separated, but taking,

many different Victorian Gothic shapes, some of which strove to heal the breach, depending on the political and ideological stances of each author or group who took up the Gothic as a mode of writing. In early Victorian Gothic

the heroine who acts as a focus for social critique is lost in the world of her tale, and the liberation from the hold of the past is replaced in such works by a repositioning of the woman to fix her in an architectural and political space. From its beginning, the already Gothic historical novel had provided a means of national self-understanding - and indeed self-creation. In particular, Sir Walter Scott's repeated rehearsals of the shift from a Gothic Highland – or Border-primitive society to commercial capitalism legitimated the Hanoverian dynasty by Gothicizing that transition as the emergence of the modern [...] The tragic romance mode serves to legitimise the line that leads to Victoria and turns political opposition into a plot calling for sympathy and pity. However, the trope of liberation from the past is separated from the heroine, who is left imprisoned by her fate (like Victoria?), as Radcliffe heroines are not. (*Gothic Fiction*: 145, 146)

This second 'Gothic cusp' gave rise to a Victorian Gothic which no longer projected contemporary issues onto a Catholic and pre-Enlightenment past, as had been done by Walpole, Radcliffe and others in the late eighteenth century. Yet, as Milbank says, this did not mean losing 'the past, and the "already having happened" character of the Gothic cusp'. Rather, it meant clothing 'the contemporary in Gothic garb'. Milbank writes 'The point of this device for the novelist G. W. M. Reynolds – as for Charles Dickens – is to speak of the present as if it were already the vanquished past' (*Gothic Fiction*: 147). Milbank argues that Dickens, although a 'promoter of domesticity', almost reunites the Radcliffian Gothic, by linking,

a Whig radicalism about removing social abuses, alongside a progressivist impatience with the entrenched privilege that holds back national development, with a more Conservative anxiety about collectivist solutions

and, indeed, group activity of any kind. Thus, he was in a unique position to recombine the Tory Gothic heroine of continuity with the Whig heroine who escapes diachronic and synchronic imprisonment. (*Gothic Fiction*: 155)

Milbank points to Dickens' *Oliver Twist* (1837), serialised in the year that Victoria became Queen, implicitly arguing that against the demonic villain Fagin, Oliver's 'pristine innocence', as a feminine quality, allows us to think of the boy-hero as equivalent to the 'Gothic' heroine who must escape from her physical or psychological prisons. More important, perhaps, is the fact that Oliver is a 'living copy' of his mother's portrait. When Mr Bedwin looks upon Oliver, with the portrait hanging on the wall above his head, in Mr Brownlow's house, Bedwin exclaims through the narrator's free indirect discourse, 'There was its living copy, the eyes, the head, the mouth; every feature was the same. The expression was, for the instant, so precisely alike, that the minutest line seemed copied with an accuracy which was perfectly unearthly' (OT: 132). Oliver's 'unearthly' or now we might say 'uncanny' similarity to his mother, allows us to think of him, and Dickens' other boy-heroes, as Gothic heroines in disguise. Oliver represents the innocence and purity by which the various demonic and Gothic villains of London are judged. Yet, 'he only reveals what is already the moral character of those he meets: he effects no change' (*Gothic Fiction*: 156). In contrast to this, Milbank points to Little Nell in *The Old Curiosity Shop* (1840-41), in which Dickens once again contrasts a child with,

a range of grotesque companions, but by placing a young *girl* in a setting of an *embalmed past* he imports expectations that equate escape with movement forward in time and the possibility of social change accompanying her rescue and maturation. (Ibid.)

Milbank says of Esther in *Bleak House* (1852-53), and Amy Dorrit in *Little Dorrit* (1855-57), that by this time,

Dickens' fiction shows a more optimistic attitude toward social change, which is illustrated paradoxically, by a reengagement with the Gothic form as a means to delineate and expose the ideological and oppressive nature of contemporary institutions. In both novels the heroine is imprisoned by these structures, and the means to their regeneration lies in her escape. (*Gothic Fiction*: 157)

Similarly, Milbank says of *Great Expectations* (1860-61), 'Mouldering Satis House, with the time-locked mistress and youthful Estella, offers a false Gothic promise that Pip is the hero come to bring change and new life by rescuing the heroine' (*Gothic Fiction*: 159). Milbank implicitly argues that just as the Victorian Gothic can be thought of as the contemporary clothed in the Gothic, so Satis House is clothed in Miss Havisham's solipsistic perception of nothing existing beyond the self. Estella cannot be rescued from Satis House, for she is merely an extension of Miss Havisham's self.

As Milbank writes, 'By projecting outwards her own delusion, Miss Havisham creates her own solipsism along with an extreme Gothic edifice, instead of escaping from solipsism by means of such a construction as Wemmick does' (*Gothic Fiction*: 159). Milbank argues that Wemmick's 'toy-Gothic cottage, with its diminutive drawbridge and tiny gun to which the law clerk [...] retires each evening, is both a marker of Wemmick's alienation from his daily employment and an attempt to render his mental division actual' (Ibid.). Yet, we might also consider Wemmick's retreat to

his miniature medieval-style castle that separates him from his work in Jagger's office, and by implication the street where the office is located, 'Little Britain', as a retreat from a 'Little Britain' into an equally diminutive medieval past. In contrast to Miss Havisham who is trapped in the past, and Estella, whom Pip believes he can rescue from Satis House and in a sense, the past, Wemmick escapes from the modern world, into a medieval past. If, as Milbank argues, Wemmick retreats into his almost toy-like castle, and pulls up the drawbridge, as a means of escaping the solipsism of the outside world, it is in the past that he finds refuge from this perception that nothing exists beyond the self. Paradoxically, Wemmick must retreat into an interior, to escape from a world in which there is nothing but interiority, a hollow world, like Satis House itself, decaying from within.

Milbank points to Dickens' last but unfinished novel, *The Mystery of Edwin Drood* (1870) as the culmination of Dickens' nightmare of 'solipsistic imprisonment within the haunted space of the mind, without connection to anything beyond its own constructs' and in particular John Jasper, the choir director [not church organist as Milbank describes him] and opium addict, who in an opium den, in his hallucinatory state, misperceives the cathedral tower and the spikes at the end of the bed, to be one giant spike threatening to enter through the window, reflecting his 'inability to maintain the separation of the worlds of inner desires and outer reality' (*Gothic Fiction*: 159). Yet, we might also say that in his drugged state of mind, Jasper exists in a modern corrupted world, symbolically threatened by a giant hallucinatory spike, a phallic symbol of a medieval, Gothic, past. Just as Jasper is unable to sustain the divide between the internal and external world, and the unconscious and conscious mind, so he is unable to sustain the divide between the medieval Gothic past, and the late Victorian world. In one sense, this arises out of his use of opium, but in another

sense, it is the opium through which he attempts to escape from this world of the Gothic past and present. Milbank takes us through a number of Dickens' novels, showing us a Dickens world where unconscious and conscious, Gothic past and Gothic present merge into one another, such that the present is already past and there is nothing but interiority, (contrasting Timothy Clarke's essay 'Dickens through Blanchot: the nightmare fascination of a world without interiority'^v), and argues that Dickens exemplifies but also sought to reconcile the division that took place in the Radcliffe tradition of the 'Gothic' novel. Yet, no mention is made of what is arguably Dickens' only truly 'Gothic' novel, *Barnaby Rudge* (1841), a novel that does not attempt to reconstruct the Radcliffe tradition, although one can find elements of it in the novel, but rather returns to the Walpole tradition.

Barnaby Rudge centres round the anti-Catholic riots of 1780 and in this respect can be thought of as an historical novel, which traditionally would include some small element of the supernatural, just as the 'Gothic' novel would focus on the supernatural and have a lesser element of the historical. However, Dickens does not simply pay homage to either genre, but creates instead one of his most self-referential novels. This is reflected in the fact that Dickens is aware of the fact that the late eighteenth century saw the emergence of what would later be called the Gothic genre, that his novel is set sixteen years after the publication of Horace Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto* (1764), and that it is set in the decade before the 'Gothic' genre explodes in popularity. Dickens incorporates Walpole's unexplained supernatural and Radcliffe's explained supernatural, elements of the historical and the 'Gothic' genre, while challenging the inherent anti-Catholic origins of the 'Gothic' with his more sympathetic portrayal of Catholicism, and more importantly, his demonstration of the paradoxical hypocrisy of the medieval Protestant disdain for the Catholic religious

signifier which would come to be parodically used as a source of entertainment in the Gothic genre. The central motif in the novel, which embodies these three different balancing acts performed by Dickens, is that of the empty signifier, specifically the sign separated from the object or concept which it signifies. While the empty signifier was an anti-Catholic trope of the early 'Gothic', Dickens uses it to illustrate the harmful divisions caused by religious intolerance: divisions that split apart the Christian Church, (Dickens ironically was a member of the Unitarian Church), fathers and sons, individual identities, and language itself.

Yet, in contrast to the use of the empty signifier that refers only to a religious signifier devoid of the belief that gave it meaning, Dickens begins the novel by pointing to an empty signifier used by the illiterate and largely Protestant locals to signify the identity of the Maypole Inn. Owing to the widespread illiteracy among people in late eighteenth century England, the identity of the Maypole Inn is signified by an inn sign, which the locals cannot read. Instead, the locals paradoxically use as a 'sign' a young 30ft tall ash tree. The narrator says,

In the year 1775, there stood upon the borders of Epping Forrest, at a distance of about twelve miles from London [...] a house of public entertainment called the Maypole; which in fact was demonstrated to all such travellers as could neither read nor write (and at that time a vast number both of travellers and stay-at-homes were in that condition) by the emblem reared on the roadside over against the house, which, if not of those goodly proportions that Maypoles were wont to present of olden times, was a fair young ash, thirty feet in height, and straight as any arrow that ever English yeoman drew.

(BR: 43)

The Maypole Inn has three signs, the first being ‘Maypole Inn’, which we read, the second being the sign outside the Inn, which has ‘Maypole Inn’ written or carved into it, and thirdly the Ash tree, ‘read’ by the illiterate locals. Yet to avoid any confusion over these different signs, the narrator ironically differentiates between them, saying, ‘The Maypole – by which term from henceforth is meant the house, and not its sign’ (Ibid.). However, he does not specify which ‘sign’ he refers to, whether he means the signifier ‘Maypole Inn’ or the signifying Ash Tree. This ambiguity, however, only adds to the sense in which the signifier is dislocated from the signified meaning, for it draws attention to the fact that first and foremost, signifiers refer to other signifiers, before referring to an actual object, and that in this sense, signifiers do not contain any inherent meaning, merely what is invested in them at any particular time. Just as Dickens describes the Last Patriarch in *Little Dorrit* as an ‘Inn signpost without any Inn’ (LD: 151), so the Maypole Inn is signified by a sign that has no ‘in’, no inherently ‘inner’ meaning. The signifier is empty, imbued with meaning only for as long as the locals remain illiterate, and ‘believe’ in the signifying Ash tree.

This ironically reflects the Roman Catholic justification for the use of religious paintings as a means of informing, helping to remember, and inspire the illiterate and uneducated faithful, while at the same time, reflecting that it is in the Maypole Inn that two ‘Gothic’ stories are told. The first Maypole story is an historical narrative concerning Queen Elizabeth I, told by John Willet, while the second Maypole story would now be classed as a Gothic tale of the supernatural, yet like the Ash tree sign, and the Roman Catholic signifier, both stories rely on the belief of their listeners. In the first and perhaps oldest of the two Maypole Stories, the narrator tells us of the historical event reputedly associated with the Maypole Inn:

there was a legend, not only that Queen Elizabeth had slept there one night while upon a hunting excursion, to wit, in a certain oak-panelled room with a deep bay window, but that next morning, while standing on a mounting block before the door with one foot in the stirrup, the virgin monarch had then and there boxed and cuffed an unlucky page for some neglect of duty. The matter-of-fact and doubtful folks, of whom there were a few among the Maypole customers, as unluckily there always are in every little community, were inclined to look upon this tradition as rather apocryphal; but, whenever the landlord of that ancient hostelry appealed to the mounting block itself as evidence, and triumphantly pointed out that there it stood in the same place to that very day, the doubters never failed to be put down by a large majority, and all true believers exulted as in a victory. (BR: 43)

Ironically, John Willet almost anticipates the fate of the Maypole Inn awaiting it when the No Popery rioters destroy it, with the possibility that were Joe and his wife Dolly (Varden) Willet not to restore it, the only clue to its ever having existed would be its sign, the Ash tree, just as John Willet takes the mounting block to be proof enough of Queen Elizabeth having once stayed in the Inn.

As if unconsciously aware of how weak this evidence is, the victory John Willet and cronies have over anyone who ‘would look upon this tradition as rather apocryphal’ results from them being ‘true believers’ (BR: 44). The word ‘apocryphal’ originally referred to ‘early Christian texts resembling those of the New Testament’ (OED) but whose authenticity was questioned. Likewise, the authenticity of John Willet’s historical story is questioned, and becomes, ultimately, a question of belief, reflecting the basis of Christianity’s pull between legend and history. Yet, by pointing to the mounting block as a signifier of the once present Queen Elizabeth, Head of the

Protestant Church, Willet shows a reliance upon a sign, an artefact, an icon, to prove that what he believes is true, reflecting his faith in God. Not only does this reliance upon physical evidence undermine his status as a ‘true believer’, his reliance upon the object and the signifier, to compensate for a lack of faith in the story itself, ironically reflects the problem the Catholic Church faced in the idolatrous worship of the images of Christ, Mary, and the Saints by the illiterate and uneducated followers.

In ironic contrast to this, Solomon Daisy’s supernatural tale is in essence a ‘gothic’ story concerning the murder of Reuben Haredale. Just as Willet’s historical story is based on the flimsiest of empirical experiences, that of looking at the mounting block, so Solomon’s ‘gothic’ story is ironically based on his much more substantial empirical experience. The telling of this second story begins when a stranger to the Maypole Inn, who we later learn is Barnaby Rudge Senior, asks after the man he murdered, Reuben Haredale, and his daughter Emma Haredale. John Willet, not knowing whom he speaks to, tells the stranger, ‘he is not alive, and he is not dead’, adding that he is ‘Not dead in a common sort of way’ (BR: 53). The stranger asks John what he means by this, to which John Willet replies,

‘More than you think for, friend [...] Perhaps there’s more meaning in them words than you suspect.’ ‘Perhaps there is,’ said the strange man, gruffly; ‘but what the devil do you speak in such mysteries for? You tell me, first, that a man is not alive, nor yet dead – then, that he’s not dead in a common sort of way – then, that you mean a great deal more than I think for. To tell you the truth, you do that easily; for so far as I can make out, you mean nothing. What *do* you mean, I ask again?’ (BR: 54)

Willet replies ““That is a Maypole story and has been any time these-four-and-twenty years. That story is Solomon Daisy’s story. It belongs to the house; and nobody but Solomon Daisy has ever told it under this roof, or ever shall”” (BR: 54).

With these words, Solomon Daisy, the Parish Clerk, prepares to tell his story, with an almost ritualistic and phallic gesture of doing so in the action of taking ‘the pipe from his lips, after a very long whiff to keep it alight’ (Ibid.). In contrast to the sense in which Daisy comes to life, the phallic gesture with the pipe, the small amount of light literally afforded by the pipe, the larger amount of light connoted by the word ‘alight’, as well as the further connotation of symbolic light, the stranger,

gathered his large coat about him, and shrinking further back was almost lost in the gloom of the spacious chimney corner, except when the flame, struggling from under a great faggot, whose weight almost crushed it for the time, shot upward with a strong and sudden glare, and illuminating his figure for a moment, seemed afterwards to cast it into deeper obscurity than before.
(BR: 54)

In contrast to the familiarity of the Inn’s environment when Willet tells his frankly boring, as well as probably apocryphal, historical story, the Inn, reflecting the supernatural nature of Solomon’s story, becomes itself ‘gothic’. The narrator tells us that,

By this flickering light, which made the old room, with its heavy timbers and panelled walls, look as if it were built of polished ebony – the wind roaring and howling without, now rattling the latch and creaking the hinges of the stout oaken door, and now driving at the casement as though it would beat it

in - by this light, and under circumstances so auspicious, Solomon Daisy began his tale. (BR: 54)

The Inn becomes almost womb-like, with the log fire against the darkness of the Inn, heightens the sense of physical depth. The warm, dark interior of the Inn contrasts with the wind outside, which metaphorically ‘roars’ and ‘howls’. The effect of this is to accentuate the listener’s (and reader’s) experience of sublime terror; safely experiencing inside what would outside be genuine terror. As if ironically aware that dark, stormy weather often accompanies such tales of terror, the narrator says,

under circumstances so auspicious, Solomon Daisy began his tale: ‘It was Mr Reuben Haredale, Mr Geoffrey’s elder brother – ‘ Here he came to a dead stop, and made so long a pause that even John Willet grew impatient and asked why he did not proceed. ‘Cobb,’ said Solomon Daisy, dropping his voice and appealing to the post-office keeper; ‘what day of the month is this?’ ‘The nineteenth.’ ‘Of March,’ said the clerk, bending forward, ‘the nineteenth of March; that’s very strange.’ (BR: 54, 55)

This inauspicious date is made all the more so because the twenty fourth year of telling has been reached, just as the day on which the story is told is in its twenty fourth hour, and the ghostly events within Solomon’s story likewise take place in the twenty fourth hour of the day. This uncanny repetition is added to by Solomon’s repetition of the date, saying “The nineteenth.” “Of March [...] “the nineteenth of March”, and his saying ‘It was just such a night as this; blowing a hurricane, raining heavily, and very dark – I often think now, darker than I ever saw it before or since’ (BR: 56). Solomon finally begins his long tale, which is perhaps too long to reproduce in full. Solomon recalls a night, twenty two years earlier, on which Mr Reuben

Haredale, the then recently widowed owner of the Warren, left for London, only to return after finding that the loneliness he wished to escape remained with him.

His one year old daughter and some of the servants remained in London, and would follow the next day. It was on the night of his return that the death of ‘an old gentleman who lived at Chigwell Row’ required Solomon to ring the ‘passing – bell’ at half past midnight. Despite the discomfort at entering the Church at such a time, Solomon was prepared, for ‘the old gentleman had often made it a request that the bell should be tolled as soon as possible after the breath was out of his body, and he had been expected to go for some days’. The small amount of familiarity that this affords Solomon, however, is contrasted by the ghostly atmosphere of the Church, brought on by his memories of ghost stories as a child. Within Solomon’s ghost story, we find embedded another ghost story. Solomon tells of a how ‘on a certain night in the year (it might be that very night for anything I knew), all the dead people came out of the ground and sat at the heads of their own graves till morning’ (BR: 55). As he thinks of this story while walking through the Church, his thoughts turn to the old man who has died, and tells his listeners, ‘I could have sworn, as I looked up the dark chancel, that I saw him in his usual place, wrapping his shroud about him and shivering as if he felt it cold’ (Ibid.).

Just as Solomon picks up the bell rope he hears the faint ringing of a bell, but which is not caused by the bell he carries. Solomon says ‘I had heard of corpse candles, and at last I persuaded myself that this must be a corpse bell tolling of itself at midnight for the dead. I tolled my bell – how, or how long, I don’t know – and ran home to bed as fast as I could touch the ground’ (BR: 57). The following morning, Solomon learns that Reuben Haredale was found murdered, ‘and in his hand was a piece of the cord attached to an alarm-bell outside the roof, which hung in his room

and had been cut asunder, no doubt by the murderer, when he seized it (Ibid.). The Steward, Barnaby Rudge, and the gardener were missing and both suspected of murder, until Rudge's body was found, 'scarcely to be recognised by his clothes and the watch and ring he wore – was found, months afterwards, at the bottom of a piece of water in the grounds, with a deep gash in the breast where he had been stabbed with a knife' (BR: 58). Unbeknown to Solomon, it was Rudge who murdered Reuben Haredale and the Steward, and who sits listening to Solomon's story.

As a Gothic story, Solomon's tale exemplifies Anne Radcliffe's 'explained supernatural'. In the story, Solomon enters an empty Church to ring a passing bell to signify the death of an old man. In thinking of the old man, he is convinced he momentarily sees the old man as if still alive but dead. The fact that Solomon was thinking of the man before catching a fleeting glimpse of the man is in a sense, the rational explanation for Solomon's vision, coming prior to the event. Just as he grasps the bell rope, the sound of another, distant bell rings, which he calls a corpse bell. Solomon rings his bell in response to this apparent communication from beyond the grave, and runs home. The next day, Reuben Haredale is found murdered, with his hand grasping the cord attached to an alarm bell on the roof of his house. Solomon says, 'That was the bell I heard' (BR: 58). Together with John Willet's historical story, Solomon's story seems to correspond with the Radcliffe tradition of combining the historical with the explained supernatural.

This is ironically reflected in Solomon's name which refers to King Solomon, 'The son of David and Bathsheba, and third King of united Israel [...] His countless foreign wives and concubines brought with them many pagan cults, leading Solomon into idolatrous forms of worship which contributed to the decline and ultimate division of the Kingdom' (Hall: 286). By explaining the supernatural, Solomon Daisy does not

need to believe in the supernatural, symbolically reflecting his Protestant rejection of the idolatrous worship of religious signifiers associated with Catholicism, despite the fact that the Catholic Church itself tried to eradicate this problem, and the fact that Martin Luther supported the use of religious imagery. At the same time, this explanation of the supernatural is added to by the fact that Solomon explains the supernatural event to the real and murderous Rudge who listens to this story about himself. He is the dead 'Mr Rudge', whose unrecognisable corpse, in contrast to the Solomon's living dead who are 'earthy and unlike' themselves, is watery and unlike himself, given the fact that he is very much alive.

Paradoxically, Rudge 'exists' as a dead man in Solomon's Maypole story, but as a living man, has no identity. Although Solomon and the Maypole cronies do not realize that the stranger is the dead 'Mr Rudge', he ironically represents the explanation of Solomon's supernatural experience. At the same time, however, the fact that Solomon's tale of the living-dead is told to a strangely undead character, divided between his nameless living self, and named dead self, renders this scene within the novel another explained supernatural moment. At this point, only the author / narrator knows the identity of the stranger, yet as readers we know by virtue of his unfamiliarity, that he must by convention be connected somehow to Solomon's story.

Much later, following the destruction of the Maypole, Mr Haredale, who searches for his niece Emma, enters the Maypole and unties Mr Willet, who had been restrained by the rioters. He asks if he has seen Emma, but Willet, in a confused state, talks about the stranger, Rudge, who had come asking about Emma and Reuben Haredale, long before. John Willet asks,

‘You didn’t [...] either of you gentlemen – see a – a coffin anywheres, did you’ [...] ‘- Because, [...] a dead man called a little time ago, on his way yonder. I could have told you what name was on the plate, if he had brought his coffin with him, and left it behind. If he didn’t, it don’t signify’ (BR: 513).

Without his signifier, the real Rudge is as dead as the dead ‘Mr Rudge’. At the same time, the double meaning of ‘signify’ both to refer to or mean something, and conversely, to mean nothing, in the sense of signifying little or nothing of importance, implies that for the dead man to be without his name, in one sense, signifies little or nothing of importance, but in another sense, implies that the dead man, without his coffin and his name on the side of the coffin, signifies nothing, in the sense of not meaning anything to anyone. The stranger’s true identity is slowly pieced together throughout the novel, until he is revealed to be one of three manifestations of Lucifer, the other two being Grip the raven, and Sir John.

When Rudge leaves the Maypole Inn, Gabriel Varden confronts him, on the dark and treacherous road, saying, ‘to be plain with you, friend, you don’t carry in your countenance a letter of recommendation’ (BR: 65). The metaphorical ‘letter of recommendation’ that Varden cannot find in the face of the stranger ironically anticipates John Willet’s later impression that the stranger was a dead man, and that if he had carried a coffin with his name on it, he could have told Mr Haredale the stranger’s name. At the same time, Gabriel’s inability to read anything good in the stranger’s face, mirrors Rudge’s reading of Gabriel Varden’s name on the side of his cart. Yet, while Gabriel implicitly uses the ‘science’ of physiognomy, the science of judging a person’s personality by their face, Rudge denies any surreptitious means by which he has learned the identity of Gabriel, saying, ‘I have not gained the

information from any confidence of yours, but from the inscription on your cart which tells it to all the town' (BR: 64). Rudge, whose identity is secret, and who by name is believed to be dead, is read by Varden, who, though unable to identify the stranger, nevertheless recognises his nature. Rudge, devoid of his signifying name, and, at least in John Willet's imagination, devoid of his coffin with his name etched on it, confronts Gabriel who travels in a horse-drawn cart with his name etched on the side for all to see.

The narrator describes the stranger as looking 'like a bloodless ghost, while the moisture, which hard riding had brought out upon his skin, hung there in dark and heavy drops, like dews of agony and death' (BR: 65). Had the strange dead man had his coffin with him, Gabriel would have seen that the name of this stranger is 'Barnaby Rudge', but allegorically speaking, he would arguably have seen that this 'bloodless ghost' is the figure of Lucifer. Later, Gabriel asks Mary Rudge, 'Who is this ghost, that is only seen in the black nights and bad weather? How does he know, and why does he haunt this house, whispering through chinks and crevices, as there was that between him and you, which neither durst so much as speak of?' Mary replies, 'You do well to say he haunts this house [...] His shadow has been upon it and me, in light and darkness, at noonday and midnight. And now, at last, he has come in the body!' (BR: 92). While Mary speaks metaphorically, in order to describe a real event, she indirectly speaks literally of the shadow manifesting as the stranger, and in so doing, paradoxically uses the literal to make the narrative more like Walpole's unexplained supernatural.

When Rudge travels though London, the narrator tells us,

Among all the dangerous characters who, in such a state of society, prowled and skulked in the metropolis at night, there was one man whom many as uncouth and fierce as he, shrunk with an involuntary dread. Who he was, or whence he came, was a question often asked, but which none could answer.

(BR: 180)

Later, the narrator says,

they who dealt in bodies with the surgeons could swear he slept in churchyards, and that they had beheld him glide away among the tombs on their approach. And as they told these stories to each other, one who had looked about him would pull his neighbour by the sleeve, and there he would be among them. At last, one man – he was one of those whose commerce lay among the graves – resolved to question this strange companion. Next night, when he had eat his poor meal voraciously (he was accustomed to do that, they had observed, as though he had no other in the day), this fellow sat down at his elbow. ‘A black night, master!’ ‘It is a black night.’ ‘Blacker than last, though that was pitchy too. Didn’t I pass you near the turnpike in the Oxford Road?’ ‘It’s like you may. I don’t know.’ ‘Come, come, master,’ cried the fellow, urged on by the looks of his comrades, and slapping on the shoulder; ‘be more companionable and communicative. Be more the gentleman in this good company. There are tales among us that you have sold yourself to the devil, and I know not what.’ ‘We all have, have we not?’ returned the stranger, looking up. (BR: 181)

Rudge answers this last question with another rhetorical question, allowing us to speculate as to what his real answer may be. Arguably, his hidden answer is that he is

one of three earthly manifestations of the Devil himself. Later, when he confronts Mary Rudge, whom he searches for, he warns her,

Hear me [...] I, that in the form of a man live the life of a hunted beast; that in the body am a spirit, a ghost upon the earth, a thing from which all creatures shrink, save those curst being of another world, who will not leave me; - I am, in my desperation of this night, past all fear but that of the hell in which I exist from day to day. (BR: 185)

Later still, during the riots, when Barnaby is imprisoned, the now one armed Joe Willet, under the pseudonym 'Tom Green', talks with the sergeant as they guard the prisoners, although Joe is unaware that Barnaby and Hugh are among the prisoners. Joe comments upon the riots, saying, 'it makes a man sorrowful to come back to old England, and see her in this condition'. The sergeant replies 'I suppose the pigs will join 'em next [...] now that the birds set 'em the example'. Joe does not understand, and the sergeant says by way of explanation, 'Go to the guard-house, and see. You'll find a bird there, that's got their cry as pat as any of 'em, and bawls "No Popery," like a man – or like a devil, as he says he is. I shouldn't wonder. The devil's loose in London somewhere' (BR: 530). Rudge's true identity is fully revealed when the narrator describes him in the prison. Just as the vagabonds and criminal underclass shrank away from him in the dark streets of London, so the prisoners shrink away in appalled fear. The narrator says, 'In all the crime and vice and moral gloom of the great pest-house of the capital, he stood alone, marked and singled out by his great guilt, a Lucifer among the devils' (BR: 585). Yet, this Lucifer is only one of many Lucifers, the others being John Chester, and Grip the raven who, though proclaiming

himself to be a devil, indirectly metamorphoses into another Lucifer, and frightens Barnaby.

Like Harold Skimpole in *Bleak House*, Barnaby is a child in an adult body. As Mr Jarndyce says of Skimpole, ‘I don’t mean literally a child, [...] not a child in years. He is grown up – he is at least as grown up as I am – but in simplicity, and freshness, and enthusiasm, and a fine guileless inaptitude for all worldly affairs, he is a perfect child’^{vi}. Later Mr Jarndyce says, ‘he had more the appearance, in all respects, of a damaged young man, than a well preserved elderly one’ (BH: 89). Yet while Skimpole is an amateur musician and artist, Barnaby lives solely for and in his imagination. That imagination, which in one sense is both the cause and symptom of his ‘idiocy’, turns against him, when Grip, transformed into a shadow, materialises as a demonic figure.

The word idiot is etymologically rooted in the Greek ‘idios’ meaning isolated from the world and thus without knowledge. We see Barnaby’s imagination merge with the real world when Barnaby discovers the wounded and robbed Edward Chester. Gabriel takes Edward back to the house of Barnaby’s mother, Mary Rudge. When Gabriel is inside the house, he asks aloud, “‘Is that Barnaby outside there?’” “‘Ay!’” he cried, looking and nodding. “‘Sure enough its Barnaby - how did you guess?’” “‘By your shadow,’” said the locksmith.’ (*Barnaby Rudge*: 94). Barnaby’s shadow is arguably an ethereal manifestation of Grip, who we are often reminded by Grip is ‘a devil’, for just as Barnaby says, much later, “‘He’s my brother, Grip is – always with me – always talking – always merry – eh Grip?’” (*Barnaby Rudge*: 520), so Barnaby says of his shadow, “‘He’s a merry fellow, that shadow, and keeps close to me, though I *am* silly” (BR: 94). Yet, as Barnaby continues to describe the shadow, we see that it is

not simply one of the devils, a servant of Lucifer, but that Grip is again a manifestation of Lucifer:

We have such pranks, such walks, such runs, such gambols on the grass! Sometimes he'll be half as tall as a church steeple, and sometimes no bigger than a dwarf. Now, he goes on before, and now behind, and anon he'll be stealing on, on this side, or on that, stopping whenever I stop, and thinking I can't see him, though I have my eye upon him sharp enough. Oh! he's a merry fellow. (BR: 94)

The playful shadow that Barnaby describes, changes shape, from the diminutive stature of a dwarf to the height of a church steeple, suggesting that in his dwarfish state, Lucifer appears as Grip the raven, the 'devil', but in his giant state, becomes a much more malevolent force. Barnaby says,

'There have been great faces coming and going – close to my face, and then a mile away – low places to creep through, whether I would or no – high churches to fall down from – strange creatures crowded up together neck and heels, to sit upon the bed- that's sleep, eh?' 'Dreams, Barnaby, dreams,' said the locksmith. 'Dreams!' he echoed softly, drawing closer to him. 'Those are not dreams!' 'What are,' replied the locksmith, 'if they are not?' 'I dreamed,' said Barnaby, passing his arm through Varden's, and peering close into his face as he answered in a whisper, 'I dreamed just now that something – it was in the shape of a man – followed me – came softly after me – wouldn't let me be – but was always hiding and crouching, like a cat in dark corners, waiting till I should pass; when it crept out and came softly after me'. (BR: 95)

Just as the two dimensional shadow is described as having a three dimensional height, which it can alter from that of a dwarf to that of a church steeple, so the many faces that haunt Barnaby are sometimes close to him, sometimes a mile away, implying that the shadow has become the strange faces. These faces then take ‘the shape of a man’ that is likened to a ‘cat in dark corners’. Barnaby tells Gabriel that in the dream, he runs faster than Gabriel had ever seen him run in reality, but paradoxically, merges dream with reality when he says ‘I ran faster – leaped – sprung out of bed, and to the window - and there, in the street below – but he is waiting for us. Are you coming?’” Gabriel asks ““What in the street below, Barnaby?” [...] imagining that he traced some connection between the vision and what had actually occurred’ (BR: 95). Barnaby, however, does not go out into the street, but goes upstairs to the recuperating Edward. This suggests that Barnaby unconsciously associates the living shadow, spectral faces, and bestial man, not only with Grip ‘the devil’, but also indirectly with Edward, the victim of Rudge the ‘Lucifer among devils’, and the son of Sir John, the third manifestation of Lucifer.

In Hablot K Browne’s illustration, which depicts Sir John lying down on a sofa, talking to his standing son, Sir John’s wig is shaped so that he appears to almost have two horns sprouting from his head. This, together with his sharp nose, sharp chin, and cruel smile, suggest that there is something devilish about him. Ironically, however, we see in the background, a painting hanging on the wall, which depicts a Biblical-looking figure about to plunge a knife into a younger man, who lies on a table (BR: 310). This is a reference to the Old Testament story of Abraham who is asked by God to prove his faith by sacrificially stabbing and burning the body of his son, Isaac. In the rest of the story, just as Abraham is about to kill his son, an angel appears and ‘stayed Abraham’s hand, saying, “Now I know that you are a God-fearing man. You

have not withheld from me your son". Abraham raised his eyes and saw a ram caught in a thicket which he sacrificed instead' (Hall: 2, 3). Sir John's wig has the appearance of being two horns, sprouting from either side of his head. In one sense, this gives Sir John a devilish appearance, but in another sense, it implies that he is also the sacrificial ram.

Just as Gabriel's angelic name, and the wooden key outside his forge, allow us to compare him with the angel with the key to Hell, so Gabriel is also comparable to the angel that intervenes to prevent the sacrifice of Isaac. In a bid to save Hugh from the gallows, following the riots, Gabriel confronts Mr Chester with the truth that he is Hugh's father, and that Hugh was born illegitimately to a gypsy woman with whom Chester had had a brief affair. Mr Chester says to Gabriel, 'my dear, good-natured, estimable Mr Varden – with whom I cannot be angry if I would' suggesting that he is unconcerned with what Gabriel has to say (BR: 679). Yet when Gabriel departs, the narrator tells us that 'Sir John's face changed; and the smile gave place to a haggard and anxious expression, like that of a weary actor jaded by the performance of a difficult part' (BR: 680).

Just as Gabriel Varden's wooden key 'swung to and fro with a mournful creaking noise, as if complaining that it had nothing to unlock', so the key finally does find something to unlock, symbolically, when Gabriel unlocks the surface identity of Sir John (BR: 77). However, in unlocking the secret identity of Sir John, and pulling away the mask from the actor, while at the same time unlocking the mystery of Hugh's parentage, in the attempt to save Hugh from hanging, he arguably gives Sir John a reason for not intervening on Hugh's behalf. In order to keep secret his relationship to Hugh, he allows Hugh to die at the gallows. In effect, Gabriel's symbolic roles of throwing the anti-Christ into Hell, and staying the sacrifice of the

son in favour of the sacrifice of the ram, is displaced, and reversed, so that it is the son who is cast into Hell, and the son who is sacrificed by the ram-like Sir John with his horn shaped wig.

In a strange sequence of cause and effect, as a consequence of Sir John not saving Hugh, Gabriel also unlocks the religious side of Hugh, who altruistically pleads for Barnaby's life. As the narrator says, 'There was, for the moment, something kind, and even tender, struggling in his fierce aspect, as he wrung his poor companion by the hand'. Yet just as he prays to a forgiving God to save Barnaby, saying, "'You see what I am – more brute than man, as I have been often told – but I had faith enough to believe, and did believe as strongly as any of you gentlemen can believe anything, that this one life would be spared. See what he is! – Look at him!'" (BR: 695) so, before being taken to the gallows, he prays to a vengeful God, to avenge the father who had betrayed his mother, and him:

'If this was not faith, and strong belief!' cried Hugh, raising his right arm aloft, and looking upward like a savage prophet whom the near approach of Death had filled with inspiration, 'where are they! What else should teach me – me, born as I was born, and reared as I have been reared – to hope for any mercy in this hardened, cruel, unrelenting place! Upon these human shambles, I, who never raised this hand in prayer till now, call down the wrath of God! On that black tree, of which I am the ripened fruit, I do invoke the curse of all its victims, past, and present, and to come. On the head of that man, who, in his conscience, owns me for his son, I leave the wish that he may never sicken on his bed of down, but die a violent death as I do now, and have the night-wind for his only mourner. To this I say, Amen, amen!' (BR: 695)

Hugh's vengeful prayer is answered when Geoffrey Haredale is drawn into a duel with Sir John. With Emma Haredale and Edward Chester married, Geoffrey Haredale pays one last visit to the ruins of his home, the Warren. Arriving in London, he stays at the coach Inn, but his sleep is interrupted by the half-conscious, half-unconscious perception of being haunted by some nameless, demonic spirit, which has haunted him before. In what is an almost perfect description of what Freud would later define as the uncanny, the narrator says,

Such conditions of the mind as that to which he was prey when he lay down to rest, are favourable to the growth of disordered fancies, and uneasy visions. He knew this, even in the horror with which he started from his first sleep, and threw up the window to dispel it by the presence of some object, beyond the room, which had not been, as it were, the witness of his dream. But it was not a new terror of the night; it had been present to him before, in many shapes; it had haunted him in bygone times, and visited his pillow again and again. If it had been but an ugly object, a childish spectre, haunting his sleep, its return, in its old form, might have awakened a momentary sensation of fear, which, almost in the act of waking, would have passed away. This disquiet, however, lingered about him and would yield to nothing. When he closed his eyes again, he felt it hovering near; as he slowly sunk into a slumber, he was conscious of its gathering strength and purpose, and gradually assuming its recent shape; when he sprang up from his bed, the same phantom vanished from his heated brain, and left him filled with a dread against which reason and waking thought were powerless. (BR: 723)

The return of the phantom to Haredale's consciousness, anticipates his confrontation with Sir John, the following day, with the implication that Sir John is the demonic phantom, which takes human form, as Hablot K Browne's illustration of Sir John's horn-like wig suggests.

When Haredale visits his old home, the Warren, he sees Sir John leaning against a tree, ironically reflecting Hugh's description of himself as the 'ripened fruit' of that 'black tree'. Hugh's metaphorical description of himself is followed by the literal description of the curse he calls in God's name upon 'that man, who, in his conscience, owns me for his son' (BR: 695). The implication is that Hugh compares his father, Sir John, to the 'black tree', in effect treating the 'black tree' as a metaphorical sign, which refers to him. Moreover, the 'black tree' could also represent an amalgam of the 'signifiers', which stand near and hang outside the Maypole Inn and the Black Lion Inn, respectively. The Ash tree and the black lion combine to form the 'black tree', as if functioning as the signifier of Sir John, against which, he ironically rests.

In their first encounter of the novel, Haredale says, 'You are a smooth man of the world, sir, and at such play have me at a disadvantage. The very last man on this earth with whom I would enter the lists to combat with gentle compliments and masked faces is Mr Chester, I do assure you. I am not his match at such weapons, and have reason to believe that few men are' (BR: 144). Ironically contrasting this, however, Haredale and Sir John fight with swords and in this combat Haredale has Sir John at a disadvantage. Yet, as if also psychologically wounded by Haredale's sword, Sir John 'dropped his mask', earlier described by Haredale as one of Sir John's weapons. Without his mask, he 'showed his hatred in his face' (BR: 729). Yet, Haredale, as if unconsciously aware of the advantage he now has, pleads with Sir John not to fight

with him on this night, saying ‘although you tear me from my better angel, I implore you not to come within the reach of my sword to-night. Oh! Why were you here at all! Why have we met! To-morrow would have cast us far apart for ever!’ (BR: 729). Sir John, in one sense, divides Haredale from his ‘better angel’, implying that while Sir John had a ‘smooth’ mask, which he presented to the world, Haredale, beneath his rough exterior, has a ‘better angel’ which Sir John tears away from him. Ironically, it is by separating Haredale from his better angel, that Haredale’s implied inner demon is unleashed, as if giving Hugh, the son of Lucifer, the freedom he had lost, and fulfils Hugh’s prayer, by killing Sir John. At the same time, this fulfils Haredale’s wish that they be cast apart forever, although not in the manner Haredale had intended. We find that these three manifestations of the fallen Angel Lucifer: Grip, Rudge, and Sir John, are all separated from their signifier or signified in their own respective ways. Grip is separated from Barnaby, and replaced by a shadow, which functions as a signifier of Barnaby, with the implication that Grip is also a signifier of Barnaby, and that Barnaby is the referent. Yet, this signifying shadow, like Grip, has a will of its own, growing from the small to the gigantic, and eventually metamorphosing into sinister faces, and then a daemonic man-like creature, that frightens Barnaby: at an unconscious level, the father, Rudge, that Barnaby should but in his naivety does not fear.

Conversely, Rudge is separated from his signifier, his name, firstly in the sense that he creates the illusion that he has been killed, and must exist as a nameless stranger, with his signifier only kept alive in Solomon’s story, and secondly in the sense that he is, in John Willet’s imagination, separated from his coffin with his name on the side, ironically reflecting Rudge’s reading of Gabriel Varden’s name on the side of the locksmith’s cart. Sir John is separated from his signifier in the sense that

he is reduced by Gabriel to being a tired actor whose mask begins to slip, and in his duel with Haredale, the mask falls away completely. Moreover, in dying, Sir John is separated from the black tree, which seems to serve as an ironic signifier that combines the Ash tree and the Black Lion signifiers of the two Inns. In this trinity of Lucifers we see in each case, the signifier separated from the person it refers to. However, while the split or empty signifier is associated with Catholicism, Dickens creates a trinity of Protestant Lucifers who in Grip's case, is an empty signifier, and in Rudge and Sir John's cases, are separated from what become their empty signifiers.

The further irony in having three Protestant Lucifers is that the three Lucifers form part of an apocryphal, and by association, medieval Catholic and Gothic subtext that tells of the Apocalypse visited upon London. In the apocryphal and apocalyptic subtext, we read a story in which Lucifer listens to a tale told by King Solomon, who, through his many foreign wives and concubines, began to worship 'false' idols bringing about the division of the Kingdom of Israel. Solomon tells him of a rationally explained experience of the supernatural. Lucifer is sceptical not of the supernatural element, but of the rational explanation. He leaves King Solomon, and is confronted by the Archangel Gabriel who does not quite recognise him. Later, however, he unmasks another manifestation of Lucifer in an attempt to rescue Lucifer's son, but to no avail. Like Abraham who was willing to sacrifice his son Isaac at God's command, Lucifer sacrifices his son despite the pleas of Gabriel. This leads Lucifer's son to pray to God that his father suffer a terrible death. This prayer later comes true when Lucifer, at one point taking the form of a demonic phantom that haunts Geoffrey Haredale, manifests in its earthly form as Sir John, and engages Haredale in a duel, only to be killed.

This is paralleled by Gabriel's capture, and imprisonment of the Lucifer he had first encountered. At the same time, however, Lucifer manifests as a devil (Grip the raven), which becomes a shadow, then a number of menacing faces, and then a daemonic man-shaped creature that crouches in dark corners like a cat, which Barnaby tells Gabriel of, and in so doing, exorcises. While the first Lucifer is captured by Gabriel, and destroyed by men, and Gabriel unmasks the second Lucifer, later destroyed by Geoffrey Haredale so the third is merely reduced to its diminutive form of Grip the raven. By showing us three manifestations of Lucifer, in a sense, daemonic possessions of mortal beings, Dickens implicitly suggests that they function as signifiers of a divine being that exists beyond the realm of human existence, language, and understanding.

Thus it seems fitting that Gabriel, both as the divine Archangel Gabriel, and the mortal Gabriel, a locksmith, should have as one of his symbols, a yellow painted wooden key that hangs outside his locksmith's forge, for this alludes to the New Testament Book of John, written at the end of the first century AD, which foretells of the Apocalypse, a prophecy which has its roots in the Old Testament prophecy of an Apocalypse, in the Book of Daniel, written in the second century BC. The Apocalypse will bring about 'the destruction of the wicked, the overthrow of Satan and the establishment of Christ's kingdom on earth, the "New Jerusalem"' (Hall: 23). In one of the Apocalyptic visions, 'An angel with the key of Hell and a chain seized the dragon, 'that serpent of old', chained him and threw him into a pit for a thousand years' (Hall: 25). The dragon represented various things throughout the centuries, but most pertinently, 'to Catholics at the time of the reformation it stood for Protestant heresy, while Lutherans made it a symbol of the corrupt papacy' (Hall: 23). Gabriel has the key with which Lucifer, a signifier both of the real Lucifer and of Protestant

extremism, can be symbolically cast into the fires of Hell. The key, in being made of wood, but painted yellow to mimic the colour of gold, is in a sense, an ‘idolatrous’ symbol of Catholicism: an empty signifier that only has meaning for as long as it is invested with meaning through religious belief, with which Gabriel helps destroy Lucifer. Yet, in a final paradoxical twist, Dickens’ apocryphal medieval story itself is dependent on the reader’s belief. While the Victorian reader would have believed in the ‘characters’ of Dickens’ story, Gabriel, Solomon, and the Devil, Dickens shows the reader that while medieval Protestantism replaced Catholic images with words, those words are as much signifiers as the images, and potentially just as apocryphal, and no closer to the thing they signify than the image.

Ironically, the Protestant leader of the anti-Catholic rioters, Lord George Gordon, converts to Judaism also as a means of distancing himself from the conflict between the Roman Catholic use of images and icons to communicate the teachings of the Bible to the illiterate, forgetful, and uninspired, and the Protestant turning away from the use of religious imagery as symbols of the idolatry some people engaged in as a consequence of the use of images, and as symbols of the Catholic Church hierarchy that separated man from God. While the real Lord Gordon converted to Judaism in the belief that this would speed up the coming of the Apocalypse^{vii}, Dickens’ ‘Lord Gordon’, brings about this Apocalypse, only to unconsciously flee from the religious intolerance and division within the Christian Church. Gordon’s secretary, Gashford, wakes him from his sleep, only for Gordon to ask, as if still dreaming,

‘You’re not a Jew then?’ ‘A Jew!’ exclaimed the pious secretary, recoiling. ‘I dreamed that we were Jews, Gashford. You and I – both of us – Jews with long beards.’ ‘Heaven forbid, my lord! We might as well be Papists.’ ‘I suppose we might,’ returned the other, very quickly. ‘Eh? You really think

so, Gashford?’ ‘Surely I do,’ the secretary cried, with looks of great surprise. ‘Humph!’ he muttered. ‘Yes, that seems reasonable.’ ‘I hope my lord –’ the secretary began. ‘Hope!’ he echoed, interrupting him. ‘Why do you say, you hope? There’s no harm in thinking such things.’ ‘Not in dreams’ returned the secretary. ‘In dreams! No, nor waking either’. (BR: 349)

Within the novel, Judaism represents more than simply the religion to which Lord Gordon converted. The character Lord Gordon unconsciously escapes the signifiatory, theological, and psychological conflict that he promotes in others, by turning to Judaism. While Protestants and Roman Catholics come into conflict over the signified concept of God, and the signifying image of God and others, how the individual should worship and connect with God, and the danger of idolatrous worshipping of the signifier rather than the thing it refers to, Judaism conversely transcends the problem, through the worship of the Old Testament God whose name, YHWH, traditionally, is never spoken. Lord Gordon unconsciously chooses the Judaic God who, as Solomon Nigosian puts it, is ‘an Absolute, Immutable Being, but beyond human comprehension’ (*Judaism*: p.19). In a sense, Lord Gordon searches for a God who is beyond language, beyond the Word, and beyond these conflicting interpretations.

While Lord Gordon unconsciously finds an escape through the Jewish understanding of God, this is contrasted, ironically, by the Jews of Whitechapel, who escape the conflict by writing upon their ‘doors or window-shutters, “This House is a True Protestant”’ (BR: 168). The statement written on the doors and window-shutters, on the one hand, suggests that its writer is not entirely familiar with the English language. At the same time, the statement, read literally, denotes that the house, in an

anthropomorphic sense, is a Protestant, paralleling the anthropomorphic description of the Maypole Inn, which, however, is destroyed during the riots. The narrator says of the Maypole Inn:

The old house looked as if it were nodding in its sleep. Indeed, it seemed no very great stretch of fancy to detect in it other resemblances of humanity. The bricks of which it was built had originally been a deep dark red, but had grown yellow and discoloured like an old man's skin; the sturdy timbers had decayed like teeth; and here and there the ivy, like a warm garment to comfort it in its age, wrapt its green leaves closely round the time-worn walls.

(BR: 44)

Despite John Willet's implied preference for the Protestant object / signified over the Roman Catholic signifier, the subtleties of these distinctions are lost on the rioting mob, which ransacks the Maypole Inn, whilst ignoring its signifier, the Ash tree. In other words, their anti-Catholic fury should have been vented at the signifying tree, not the signified Inn. Conversely, the Jews of Whitechapel avoid the violence of the mob, by ironically using the signifier 'Protestant' to show that their houses are Protestant, despite the fact that behind the signifier 'Protestant', they are in fact Jewish. This is all the more ironic, for Lord Gordon, the leader of Protestants, is consciously Protestant, but as his dream suggests, unconsciously Jewish.

Divided between a desire to be at the heart of Protestant anti-Catholic anarchy, and the desire to stand outside the Christian conflict with itself, Lord Gordon escapes from this conflict between two Gods, through the original God, YHWH, who exists beyond human language and human comprehension. Yet, by converting to Judaism, as a means of bringing about the Apocalypse, he provokes the fallen Angel, Lucifer, who

like God, exists beyond human language and human comprehension. This separation of the signifier from its referent, be it the signified mental concept, or the object; its association with largely daemonic figures; and its association with forgery and the forge, in particular through Gabriel's 'golden key' which hangs outside the forge, allow us to think of Dickens' signifier, separated from its signified meaning and / or its object, as a form of double, a forgery, which as Nick Groom says 'has no actual original source; it conjures the illusion of a source', doing so in order to disguise its own arbitrariness (Groom: 16). While we could in a broader sense, apply this to any text, it is of particular relevance to Dickens' *Barnaby Rudge*, because Dickens self-consciously draws attention to the relationship between the signifier, its accompanying theological signified, and what Dickens recognised without naming, as being the castration and Oedipus complex.

In Freud's study of a medieval, historically Gothic text, 'A Seventeenth Century Demonological Neurosis', he develops his theory that God and Satan are psychologically rooted in the imago of the father, divided between the ego ideal and the castration threat, and the Oedipus complex. While Freud's essay engages with a Gothic text, in the sense that it analyses an historically Gothic manuscript, Robert J C Young argues in 'Freud's secret: *The Interpretation of Dreams* was a Gothic novel', that certain characteristics of Freud's writing, evidenced in particular in *The Interpretation*, can be described as being 'Gothic' in style. Young ironically compares Freud's writing to those fin de siecle novels such as Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, Henry James' *The Turn of the Screw*, and Bram Stoker's *Dracula*.

However, Young does not argue that Freud wrote in the style of the Victorian Gothic of the nineteenth century, but rather makes the audacious but unconvincing

claim that *The Interpretation* and indeed ‘A Seventeenth Century Demonological Neurosis’ are late nineteenth century works of Colonial ‘Gothic’ fiction. To arrive at this conclusion, Young attempts to undermine Freud’s scientific and academic credibility. He argues that ‘Scholars continue to ask [...] how a small-time, apparently pedestrian doctor could have conjured up the extraordinary range of literary and imaginative resources to write a work such as *The Interpretation of Dreams* and to have won the Goethe Prize for literature’^{viii}. However, we are not told who these ‘scholars’ are, and while Freud does himself say he, ‘had no particular partiality for the position and activity of a physician in those early years, nor, by the way, later’ he adds to this saying ‘Rather, I was moved by a sort of greed for knowledge’ (Breger: 48).

This is reflected in the fact that as a boy, Freud was accepted into the Sperl Gymnasium (high school) in Leopoldstadt aged nine, when the entrance age was ten. While at the Gymnasium, Freud was an excellent student, and learned Latin, Greek, French, English, and later Italian and Spanish, in addition to the Hebrew, which Freud read, and German, which he spoke as his mother tongue (Breger: 30). At school, language and literature were Freud’s great passions, and indeed in his graduation examination, Freud translated Sophocles’ *Oedipus Rex* from Greek into German. Freud then entered the University of Vienna. In his third year, he began working in Carl Claus’ Institute of Comparative Anatomy, and through his research into the gonadal structure of eels, had his work published (Breger: 49). His ‘greed for knowledge’ is also reflected in the fact that the university, with his mentor Ernst Brucke’s support, later awarded him a travel bursary to allow him to study under Jean Martin Charcot in 1885, who in the nineteenth century was one of Europe’s foremost neurologists.

Young then attempts to discredit Freud by questioning whether he was in fact the author of *The Interpretation*. Just as he refers to unnamed scholars to support his argument, so he tells us ‘Some have argued that not only was *The Interpretation of Dreams* a hoax, but that ‘Sigmund Freud’ was itself a pseudonym’ (Young: 208). Young points to *A Young Girl’s Diary*, edited by Dr Hermine Hug- Hellmuth, and prefaced by Freud, and says ‘some suggested that the diary was in fact written by Dr Hug-Hellmuth herself, or even Freud’ (Young: 209). Young also makes the point that when *The Interpretation* was first published, ‘some conjectured that it might have been written by the well-known French psychologist Michel Foucault’ (Young: 209, 210). Young then speculates that it was the author Arthur Schnitzler who wrote *The Interpretation*, saying, ‘Some have speculated that while he published his fictional work, famous for challenging contemporary bourgeois morality, under his own name, he published his “psychological” literary texts under the name of his contemporary – Sigmund Freud – a practice in which Dr Freud was allegedly happy to collude in’ (Young: 210). Yet, this speculation, for which Young admits there is ‘no absolutely conclusive evidence to substantiate it’ is made all the more unsubstantial by the fact that the speculations are attributed to unspecified ‘scholars’ and an unnamed speculating ‘Some’. Without any specific sources, Young’s criticisms become something of a forgery themselves, predicated on an illusion of origin.

Having attempted to discredit Freud as a scientist, psychoanalyst and writer, Young goes on to argue that Freud’s oeuvre is composed of Gothic novels and short stories. Young points to Freud’s ‘so-called “case-histories”’ and their ‘clearly fictitious, novelistic nature’, drawing attention to Freud’s ‘disavowal of any literary dimension or pretension’ to his case histories, which Young asserts is ‘wholly typical of the Gothic narrator, and thus immediately betrays its literary provenance’ (Young:

212). As the essay progresses, however, we are allowed to ‘discover’, ironically casting the implied reader in the role of the colonialist explorer, that Young is not concerned with the Gothic, but with the Imperial or Colonial Gothic. Young makes the point that while

in the nineteenth century, it has been suggested, the Gothic moved away from romance into the realm of science fiction [...] Patrick Brantlinger has argued, the earlier romance form was not obliterated but simply displaced – into the ‘imperial Gothic’ of colonial fiction [...] The links between the imperial fiction and psychoanalytic narration are clear: in Anne McClintock’s words, ‘true to the trope of anachronistic space, the journey into the interior is, like almost all colonial journeys, figured as a journey forward in space but backward in time’. (Young: 226)

Young argues that *The Interpretation* is a Gothic novel, so that he can covertly argue that *The Interpretation* and indeed ‘A Seventeenth Century Demonological Neurosis’, are imperial, colonialist texts.

Whether one is convinced by Young’s entire argument, comes down to one’s perspective, be it psychoanalytic or post-colonial. From a psychoanalytic perspective, there is no contradiction in finding the double, or Dickens’ influence, both symptomatic of a repressed Oedipus complex, in Freud’s psychoanalytic writing, anymore than in finding a repressed Oedipus complex in Dickens’ novels. Nor, indeed, is there anything contradictory in finding that through the process of counter-transference, Freud unconsciously brings his identification with Dickens into the psychoanalytic session. From a post-colonial perspective, however, there does seem to be something of a contradiction in Young’s colonialist gesture of clandestinely

invading the territory of the Freudian text, under the guise of the 'Gothic', only to claim it for post-colonial theory. Young's essay in this respect should have been titled 'Freud's Secret: The Interpretation of Dreams was a Colonialist Novel'.

Young's attempt to appropriate Freud's writing into the Imperial Gothic is further problematised by the fact that he relies unquestioningly upon James Strachey's translation of Freud. This is somewhat ironic, given that Young makes reference to Patrick Mahoney, one of the theorists cited by Stanley J Coen in *Between Author and Reader*, as critical of Strachey's translation. In effect, Young's criticism that *The Interpretation* and other writing are a fiction has an element of truth, in so far as Strachey did much to change what Freud had written, through his translation of the original German into English. Yet, because of this, Young's attempt to appropriate Freud's writing into the colonial genre is an unwitting attempt to appropriate Strachey's translation of Freud.

Perhaps the most important thing Young does not consider, is that 'Gothic' writers such as Horace Walpole, in the eighteenth century, and Sheridan Le Fanu in the nineteenth century (who was influenced by Charles Dickens) make their fictional writing as close as possible to the genuine article. Just as Walpole presented *The Castle of Otranto* as a genuine medieval manuscript describing supernatural events, Sheridan Le Fanu's *In a Glass Darkly* is presented as a collection of scientific case histories of uncanny experiences, researched and compiled by the German metaphysical physician, Dr Martin Hesselius^{ix}. In Robert Tracy's introduction to *In a Glass Darkly*, he points to the influence that Dickens had upon Le Fanu, in adopting a sceptical narrative perspective upon the strange and supernatural not to diminish the sense of the frightening and the uncanny, but in fact to enhance it. Tracy writes:

Though *Melmoth the Wanderer* (1820), by the Dublin clergyman Charles Robert Maturin, enjoyed considerable popularity, the tale of terror as developed by Walpole and his successors had already ceased to attract many readers. Sir Walter Scott used the supernatural sparingly. By the 1830s it was clear that the writer of supernatural fiction needed a new method. Charles Dickens and Le Fanu seem to have discovered that method independently, at about the same time, though Dickens has priority. But the Irish novelist realized that Dickens's sceptical narration could be used not to undermine a supernatural story but to enhance it, to make it more mysterious and perhaps more terrifying. (*In a Glass Darkly*: viii)

We see this at work in *Barnaby Rudge* in Solomon Daisy's narration of his own ghost story, where the memory of childhood ghost stories represent the stimulus for his seeing the ghost of the old man, while the sound of the corpse bell is explained the next day, as being the last sound to be made by the murdered Reuben Haredale. The effect is to point to the mind as the source of the supernatural experience, a precursory understanding of what Freud defines as the uncanny experience, as discussed in Chapter One. However, the narrator in *Barnaby Rudge* also colludes in the supernatural aspect of the novel, through a narrative description of Grip, the raven's thoughts, feelings, and actions that does not once question the reality of this talking bird that proclaims itself to be a devil.

Yet, at these moments, arguably, the narrator enters into Barnaby's world, only to leave it again, so that the narrator is able to switch between being a sceptical narrator to being a narrator that suspends his / her disbelief. Through the use of a sceptical, rational, and / or scientific perspective upon the supernatural and uncanny, together with the earlier Romanticist Gothic devices of the epistolary novel, and the forgery,

which mimic the real Renaissance manuscript or scientific case history, it is of little surprise that Freud's analysis of an authentic medieval 'case history' of the demonically possessed Christoph Haizmann's in 'A Seventeenth Century Demonological Neurosis' should then have an apparently fictional quality. When literature mimics the scientific, the scientific unavoidably appears to mimic the literary.

The original medieval case history of the demonically possessed Christoph Haizmann, however, is difficult to categorize, for it is not quite imaginative literature, not quite a religious manuscript, and not quite a scientific investigation. Ironically, Freud anticipates that this manuscript describing pacts with the Devil, demonic possession, and persecution by divine figures might be thought of by the sceptical reader as being little more than 'a product of monastic superstition' (*Art and Literature*: 389). Freud however, points out that several clerics helped in the exorcism of the Devil, and that had it been recorded that they too saw the Devil, we would have to assume, among other things, that they had all experienced a collective hallucination. The reason, it would seem, that the Fathers had not recorded that they too had seen the Devil, is that even in this medieval period, in Roman Catholic Bavaria, Haizmann's behaviour was very likely treated as symptomatic of a mental illness.

The psychiatrists Kotaro Otsuka and Akio Sakai argue that Christoph Haizmann's behaviour, and the nature of his hallucinations, and his paintings, which they group under the term 'bizarre', in its dislocation from social norms and religious paradigms of the period, 'may have been regarded as unnatural within the contemporary religious context, and therefore seen as evidence of a pathological mental state'^x. Otsuka and Sakai point out that 'In the medieval period, local convents operated as

hospitals and also served for “those who are mentally ill” (Ackerknecht, 1967). The religious order of the Brothers Hospitallers was established by St John (1495-1550) and still functions as a hospital order. The Rosicrucian Brotherhood has its origin in a pamphlet “Invitation to the Christian Fraternity”, and one of their missions was to save the sick (from a humanitarian perspective). They acknowledge that ‘There is no record that contemporary doctors diagnosed Haizmann with any category of mental disease such as melancholia or mania’, but point out that,

he was not the subject of witch trials either. This might be because he did no harm to others in his social life and was not judged as using harmful magic. It was therefore suggested that Haizmann was treated as one of “those who are mentally ill” according to the religious paradigm in those days and regarded as a person to be saved according to Christian dogma. (Otsuka: 79)

Throughout Europe’s medieval period, the signing of a pact with the Devil was seen as an act of witchcraft. However, Anthony Harris writes in ‘Manifold impieties: The Social Setting’,

Whilst the sorcerer retained control over the demons at his disposal, the witch, whether he or she realised it or not, was completely subservient to the devil. By the orthodox teaching of both the Roman Catholic and Protestant churches the witch was regarded as the victim of the devil, serving his ends but ultimately forfeiting his or her own soul. (*The Renaissance*: 343)

It is perhaps because Haizmann is seen as a victim of the Devil, rather than a servant, that he is treated so well by the priests, who eventually accept him into their Order,

having on two occasions, exorcised the demon. Harris, however, makes the point that ‘for most writers of the period the major interest lay in the cataloguing of the evil deeds – or “maleficia” – real or imaginary that were ascribed to witches, with fewer expressing concern for the fates of the perpetrators of the alleged misdeeds’ (Ibid.). The manuscript describing Haizmann’s pact with the Devil is composed of a ‘coloured title-page representing the scene of the signing of the pact and the scene of the redemption in the chapel of Mariazell’. On the next page, there are eight colour paintings ‘representing the subsequent appearances of the Devil, with a short legend in German attached to each. These pictures are not the originals; they are copies – faithful copies, we are solemnly assured – of the original paintings by Christoph Haizmann’. The main body of the manuscript ‘consists of two pieces of writing: the letter of introduction from the village priest, Leopold Braun of Pottenbrunn, dated 1 September 1677, and the report by the Abbot Franciscus of Mariazell and St Lambert, describing the miraculous cure [...] dated 12 September 1677 [...] and, at the end, an account of the subsequent vicissitudes of the painter, based on inquiries made in the year 1714’ (*Art and Literature*: 388). Reflecting, unconsciously perhaps, the two-part structure of the *Trophaeum* Freud relates Christoph Haizmann’s story in two parts^{xi}.

Following the death of Haizmann’s father, ‘the Devil had approached him and asked him why he was so downcast and sad, and had “promised to help him in every way and to give him support”. Here was a person, therefore, who signed a bond with the Devil in order to be freed from a state of depression’ (*Art and Literature*: 394). The first bond, written in ink, reads, ‘I, Christoph Haizmann, subscribe myself to his Lord as his bounden son till the ninth year. Year 1669’. The second bond, written in blood, reads, ‘Christoph Haizmann. I sign a bond with Satan, to be his bounden son, and in the ninth year to belong to him body and soul’ (*Art and Literature*: 395). Freud

notes with surprise, however, that Haizmann signs a pact with the Devil, not in exchange for something the Devil can give him, but in exchange for something Haizmann can do for the Devil. Freud however, suggests that this ceases to be illogical if we simply reverse the exchange made between the painter and the Devil, so that 'The Devil undertakes to replace the painter's lost father for nine years' (*Art and Literature*: 395).

The Devil first appears, as depicted by Haizmann, in the form of 'an honest elderly citizen with a brown beard, dressed in a red cloak and leaning with his right hand on a stick, with a black dog beside him' (*Art and Literature*: 399). On the second occasion, the Devil 'was naked and misshapen, and had two pairs of female breasts, and every other manifestation of the Devil is subsequently feminized in this way. In one of the hallucinations / paintings, however, the Devil also has 'a large penis ending in a snake', together with horns on his head, bat's wings, a tail, and eagle-clawed feet. In the last painting, the Devil appeared as a dragon (*Art and Literature*: 404, 405). When the Holy Fathers exorcise the demon, Haizmann is relieved of the Devil's torments.

He lives with his sister and her husband in Vienna, but from 11 October 1677 onward suffers from 'fresh attacks, with visions, convulsions, loss of consciousness and painful sensations, and these finally led to his return to Mariazell in May 1678' (*Art and Literature*: 417). The first of these new visions, like the earlier visions of Satan, seems to take the form of an hallucinatory presence, when 'temptation appeared in the form of a finely dressed cavalier, who tried to persuade him to throw away the document attesting his admission to the Brotherhood of the Holy Rosary' (*Ibid.*). In the next vision, however, what Haizmann sees is more like a dream: 'the scene was laid in magnificently decorated hall in which grand gentlemen were dancing with beautiful ladies. The same cavalier who had tempted him before made a

proposal to him connected with painting and promised to give him a handsome sum of money in return' (*Art and Literature*: 418). Haizmann's prayers dispel the vision, but days later, the vision returned:

This time the cavalier sent one of the most beautiful of the ladies who sat at the banqueting table to him to persuade him to join their company, and he had difficulty in defending himself from the temptress. Most terrifying of all, moreover, was the vision which occurred soon after this, He saw a still more magnificent hall, in which there was a 'throne built up of gold pieces'. Cavaliers were standing about awaiting the arrival of their King. The same person who had so often made proposals to him now approached him and summoned him to ascend the throne, for they 'wanted to have him for their King and to honour him for ever'. (Ibid.)

Freud says, however, that there was 'bound to be a revulsion against this', and it took the form of visions of Christ and Mary demanding that he forsake the earthly world of pleasures and 'serve God in the wilderness for six years' (*Art and Literature*: 418). Just as Satan had agreed, in the pact, to serve Haizmann for nine years, so Christ demands that Haizmann serve God for six years.

Freud does not comment on this, but it would suggest that the number six is an inversion of the number nine. Haizmann suffers from convulsions, and admits that nine years earlier, he had signed a pact with the Devil, who had tempted him on nine occasions, and had agreed to serve him for nine years. We have, then, three iterations of the number nine, '999', which arguably represent an inversion of the Number of the Beast '666', although recent archaeological research has found that the true number of the beast was in fact '616'^{xii}. Ironically, however, while the number nine is

associated with Satan, the anti-Christ, its obverse, the number six, is associated with Christ. This in fact supports Freud's theory that 'God and the Devil were originally identical – were a single figure which was later split into two figures with opposite attributes' (*Art and Literature*: 400). As Freud says, Haizmann 'made no sharp distinction between the operations of the Evil spirit and those of the Divine Powers. He had only one description for both: they were manifestations of the Devil' (*Art and Literature*: 423). Reflecting this split in the identity of the Devil as both Christ and Satan, Christ threatens Haizmann for not having followed the first instruction, and takes Haizmann 'down into Hell so that he might be terrified by the fate of the damned' (*Art and Literature*: 418). Christ takes Haizmann into the realm of the anti-Christ.

One important aspect of this divided patriarchal figure that Freud does not consider, is its split gender identity. Not only is this figure divided between representing the castration threat, and the ego ideal that represents an alternative to and protection from the castration threat, this figure is divided in gender between representing the divided father, and representing the divided mother. In one sense, the mother who 'was naked and misshapen, and had two pairs of female breasts', represents the mother punished with castration by the father (*Art and Literature*: 404). In another sense, the Devil with four breasts represents the mother as castration threat. In a third sense, the Devil represents the mother as object of desire. While the mother is depicted as being perverted and misshapen, it is arguably Haizmann's incestuous desire which he perceives to be perverted, misshapen, and unnatural, and which he projects onto the mother.

Haizmann's desire for his mother is later challenged when he would fall into an ecstatic 'absence' each time he had a vision, and in,

the grandest of these ecstasies the figure surrounded by light took him first into a town whose streets people were perpetrating all acts of darkness; and then, in contrast, took him to a lovely meadow in which anchorites were leading a godly life and were receiving tangible evidence of God's grace and care. There then appeared, instead of Christ, the Holy Mother herself, who, reminding him of what she had already done on his behalf, called on him to obey the command of her dear Son. "Since he could not truly resolve so to do", Christ appeared to him again the next day and upbraided him soundly with threats and promises. At last he gave way and made up his mind to leave the world and to do what was required of him. (*Art and Literature*: 418, 419)

In one sense, the 'Holy Mother' asks Haizmann to obey her son, Christ, who commands that he too become an anchorite. However, if we treat this vision as a kind of dream, then according to one of Freud's own methods of dream interpretation, we can simply reverse what has occurred or been said. The Holy Mother commands that Haizmann obey her son, Christ, and 'go into the wilderness' (*Art and Literature*: 420). Not only does Christ in relation to Mary represent Haizmann in relation to his mother, the 'wilderness' symbolically represents the pubic area of the mother's genitalia. By having the Holy Mother make this demand, Haizmann disguises his repressed oedipal desire, and his command to himself that he must enter the wilderness, that is have sexual intercourse with his mother. Moreover, by projecting this desire onto the mother-figure, Haizmann can displace his sense of guilt, thereby avoiding the castratory punishment that he fears. This desire for the mother manifests again, when Haizmann is in St Stephen's Cathedral performing his devotions (prayers), on 26 December. He catches,

sight of a strapping young woman accompanied by a smartly dressed gentleman, he could not fend off the thought that he might himself be in this gentleman's place. This called for punishment, and that very evening it overtook him like a thunderbolt. He saw himself in bright flames and sank down in a swoon. Attempts were made to rouse him but he rolled about in the room till blood flowed from his mouth and nose. He felt that he was surrounded by heat and noisome smells, and he heard a voice say that he had been condemned to this state as a punishment for his vain and idle thoughts. Later he was scourged with ropes by Evil Spirits, and was told that he would be tormented like this everyday until he decided to enter the Order of the Anchorites. (*Art and Literature*: 419)

While it could be said that the 'strapping young woman' represents, not the mother, but women who, were the Oedipus complex destroyed, Haizmann would subsequently turn his attention to, the fact that any desire he expresses for this woman, in the form of his identification with the gentleman, is again met with terrible punishments by Evil Spirits. This punishment, as a symbolic threat of castration, suggests that by association, the 'strapping young woman' represents the mother, his desire for whom is always met with castratory punishment by divine or demonic figures.

Psychoanalysis offers us, paradoxically, a blasphemous interpretation of an apocryphal text. Just as Anthony Harris makes the point that for most priests, there was a greater concern with cataloguing the visions people had, whether in accordance with Christian and Roman Catholic thinking, or not, so this would suggest that Haizmann's seventeenth century priests might also have recorded the events surrounding Haizmann's pact with the Devil, unconcerned with the truth, untruth, or

apocryphal nature of his visions. Had Haizmann seen these visions sixteen centuries earlier, they might have found their way into the New Testament, or at least been included in one of the Apocryphal texts. Yet, in the seventeenth century, the visions of Satan, Christ, and Mary, and paintings by Haizmann are objectively, almost scientifically catalogued by the monks who treat him and later accept him into their Order, suggesting that the religious signifier has both a depth that is found in the past, and an emptiness that is found in the present.

Michael Baxendall points to S. Antonino, Archbishop of Florence, who criticizes the apocryphal painting being produced:

Painters are to be blamed when they paint things contrary to our Faith – when they represent the Trinity as one person with three heads, a monster; or, in the Annunciation, an already formed infant, Jesus, being sent into the Virgin’s womb, as if the body he took on were not of her substance; or when they paint the infant Jesus with a hornbook, even though he never learned from man. But they are not to be praised either when they paint apocryphal matter, like midwives at the Nativity, or the Virgin Mary in her Assumption handing down her girdle to St. Thomas on account of his doubt [...] and so on. Also, to paint curiosities into the stories of Saints and in churches, things that do not serve to arouse devotion but laughter and vain thoughts – monkeys, and dogs chasing hares and so on, or gratuitously elaborate costumes – this I think unnecessary and vain. (*The Renaissance*: 134, 136)

While Antonino wrote this in the fifteenth century AD, Baxendall points out that ‘the complaint is not new or particularly of its time; it is just a Quattrocento version of a stock theologian’s complaint, voiced continually from St. Bernard to the Council of

Trent' (*The Renaissance*: 137). With sanctioned Catholic religious imagery slowly losing its meaning, partly as a result of so much apocryphal religious painting being produced, of which Haizmann's paintings could be included, partly as a result, paradoxically, of the idolatrous worship of religious images, and partly as a result of the Protestant rejection of religious imagery, by the time we reach the late eighteenth century, as we see in Horace Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto*, and as depicted in Charles Dickens' *Barnaby Rudge*, the sign is completely separated from its signified concept, and or the object.

While the emptiness of the religious signifier allows it to be used in the 'Gothic' novel, as a means of entertaining readers with the sublime terror of sorcery, witchcraft, demonic possession, pacts with the devil, and hauntings, once treated as a reality in an earlier medieval Catholic Europe, those religious signifiers, outside the Catholic Church, remained empty. It was only with the advent of Freud's psychoanalytic theory, together with the theories of his colleagues in the Wednesday Society of 1902-1907, later the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, that a new signified meaning can be attached to the religious sign, a psychoanalytic meaning, specifically one which traces the religious signifier, be it of Lucifer, Christ, or Mary, back, to a lesser extent, to the castration complex and to a greater extent to the Oedipus complex.

Just as the double encountered in Dickens' novels and Freud's case histories, has been shown to relate to the Oedipus complex and castration anxiety, so not only can we think of the religious signifier in Dickens' *Barnaby Rudge* and Freud's 'A Seventeenth Century Demonological Neurosis' as a double of the thing it signifies, we see that the double, even at the level of the signifier, is likewise rooted in the Oedipus complex. As a double separated from its religious signified meaning, the

satanic signifier is now given a new psychoanalytic meaning by being traced back to the Oedipus complex, and the son's 'masculine protest' against the threat of castration posed by the father. The 'masculine protest' is a term coined by Alfred Adler, which he uses to refer to the 'longing for power' but which Freud restricts to the boy's protest against the threat of castration, the girl's envy for the penis (which has been revised by Jacques Lacan and others as envy for the phallus as a symbol of power) and the boy's protest against the 'feminisation' that castration would involve. The boy's protest can, as we see in Haizmann's painting of the Devil, take the form a retaliatory feminizing of the father figure, explaining the four breasts adorning the otherwise overtly masculine image of the Devil. Yet, Freud does not consider the possibility that the Devil also represents the mother.

In Freud's case history of *The Wolfman*, the English governess, as the referent behind the image of the wolf that terrifies Sergei Pankejev, is a woman who is both the castration threat and substitute mother. Likewise, in Dickens' *Little Dorrit*, we see Mrs Clennam, the stepmother symbolised by the Etruscan she-wolf, unconsciously threatening her son with castration. While Freud acknowledges that the wolf might be a maternal figure, he does not pursue this, favouring instead an interpretation of the wolf as a patriarchal figure. Yet, this is arguably a denial on Freud's part, of the fact that his mother, whom he unconsciously saw in the figures of Pankejev's English governess, and Dickens' Capitoline Wolf, and the character Mrs Clennam, a denial which we see again in Freud's refusal to consider that the image of the Devil that Haizmann creates, is a condensation of the patriarchal and matriarchal, the castration threat and Oedipus complex.

That the phallic symbols associated with the Devil, a dog, a walking stick, a tail, two eagle claws on his feet, claws on his hands, two bat wings, horns, a serpentine

penis, a pointed tongue, and pointed beard, greatly outnumber the maternal symbols, the four breasts, suggests that the Devil reflects Haizmann's unconscious struggle between the threat of castration, and oedipal desire for his mother. While his father was alive, the castration threat was alive, and any oedipal desire was either destroyed or repressed. With his father's death, however, came the death of the castration threat, allowing his Oedipus complex to express itself again. The only solution for Haizmann was to find a substitute father, in the form of the ultimate expression of castration threat, the Devil himself. Yet, so severe was Haizmann's neurosis that as soon as he consciously expressed any sexual desire, as we see in his identification with the young man escorting the young woman, the castration threat appears, this time in the form of his opposite, Christ, and later as Mary, urging him away from any sexual thoughts. His only cure was a renunciation of sex, and his entrance into the Holy Order of the Fathers who had originally performed the exorcism.

The sign, separated from its old meaning, is used in the Gothic romance of the eighteenth century and early nineteenth century, and indeed, the Victorian Gothic novel, as we see in *Barnaby Rudge*. It is only in Freud's analysis of an historically 'Gothic' text from the late seventeenth century and early eighteenth century, composed of the *Trophaeum Mariano-Cellense*, Haizmann's diary, and copies of Haizmann's demonic paintings, that a new psychoanalytic meaning can be attached to the sign that was once imbued with religious meaning. The signifying names and images of God, Christ, Mary, the Saints, Lucifer, and his fallen angels, separated from their religious meaning, are ascribed a new psychoanalytic meaning, showing them to be rooted in the Oedipus complex, and castration anxiety, with God, Moses, Christ, the patriarchal Saints, and angels, representative of the authoritative but protective Father; Satan and his devils, representative of the Father as castration threat; and

Mary, the angels in their more feminine form, and the female Saints, representative of the Mother as the object of desire. At the same time, we see in the split between the signifier and the signified, the symbolic threat of castration with which the Oedipus complex can be destroyed. In its weakness, however, the castration threat can only repress the Oedipus complex, allowing the desire for the mother to dominate even the most patriarchal of texts.

ⁱ First translated into English by John Purvey in the 15th century AD, and translated into modern English in the 18th century, forming the basis for the Swiss Linguist Ferdinand De Saussure's late 19th / early 20th century structuralist model of signification

ⁱⁱ St. Augustine *On Christian Doctrine* (Indianapolis: The Library of Liberal Arts 1958) p. 11. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

ⁱⁱⁱ V. B. Leitch et al (Ed.) *The Norton Anthology of Critical Theory* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company 2001) p. 186.

^{iv} Michael Baxendall 'Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy' in *The Renaissance in Europe: A Reader* Ed. By Keith Whitlock (New Haven and London: Yale University Press 2000) p. 133. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^v Timothy Clark 'Dickens through Blanchot: a nightmare fascination of a world without interiority' in *Dickens Refigured: Bodies, desires and other histories* Ed. By John Schad (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press 1996). Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{vi} Charles Dickens, *Bleak House* (London: Penguin 1996) p. 87. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{vii} Conversation with Robert Miles.

^{viii} Robert J C Young 'Freud's Secret: *The Interpretation of Dreams was a Gothic Novel*' in *Sigmund Freud's The Interpretation of Dreams: New Interdisciplinary Essays* Ed. By Laura Marcus (Manchester: Manchester University Press 1999) p. 210. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{ix} Sheridan Le Fanu *In a Glass Darkly* (Oxford: Oxford World Classics 1999). Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^x Kotaro Otsuka & Akio Sakai 'Haizmann's Madness: the concept of bizarreness and the diagnosis of schizophrenia' in *History of Psychiatry* Vol. 15 Issue 1 Number 57 March 2004 p. 79

^{xi} On 5 September 1677, the painter Christoph Haizmann, a Bavarian, was brought to Mariazell, with a letter of introduction from the village priest of Pottenbrunn [Leopoldus Braun] (in lower Austria) not far away. The letter states that the man had been staying in Pottenbrunn for some months, pursuing his occupation of painting. On 29 August, while in the church there, he had been seized with frightful convulsions. As these convulsions recurred during the following days, he had been examined by the *Praefectus Domini Pottenbrunnensis* with a view to discovering what it was that was oppressing him and whether perhaps he had entered into illicit traffic with the Evil Spirit. Upon this, the man had admitted that nine years before, when he was in a state of despondency about his art and doubtful whether he could support himself, he had yielded to the Devil, who had tempted him nine times, and that he had given him his bond in writing to belong to him in body and soul after a period of nine years. This period would expire on the twenty-fourth day of the current month. The letter went on to say that the unfortunate man had repented and was convinced that only the grace of the Mother of God at Mariazell could save him, by compelling the Evil One to deliver up the bond, which had been written in blood. For this reason the village priest ventured to recommend *miserum hunc hominem omni auxilio destitutum* ['this wretched man, who was bereft of all help'] to the benevolence of the Fathers of Mariazell [...] After he had undergone a prolonged period of penance and prayer at Mariazell, the Devil appeared to him in the sacred Chapel at midnight on 8 September, the Nativity of the Virgin, in the form of a winged dragon, and gave him back the pact, which was written in blood. We shall learn later, to our surprise, that *two* bonds with the Devil appear in Christoph Haizmann's story – an earlier one, written in black ink, and a later one, written in blood. The one referred to in the description of the scene of exorcism, as can also be seen from the picture on the title-page, is the one written in blood – that is, the later one. [...] the painter suddenly tore himself away from the Fathers who were holding him, rushed into the corner of the Chapel where he saw the apparition, and then returned with the paper in his hand. The miracle was great, and the victory of the Holy Mother over Satan without question. [...] After a short time the painter left Mariazell in the best of health and went to Vienna, where he lived with a married sister. On 11 October fresh attacks began, some of them very severe, and these are reported in the diary until 13 January [1678]. They consisted in visions and *absences*, in which he saw and experienced every kind of thing, in convulsive seizures accompanied by the most painful sensations, on one occasion in paralysis of the legs, and so on. This time, however, it was not the Devil who tormented him; it was by sacred figures that he was vexed – by Christ and by the Blessed Virgin herself. [...] In his diary, indeed, he included these fresh experiences too as manifestations of the Devil; and when, in May 1678, he returned to Mariazell, he complained of *maligni Spiritus magnificationes*

[of 'molestation by the Evil Spirit']. He told the reverend Fathers that his reason for returning was that he had to require the Devil to give him back another, earlier bond, which had been written in ink. This time once more the Blessed Virgin and the pious Fathers helped him to obtain the fulfillment of his request. As to how this came about, however, the report is silent. It merely states shortly: *quâ iuxta votum redditâ* ['when this had been returned in accordance with his prayer'] – he prayed once again and received the pact back. After this he felt quite free and entered the Order of the Brothers Hospitallers. We have occasion yet again to acknowledge that in spite of the obvious purpose of his efforts, the compiler has not been tempted into departing from the veracity required of a case history. For he does not conceal the outcome of the inquiry that was made in 1714 from the Superior of the Monastery of the Brothers Hospitallers [in Vienna] concerning the painter's later history. The Reverend Pater Provincialis reported that Brother Chrysostomus had again been repeatedly tempted by the Evil Spirit, who tried to seduce him into making a fresh pact (though this only happened "when he had drunk somewhat too much wine"). But by the grace of God, it had always been possible to repel these attempts. Brother Chrysostomus had died of a hectic fever 'peacefully and of good comfort' in the year 1700 in the Monastery of the Order, at Neustatt on the Moldau (*Art and Literature*: 386-391).

^{xiii} <http://www.religionnewsblog.com/11134>

CHAPTER THREE

Remembering Dora: reconstructing the Mother

The first ever patient to be treated using psychoanalysis by Freud, was a young woman called Ida Bauer, better known by the pseudonym 'Dora'. Freud tells us that when it came to choosing a pseudonym, this name alone occurred to him. Freud writes, 'One would expect, and I myself did expect, that a whole host of women's names would suggest themselves to me. Instead, only a single name came into my mind: the name *Dora*. I wondered what had determined it. Who else was called Dora?'¹ The signifier 'Dora' in one sense, refers to Freud's patient, Ida Bauer, yet in another sense, is empty, and leads Freud, in *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, to consider the possible reason for his being so compelled to use this name, and where he took the name from. Yet, of the possible sources, Freud forgets one in particular, Charles Dickens' novel *David Copperfield*. He forgets that in his favourite Dickens novel, there was a character called Dora, the doll-like first wife of the hero, David Copperfield.

In this chapter, Steven Marcus's assertion that Freud had taken the name 'Dora' from *David Copperfield* will be elaborated upon both in terms of identifying the problems with the assertion, and in terms of substantiating it. The fact that Freud forgets Dickens when considering where he took the name 'Dora' from, suggests that simply connecting the pseudonym chosen by Freud with the fact that he had read

David Copperfield, not only invites but requires a closer, psychoanalytic analysis in order to substantiate the connection identified by Marcus. This Chapter will argue that Freud forgets the Dickensian origin of the name 'Dora', just as he had omitted much of the detail concerning LG Moberly's 'Inexplicable', because the act of naming his patient Ida Bauer 'Dora' was an attempt to reconstruct the identity of his patient on both a signified and signifying level, into a passive double of his mother, as he had previously done with his wife Martha Bernays, the knowledge of which Freud was then at pains to repress through significant lapses in memory.

When Freud begins to consider the possible origin of the name 'Dora', the first idea that occurs to him is apparently too incredible for him, but he resists the urge to reject it, and deduces that the name might have come from a nanny, called Dora, who took care of his sister Rosa's children. Freud tells us, however that Dora was not her real name. He recalls seeing a letter addressed to a Fräulein Rosa W, and that from this, he,

learned that the nanny Dora was really called Rosa, but had been obliged to change her name on entering the household because my sister is a Rosa too and could have taken the name to mean herself. I said, sympathetically: Poor servants, they can't even keep their own names! My thoughts trailed vaguely away, but I could now easily recall them to my conscious mind. So when next day I was looking for a name for someone *who could not be allowed to keep her own*, only *Dora* sprang to mind. In this instance the fact that it was the sole name to occur to me was based on a strong similarity of content, for in my patient's case history the crucial influence on her course of treatment had also been exerted by someone working in the capacity of a servant in a strange house, this time as a governess. (*The Psychopathology*: 230)

In *The Spectral Mother: Freud, Feminism and Psychoanalysis* Madelon Sprengnether accepts Freud's self-analysis on the origin of the name 'Dora', and argues that the figure of Dora the nurse is a maternal figure in Freud's unconscious imagination. Conversely, she marginalizes, to the point of dismissing, Steven Marcus' claim that Freud took the name from *David Copperfield*. This, in itself, is understandable, given that Marcus does not provide anything other than anecdotal evidence to substantiate his claim. Yet, Sprengnether does not question from where Rosa Freud took the name 'Dora.' Nor indeed does Freud. More importantly, Sprengnether does not consider the significance of the fact that Freud forgets Dickens' *David Copperfield*, despite the fact that Freud ironically theorises in the case history *Dora* and in *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* that forgetting can serve the purpose of repressing certain feelings associated with the thing being forgotten.

In *Dora*, Freud discusses what it means for a patient to forget certain details of their 'story', their 'inability to give an ordered history of their life in so far as it coincides with the history of their illness.'ⁱⁱ He argues that there are three possible reasons for the forgetting of certain facts:

patients consciously and intentionally keep back part of what they ought to tell – things that are perfectly well known to them – because they have not got over their feelings of timidity and shame (or discretion, where what they say concerns other people); this is the share taken by conscious disingenuousness. In the second place, part of the anamnestic knowledge, which the patients have at their disposal at other times, disappears while they are actually telling their story, but without their making any deliberate reservations; the share taken by unconscious disingenuousness. In the third place, there are invariably true amnesias – gaps in the memory into which not

only old recollections but even quite recent ones have fallen – and paramnesias, formed secondarily so as to fill in those gaps. (*Dora*: 10,11)

Given that there is no evidence that Freud ever suffered from amnesia, Freud's lapse in memory would seem to represent a means of 'consciously and intentionally keep[ing] back part of what [he] ought to tell – things that are perfectly well known to [him]' (*Dora*: 10). Two years after the publication of *Dora*, Freud discusses the implications of his forgetting names, in *The Psychopathology*. In the chapter 'Forgetting Proper Names', Freud argues that, 'while proper names are sometimes forgotten for simple reasons, they are also sometimes forgotten for reasons motivated by repression' (*The Psychopathology*: 11). Later, he writes,

When I analyse those instances of forgetting names that I observe in myself, I almost always find that the name which eludes me is related to some subject closely affecting my own person, and able to cause me strong and often painful feelings. According to the felicitous phraseology of the Zurich school (Bleuler, Jung, and Riklin), which I recommend, the phenomenon can be expressed thus: the name eluding me has touched upon some 'personal complex' of mine. (*The Psychopathology*: 25)

That we might think of Freud's forgetting of Dickens' novel, as a means of repressing some 'personal complex' is added to by the fact that many years later, Freud reads a short story called 'Inexplicable', written by Lucy Gertrude Moberly, which shares many similarities with *David Copperfield*, aspects of which were discussed in the previous chapter. Through its similarity to *David Copperfield*, LG Moberly's story not only reminded Freud of the English female first-person character-narrator he had

to 'become' through his reading of the story, the mother he desired, and the wife he transformed into a mother-substitute, but also of his first-ever patient to be treated, and in retrospect unsuccessfully, using psychoanalysis. In naming Ida Bauer 'Dora', Freud unconsciously attempts to reconstruct another passive double of his mother, who is incapable of rejecting him, while casting himself in the role of the David-like hero of the case history, which Steven Marcus calls a 'classical Victorian domestic drama' and a 'late Victorian romance' (Marcus: 45, 47), to which we might also add the description 'oedipal drama'. In considering Freud's reading of *David Copperfield*, and L. G. Moberly's short story, we begin to see that the apparent innocuousness of the name Freud gave his patient, including the initial explanation as to its origin, disguises a depth of unresolved emotions within Freud, relating to his relationship to his mother and father, and to similar conflicts within Dickens, that led him to create the character Dora in the first place.

In a letter written to Wilhelm Fleiss while he was courting Martha Bernays, Freud suggested that what typified Dickens' writing was a creation of psychologically flat female characters: Freud writes,

You must have noticed that all our writers and artists have a "mannerism", a stereotyped series of motives and arrangements which indicates the limits of the art...To these mannerisms belong, in the case of Dickens, those flawless girls, selfless and good, so good they are quite colourless.ⁱⁱⁱ

Yet, Dora's flawlessness is so acute, that it becomes something of a flaw in itself, rendering her less a character, and more a figure, less human, and more automaton-like. In one sense, she lacks the psychological depth or dimension that would allow us to call her a character, and yet as the analogue of David Copperfield, indicated by her

matching initials following her marriage to David, which ironically match those of Charles Dickens, the psychology that she apparently lacks, is instead found in David. We find in David evidence of a repressed Oedipus complex, which not only point to his choice of Dora as a substitute for his mother, but also suggests that in Dora, there is a reciprocal Oedipus complex, which leads her to find in David a father-substitute. As they grow accustomed to life as a married couple, Dora asks David to think of her as his 'Child-wife', saying,

‘I don’t mean, you silly fellow, that you should use the name instead of Dora. I only mean that you should think of me that way. When you are going to be angry with me, say to yourself, ‘it’s only my child-wife!’ When I am very disappointing, say, ‘I knew, a long time ago, that she would make but a child-wife!’ When you miss what I should like to be, and I think can never be, say, “still my foolish child-wife loves me!” For indeed I do’ (DC: 610).

Arguably, by asking David to see her as a child-wife, she not only reveals the fact that she sees him as a father figure, but also reflects back at David, the reality that she represents for him, a substitutive double of his mother. David’s paternal role is further reflected in the pet name she gives him. When Dora becomes irrationally anxious about David’s Aunt Betsy visiting, as if afraid of meeting David’s other mother substitute, she says “No, please don’t bring her!” and gives David ‘a horrified little kiss’. Dora reiterates her plea saying “Don’t. I know she’s a naughty mischief-making old thing! Don’t let her come here, Doady!””. The narrator explains that ‘Doady’ is ‘a corruption of David’ (DC: 568). The nickname ‘Doady’, however, seems more likely to be a corruption of ‘Daddy’, the infantile colloquial term for father. The fact that David considers ‘Doady’ to be a corruption of ‘David’ not only

points to the possibility that he unconsciously perceives Dora to be corrupting him, emotionally, but to the possibility that paralleling this corruption of 'David' and 'Daddy', Dora, on a psychological and signficatory level, is a distorted reflection of the idealized, and thus in its own way distorted, imago of Clara Copperfield, as perceived by David.

The idealised vision of Clara Copperfield is first revealed when David leaves home and makes the long journey to his Great Aunt Betsy in Dover. David says,

I seemed to be sustained and led on by my fanciful picture of my mother in her youth, before I came into the world. It always kept me company. It was there, among the hops, when I lay down to sleep; it was with me on my waking in the morning; it went before me all day...But then, strange to say, when I stood with my ragged shoes, and my dusty, sunburnt, half-clothed figure, in the place so long desired, it seemed to vanish like a dream, and to leave me helpless and dispirited. (DC: 178)

When David returns home for Christmas, he returns to a scene that prefigures Freud's definition of the Oedipus complex and the uncanny. Echoing Dickens' own childhood experience of being sent away from home, only for his father to be imprisoned, as if fate was cruelly thwarting his Oedipal desire to take his father's place, David considers,

what a strange feeling it was to be going home when it was not home, and to find that every object I looked at, reminded me of the happy old home, which was like a dream I could never dream again! The days when my mother and I

and Peggotty were all in all to one another, and there was no one to come between us. (DC: 103)

David returns to the familiar yet unfamiliar home, once the locus of his oedipal desires, saying,

God knows how infantine the memory may have been, that was awakened within me by the sound of my mother's voice in the old parlour, when I set foot in the hall. She was singing in a low tone. I think I must have lain in her arms, and heard her singing so to me when I was but a baby. The strain was new to me, and yet it was so old that it filled my heart brimful; like a friend come back from a long absence. (DC: 104)

This uncanny return of the memory of his mother's song, which he had so long repressed, culminates in the fulfilment of his oedipal desires. David returns to this familiar yet unfamiliar home, to find his mother suckling her new baby on her exposed right breast, as can be seen in Hablot K. Browne's illustration 'Changes at Home', but upon hearing David's approach, they meet half way in the parlour, with the baby still suckling (DC: 105). His mother,

kneeled down upon the ground and kissed me, and laid my head down on her bosom near the little creature that was nestling there, and put its hand up to my lips...Then she kissed me more and more, and clasped me round the neck. This she was doing when Peggotty came running in, and bounced down on the ground beside us, and went mad about us both for a quarter of an hour. (DC: 104)

In an almost physically telepathic sense, the infant suckles on the breast, while touching David's lips, as if, like the flow of an electric current from one body to another, David's lips are able to once again touch his mother's breast. The sense in which this represents the fulfilment of Oedipal desires, is added to by the ambiguity surrounding the identity of who initiates this telepathic connection, for it could be either the child or the mother who 'put its hand up to my lips' (Ibid.). The fulfilment of his Oedipal desires leads David to proclaim 'I wish I had died. I wish I had died then, with that feeling in my heart! I should have been more fit for Heaven than I ever have been since' (DC: 104). Much later, as if aware of the dangerous incestuous feeling in his heart, he says,

The man who reviews his own life, as I do mine, in going on here, from page to page, had need to have been a good man indeed, if he would be spared the sharp consciousness of many talents neglected, many opportunities wasted, many erratic and perverted feelings constantly at war within his breast, and defeating him. (DC: 573)

The 'many perverted feelings' arguably represent in nature, if not name, the Oedipus complex.

This association between home and the Oedipus complex is observed by David E. Musslewhite in his examination of *The Old Curiosity Shop*. Musslewhite observes that in the four principal families in the novel, Nell and her grandfather, the Garland family, Kit and Barbara, and Dick Swiveller and the Marchioness,

they contain an old man obsessed by 'games of chance', a compulsive gambler, that is, prepared to risk his fate on the turn of a card; a hereditary

club foot (the Garlands) which is the mark of an 'Abel' not a nomadic 'Cain'; the production and reproduction of children who are 'exact facsimiles and copies' of their parents' parents' offspring; and finally a Sophronia *Sphynx*, the name chosen for the Marchioness 'as being both euphonius and genteel, and furthermore indicative of mystery' [...] Divination, club foot, confusion of generations, a Sphynx and a mystery: Oedipus no less. (Musslewhite: 193)

Musslewhite presents this as evidence that in *The Old Curiosity Shop*, 'What Dickens seems to be doing in the novel is to promote at one and the same time an ideological myth of the sanctity of the home [...] and the demonology which, later, in the formulation of the Oedipus complex both underwrites and threatens it' (Ibid.). The sanctity and the demonology of the home, in one sense, are embodied in the mother, or rather the mother divided between her identity as the child's maternal protector, and the child's object of desire. In another sense, the sanctity of home, at the centre of which is found the mother, again as both protector and object of desire, is threatened by the demonic father-figure who represents the threat of castration that destroys the Oedipus complex. Yet, ironically, apart from the figure of the Sphynx, the figure of the mother is missing from the families that Musslewhite points to. Although Musslewhite makes a comparison between the novel's families, and Sophocles' tragic hero Oedipus, and at the same time, a comparison between the novel and Freud's theory of the Oedipus complex, it is the mother, and the horror of incest, rather than the unwitting murder of the father, that form the basis of the Oedipus complex.

Like Sabine Prokhoris, who argues that Dickens' novels are littered with castration symbols and themes, Musslewhite focuses on the father who threatens the son. The gambler, who thrives on chance, always runs the risk of losing not only financially in the literal sense, but in the symbolic sense of being castrated. Yet, as someone who

wins, he is the figure who inflicts castration upon the loser. Just as the Biblical figure Cain is marked by God for his transgressions, Abel is 'marked' with a clubfoot, which also functions as a symbol of castration. Kitt and Barbara marry, and have three children Abel, Barbara, and Dick, who are exact copies, in appearance, of their parents, and grandparents. Such a replication connotes the division of the individual, which by definition is, in its original Latin meaning, literally 'indivisible', into one or more copies of the original, the splitting of the self again symbolically representing castration.

And while the Sphynx in one sense is a condensed image of a lion and woman's upper torso, suggesting that the Sphynx represents the mother, the Sphynx is also representative of the castration threat. The female human upper torso represents the mother as object of desire, while the leonine lower half, represents the castration threat. Indeed, the fact that the Sphynx is composed of two halves brought together, again points to a splitting of identity as another symbolic threat of castration. Yet, these symbolic threats of castration are too weak to have any effect on the Oedipus complex that pervades the Dickens text, evidenced by the fact that so many of Dickens' novels focus on the idealised mother-substitute. In Dickens' unconscious mind, if the symbolic threat were potent enough, his Oedipus complex would be destroyed, and he would have no need to use his writing to fulfil his Oedipal desires, as we see occurring in *David Copperfield*.

Following the funeral of David's mother, psychologically murdered by Mr Murdstone and his sister, David again experiences the touching of the lips and the wish for death he had years earlier experienced as a child. In this repetition of the past, however, David switches from having spoken in the past tense, when describing his childhood, to the present tense, in describing the funeral wake. David says, 'Mr

Chillip talks to me; and when we get home, puts some water to my lips; and when I ask his leave to go up to my room, dismisses me with the gentleness of a woman' (DC: 124). The impression created is that Clara reaches out to David through Mr Chillip, from the past into the present. David's implied unconscious awareness of his mother's paradoxical presence and absence faintly echoes his earlier and comparatively more substantial awareness, as a child, of his mother as a spectral figure, who emotionally and psychologically sustained him, as he made his way to Aunt Betsy.

Jacques Lacan argues in his discussion of the psychoanalyst's cure of 'the hysteric', that while the process of transference may seem to satisfy the desires of the patient, this process nevertheless does not address the paradox that the repressed desire can only be sustained as an unsatisfied desire^{iv}. Lacan argues that when that desire had been 'fulfilled' the patient, or other individual, merely displaces that desire onto another object. David's oedipal desire for his mother, in one sense, sustains him. Yet in another sense, David sustains that desire only through his inability to satisfy it, leaving him to displace it. In one sense, this displacement takes the form of his projection of the maternal onto Mr Omer. Later, David's oedipal desires are displaced onto his first wife, the doll-like Dora Spenlow, paralleled by the fact that Dora displaces her own repressed Oedipus complex onto David. Just as Peter Ackroyd argues that all the maternal figures in Dickens' novels serve as substitutes for his mother, so David reinstates in his mother's place, Dora, a doll-like woman who is as psychologically passive as his mother had become under the domination of Mr Murdstone.

Reflecting David's repressed desire for his mother's breast, and the psychological sustenance that the image of his mother provided David on his arduous journey to his

Aunt Betsy, David's attraction towards Dora is described in metaphors that connote milk, sustenance, and the maternal breast. David's childhood need for the mother's breast, becomes transformed by a process of 'erotization', defined by Reber and Reber as 'the process by which a body part or bodily function becomes a source of erotic pleasure', and displaced onto Dora (Reber: 248). David says 'I have not the least idea what we had for dinner, besides Dora. My impression is that I dined off Dora entirely' (DC: 170). After dinner, he alludes to his brother who while suckling at the mother's breast had touched David's lips with his hand, thereby linking David to his mother's breast, saying, 'she smiled and gave me her delicious hand' (DC: 171).

The following day, when David awaits the arrival of his dinner guests Traddles, and the Micawbers, he says, 'Until the day arrived on which I was to entertain my newly found old friends, I lived principally on Dora and coffee' (DC: 187). David adds that, 'In my love-lorn condition, my appetite languished; and I was glad of it, for I felt as though it would have been an act of perfidy towards Dora to have a natural relish for my dinner' (DC: 187). This sentiment is later parodied to great comic effect in *Bleak House* when Mr. Guppy proposes to Esther Summerson. Having proposed, much to Esther's embarrassment, Guppy says, "'Yet what a mockery it is, miss [...] to be stationed behind food at such a moment. The soul recoils from food at such a moment, miss'" (*Bleak House*: 152). Just as David had once been physically sustained by the milk from the mother's breast, and later psychologically sustained by the fleeting image of his mother, so he believes he has found in Dora the perfect combination of both forms of sustenance. At an unconscious level, David arguably sees in 'her dimpled chin', the maternal bosom that he had once laid his head against as a child (DC: 373). Reber and Reber say of the breast,

In classical psychoanalytic writings, the term refers to both the anatomical part and to a symbolic representation of it in the mind. In the latter (and psychoanalytically interesting) sense the breast becomes the focus of oral wishes, the source of psychic nutrition, the object, which satisfies needs. In short it becomes the mother but without the personhood of the real mother.

(Reber: 100)

Just as the image of Clara Copperfield, which had temporarily sustained David as a child, in his journey to his Aunt Betsy, evaporates like a fleeting dream, so the 'image of Dora', which David falls in love with and finds consolation in, proves to be just as fleeting, a mirage that David follows without ever quite reaching (DC: 448). Only later in their marriage, however, does he begin to realize that she does not represent the perfect mother substitute. Rather, she treats him as a father substitute, bringing to the marriage her own repressed Oedipus complex. In his attempt to find in Dora a repetition of his mother, David inadvertently finds in her his own reflection, both in the sense that they share the same initials, DC, and in the sense that they bring to their marriage a mutually repressed Oedipus complex, each seeking the oedipal object of desire in the other.

David's greatest problem, however, is that the woman he has married is only a repetition of his mother, as she was when married to Mr Murdstone: bullied into submissiveness and timidity. Despite David's hatred of Mr Murdstone, he unconsciously takes on a Mr Murdstone-like role in relation to Dora. We see this when David attempts to discuss the financial reality that they will face when married. David tentatively asks her to consider that she is not marrying a rich man, but, more cheerfully, suggests that she 'look about now and then at papa's housekeeping, and endeavour to acquire a little habit – of accounts, for instance' (DC: 511). His cheerful

discussion of their 'stony and rugged' 'path in life', however, is comparable to the psychological violence done to his mother by the Murdstones (Ibid.). David talks to her of financial realities as though he were throwing punches, with the result that Dora faints. David says, 'I was going on at a great rate, with a clenched hand, and a most enthusiastic countenance; but it was quite unnecessary to proceed. I had said enough. I had done it again. Oh, she was so frightened...I thought I had killed her, this time' (DC: 511). At the same time, David expresses this psychological violence in almost masturbatory terms, when he says, 'I was going on at a great rate, with a clenched hand, and a most enthusiastic countenance' (DC: 511). The suggestion would seem to be that Dora's psychological impotence extends to the area of sexual relations with her husband, which leads to a sexual frustration in David, unconsciously expressed in a masturbatory gesture, but more seriously to the possibility of sexual violence, as if repeating the psychological violence done by Mr Murdstone to Clara^v. Arguably, David's frustration lies in his unfulfilled oedipal wish to recreate in Dora, the mother he has lost.

We see in David's Oedipus complex, a desire for the image, the doll-like double of the mother, and conversely, in Dora's Oedipus complex, a desire for the doll-like double of the father. There exists a parallel between the real mother / father (although in truth even here we are dealing with the representation of the real) and the representation of the signifier that has been separated from its signified concept / object. This break in the link between the signifier and its signified arguably arises out of Dickens' and Freud's respective need to create substitutes for the imagos of their mothers and fathers. The dysfunctional imago of the mother / father is remedied through the creation of a substitutive idealised double. Yet, this substitute is itself damaged as we see in the character Dora, and as is explored in Chapter four, can

manifest as fracturing of language itself, in the form of a damaged or split sign, separated into the signifying word/image and the signified mental concept. This represents one of the forms of symbolic castration through which the Oedipus complex is potentially destroyed, other forms of which Diane F. Sadoff identifies occurring throughout Dickens' novels and Freud's 'The Uncanny'. Both on a signifying and signified level, the double we find in Dickens and Freud's writing, does not function properly.

On a signifying level, the substitute mother's and father's dysfunction as a divided sign results from the symbolic castration, which destroys the Oedipus complex. Yet, paradoxically, on a signified level, the substitute mother's presence, as we see in the broken doll-Dora, arises out of that castratory separation of signifying substitutive image from the signified original. The destructive impulse of the repressed castration complex that gives rise to the divided sign, should destroy the Oedipus complex, but instead perpetuates it. The strength of the repressed Oedipus complex and the relative weakness of the castration threat, in Dickens, means that these doubles of the mother are not destroyed, only damaged, thus allowing them to appear in Dickens' writing. Freud, in contrast, creates these same oedipal doubles, but then represses any knowledge of his Oedipus complex by forgetting those things he associates with his need to recreate the ideal mother figure. While Freud does discuss ETA Hoffmann's 'The Sandman', he does not, as Nicholas Royle points out, discuss the significance of Nathaniel falling in love with the automaton Olympia, an oedipal substitute who replaces his fiancée Clara, and at a deeper psychological level, replaces his mother. He forgets that David Copperfield, similarly, falls in love with the doll-like Dora who replaces his mother, Clara. And he forgets or ignores the fact that LG Moberly's 'Inexplicable' is written by a woman, narrated by a female character, and

shares thematic similarities, in particular the crocodiles and the newly wed house, with *David Copperfield*.

Dora represents, on the one hand, a fragment of the imago of Clara Copperfield, simultaneously a broken and dysfunctional copy of David's mother, and an idealised version of her. Just as Clara ceased to work, in the sense of psychologically functioning, until she eventually stopped living, Dora, like a broken doll, has never worked, in the sense of physically or intellectually engaging with the world, and as a result has never lived. As David says of Dora, 'It was impossible to say to that sweet little surprised face, otherwise than lightly and playfully, that we must work, to live' (DC: 513). We can read in this a double play on the word 'work' to mean 'employment' as a means of 'living', and 'to function properly', adding to the sense in which Dora is more like a mechanical doll, than a living person. As if using as simple and logical an explanation as possible, so that an inorganic, mechanical doll would understand, David explains that 'to function is to live'.

Ironically, however, when David explains that he must get up next morning at five o'clock she gently chastises him for talking about such a 'nonsensical' idea. David tells us that she spoke to him 'as if I were a doll' (DC: 513). Dora ironically projects onto David the doll-like identity that David begins to see in her, and which Aunt Betsy had once accused Clara Copperfield of possessing. Indeed, later David is disturbed to see that Dora is treated by his Aunt Betsy and Miss Lavinia as 'a pretty toy or plaything,' that Miss Lavinia treats Dora 'like a pet child' and that 'they all treated Dora, in her degree, much as Dora treated Jip [her dog] in his' (DC: 570). Dora's reluctance to meet the visiting Aunt Betsy ironically echoes Clara's 'sure foreboding at the second glance, that it was Miss Betsy' (DC: 5), as if afraid of being greeted with the same disapproval that Clara had met with. David's Great Aunt Betsy

had long ago been ‘mortally affronted by his [father’s] marriage [to Clara], on the ground that [David’s] mother was a ‘wax doll’ (DC: 5). Dora, in similarly wishing to avoid the judgement of Great Aunt Betsy, speaks as though she were unconsciously aware that Miss Betsy would judge her to be the double of Clara Copperfield, a poor copy of the ‘wax doll’. David’s unconscious concern at this is that he married Dora in an attempt to create a substitute mother who would fulfil his oedipal desires. Yet, he is reminded that Dora is psychologically a child caught in an arrested development, and that she has ironically married him in an unconscious attempt to create a substitute father.

Timothy Clark observes that the typical Dickens character is drawn like a caricature, composed of one or two condensed descriptions, which are repeated without any significant variation^{vi}. At the same time, the psychology of this caricature-like character is completely exteriorised, so that there is no distinction between the character’s inner psyche and the external environment. The environment does not simply reflect, but is a part of the character’s psychology. In so doing, Dickens creates ‘satirical portraits of a world of atrophied or perverted development in which people have been reified into mere fetishised fragments of some putative fuller personality’ (*Dickens Refigured*: 27). In this respect, the ‘putative fuller personality’ is that of Clara Copperfield, while Dora is simply a ‘fetishised fragment’ of that personality, caught in an ‘atrophied or perverted development’ (Ibid.).

Yet, in a sense, that fuller personality of Clara Copperfield is something that David has never known. His oedipal desire has only ever been for a different ‘fetishised fragment’ of that personality, the imago of the mother that psychologically sustains him, later to be replaced by the other ‘fetishised fragment’ of his mother, Dora. Clark finds in Dickens’ writing, a correlation between the ‘aesthetics of the image and a

kind of phenomenology of the corpse' in which Dickens' predilection for creating literary identities which are part character and part caricature can lead to the accusation that what he creates are 'notoriously "flat"' characters (*Dickens Refigured*: 26). This echoes Freud's description of Dickens' female characters as, 'flawless girls, selfless and good, so good they are quite colourless' (Spilka: 50). Clark uses the writing of the philosopher Maurice Blanchot to understand the broken form and function of the Dickens character.

Blanchot develops Martin Heidegger's argument in *Being and Time* and *The Origin of the Work of Art* that the object which is,

broken, or detached from its context in some way may acquire a peculiarly disclosive nature. Instead of disappearing into its use, the object, precisely by no longer accommodating itself to the network of possible uses, purposes, etc. that had hitherto defined its being, renders unusually apparent to us that "world" or network of possible assignments. A whole way of life may seem latent, newly exposed, in say "the useless fragment of a wooden bowl" (Wordsworth). There is a homology between the broken and the aesthetic. (*Dickens Refigured*: 25)

Blanchot argues that 'a tool, when damaged, becomes its *image* [...] the tool, no longer disappearing into its use, *appears*. This appearance of the object is that of resemblance and reflection: the object's double, if you will' (Clark: 24). Clark applies this philosophical concept to the typical Dickens character, which combines elements of characterization and caricature. Clark says of Dickens' 'flat' characters:

One or two salient characteristics, gestures or items of speech are repeated in different situations without reference to the possibility of some sort of

psychological change or development. The current tendency in criticism is to relate this method of characterisation to a reading of Dickens as a defender of a romantic psychology. Dickens is said to be advocating an ideal of psychic wholeness, of an integrated relation between all aspects of the psyche and between the psyche and its environment. (*Dickens Refigured*: 26, 27)

Clark argues that certain Dickens characters can on the one hand be described as being flat, or one might say 'sketches', but that characters such as 'Turveydrop, Grandfather Smallweed, Heep, Mrs Skewton and others also possess a compulsion and interest that is other than that of satire or comedy. They transmit the fascination of the image in Blanchot's sense' (*Dickens Refigured*: 27).

By image, Clark means Heidegger's, and Blanchot's sense of being that is attained by the object / tool only when it is broken and no longer able to hide behind its function. Just as we can think of Dora as a broken character, so Clark 'illustrates' his point by looking at the character Silas Wegg in *Our Mutual Friend*, 'so wooden a man that he seemed to have taken his wooden leg naturally' (Clark: 27). What Clark seems to argue is that despite the sense in which Wegg might in his own way be thought of as complete, he is also a broken character. Yet, as Clark admits, 'I do not find this passage easy to assimilate to any straightforward sense of Dickens' moral vision or a conception of the world as one of fragmented pieces that call for reintegration. Wegg is, in his way, complete' (*Dickens Refigured*: 27).

This difficulty may arise because Dickens' moral vision or conception of the world is arguably dominated by psychology rather than phenomenology. While Wegg is perhaps complete in the sense of having a substitute leg, it is a leg that has a humorously phallic life of its own. Indeed, it is the phallic substitute that arguably

represents the ‘fragmented piece that calls for reintegration’. At one point, Wegg ‘looked distrustfully at his own limb’^{vii}. Much later, when employed by the illiterate Mr Boffin to read to him, he reads from F. Somner Merryweather’s *Lives and Anecdotes of Misers, or the Passion of Avarice Displayed* (1850), which Dickens in fact owned a copy of (OMF: 828). With Mr Venus beside him, Mr Wegg reads to Mr Boffin a section of chapter eight entitled ‘The Treasures of a dunghill’. As Wegg reads about the numerous monetary treasures found in and around the dung heap, Mr. Wegg’s distrust of his wooden leg is confirmed when it begins to rise into the air, in a state of symbolic sexual arousal. The narrator says,

On the way to this crisis Mr. Wegg’s wooden leg had gradually elevated itself more and more, and he had nudged Mr. Venus with his opposite elbow deeper and deeper, until at length the preservation of his balance became incompatible with the two actions, and he now dropped over sideways upon that gentleman, squeezing him against the settle’s edge. Nor did either of the two, for some few seconds, make any effort to recover himself; both remaining in a kind of pecuniary swoon. (OMF: 476, 477)

In contrast to Mr. Wegg’s rigid, phallic leg however, we later learn that Mr. Boffin has a servant, whom Mr. Wegg calls ‘a menial tool of his own, a young man by the name of Sloppy’ (OMF: 568). In terms of Clark’s phenomenology of the corpse, Mr. Boffin is broken, or at least flaccid, in the sense that his corresponding phallic symbol, his servant the ‘menial tool’ is called ‘Sloppy’, connoting weakness and post coital flaccidity. Given that the word ‘tool’ is used by Wegg to describe Sloppy, and is used by Maurice Blanchot, it seems strange that Clark did not use such a pertinent example from *Our Mutual Friend*.

Clark argues that while many of Dickens' characters are more like caricatures than rounded characters, there is a distinction between those characters with a caricature-like structure, composed of 'one or two salient characteristics, gestures or items or speech', and those characters who are broken, no longer able to function as caricature-like characters (*Dickens Refigured*: 26, 27). Yet, Clarke creates, perhaps unintentionally, the impression that Dickens was unaware or not fully aware of what he was doing in his writing. Dickens in fact, compared his ability to 'sketch' a character or scene using only 'one or two salient points' to the impressionistic style of painting by artists, such as William Turner, John Constable and John Millais. In a letter to John Landseer, an illustrator who contributed to Dickens' *The Cricket on the Hearth*, Dickens explains why it was necessary to omit certain historical figures pertinent to the Gordon Riots depicted in *Barnaby Rudge*^{viii}. Dickens explains that if all the historical figures had been included, it would 'stem the current of the Tale'^{ix}. Dickens says,

I need not tell you who are so well acquainted with "Art" in all its forms, that in the description of such scenes, a broad, bold, hurried effect must be produced, or the reader instead of being forced and driven along by imaginary crowds will find himself dawdling very uncomfortably through the town, and greatly wondering what may be the matter. In this kind of work the object is, - not to tell everything, but to select the striking points and beat them into the page with a sledgehammer (BR: 739).

The literary style of sketching or illustrating a scene or character similarly dates back to the early 19th century. As Richard L. Stein says of the word 'illustrate', the,

sense of the word as primarily visual was only becoming widespread in the first decades of the nineteenth century, as illustrated books (which had appeared frequently in the eighteenth century) began to proliferate. According to Martin Meisel, ‘the pictorial sense of “illustration” came to speak for itself” by 1844, when the *Quarterly* printed a review of “Illustrated Books”. (CCCD: 167, 168)

Stein adds that, ‘In the early nineteenth century the word commonly denoted verbal explanation or exemplification, as in Harriet Martineau’s *Illustration of Political Economy* (1832-34), which elucidated economic theories as simple, fictional narratives’ (Stein: 168). Thus with the emergence of a dual meaning to the word ‘illustrate’, Stein argues, Dickens, as a ‘young, ambitious writer in the 1830s might have insisted on a parity of roles in the title of his first book. The writer also illustrates, as the subtitle of *Sketches by Boz* reminds us – *Illustrative of Every-Day Life and Every-Day People*’ (CCCD: 168). Later, however, these sketches and illustrations of characters, take on, as Clark ‘illustrates’, a phenomenological physicality that while rounder than the caricature, is devoid of the interiority that we find in the round ‘character’.

Dora, in these terms, represents just such a corpse-like character, unable to hide behind her function, that of the oedipal substitute, as unconsciously ascribed by David, because her own unconscious function is to precisely not function, to be the helpless child that must be protected by the substitute father, David. As Steven Marcus describes her, she, ‘is at once a duplication of David’s dead mother and an incompetent and helpless creature.’^x While David was once psychologically sustained by the hallucinatory image of his mother as he made his way to see his Aunt Betsy, Dora, as a fragment of that image, cannot perform that function. Yet, it is

paradoxically as a result of her dysfunction, that she ‘appears’, in a comparatively more permanent, physical and tangible sense, than the image of his mother. As Maurice Blanchot argues, ‘This appearance of the object is that of resemblance and reflection: the object’s double, if you will’ (Clark: 24). Clara and Dora represent the separation of image and object, but with Clara the image, perceived by David to be the original, despite only being the imago of the ‘real’ Clara Copperfield, and Dora the tangible corpse and broken object that does not work, and is unable to hide behind its function, that ironically becomes its signifier and double. Yet, her sole function, in a sense, is to double Clara. She fails in this, because she can only resemble the broken Clara, destroyed by Mr Murdstone. She cannot replace the mother that David remembers.

Towards the end of the novel, David leaves England, ‘haunted by the ghosts of many hopes, of many dear remembrances, many errors, many unavailing sorrows and regrets’ and lives in Switzerland, grieving the loss of his mother, Dora, Ham, Steerforth, who have all died, and the Micawbers who now live in Australia (DC: 772). Most of all, however, he arguably grieves the destruction and loss of the image of his mother. David says, ‘The knowledge came upon me, not quickly, but little by little, and grain by grain [...] By imperceptible degrees, it became a hopeless consciousness [...] of all that had been shattered – my first trust, my first affection, the whole airy castle of my life’ (DC: 773). His ‘first trust’ and ‘first affection’, the idealised imago of his mother at the heart of his Oedipus complex, and the ‘airy castle’ the familiar yet unfamiliar family house to which he had once returned to find his Oedipal desires fulfilled, are lost to him forever.

We move from the double as a signified psychoanalytical-literary concept bound up with the Oedipus complex, to the double as a signifying word /image, arriving at

the name, 'Dora', the name which springs to Freud's mind, when coming to choose a pseudonym for his patient Ida Bauer. Yet, by forgetting the origin or meaning of that name, he is left with an empty signifier. Freud attempts to reattach a meaning to that name, when he considers its origin in *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*. Yet, his explanation that the name was originally chosen by his sister, Rosa, for her servant whose name was also Rosa, does not explain where Rosa took the name 'Dora' from, or take into account the fact that the name is also that of a character in Freud's favourite Dickens novel, *David Copperfield*. These two facts, added to by the fact that Freud exercised an overbearing control over his sisters and what they read, allows us to at least speculate that Rosa might have taken the name 'Dora' from Dickens' novel (Breger: 32).

The explanation Freud offers is arguably a smokescreen, which Freud uses to repress the deeper significance of the name 'Dora'. Freud tells us that the, 'strong similarity of content' between his patient's case, and the servant whose name was changed to Dora, stems from the fact that central to Ida Bauer's life was a governess who in her role, was herself, 'a servant in a strange house' (*The Psychopathology*: 230). Freud's memory of the name 'Dora' would seem, then, to be an association of the name 'Dora' with a domineering maternal figure who is simultaneously subservient within a 'strange house', which arguably takes us back to Dickens' *David Copperfield*. Behind these associations lie Freud's repressed Oedipus complex, his need for control over women with whom he is intimate as a consequence of living under a volatile and domineering mother, and an unconscious need to fulfill that desire for and control over his mother. He attempts this early on by controlling the personal development and reading habits of his sisters, most significantly, his sister Rosa. As Louis Breger says,

When he was twenty, he wrote to his sister Rosa, four years younger than he, and warned her against having her head turned by a slight social success. She had given a performance on the zither, an instrument on which she was not terribly accomplished. Freud went on about how unscrupulous people give too much praise to young girls, which was bad for their characters and could end in their 'becoming vain, coquettish, and insufferable!' (Breger: 32)

Later he does so by reconstructing his fiancée Martha Bernays into a submissive Dora-like automaton. Breger writes: 'The picture of Martha that Freud held in his mind was powerfully colored by his fantasies. His lack of experience with women, and the paucity of direct contact with his beloved fiancée, no doubt facilitated this' (Breger: 58). Just as Freud, 'effaced Martha's individuality and made her into the woman who attended to all his outer needs', in effect reconstructing her into the mother who could attend to his inner, psychological needs, so Freud transforms his patient Ida Bauer, through the course of the analysis, into a Dora-like substitute (Breger: 96). Initially, it would seem his unconscious intention is to cast himself in the role of David, the heroic lover. Yet, given what has been argued so far about *David Copperfield*, that David creates in his Dora, a substitute mother, it would seem, by extension, that Freud similarly attempts to create his own 'Dora', a mother-substitute who is incapable of rejecting or domineering over him.

In the case history of *Dora* we learn that Dora's father has been having an affair with a family friend, whom Freud refers to as Frau K. At the same time, Herr K. had twice attempted to seduce Dora, first when she was thirteen, and then when she was fifteen. When Dora complained to her father, he chose to believe Herr K., which Dora believed he did in order to leave undisturbed the affair he was having with Frau K. At

the same time, however, Dora believed that her father was in effect offering her to Herr K. in exchange for his complicity in the affair her father was having with Frau K. Moreover, he brought his daughter to see Freud, not so much that she should get better, but that Freud should 'cure' her of her hatred of the Ks, which by implication threatened to undermine the affair.

Problems arise in Freud's treatment of the patient, when his unconscious perception of her, and of himself in relation to her, results in a counter-transference, together with Dora's transference onto Freud. Transference occurs when a patient unconsciously projects his or her feelings about someone central to their illness, for example the mother or father, onto the analyst. Counter-transference occurs when the analyst mirrors the patient's transference, and projects feelings he or she has about someone central to their lives onto the patient. This implies that the transference process is always initiated by the patient, with the analyst only subsequently countering that transference, with his or her counter-transference. However, it would seem that in Freud's analysis of Dora, the reverse is true. Freud transfers onto Ida Bauer, not least through the name 'Dora' which he retrospectively gives her, with Dora counter-transferring onto Freud.

Freud unconsciously attempts to reconstruct Ida into a passive, idealistic version of his mother, in the guise of 'Dora', with Freud in the role of David Copperfield, the oedipal hero who simultaneously cures her and seduces her. Freud's transference goes unnoticed by him, even when he retrospectively considers transference as a major factor in the treatment of the patient, through Dora's transference onto him. The fact that he believes that Dora has counter-transferred onto him, but without considering that he has transferred onto her, or that her counter-transference is in response to his transference, suggests that he still represses the Oedipus complex that drives him to

transfer onto the patient in the first place. The extent to which Freud denies any transference on his part is reflected when he writes,

Might I perhaps have kept the girl under my treatment if I myself had acted a part, if I had exaggerated the importance to me of her staying on, and had shown a warm personal interest in her – a course which, even after allowing for my position as her physician, would have been tantamount to providing her with a substitute for the affection she longed for? I do not know. Since in every case a part of the factors that are encountered under the form of resistance remains unknown, I have always avoided acting a part, and have contented myself with practicing the humbler arts of psychology. (*Dora*: 100,101)

Freud is ironically unconscious of the fact that he has played a role in relation to Dora, or that he has created in her ‘a substitute for the affection’ that he longed for. While Freud treats her as a mother substitute, Dora unconsciously treats Freud as the Oedipal father whom she once loved and desired, and still does, even though that love is later expressed as a rejection of her father and Freud, stemming from her father’s perceived betrayal of her. Like David Copperfield and Dora Spenlow, Freud and Dora bring to the psychoanalytic session their respective repressed Oedipus complexes.

Freud suggests to Dora that ‘her affection for her father must at a very early moment have amounted to her being completely in love with him’. However,

she of course gave me her usual reply: ‘I don’t remember that.’ But she immediately went on to tell me something analogous about a seven year old girl who was her cousin (on her mother’s side) and in whom she often

thought she saw a kind of reflection of her own childhood. This little girl had (not for the first time) been witness of a heated dispute between her parents, and, when Dora happened to come in on a visit soon afterwards, whispered in her ear: 'You can't think how I hate that person!' (pointing to her mother), 'and when she's dead I shall marry papa' (*Dora*: 50).

Dora's cousin expresses the oedipal desire to replace her mother, and take her place beside her father, that Dora herself repressed, but which she can safely express through her preserved memory of the cousin. In effect, it is also Dora who says, "You can't think how I hate that person [...] and when she's dead I shall marry papa" (Ibid.). According to Freud, however, Dora then transfers the imago of her father onto him. Freud writes:

At the beginning it was clear that I was replacing her father in her imagination, which was not unlikely, in view of the difference between our ages. She was even constantly comparing me with him consciously, and kept anxiously trying to make sure whether I was being quite straightforward with her, for her father 'always preferred secrecy and roundabout ways'. (*Dora*: 108, 109)

It would seem however, that Dora is concerned not with the similarity between Freud and her father, but with the difference between Freud and her father, in effect anxiously saying, 'You're not my father'. Arguably, at this point, she responds in this negative way because she has already transferred the imago of Herr K. onto Freud. Her original disgust at Herr K.'s sexual advances was not only the result of her being a sexually adolescent girl faced with the advances of a much older man, or because

Dora's true affections were for Frau K., but unconsciously, because Herr K. was not her father, and thus did not fulfill her Oedipal fantasy of her marrying her father. In transferring the imago of Herr K. onto Freud, which ironically Freud participates in through his identification with Herr K., her rejection of Herr K. becomes translated into her anxious awareness that Freud is not her father, leading to her rejection of Freud.

This is reflected in the first of two dreams that Dora has. Because Dora 'had already had some training in dream interpretation from having previously analysed a few minor specimens', she and Freud analyse the dream together (*Dora*: 56). Freud presents the dream as recalled by Dora:

A house was on fire. My father was standing beside my bed and woke me up. I dressed myself quickly. Mother wanted to stop and save her jewel-case; but Father said: 'I refuse to let myself and my two children be burnt for the sake of your jewel-case.' We hurried downstairs, and as soon as I was outside I woke up. (Dora: 56)

This dream is a condensation of different memories and feelings. The fire alludes to her father's fear of fire, which he expresses when they arrive for their holiday at L-, upon discovering that despite the thunderstorm, the house does not have a lightning conductor. Simultaneously, the fire alludes to her mother's obsessive-compulsive behaviour of locking the only door, which provided access to, and entrance from her son's bedroom. Dora's mother and father disagreed over this, her father being anxious that should a fire occur, their son would be unable to escape. The jewelry-box refers to an argument that took place between Dora's mother and father, over his giving her a bracelet because he did not approve of the pearl earrings that she wanted, and at the

same time, represents a jewelry-box, which Herr K. had given Dora. However, Dora has the dream after Herr K.'s attempted seduction of her, at L-, and it is another encounter with him, which provides the central external stimulus for the dream. Dora recalls that,

'In the afternoon after our trip on the lake, from which we (Herr K. and I) returned at midday, I had gone to lie down as usual on the sofa in the bedroom to have a short sleep. I suddenly awoke and saw Herr K. standing beside...' Freud intercedes to ask 'In fact, just as you saw your father standing beside your bed in the dream?' 'Yes. I asked him sharply what it was he wanted there. By way of reply he said that he was not going to be prevented from coming into his own bedroom when he wanted; besides, there was something he wanted to fetch. This episode put me on my guard, and I asked Frau K. whether there was not a key to the bedroom door. The next morning (on the second day) I locked myself in while I was dressing. In the afternoon, when I wanted to lock myself in so as to lie down again on the sofa, the key was gone. I am convinced that Herr K. had removed it [...] It was then that I made up my mind not to stay with Herr K., without Father.'

(Dora: 58, 59).

Freud tells us that while in *The Interpretation of Dreams* he might have given the impression that all dreams are wish fulfillments, he must correct this 'generalization', telling us rather that the dream can be a 'fulfilled wish', a 'realized fear', a 'reflection persisting on into sleep', a 'piece of creative thought during sleep' and in the case of Dora's recurring dream, a 'resolution', representing her resolve to leave the house and Herr K. (Dora: 60). We find, however, that Freud's interpretation of Dora's first

dream is not exhaustively detailed, takes a detour into an area of interpretation which in retrospect is simply wrong, and arrives at a conclusion which Freud had been determined to force on Dora from the beginning.

With his interpretation focusing on the personal significance of the jewel-case, and its contents, and their symbolic meaning, Freud coerces Dora into agreeing that when the mother rejects the bracelet, Dora secretly would have accepted the gift. Freud says, “I dare say you thought to yourself you would accept it with pleasure”. He then interprets her response “I don’t know” as an expression of her repressed agreement (*Dora*: 61). Freud develops this supposition, arguing that, ‘In the incident of the bracelet, you would have been glad to accept what your mother had rejected. Now let us just put ‘give’ instead of ‘accept’ and ‘withhold’ instead of ‘reject.’ Then it means that you were ready to give your father what your mother withheld from him’ (*Dora*: 62).

When this is combined with Herr K.’s gift of a jewel-box to Dora, Herr K. takes the place of the father, while Frau K. takes the place of the mother. Freud says, ‘So you are ready to give Herr K. what his wife withholds from him. That is the thought which has had to be repressed with so much energy, and which has made it necessary for every one of its elements to be turned into its opposite’ (*Dora*: 62). Freud tells Dora, ‘you are summoning up your old love for your father in order to protect yourself against your love for Herr K.’ (*Dora*: 62). Freud adds, ‘The dream confirms once more what I had already told you before you dreamed it’, namely that she is struggling between an Oedipal desire for her father, and post-Oedipal desire for Herr K. (*Dora*: 62). Throughout the case history, Freud insists that Dora is in love with Herr K. and interprets Dora’s protestations and denials as a form of repression. However, it is possible that Freud’s overt concern with Dora’s supposedly repressed

desire for Herr K. represents an unconscious concern with her oedipal desire for her father, a displacement onto her of his Oedipus complex.

Freud goes on to provide the reader with what is in part a new line of psychoanalytic enquiry into the childhood origin of the dream, which he believes to be scientifically accurate, although in retrospect it is completely inaccurate, but which also represents something of a red herring that covers up Freud's own unconscious involvement in the interpretation of the dream, beyond that of his conscious involvement as the analyst. As if desperate to have Dora agree with something he says, instead of responding with her usual 'no' or 'I don't know', Freud engages in a rather elaborate game of asking closed questions which direct her to the answer he wishes her to arrive at. Freud describes the game as 'a little experiment, which was, as usual, successful' (*Dora*: 63). Freud says, 'There happened to be a large match-stand on the table. I asked Dora to look round and see whether she noticed anything special on the table, something that was not there as a rule' (*Dora*: 63). Dora does not notice the match-stand. Was this Freud's 'little experiment'? If so, and if the expected result was that she should notice the match-stand, the experiment would seem in fact to have been unsuccessful. The other possibility is that if, by not noticing the match-stand, Dora was nevertheless unconsciously aware of the object, Freud may have been attempting to influence the outcome of the experiment by planting the thought of matches, fire, and everything associated with fire, into Dora's unconscious mind. This would then mean that his exploration of her unconscious would uncover the answer he was determined to find. Either way, the experiment is neither successful nor what one could call scientific.

Freud asks her ‘if she knew why children were forbidden to play with matches’? She replies: “‘Yes; on account of the risk of fire. My uncle’s children are very fond of playing with matches.’” Freud rejoins:

Not only on that account. They are warned not to ‘play with fire,’ and a particular belief is associated with the warning. She knew nothing about it, - Very well, then; the fear is that if they do they will wet their bed. The antithesis of ‘water’ and ‘fire’ must be at the bottom of this. Perhaps it is believed that they will dream of fire and then try and put it out with water. I cannot say exactly. But I notice that the antithesis of water and fire has been extremely useful to you in the dream. (*Dora*: 63, 64).

Freud then argues that one also thinks of fire as a symbol of love, with water again as its antithesis, and that related to this, Dora’s expressions ‘*an accident might happen in the night*’ and ‘*it might be necessary to leave the room*’, are an allusion to bedwetting.

When Dora remembers that she wet the bed for some time in her seventh or eighth year, Freud, as current medical science now argues, wrongly asserts that ‘Bedwetting of this kind has, to the best of my knowledge, no more likely cause than masturbation, a habit whose importance in the aetiology of bed-wetting in general is still insufficiently appreciated’ (*Dora*: 66). Freud traces her childhood masturbation, which she ‘admits’ to, implying either that Dora does or should feel guilty, to her father having once contracted syphilis. Just as Dora asks ‘why it was precisely *she* that had fallen ill’ (*Dora*: 66), so, the answer is connected with her father, who ‘had fallen ill through leading a loose life’ (*Dora*: 67), for he had not only given her mother gonorrhoea, but Dora herself had had a similar infection called leucorrhoea, manifested as an irritation of the genital region, leading her to identify more strongly

with her mother, and unconsciously blame her father for the infection. It is this infection, which also 'pointed primarily to masturbation'. Thus, Freud says, 'she was now on the way to finding an answer to her own question of why it was precisely *she* that had fallen ill – by confessing that she had masturbated, probably in childhood'. While Dora initially 'denied flatly that she could remember any such thing' she later exhibits a form of behaviour, which Freud takes to be 'a further step towards the confession' (*Dora*: 68). She wears around her waist a,

reticule of a shape which had just come into fashion; and, as she lay on the sofa and talked, she kept playing with it – opening it, putting a finger into it, shutting it again, and so on. I looked on for some time, and then explained to her the nature of a *symptomatic act*. I give the name of symptomatic acts to those acts which people perform, as we say, automatically, unconsciously, without attending to them, or as if in a moment of distraction. They are actions to which people would like to deny any significance, and which, if questioned about them, they would explain as being indifferent and accidental. Closer observation, however, will show that these actions, about which consciousness knows nothing, in fact give expression to unconscious thoughts and impulses, and are therefore most valuable and instructive as being manifestations of the unconscious which have been able to come to the surface. (*Dora*: 68)

There are several problems with Freud's conclusions, however. His assertion that bedwetting is connected with childhood masturbation is scientifically incorrect. The psychologists Arthur S and Emily Reber's merely list bedwetting, or 'enuresis', as 'Incontinence, the involuntary passing of urine. Sometimes equated with bedwetting,

particularly when it occurs in young children, although the term applies to a broader class of phenomena', with masturbation given a separate and unrelated definition (Reber and Reber: 243). Symbolically, however, the dream connection is clear. Dora's genital infection is symbolized by the fire in the house. Simultaneously associated with masturbation through the rubbing of the infected genitals, the allusion to bed wetting not only represents the wish that water be released to douse the flames, the inflammation of the genitals, the release of water also represents the orgasm achieved through masturbation.

Freud argues that the bracelet represents the female genitals, and in a footnote, says that the pearl drops can also be thought of as male sexual symbols, implying that they represent either semen or the testes where the semen is produced. Yet, we must then depart from Freud's original interpretation. While the mother's concern is with protecting the 'jewels', the father's concern is with protecting the children, who are, in reproductive terms, the product of the bracelet and pearl drops joining together. At the same time, the bracelet and the pearl drops might correspondingly be said to represent Dora and her brother, and while her mother had shown a preference for the pearl drops over the bracelet, in the dream, she makes no distinction between one jewel or another. The burning of the jewels, and the danger posed to the children, symbolically represents Dora's leucorrhoea, which she perhaps unconsciously fears may threaten her future ability to have children, represented by the burning house as a womb-like structure which must be escaped from. At the same time, the burning of the jewels, like the burning of the house, corresponds with the irritation and discomfort no doubt resulting from the infection Dora once had, and which she now associates with her father.

It is the question of who the father represents which is most problematic. Freud stresses throughout his treatment of Dora that she is in love with Herr K. and argues that in the dream, the man is Herr K. disguised as Dora's father. Freud cannot accept that it really does represent her father, and in this sense, cannot accept that Dora's repressed Oedipus complex is the underlying factor in her conflicting emotional responses to her mother, father, Frau K. and Herr K. At a conscious level, as Freud says, she blames her illness on her father, who had before contracted syphilis, which Dora assumed he had passed to her through heredity. At an unconscious level, however, she arguably believes that she has contracted a venereal disease from her father, because, in her unconscious fantasy, she has had sexual intercourse with him. Unconsciously, she knows that she must leave behind the Oedipus complex, as much as she must leave Herr. K., represented in the dream as the imperative that she must leave the burning house, later manifested in her leaving Freud.

Dora's second dream seems to be a fulfillment of the wishes expressed in the first dream. Freud himself says: 'A few weeks after the first dream the second occurred, and when it was dealt with the analysis was broken off' (*Dora*: 85). This suggests that where the first dream was one of many recurring resolution dreams, but with wish fulfillment elements in it as well, the second dream is an expression of Dora's 'morbid craving for revenge', in effect, the fulfillment of the resolution expressed in the first dream (*Dora*: 87). Yet, given that Freud's interpretation of the first dream was incorrect in some crucial areas, a shadow is cast over his interpretation of the second dream. We find that much of what Freud has to say about the second dream is simply an exploration of the various external stimuli that Dora unconsciously drew the imagery from, coupled with an almost preposterous theory that connects Dora's anxiety about becoming pregnant with the hysterical symptom of a limp.

In itself, Dora's anxiety about pregnancy is more convincing, as we see the theme of pregnancy expressed in the first dream, in the mother's protection of the jewels, the bracelet and the pearl drops, and the father's protection of the children. However, it seems more likely that Dora's fear was not that Herr K. would make her pregnant, but rather that the sexually promiscuous Herr K., in attempting to have an affair outside of marriage, would be syphilitic just as her father had once been. Yet, conversely, her first dream is demonstrably the wish for the sexual disease that would arise out of sexual intimacy with her father, the price she would pay for the fulfillment of her oedipal desires.

In order to provide a new interpretation of the second dream, as a continuation of the first dream, we need not repeat every aspect of Freud's original analysis, for much of it simply involves establishing the external stimuli for the dream, which while useful, does not engage in any substantial analysis of the dream symbolism, either in relation to the Oedipus complex or in relation to the meaning of the first dream. We can, however, do as Freud did, and deconstruct the dream into its constituent elements, but include the addendums, originally included by Freud as footnotes. Dora says:

I was walking about in a town which I did not know. I saw streets and squares which were strange to me. I saw a monument in one of the squares. Then I came into a house where I lived, went to my room, and found a letter from Mother lying there (*Dora*: 85, 86).

While there may be no significance in the similarity, it is worth noting that Freud had his own dream of being in a strange city, a familiar yet unfamiliar Rome, in which he was obliged to ask for directions in order to paradoxically reach the city (*The*

Interpretation: 149). Dora finds herself in unfamiliar territory, and must negotiate her way to more familiar territory. Yet, what she returns to is not the 'heimlich' home, but is described in more impersonal terms: 'a house where I lived'. It is only the room, which she describes as 'my room' that carries with it the implication of possession and familiarity (Ibid.). It is in the womb-like sanctity of her room to which she can retreat, that she is protected from a threatening and unfamiliar world. At the same time, her room represents her unconscious mind, where her deepest wishes can be expressed and fulfilled. One of those wishes is paradoxically for the death of her mother.

When Dora says she 'found a letter from Mother lying there', there is a sense in which this sentence, and the dream elements the sentence describes, are a condensation of two themes: 'a letter from Mother' and the 'Mother lying there' (Ibid.). We can interpret the latter part of the sentence as the wish for the mother's death, stemming from Dora's unconscious wish to take her place as her father's wife, and at the same time, her love for and identification with Frau K., through which she can again connect with her father. Dora then says: 'She wrote saying that as I had left home without my parents' knowledge she had not wished to write to me to say that Father was ill' (*Dora:* 86). Dora distinguishes between 'She', apparently referring to the mother, and 'the parents', further suggesting that Dora has in fact replaced her mother, 'Frau Bauer', with someone else, Frau K.

Frau K. had not wished to write to Dora to say that her father was ill, because Dora had left home without telling her parents. This is arguably a reversal of the real state of affairs that led to Dora being brought to Freud for treatment: she had threatened to leave home, in a letter, because she was ill. At the same time, however, Frau K. does write to tell Dora that her father has died, and by implication, does so, because Dora

left home without telling her parents. In other words, Dora's action of leaving home was the cause of her father's death. We see in this a reversal of Dora's earlier dream. In her first dream, the father saves the children by taking them out of the house. In this second dream, Dora leaves the house, resulting in the father's death, implying that through the relation to the first dream, the father is burnt to death. In one sense, this represents, to use Freud's words, the fulfillment of Dora's 'morbid craving for revenge' (*Dora*: 87), for she has indirectly caused her father to die from the fire that he had once expressed his fear of. At the same time, it represents her wish that that he succumbs to the *burning* venereal disease that had afflicted her.

Frau K. continues, in the letter, by writing, 'Now he is dead, and if you like? you can come' (*Dora*: 86). Freud's initial analysis of this part of the dream is traced back to the strange grammar used by Frau K. in the letter she wrote to Dora, asking her to holiday with them, by the lake, for Frau K. places the question mark in the middle of, rather than at the end of, the sentence. We see in this further evidence that the Mother, the writer of the dream letter, is Frau K. The odd sentence used in the dream by Frau K. suggests that because Dora's father has died, Dora can now come, as if to suggest that she can now take her father's place, now that he is dead. Dora continues, saying, 'I then went to the station ['Bahnhof'] and asked about a hundred times: 'Where is the station?' I always got the answer: 'Five minutes' (Ibid.). Just as Dora's room exists within a more impersonal house, within an unknown town, so Dora goes to 'the station', implying that she already knows how to get there, and thus has a degree of familiarity with the station, and yet when there, asks repeatedly, 'Where is the station?' According to Freud, the station symbolically represents the female genitals, through the similarity of the word "*Bahnhof*" ["station"; literally, "railway-court"] and the 'similarly formed "*Vorhof*" ["vestibulum"; literally, "forecourt"] – an

anatomical term for a particular region of the female genitals' (*Dora*: 91). By implication, the trains that enter the station are phallic symbols, representing the male genitals.

The unfamiliarity of the station, in a sense, represents Dora's unfamiliarity with the sexual organs of women and men, or at least her denial of familiarity, and is reflected in the fact that the station becomes a wood, into which Dora enters, and asks another man the same question, but this time, only once. Dora says, "I then saw a thick wood before me which I went into, and there I asked a man whom I met. He said to me: "Two and a half hours more"" (*Dora*: 86). In Dora's initial recollection, the answer she receives is two hours. The 'thick wood' into which Dora enters, is clearly sexual, referring in one sense, to a phallically shaped single plank of wood, and thus the penis, and in another sense, the 'wood' as a synonym of 'forest', represents the pubic hair that covers the entrance to the vagina. Dora's entrance into the 'thick wood' symbolically represents her repressed desire for sexual intercourse, and / or an orgasm through masturbation.

Ironically, however, the image of the wood reminds Dora of a painting she had seen in the Secessionist Exhibition in Dresden, the town on which she had modeled her unfamiliar dream town. In the painting, nymphs could be seen in the background of the tree painting. While Freud takes this to be further evidence of the sexual nature of the dream, the nymphs are only sexual in the sense that they are in one sense, associated with chastity, and at least in one other sense, associated with the threat of castration. Nymphs, as James Hall says, were in Ancient Greek mythology, the 'guardians of chastity', 'frequently harassed by the lecherous Satyrs', who 'punished Cupid by breaking his weapons'^{xi}. Dora's unconscious desires are answered when, 'He offered to accompany me. But I refused and went alone' (*Dora*: 86). In a

symbolic sense, Dora's chastity is protected by the nymphs that she associates with the wood, despite their absence from the dream. The wood becomes a train station, and Dora says, 'I saw the station in front of me and could not reach it. At the same time I had the usual feeling of anxiety that one has in dreams when one cannot move forward' (Ibid.). Dora refuses the opportunity to fulfill her sexual desires, through any intimacy or union with the young man in the wood. Her walking alone, her inability to reach the station, and then her inability to move forward towards the station, the symbolic representation of the female genitals, represent her ability to be fully satisfied, sexually or emotionally. Dora continues, saying, 'Then I was at home. I must have been traveling in the meantime, but I know nothing about that. I walked into the porter's lodge, and inquired for our flat. The maidservant opened the door to me and replied that Mother and the others were already at the cemetery ['Friedhof']' (*Dora*: 86). Just as Freud compares the German word for station 'Bahnhof' with the word 'Vorhof', a part of the female genitals, so likewise, he compares the word 'Friedhof', meaning cemetery, with 'Vorhof' (*Dora*: 91).

The unreachable 'station' continues to be so, by becoming an unreachable 'cemetery'. Once again, the father's death is associated with the female genitals, and thus the venereal disease that had once afflicted Dora, and which she believed he had passed on to her, and which at an unconscious, Oedipal level, she wishes he had passed on to her in the only way possible, through sexual intercourse. The dream ends, however, not with Dora seeking the cemetery, but with, as Dora adds in her addendum, her going back up to her room. Dora says, 'I saw myself particularly distinctly going up the stairs. After she had answered [one presumes 'she' is the maidservant] I went to my room, but not the least sadly, and began reading a big book that lay on my writing-table'. Arguably, Dora is happy because she has replaced the

‘Friedhof’, with another symbol for the female genitals, the ‘big book that lay on her writing-table’ (*Dora*: 85, 86).

Like Dickens’ character, Peggotty, with her natural history book full of crocodiles in *David Copperfield*, Freud’s Dora is sexually empowered by her big book, traced back to an encyclopedia which Dora had read in real life. Dora opens the reticule on her dress, and opens the book in her dream, as a means of taking comfort in what is implicitly an aid to autoerotic stimulation. This can be contrasted with Freud’s later patient, Sergei Pankejev, the ‘Wolfman’ who suffered from a phobia of butterflies that flexed their wings. As Freud says,

the patient remarked that it was the way the butterfly’s wings opened and closed once it had settled that had given him such an uncanny feeling. It had been like a woman opening her legs, and the legs then made the shape of a Roman V. (*The Wolfman*: 289)

Just as Pankejev finds threatening the butterfly wings, symbolically representative of the mother, and of the castration threat, so Dora finds comfort in the opening of the book. Likewise, just as the crocodiles represent a castration threat, easily defeated by David Copperfield, so in Dora’s second dream, the book is a symbol for her wish for revenge against her father, her desire for her father, her wish for her mother’s death, in order that she can take her mother’s place, and at the same time, a symbolic representation of Dora’s love for and identification with Frau K. Just as Dora had gone up to her room, and ‘*found a letter from Mother lying there*’, which can be separated into ‘found a letter’ and ‘Mother lying there’, so in this last part of the dream, Dora’s happiness seems to be that the funeral is taking place, and

simultaneously that the funeral has become a 'big book that lay on my writing-table'.

More specifically, Freud suggests that,

Dora's father was dead, and the others had already gone to the cemetery. She might calmly read whatever she chose. Did not this mean that one of her motives for revenge was a revolt against her parents' constraint? If her father was dead she could read or love as she pleased. (*Dora*: 92)

An alternative interpretation of this is that while Dora is told by her mother, and the mother-substitute Frau K., that her father is dead, as if to say that as an accessible object of desire, her father is gone, Dora counters this with the wish for her mother's death, and puts Frau K. in her place, a woman who is both a mother-substitute whom Dora can identify with, thereby unconsciously becoming the woman her father desires, and who is at the same time, another object of desire for Dora.

While in the beginning of the dream, Dora indirectly sees her 'Mother lying there', so at the end of the dream, the big book lies down, metaphorically and anthropomorphically speaking, and just as Dora reads a letter from her substitute mother Frau K., at the beginning of the dream, so at the end of the dream, she reads a book, which lies upon a writing-desk, typically where one would compose a letter. While Freud considers the symbolic meaning of the encyclopedic book by analyzing Dora's memories associated with once having read an encyclopedia, Freud ignores the more obvious symbolism at play, which would at least indicate where his questioning might have gone instead. Dora remembers reading an encyclopedia in order to look up the definition of appendicitis, which her cousin had become ill with. At this time, Dora herself developed a fever and abdominal pains, compounded by her period and constipation.

Dora then recalls that after the illness, ‘she had not been able to walk properly and had dragged her right foot [...] Even now her foot sometimes dragged’ (*Dora*: 93). Freud says ‘Dora had therefore given herself an illness which she had read up about in the encyclopedia, and she had punished herself for dipping into its pages.’ (*Dora*: 94). However, this merely covers some deeper memory, according to Freud. He asks her when the appendicitis incident took place, specifically, whether it took place before or after the seduction scene beside the lake. Dora almost automatically replies ‘nine months later’ (*Dora*: 94). Freud does not make any comparison between this and the second dream, in which the man at the station had said ‘five minutes’ in response to the question of where the station was, and the young man in the forest, who answers ‘another two and a half hours’ to the same question (*Dora*: 86). Instead, Freud goes on to consider the reference to ‘nine months’, convincingly enough, as an indication that the appendicitis episode was a ‘phantasy of *childbirth*’ (*Dora*: 94).

However, the connection between the encyclopedia and childbirth is based only on Dora’s not disputing the probability that she had read about it in the book. More likely, the childbirth phantasy can be connected with the encyclopedia, within the dream, through the book being a symbol of the female genitals, and the entrance to the womb. Just as Freud uses the expression ‘deflowering’ as a euphemism for the loss of virginity that Dora is faced with in Herr K., so the flower is often taken to be a symbol of the vagina through the similarity between the opening of the petals as a part of the flower’s reproductive cycle, and the opening of the labia as a response to sexual arousal. In this sense, the opening of the big book can also be thought of in sexual and reproductive terms, suggesting a connection between the appendicitis read about in the book, and the phantasy of pregnancy. This would further suggest that in the second dream, the references to ‘five minutes’ and ‘two and a half hours’, as the

answers given by two men, in response to the question of where the station is, which as Freud elucidates, represents the female genitals, merely disguise Dora's desire for and fear of pregnancy, that Dora then expresses in her 'nine months' response to Freud's question of whether she had appendicitis before or the Herr K. scene.

Freud examines the relationship between Dora's fantasy of pregnancy and her limp. Freud asks rhetorically, 'But what was all this about her dragging her leg? I could now hazard a guess. That is how people walk when they have twisted a foot. So she had made a "false step"; which was true indeed if she could give birth to a child nine months after the scene by the lake'. However, the limp is also traced back to Dora's memory of having fallen down some stair, as a child, 'twisting the same foot' (*Dora*: 95). The latter part of this interpretation is logical enough, but to connect Dora's psychosomatic limp with the metaphor of making a 'false step' is almost naïve, not least because he makes this supposition before uncovering Dora's memory of having fallen down the stairs. At the same time, it seems strange that while Freud pursues the idea that Dora is in love with Herr K. and that any normal thirteen and fifteen year old girl, (Freud mistakenly makes her one year older each time) would welcome the sexual advances of an older man, he would conversely blame Dora, were she to fall pregnant. If she became pregnant, it would be her 'false step' rather than Herr K.'s. Freud says to Dora:

"If it is true that you were delivered of a child nine months after the scene by the lake, and that you are going about to this very day carrying the consequences of your false step with you, then it follows that in your unconscious you must have regretted the upshot of the scene. In your unconscious thoughts, that is to say, you have made an emendation to it. The assumption that underlies your phantasy of childbirth is that on that occasion

something took place, that on that occasion you experienced and went through everything that you were obliged to pick up later on from the encyclopedia" (*Dora*: 95).

Like Mr. Gradgrind's attack upon the imagination in Dickens' *Hard Times*, Freud grinds away at Dora's denials and protestations, until the uncertainty she expresses, becomes the admission, and finally silent submission. His insistence that she was consciously in love with Herr K. is so great that he fails to recognize that what he thinks of as Herr K.'s almost natural and rightful attempt at seduction, in contrast to Dora's almost abnormal rejection of his advances, is the traumatic experience that haunts Dora. In this last piece of analysis, he concludes that there might be signs that she unconsciously 'regretted the upshot of the scene', despite the fact that Dora has talked about being consciously disgusted by Herr K., implying that Freud believes that Dora's regret is that she rejected Herr K. Freud almost triumphantly assumes that Dora's silence, in the end, is an acceptance of his conclusion. Freud writes: 'So you see that your love for Herr K. did not come to an end with the scene, but that (as I maintained) it has persisted down to the present day – though it is true that you are unconscious of it – and Dora disputed the fact no longer' (*Dora*: 95). She no doubt gave up disputing his theories because she had already given up on Freud and the treatment.

The question, then, is why Freud was so convinced that Dora was in love with Herr K., and why he was so reluctant to consider that Dora was still struggling with her Oedipus complex, and that she might all along have been in love with, as part of her identification, with Frau K., which he only considers retrospectively. Madelon Sprengnether argues that,

The interpretation of Dora's two dreams serves at least two functions, that of Oedipal camouflage for a pre-oedipal fantasy based on the figure of the nurse and that of revenge. It is the combination of these two elements that accounts, I believe, for the coercive quality of Freud's interpretations and for the uneasy tone of the narrative. In his relentless pursuit of a heterosexual interpretation of Dora's desire, Freud often substitutes his own train of associations for hers, a tactic that reveals the extent to which he idealizes the figure of Herr K. in order to blame Dora for her refusal. On an interpretative level, he subjects her to a process of defloration, impregnation, and parturition, in an aggressively oedipal fashion at the same time that he invalidates her rejection by naming it hysteria [...] Thus discredited and shamed, the nurse / nursemaid / governess is deprived of her power. (Sprengher: 50)

Whether Freud unconsciously has in mind the nurse Dora, or the Dickensian character Dora, Dora nevertheless represents the mother substitute who is more easily controlled, disempowered, and unable to reject Freud (or indeed Dickens). Freud transfers the imago of his mother, in its most idealistic form, onto the patient, and attempts to construct her into a passive, easily controlled mother-substitute, just as he had done, fifteen years earlier, with his fiancée Martha Bernays. While it is only retrospectively that Freud gives Ida Bauer the name 'Dora', arguably, Freud had unconsciously been thinking of the Dickens character he apparently disliked, throughout his treatment of the patient. Freud's criticism of Dickens' Olympia-like character Dora, the uncanny feeling he experiences after reading L. G Moberly's 'Inexplicable' (1917), which arguably reminds him of Dickens' *David Copperfield* and E. T. A Hoffmann's 'The Sandman', his reluctance to discuss properly the

automaton doll Olympia in Hoffmann's 'The Sandman' in 'The Uncanny' (1919), and his omission in the essay of any details about Moberly, such as her name or sex, suggest that these repeated occurrences of forgetting to discuss either the woman in authority, such as the author LG Moberly and her character-narrator May, or the enfeebled, doll-like woman such as Dora in *David Copperfield*, stem from Freud's fear of his authoritarian, and emotionally distant mother, Amalia Freud, and simultaneously his oedipal desire for a highly idealistic version of her, one which is passive, and submissive.

Freud reconstructs the women in his life into doubles of his mother, modeled on Charles Dickens' own mother substitute. Peter Ackroyd's observation that, 'All the maternal figures in his novels are ways of reinstating someone else in her place', could equally be applied to Freud (Ackroyd: 6). With Ida Bauer the new actress performing the role of Dora, Freud once again casts himself in the role of David Copperfield, the hero. As Stanley J. Coen points out:

In 1885, Freud wrote (E. Freud 1960: 140-41) his fiancée, Martha Bernays, that he had almost completed a task 'which a number of as yet unborn and unfortunate people will one day resent...they are my biographers...we have no desire to make it too easy for them. Each one of them will be right in his opinion of "The Development of the Hero," and I am already looking forward to seeing them go astray.'^{xii}

In contrast to his assertion that, 'I have always avoided acting a part, and have contented myself with practising the humbler arts of psychology', Freud, like the heroic David Copperfield, is the Hero of his own story, a story woven into what he presents as 'Dora's' (Ida Bauer's) story, within a psychoanalytic framework (*Dora*:

101). Through the use of metaphor, and analogy, as well as the pseudonym ascribed to the patient, Freud unconsciously constructs and acts out an oedipal phantasy of the hero, who having defeated his father pursues the mother. Freud's denial of this, however, manifests in his refusal to accept that Dora desires her father, and his insistence that she desires Herr K., in effect denying in her the Oedipus complex that is still repressed within him.

In Freud's short discussion of 'the *motives of illness*' (*Dora*: 35), he argues that the patient can sometimes find a secondary function in the illness that gives rise to the patient's resistance to being cured. He uses an analogy that on the one hand reflects the dream imagery found in Dora's two dreams, but on the other hand, represents his own fantasy that in a sense, places him at the center of Dora's dreams:

Let us imagine a workman, a bricklayer, let us say, who has fallen off a house and been crippled, and now earns his livelihood by begging at the street corner. Let us then suppose that a miracle-worker comes along and promises him to make his crooked leg straight and capable of walking. It would be unwise, I think, to look forward to seeing an expression of peculiar bliss upon the man's features. No doubt at the time of the accident he felt he was extremely unlucky, when he realized that he would never be able to do any more work and would have to starve or live upon charity. But since then the very thing which in the first instance threw him out of employment has become his source of income: he lives by his disablement. If that is taken from him he may become totally helpless. He has in the meantime forgotten his trade and lost his habits of industry; he has grown accustomed to idleness, and perhaps to drink as well. (*Dora*: 37)

While Dora's first dream involved escaping from a burning house, and her second dream involved entering into a house, so Freud's fantasy involves a bricklayer, one who implicitly builds houses, and whose accident occurs when he falls from the roof, suggesting that he was in fact, in the process of building a house. Just as Louis Breger tells us that dreams do not function so much as wish fulfillments, as a means of integrating 'a variety of emotional experiences – anxiety and conflict being most frequent – into the structure of the personality', so in this fantasy, Freud unconsciously attempts to integrate his desire for the mother, through his reconstruction of the patient into Dora, symbolized by the house that the bricklayer builds or repairs, into the structure of his personality (Breger: 376). Just as Dora had asked Freud 'why it was precisely *she* that had fallen ill' (*Dora*: 66), blaming the illness on her father who 'had fallen ill through leading a loose life' (*Dora*: 67), and recalls having once fallen down some stairs, twisting her foot, so the metaphor and memory of 'falling' are repeated in Freud's fantasy, when the bricklayer falls from the roof of the house.

The imagery of the house and the bricklayer, and the symbolic fall from the roof of the house, may have been a deliberate attempt by Freud to make his analogy fit into the imagery already employed in Dora's dreams, thereby giving his analogy an added credibility, made less obviously so by reversing the gender of the central character. It also represents, however, Freud's unconscious castration anxiety that implicitly stops the bricklayer (Freud) from completing the reconstruction of the house. He falls, and is crippled, symbolically representing the threat of castration. We do not see who or what causes the bricklayer to fall, creating a sense in which it is the superego as castration threat within Freud the narrator and implied author that is responsible. However, the castration threat then appears in the form of its apparent opposite, the

‘miracle worker’, who offers to fix the bricklayer’s crooked leg, and by implication, undo the castration that the worker has suffered. Paradoxically, however, the former bricklayer-turned street beggar has turned his disability to his advantage, and makes a living from begging. Were the miracle worker to fix the beggar’s leg, and take his new source of income away from him, Freud tells us, ‘he may become totally helpless. He has in the meantime forgotten his trade and lost his habits of industry’. Like Dickens’ parody of William Hogarth’s characters, Goodchild and Idle, Freud’s workman has ‘grown accustomed to idleness, and perhaps to drink as well’ (*Dora*: 37). In effect, the miracle worker has become the new threat of castration, threatening to undo the first castration, which paradoxically has phallically empowered the former workman.

The father as castration threat is replaced with the father as protector against castration, only for that protection to become once again the threat of castration. As much as this symbolic castration of the bricklayer reflects Freud’s failure to cure his patient, Dora, which he could not bring himself to recognize, so it also represents his inability to either fully realize or fully destroy his repressed Oedipus complex. Just like Charles Dickens in relation to his father John Dickens, and mother Elizabeth Dickens, Freud is haunted by the father whom he can neither fear enough to end his oedipal desire for the mother, nor fully identify with, and by the mother he feels compelled to reconstruct in his fantasies. Dickens and Freud, whose lives briefly overlapped, but who never met, are brought together indirectly through the name ‘Dora’, a name that for both comes to signify the reconstructed idealised double of the mother.

ⁱ Sigmund Freud, *The Psychopathology of Every Day Life* (London: Penguin 2002) p. 230. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

ⁱⁱ Sigmund Freud, *Dora: An Analysis of a Case of Hysteria* trans. by Philip Rieff (New York: Simon & Schuster 1997) p. 10. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

ⁱⁱⁱ Mark Spilka, *Dickens and Kafka: A Mutual Interpretation* (London: Dennis Dobson 1963) p. 50. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{iv} Jacques Lacan, *The Four Fundamentals of Psychoanalysis* (London: Vintage 1998) p. 12. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^v The imagery of pins piercing the female body, sexual frustration, and the possibility of violence, is repeated in the character Mrs Joe in *Great Expectations*. Pip tells us, innocently, that his sister 'almost always wore a coarse apron, fastened over her figure behind with two loops, and having a square impregnable bib in front, that was stuck full of pins and needles. She made it a powerful merit in herself, and a strong reproach against Joe, that she wore this apron so much. Though I really see no reason why she should have worn it at all: or why, if she did wear it at all, she should not have taken it off, every day of her life' (GE: 8). Unlike Dora, however, Mrs Joe is a phallicized woman, not only through the 'two loops', which symbolically represent testicles, but through her stick, with which she hits Pip and Joe, and which she calls 'Tickler'. Indeed, like Peggotty, the phallic substitute is associated, through the name 'Tickler', with female masturbation, while the playful connotations of the name simultaneously counter the violence with which it is used.

^{vi} Timothy Clark 'Dickens through Blanchot: the nightmare fascination of a world without interiority' in *Dickens Refigured: Bodies, desires and other histories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press 1996) p. 26. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{vii} Charles Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend* (London: Penguin Books 1997) p. 85. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{viii} Richard L. Stein 'Dickens and Illustration' in *The Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2001) p. 167. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{ix} Charles Dickens, *Barnaby Rudge* (London: Penguin Books 1997) Appendix A. p. 739. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^x Steven Marcus, *Freud and the Culture of Psychoanalysis: Studies in the Transition from Victorian Humanism to Modernity* (Boston: George Allen & Unwin 1984) p. 85. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{xi} James Hall, *Hall's Dictionary of Subjects & Symbols in Art* Revised Edition (London: John Murray 1995) p. 227. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{xii} Stanley J Coen, *Between Author and Reader: A Psychoanalytic Approach to Writing and Reading* (New York: Columbia University Press 1994) p. 69. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

Chapter Four

The Wolfman and Little Dorrit: Fear of the Maternal Wolf

In the case history of Dora, Freud unconsciously saw himself as a David Copperfield-like oedipal hero in pursuit of Dora, the mother-substitute. In the much later case history of the Wolfman, Freud is aware that he has played a role in his interaction with the patient, Sergei Konstantinovitch Pankejev, seeing it as part of the treatment. Yet, he is still unconcerned with how his counter-transference onto the patient might affect the patient or the outcome of the treatment, and more importantly, is unconscious of just what that role was. On a conscious level, he implicitly believes that he has played the part of the Wolf, the father figure who symbolically threatens the son with castration, as punishment for the son's oedipal desires for the mother. In one sense, this would seem to be correct as far as it corresponds with the patient's transference onto Freud. Yet, this is only the case if we accept Freud's interpretation of what lies at the heart of the patient's neurosis. Freud believes that Pankejev's neurosis results from his fear of his father, manifested as a castration complex. Conversely, however, Pankejev believes that his illness is rooted in the arrival of his Governess, who traumatically for Pankejev replaced his beloved nurse. At the same time, he believes that he was traumatised by his sister's seduction of him. Freud, however, dismissed Pankejev's conclusion, focusing on the castration complex. That Pankejev should transfer the identity of the father / Wolf onto Freud, according to Freud, was simply a part of the therapeutic process.

Freud's counter-transference alters this. It is paradoxically Freud's repressed Oedipus complex, which leads him to switch his attention from Pankejev's governess and sister to the father, as the person central to the Pankejev's neurosis. Yet, because we can identify an unconscious attempt to marginalize the role of women in Pankejev's neurosis, and on the basis of what we see occurring in the case of *Dora*, it becomes possible to view the Wolf that Freud plays the part of, not as the transferred imago of Pankejev's father, but that of Pankejev's sister and governess. More importantly, from Freud's unconscious perspective, the Wolf that he sees himself playing in relation to Pankejev represents his mother Amalia Freud. Freud transfers onto Pankejev, the identity of himself as a child who is threatened by and must escape from his mother, Amalia, while Freud plays the part of Amalia who will not let the child leave, a reversal of Amalia's emotional abandonment of Freud as a child. Not only is the 'Wolfman' a signifying mask behind which we find Freud, as well as Pankejev, but while the Wolf, from Pankejev's unconscious perspective, represents the castratory governess and abusive sister, from Freud's unconscious perspective, the Wolf represents the phallicized, castratory mother whom Freud identified with, feared, but also desired.

When Freud wrote up his case histories, he did so sometimes months after the psychoanalytic session had taken place, and with a method of recollection that involved reliving the past event in his mind. Such a method, however, was not infallible and arguably allowed Freud's unconscious fears and desires to reshape his memories. As Freud acknowledges of the case history *Dora*,

The case history itself was only committed to writing from memory, after the treatment was at an end, but while my recollection of the case was still fresh

and was heightened by my interest in its publication. Thus the record is not absolutely – phonographically – exact, but it can claim to possess a high degree of trustworthiness. (*Dora*: 4)

Stanley J Coen explores the relationship between psychoanalytic literary criticism and psychoanalytic practice, comparing the psychoanalyst to the Author, and the patient to the text. Through the process of transference or counter-transference, the patient sometimes perceives the psychoanalyst to be the ‘Author’ of his or her illness. At other times, the patient perceives the psychoanalyst to be the ‘Author’ of the cure.

Coen, however, compares the ‘psychoanalyst’ to the figure of the ‘reader’ who reads the patient as though she or he were a text. In comparing literary criticism with psychoanalytic practice, Coen argues that we see literary criticism moving ‘away from attempts to determine objective meanings hidden within a text, meaning the reader needs to extricate’. He argues that there has been a greater emphasis on ‘the subjective experience of the reader; interaction between reader, text, and, at times, the author; and the values and premises with which the reader approaches interpretation of the text’ (Coen: 13). Coen argues that,

As within psychoanalysis proper, so too within literary criticism, revisionists have focused on problems of indeterminacy, uncertainty, perspective, hermeneutics, and subjective and communal assumptions and agreements. Literary critics have come to focus more on how a reader reads a text and on what happens to her as she does so, equating this with the “meaning” of the text. The psychoanalyst’s position in the consulting room, and her attitudes toward what her patients tell her, have often been ignored when she has tried to decipher hidden meanings contained within the written text. (Coen: 13)

The reader, Freud, as the analyst analysing his patient, as the writer who recalls his experience of interacting with the patient, and the writer who writes and reads the case history, ignores his 'position in the consulting room when [he] has tried to decipher hidden meanings contained within the written text [the patient]' (Ibid.). In one sense, Freud enters into a dramatisation called 'the psychoanalytic session.' In another sense, he engages with a textual representation of the psychoanalytic session, with the mistaken assumption that in both senses, he is equivalent to the ideal reader who exists objectively outside the 'text'. As Coen says, however,

In the consulting room, no psychoanalyst would attempt to understand the content of a patient's communications without simultaneously considering why the communication is being made, how it is being reported, who the patient imagines the analyst represents at the moment, what responses the patient hopes for from the analyst, and so forth. Thus content is always considered by a psychoanalyst in relation to transference, defense, wish, and the functions of the communication. (Coen: 13)

This in a sense describes the problem with Freud's method of analysing his patients. The process of transference did not simply turn Freud into an amalgam of the 'reader' and the 'psychoanalyst', with the patient and his story a metaphorical text to be analysed. The process of transference allowed Freud to become as much a central character as the patient, in a drama mutually written by Freud and Pankejev, in which both performed the role of the Wolfman. Freud performs the role of the threatening Wolf in relation to the Wolfman. Conversely, the patient is the Wolfman in the sense that he is a man obsessively afraid of wolves, among other creatures. Yet, while

Pankejev unconsciously views Freud the Wolf as representative of his father and his governess, Freud not only refuted this association between the Wolf and the governess, in favour of the father-theory, but arguably did so as a means of repressing the possibility that he unconsciously views himself in the role of the Wolf, not as a father-substitute, but as a mother-substitute.

Simultaneously, when performing this role, he treats Pankejev as the young Freud threatened by his mother who seeks refuge in his protective father, the grandfather clock in the adult Freud's office. Just as the case history of *The Wolfman* is dominated by Freud's performance of the role of the Wolf, who it will be shown, represents for Freud, the mother, and for Sergei Pankejev a condensation of his governess and father, so in *Little Dorrit*, we find that the hero of the novel, Arthur Clennam, is dominated by his step-mother, Mrs Clennam, a woman indirectly compared to the Capitoline she-wolf of Rome. And just as we see during Freud's treatment of Pankejev, the patient displays an anxiety-driven obsession with Freud's grandfather clock, so in *Little Dorrit*, Arthur Clennam seeks refuge from his step-mother by visiting The Last Patriarch, whose house is both timeless, and dominated by clocks and the measurement of time.

To understand just how Dickens enters into Freud's case history of *The Wolfman* we must begin first with the question of who Sergei Pankejev was, and how he developed a phobia of wolves. Freud's patient was a Russian aristocrat who lived from 1887-1979, whom Freud treated between 1911 and 1914. Freud wrote the case history in the winter of 1914 / 1915, and gave the patient Sergei Pankejev the pseudonym 'Wolfman' as a means of concealing the patient's true identity, while communicating to the implied reader one of the central components of the patient's neurosis, an intense phobia of wolves. Freud writes,

There was a particular picture book, which showed a picture of a wolf standing on its hind legs and stepping out. Whenever he set eyes on this picture he would start to scream furiously, fearing that the wolf would come and gobble him up. His sister, however, always managed to arrange matters so that he would have to see this picture and took great delight in his terror.

(The Wolfman: 213)

Yet, he suffered from a phobia of a number of things. Freud tells us that he was also afraid of butterflies when their wings were outstretched. At the same time, he was also afraid of beetles and caterpillars, and as Freud says, ‘horses also gave him an uncanny feeling’ (*The Wolfman: 214*). Likewise, he was afraid of bad-smelling, and by association, unhygienic beggars, cripples, and old men, and would either hold his breath or breathe out as he walked past them, for fear of becoming one of them. Later in his life, he showed obsessive thinking and behaviour reminiscent of the demonically possessed Christoph Haizmann in Freud’s essay ‘A Seventeenth Century Demonological Neurosis’. Freud writes,

He told me that for a long period of time he had been very pious. He had had to pray at great length and cross himself endlessly before he could go to sleep at night. Every evening he would do the rounds of the holy pictures hanging in his room, using a chair to stand on, and bestow a reverent kiss on each one. It was somewhat out of keeping, then – or actually perhaps entirely in keeping – with this pious ritual that he recalled blasphemous thought coming into his mind, as if planted there by the devil. He was obliged to think: “God – swine” or “God-crud”. Once, journeying to a German spa, he was tortured

by a compulsion to think of the Holy Trinity when he saw three piles of horse dung or other excrement lying on the road. At this time he used also to adhere to a peculiar ritual if he saw people who inspired pity in him, beggars, cripples, old men. He had to breathe out noisily in order not to become one of them, and under certain conditions also had to inhale deeply. (*The Wolfman*: 214)

Freud traces this fear of castration back to Pankejev's older sister, who sexually abused him when he was three and a quarter years old. Freud writes,

It was in the spring, at a time when the father was away from home; the children were playing on the floor in one room while their mother was working in the next room. His sister had reached for his penis and played with it, saying incomprehensible things about Nanja all the while, as if by way of explanation. She said that Nanja did this all the time with everyone, the gardener, for example, she would turn him upside down and then take hold of his genitals. (*The Wolfman*: 218)

Pankejev, however, rejects his sister's attempts at seduction, although as Freud suggests, he was rejecting the person, not the sexual experimentation. Pankejev, thus, turns his attention to Nanja the nurse, and attempts to seduce her by playing with his penis in front of her. As Freud says, however, 'Nanja disappointed him, telling him with a serious expression that that was a naughty thing to do. Children who did that would get a "wound" there' (*The Wolfman*: 222). While Pankejev rejects this idea, and reasons that the "wound" is in fact the female genitals, or 'front bottom', he is not able to free himself of a castration anxiety.

Having once been a quiet and passive child, it is noticed by Pankejev's mother that following the arrival of the governess, Pankejev's behaviour changes. His mother assumes that the governess is treating Pankejev badly. Pankejev's grandmother assumes that this behavioural change has arisen out of the conflict between the governess and the nurse. However, the evidence suggests that the governess provoked Pankejev with unconscious threats of castration. The fear of wolves and other creatures, symptomatic of a castration anxiety, is provoked by the arrival of an English governess. Freud tells us the patient recalls one occasion on which 'she was walking ahead of them. She said to the children following behind: "Look at my little tail!" On another occasion, her hat blew away when they were out on a trip, to the great satisfaction of brother and sister' (*The Wolfman*: 217). We can compare the fact that she pretends to have a tail, with the fact that Pankejev's fear of butterflies first emerged when he was chasing a species with 'yellow striped wings that had pointed tips' which Freud says was 'Probably a "swallowtail"' (*The Wolfman*: 213). No mention is made of why Pankejev found the beetle, the caterpillar, or the horse uncanny. However, the beetle's opening of its outer shell to reveal its wings, the caterpillar which has a phallic tail, in the sense that its body is nothing but a tail, and the horse, which typically has a long tail, and in male horses, a long penis, all seem to contribute to Pankejev's castration anxiety through their phallic attributes.

The governess is later sent away, but Pankejev's behaviour remains changed. Following the governess's departure, Pankejev's sister exploits a fear he develops of a picture of a wolf in a book. Pankejev's memory of his sister's seduction, his attempted seduction of the nurse, her threat of castration, the unconscious threats of castration by the governess, and following her departure, the sister's unconscious threats of castration using the picture book, create a strong association between the substitute

mother and the threat of castration. This association is added to, through Pankejev's childhood reading of 'Little Red Riding Hood' and 'The Seven Little Kids' in which the grandmother and little goats, which represent children, are respectively pulled out of the body of the wolf. And, just as the governess has a tail, which would seem to either be her hair tied in a pony tail, or perhaps a ribbon in her hat, which she later loses, so the wolf in *Raynard and the Fox* loses his frozen tail. The English governess is the lupine mother substitute who displaces the first beloved mother substitute, Nanja, and symbolically threatens Pankejev with castration.

Freud's interaction with Pankejev, becomes, as the American psychiatrist Abram Kardiner would later observe in his own treatment under Freud, an historical reconstruction of both Freud's and the patient's respective childhoods. Kardiner writes,

The man who had invented the concept of transference, did not recognize it when it occurred here. He overlooked one thing. *Yes, I was afraid of my father in childhood, but the one whom I feared now was Freud himself.* He could make me or break me, which my father no longer could. By his statement, he pushed the entire reaction into the past, thereby making the analysis a historical reconstruction. (Breger: 279)

Freud engages in a similar 'historical reconstruction' in relation to Pankejev. However, what Freud creates is less an historical reconstruction and more a primal phantasy constructed from 'historical' fragments. The fragments themselves are accurate, but in piecing them together, Freud arrives at a distorted phantasy that points to his repressed Oedipus and castration complex. This extends not only to his

reconstruction of the patient's story, but to his representation of the psychoanalytic session, his representation of himself, and his representation of the patient.

Freud describes his reconstruction of the patient in macabre terms, saying,

I must ask the reader to remember that this history of an infantile neurosis was recovered as a by-product, so to speak, of the analysis of a patient who had fallen ill in more mature years. I was thus obliged to piece it together out of even tinier fragments than those that are normally available when any kind of synthesis is attempted. Such work, which is otherwise not difficult, finds its natural limit at the point where it becomes a question of capturing a multi-dimensional structure in the two dimensionality of description. I must therefore content myself with offering individual limbs which the reader can join together into a living whole. (*The Wolfman*: 271)

While Freud seems to be describing the case history itself, one could also read the 'it' which is pieced 'together out of even tinier fragments' as being the patient 'itself', particularly through the metaphorical 'individual limbs which the reader can join together into a living whole'. Like Leonardo da Vinci dissecting a human corpse, Freud presents the 'individual limbs' of the patient to the ideal reader so that she or he can participate in its final construction, implicitly suggesting that the limbs of the 'two dimensionality of description' can only be brought to life as a 'multi-dimensional structure' through the implied reader's imagination, and psychoanalytic knowledge. That Freud took fragmentary thoughts and memories from Pankejev, and constructed them into 'limbs' which the reader could then put together, bringing the corpse to life, is also reflected in his earlier case history of *Dora* when Freud says,

The case history itself was only committed to writing from memory, after the treatment was at an end, but while my recollection of the case was still fresh and was heightened by my interest in its publication. Thus the record is not absolutely – phonographically – exact, but it can claim to possess a high degree of trustworthiness. (*Dora*: 4)

What Freud really says is, ‘I am not absolutely – phonographically - exact, but I can claim to possess a high degree of trustworthiness.’ The significance of the word ‘phonograph’ relates to the fact that while cinematic film had already been developed by Louis Lumiere in 1895, ‘talking’ films would not be invented until 1906, and patented in 1910 by Eugene A. Lauste, who worked for the Edison Companyⁱ.

Freud uses the word ‘phonographic’ because at the time, the phonograph was the only means of exactly recording a conversationⁱⁱ. Without this means of recording the psychoanalytic session with Dora, the implied / ideal reader is asked to trust him, and indeed have faith in his ability to relive past events as though they were present, and commit them to paper. Yet, for the reader to have faith in, and believe everything that Freud writes is for the reader to place him or herself in the same position that the patient finds him or herself in, in relation to the analyst. It is only when we do not fully ‘believe’ in what Freud has written, while ironically accepting his theories and using them to analyse what Freud has written, that we really bring to life, and understand the limbs of the corpse that Freud presents us with.

In contrast to this reconstruction of limbs, Robert J C Young points to Freud’s analytical dissection of himself in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Young writes,

The representation of the process of self-analysis of *The Interpretation of Dreams* as self-dissection also suggests that Freud is identifying with the

famous dissector and mortician of Gothic literature – Count Frankenstein, himself another transgressive searcher, in his workshop of filthy creation, for secrets of life and death which should have remained hidden, knowledge of which eventually rebounds upon him. (Young: 225)

Frankenstein, a Doctor and not a Count as Young suggests, is in a sense, a modern and macabre version of Leonardo da Vinci. Just as Leonardo da Vinci cut the body apart into its constituent organs, in order to understand the whole organism, so Freud puts the fragments of the patient's psychological identity back together, comparing the patient's mind metaphorically to the corpse, for the reader to reanimate through his or her imagination and psychoanalytic knowledge. Yet, at an unconscious level, Freud's metaphorical language points to his need to both destroy and yet simultaneously recreate his Oedipus complex, to destroy and yet recreate his mother.

Just as Freud is prone to reversing things his patients say, for example in the case of Dora when 'no' is interpreted as being an unconscious 'yes', and her disgust at Herr K. is interpreted as repressed desire, so we can likewise reverse Freud's piecing together of the limbs to form a whole body. His reconstruction of dissected limbs to form a new body is, in reverse, the dissection of a whole body, broken down into limbs. In one sense, Freud reconstructs his mother in the form of the Wolf, which through his identification with her, he becomes in relation to the patient, and who in turn is treated by Freud as Freud the child. In another sense, however, the destruction of the body represents the symbolic castration that destroys the Oedipus complex.

While Freud initially considers the possibility that the Pankejev's wolf is female, he later abandons this, and reverts to an interpretation of the wolf as a substitute father. This arguably serves the purpose of repressing the feelings, thoughts, and memories associated with his repressed Oedipus complex. The psychological threat

that the English governess posed to Pankejev, and the trauma Pankejev experienced at being 'seduced' by his sister, and later his grief at her suicide, are marginalized, with Freud focusing on the fantasised primal scene of Pankejev witnessing his parents having sexual intercourse 'coitus a tergo'. It is perhaps because Freud is in denial about his repressed oedipal feelings that he then chooses to view the wolf as symbolically representative of the father. Freud ignores what Pankejev believes to be his primal scenes, the memories of the English governess, and his sister's seduction of him, in pursuit of what he thinks is Pankejev's primal scene, the fantasised scene of his parents having intercourse.

Freud theorised that the 'primal scene', a real or imagined first observation of sexual intimacy, often of the parents having sexual intercourse, the primal act of procreation that gave rise to the observing child, was at the heart of the Wolfman's phobia of wolves and other animals. Freud believes that it was the primal scene of his parents having sexual intercourse 'Coitus a Tergo', (in the manner of animals), that had traumatized the young Wolfman, later manifesting in his obsessive fear of various creaturesⁱⁱⁱ. However, through his analysis of the Wolfman and his dreams, Freud argues that this primal scene is a combination of two memories. The Wolfman recalls being taken as a child to his grandfather's farm, not long before he had the first dream of the wolves. At the farm, on several occasions, he was taken to see the sheep, providing the opportunity, Freud speculates, to witness sheep-dogs copulating. However, it seems just as likely that Pankejev might have witnessed the sheep copulating. Freud theorises that the Wolfman took '*every detail* of the recently acquired memory-image', and transferred this onto his parents by combining it with 'the memory of a real scene where his parents were enjoying intimacy', although as Freud suggests, this need not necessarily have been sexual intimacy (*The Wolfman*:

257). The Wolfman constructs this primal scene, Freud writes, ‘just as if it had been entirely real and had not been glued together from two components, an earlier one without any real significance and a later one which had left a deep impression’ (*The Wolfman*: 257). As Ned Lukacher points out, however, the Wolfman did not agree with Freud’s conclusions.

The Wolfman came to take a great deal of interest in psychoanalysis and believed that his neuroses derived, not from an imagined scene of his parents having sexual intercourse, *Coitus a Tergo*, but from the primal scene of his sister’s real incestuous seduction of him. As the Wolfman, Pankejev, says “‘This sister complex is really the thing that ruined my life’”^{iv}. Lukacher notes that Pankejev ‘is not opposed in principle to the notion of the primal scene, as far as he understands it. It’s simply that for him the seduction scene has a far greater explanatory power than Freud’s constructed scene’. While Freud acknowledged that the Wolfman’s primal scene of seduction by the sister ‘was certainly not a phantasy’, Pankejev is more emphatic, pointing out that his primal scene, while a memory, is ‘not a fiction, not an inference, and not a construct’ (Lukacher: 137).

This difference of opinion between Freud and Pankejev, Lukacher argues, is ‘emblematic of the division Freud created between his theoretical and clinical work as a result of the primal scene’ (Ibid.). Likewise, Patrick Mahony makes the point that ‘Freud exaggerated his therapeutic results – an exaggeration certainly arising from his own denial’ (Mahony: 184, 185). Freud represses the knowledge that his mother was the castratory, prohibitive force within his childhood, and represses his Oedipus complex through his denial that the English governess and Pankejev’s sister are central to the patient’s neurosis. In so doing, he represses the possibility that in playing the role of the Wolf, he plays the role of a woman, be it his mother,

Pankejev's governess or sister, for this would bring him back to his difficulty in identifying with women.

While the central focus of the case history is Pankejev's dream about white wolves, it is the recollection of Freud's behavioural interaction with Pankejev which shows us Freud as the Wolf, which consequently changes how we interpret Freud's recollection of Pankejev's dream. Freud writes,

In the room where the first sessions took place there was a large grandfather clock opposite the patient, who lay on a divan with his head turned away from me. I was struck by the fact that, from time to time, he would turn his face towards me, look at me in a very friendly way, as if to placate me, and then turn his gaze away from me towards the clock. At the time I thought this was an indication that he was longing for the end of the session. A long time afterwards the patient reminded me of this dumb-show and gave me the explanation, reminding me that the youngest of the seven little kids found a hiding-place in the case of the wall-clock while his six brothers were gobbled up by the wolf. And so what he wanted to say was: Be kind to me. Must I be afraid of you? Are you going to gobble me up? Should I hide from you in the clock-case, like the youngest of the seven little kids? (*The Wolfman*: 237)

Pankejev's repetitious and seemingly unconscious behaviour is an example of what Freud calls, in his earlier study of Dora, 'symptomatic behaviour' (*Dora*: 68). However, it is in *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* that Freud defines this term. Freud tells us that symptomatic acts,

express something that passes unsuspected even by the person executing them, and which he does not as a rule intend to impart, but to keep to himself.

They therefore act as symptoms, just like all the other phenomena considered in this work so far. (*The Psychopathology*: 183)

Yet, Freud does not consider Pankejev's repetitious behaviour in these terms, assuming, rather, that the repetitious action of looking from him to the grandfather clock is simply a 'dumb-show' that indicates Pankejev's wish to end the psychoanalytic session.

Freud's curious expression, however, unconsciously connotes one of the many symbolic threats of castration that Diane F. Sadoff identifies, suggesting that the 'dumb-show' is more than simply an inconsequential action, and that Freud unconsciously perceives the action to be of greater significance than he is willing to acknowledge. The term Freud uses could be a reference to the dumb-shows which would precede the main performance of Elizabethan dramas, as we see in William Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. When Hamlet has performed for the King, his Uncle, a play which implicitly re-enacts his murder of Hamlet's father, the play begins with a silent, condensed synopsis or dumb-show of what will take place in the actual play, namely the poisoning of the sleeping King^v.

The term 'dumb-show' could also be a reference, however, to Charles Dickens' *Oliver Twist*. In what may itself be a reference to William Shakespeare, by Dickens, Bill Sikes 'contented himself with tying an imaginary knot under his left ear, and jerking his head on the right shoulder; a piece of dumb show which the Jew appeared to understand perfectly' (OT: 137). In a further possible reference to the dumb show in *Hamlet*, and the poisoning of the King, Sikes then demands a glass of liquor but warns ' "And mind you don't poison it," [...] laying his hat upon the table', his hat being equivalent to the King's crown (Ibid.). However, we also find in *Bleak House*

Miss Flite's 'dumb show' at the scene of Nemo's opium-related death (BH: 169). Most significantly, as will be discussed shortly, we find in *Little Dorrit*, Mrs Clennam described metaphorically performing upon a 'dumb Church organ' which parallels her sermon, the previous morning, about the punishment that God will inflict upon her enemies (LD: 55). In each case, the 'dumb show' is associated with death or the threat of punishment.

Freud's use of the term 'dumb-show' implies that Pankejev's silent action of looking anxiously from him to the grandfather clock is a symbolic indicator of another symbolic action, namely Freud's threatening of Pankejev, who finds refuge in the grandfather clock, which represents the father's, but in this case also the mother's symbolic threat of castration against the son. The patient, some time later, however, reminds Freud of this incident, and offers the explanation that the behaviour might be traced back to the Brothers Grimm' story of the 'Wolf and the Seven Little Kids'. Freud interprets Pankejev's explanation by speaking in the voice of the patient, saying, 'Be kind to me. Must I be afraid of you? Are you going to gobble me up? Should I hide from you in the clock-case, like the youngest of the seven little kids?' (*The Wolfman*: 237). Freud perceives himself to be the Wolf, the threatening figure, while he perceives Pankejev to be the little kid who is frightened by the Wolf. Yet, if Freud implicitly believes that Pankejev perceives him to be the Wolf, showing us that this is how Freud unconsciously perceives himself, then the three questions become questions directed at himself.

While Pankejev traces his symptomatic act of looking repeatedly at the grandfather clock back to the story of 'The Wolf and the Seven Little Kids', Freud's question of why there are six or seven wolves, seems to relate to the seven little kids in the Brothers Grimm fairy tale, which the patient associates with the grandfather clock. As

a question asked by Freud of himself, however, the answer perhaps lies in the fact that there were six children in Freud and Martha's family, and seven children in the Jacob–Amalia Freud family. Freud asks himself, or in a sense, asks himself in the role of the Wolf, the mother, why there were six or seven children. In asking this, Freud indirectly asks her why she abandoned him as a child, in favour of the newborn siblings, and in particular, his younger brother Julius, whose death in infancy caused the grief that would lead Amalia to stop showing Freud any attention. The trauma that Freud felt over this period of his life manifests as one of his earliest childhood dreams, which he analyses in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. It is worth taking a moment to consider this dream because it offers us a greater insight into what Freud unconsciously believes are the answers to the questions he indirectly asks himself as the Wolf.

In the dream, Freud is confronted with the death of his brother, that he theorises he must have unconsciously wished for, and the depression that his mother suffered from, following the death of Julius. Freud says of the dream,

It was very vivid, and it showed me *my beloved mother with a distinctively tranquil, sleeping expression on her face, who was being carried into the room by two (or three) people with birds' beaks, and laid on the bed*. I woke up crying and screaming, and disturbed my parents' sleep. The - curiously draped - elongated figures with the birds' beaks I had taken from the illustrations to *Philippon's* edition of the Bible; I believe they were gods with falcons' heads from an Egyptian tomb relief. Besides this, the analysis provided me with the memory of a badly behaved boy...and I rather think he was called *Philipp*. I have the feeling as though it was from this boy that I heard the vulgar word for sexual intercourse for which the educated substitute

a Latinate word, 'coition', but which is characterized clearly enough by the choice of falcons' heads. I must have guessed the sexual meaning of the word from the face of my experienced mentor. The expression on my mother's face in the dream was copied from the sight of my grandfather, whom I had seen snoring in a coma a few days before his death...I woke up in this state of anxiety, and did not stop until I had wakened my parents. I remember I calmed down all of a sudden when I saw my mother, as though I needed the reassurance: so she is not dead, after all.^{vi}

Freud offers a cursory analysis of the dream, saying,

I was not anxious because I had dreamt that my mother was dying; but I interpreted the dream in that sense in my preconscious revision of it because I was already under the influence of the anxiety. The anxiety can be traced back, when repression is taken into account, to an obscure and evidently sexual craving that had found appropriate expression in the vital content of the dream. (TID: 741)

We see in the dream a symbolic narrativisation of the Oedipus complex and its accompanying castration anxiety centred on the fear that like his brother Julius, his mother will die, as punishment for the fulfilment of his Oedipal wishes. In the dream, the two or three genderless people have on their faces bird beaks, which we can interpret as phallic symbols representing the threat of castration. Yet, as Freud writes in 'The Uncanny', 'The invention of such doubling as a defence against annihilation has a counterpart in the language of dreams, which is fond of expressing the idea of castration by duplicating the genital symbol' (Freud, *The Uncanny*: 142). In one

sense, the Egyptian gods with their phallic beaked-heads represent the threat of castration posed to Freud. At the same time, the doubling of the bird heads itself represents the threat of castration. In another sense, however, the threat of castration is itself castrated and diminished by being doubled, arguably representing the psychological weakness of Freud's father, Jacob. In this respect, the bird humans also represent Freud's sense of alienation from his father, through their half-human, half-bird forms, while the allusion to ancient Egyptian gods reflects Freud's search for near super-human father-substitutes. Moreover, it demonstrates the fact that Freud unconsciously looked to his mother as the authoritative, patriarchal figure within his family. This is not to suggest that there is a natural correlation between patriarchy and authority, but that within the nineteenth century context in which the dream was experienced and later written about, such a correlation was socially accepted. Freud sees in his mother the face of his grandfather, the face of patriarchal authority.

Yet, within this dream, the punishment is also associated with the death of his mother, suggesting that Freud unconsciously felt responsible for the profound depression that seems to have afflicted Amalia following the death of Julius. In successfully wishing for the death of Julius, he indirectly brought about, whether wished for or not, the depression that his mother suffered. In a sense, Freud could acknowledge, within the dream, the more aggressive instinct, and its accompanying guilt, of wishing he were free of his sibling rival. What he finds almost impossible, however, is facing the feeling of powerlessness and low self-esteem at being rejected by his mother. Freud unconsciously deals with this fear of rejection by reconstructing the idealised, passive double of his mother, who is incapable of rejecting him, firstly through his Dora-like wife Martha, and later his first patient *Dora*. In the case of *The Wolfman*, however, Freud counters the fear of rejection by adopting the role of the

mother that Amalia would later become, following the period of depression: an angry, volatile, and domineering mother, in other words the Wolf, who stops Freud the child (played by the patient) from leaving.

When Freud the child asks Freud the Wolf, should I hide from you in the grandfather clock like the youngest of the seven kids, what he really does is unconsciously ask his domineering mother whether he should seek refuge within the womb of the maternalised father, the grandfather clock. The fact that the grandfather clock has an accessible interior gives it a womb-like quality. Moreover, the association between the mother and the grandfather, the maternal and the paternal, that we see here in Freud's recollection of the psychoanalytic session echoes Freud's childhood dream of his mother's death. Freud recalls that, 'The expression on my mother's face in the dream was copied from the sight of my grandfather, whom I had seen snoring in a coma a few days before his death' (TID: 382). By escaping into the womb, Freud attempts to escape the guilt of having unconsciously wished for the death of his brother, which consequently led to his mother's rejection of him. He reverses his mother's rejection of him, by becoming, in a sense, a part of her again, through a return to the womb. At the same time he reverses her rejection of him by identifying with her and becoming the Wolf.

Given Freud's assumption that the patient views him as the Wolf, while at a certain unconscious level wishing to be the Wolf, as perceived by Pankejev, but at a deeper unconscious level viewing himself as the Wolf as the symbolic representation of his mother, we then must reconsider Pankejev's dream about the wolves. We must reconsider the dream, not because Pankejev is responsible for Freud's perception of himself as performing the role of the Wolf, although he plays a part, but because Freud's method of recording the psychoanalytic session as a case history, including

the patient's dream, allows Freud's unconscious fears and desires, in particular those associated with the figure of the Wolf, to shape his interpretation, recollection, and recording of the psychoanalytic session. The gap between the event and its second-hand recollection allows Freud's unconscious need to recreate an interaction between himself and his mother to enter into his interpretation of Pankejev's dream. Freud recalls Pankejev saying,

I dreamed that it is night and I am lying in my bed (the foot of my bed was under the window, and outside the window there was a row of old walnut trees. I know that it was winter in my dream, and night-time). Suddenly the window opens of its own accord and terrified, I see that there are a number of white wolves sitting in the big walnut tree outside the window. (*The Wolfman*: 227)

If Freud unconsciously perceives himself as the white wolf, this would suggest that the three questions that Freud asks Pankejev about the dream are also unconsciously asked of himself: 1. *Why are the wolves white?* 2. *How did the wolves get up in the tree?* 3. *Why are there six or seven wolves?* We can better understand what the answer might be to these questions, if we consider them in relation to the first three questions. We can place them in order thus: 1. Why are the wolves white? Must I be afraid of you? 2. How did the wolves get in the tree? Are you going to gobble me up? 3. Why are there six or seven wolves? Should I hide from you in the clock-case, like the youngest of the seven little kids? The six questions, the seven little goats, and the six or seven wolves, numerically and symbolically reflect Freud's childhood, in which his Oedipal desire for his mother, on the one hand was allowed to ferment unchallenged by any potent threat of castration from his father. Yet, on the other hand, it was

countered, but again unsuccessfully, by his phallicized mother. At the same time, his desire for his mother was frustrated by his six siblings. Just as the wolf gobbles up the six kids, with the seventh kid seeking refuge inside the womb-like interior of the grandfather clock, so Amalia gave birth to seven children. Freud's unconscious fantasy of returning to the womb could thus also represent an attempt to fulfil his oedipal desire.

Freud arguably sees in Pankejev's dream an enactment of both his Oedipus complex, and his castration complex. In the latter sense, the wolves represent the castration threat posed by his domineering mother, Amalia, which seeks to destroy the Oedipus complex. Yet, simultaneously, the wolves also represent Freud's oedipal desire for his mother. Freud's transference that we see occurring in his interaction with Pankejev continues, by implication, into his unconscious perception and interpretation of Pankejev's dream. Freud's question of whether he should be afraid of the wolf parallels the question of why the wolves are white. This suggests that it is the fact that the wolves are white that makes them frightening.

There are several associations with the colour white that Freud may have unconsciously thought of when the patient related the dream to him. The white wolves could symbolically represent droplets of semen attempting to enter the womb-like interior of the bedroom via the phallically shaped tree, just as Freud interprets the pearl drops associated with the jewellery box in Dora's dream as symbolically representing droplets of semen. In the illustration of the wolves in the tree that Pankejev draws for Freud, we see that the tree symbolically represents an upturned penis with the ten upper branches representing pubic hair. The fact that the tree, as a phallic symbolic, is turned away from the object of desire, the room, suggests that it is not only a phallic symbol that represents the potential threat of castration, by allowing

the wolves to enter the room, but also represents the threat of castration through the sense in which the tree has been separated from the house, which in this sense could represent the body.

The association between the grandfather clock, the patriarch, the mother, and the wolf that Freud unconsciously brings to the psychoanalytic session may also have arisen out of the strange fact that we find these key elements of the depicted psychoanalytic session share many similarities with scenes in Charles Dickens' *Little Dorrit*. Dickens' novel charts the emancipation and rise in social status of the imprisoned Dorrit family, through the efforts of Mr Pancks, employed by Arthur Clennam, in uncovering Mr Dorrit's inheritance, ironically mirrored by Clennam's later loss of social status and imprisonment in the same Marshalsea debtors prison. The novel ends with the eventual emancipation of Little Dorrit from the aristocratic life she could not adjust to, and Mr Clennam's emancipation from prison, and their marriage. Perhaps the most significant event in Dickens' life to influence the novel was the death of his father one year earlier, the driving force behind the novel's obsession with the passage of time.

This obsession with time is manifested in Clennam's unconscious perception of himself as being too old to fall in love with the younger Amy Dorrit; Flora Casby's ageing, and her unpunctuated manner of speaking as though there were not enough time left in the world; Mrs Clennam's timeless house; the Patriarch's timeless house which is perceived by Clennam to be a superficial repetition of his mother's house; the Patriarch's compulsive repetition of speech, and Mrs Flintwinch's 'dream' of the double. Perhaps the most striking symbol of timelessness is the Etruscan bronze sculpture in Rome, created in the fifth century BC, with the twins added in the

fifteenth century AD and often called the ‘Capitoline wolf’, which depicts a she-wolf suckling Romulus and Remus, the twin founders of ancient Rome (LD: 880).

Just as Freud theorises that the wolf, as a symbol of the father, is central to Sergei Pankejev’s neurosis, so in *Little Dorrit*, the wolf, as a symbol of the mother, stands at the symbolic centre of the novel, just as Mrs Clennam, his stepmother, is central to Arthur Clennam’s life, until she is replaced by Amy Dorrit. In one sense, the wolf symbolizes the motherless Amy Dorrit who looks after her father in the Marshalsea debtors prison, and the child-like Maggy, who calls her ‘Little Mother’, and who Dickens likens to Euphrasia, the ‘classical daughter’, who visits her imprisoned father Evander, King of Syracuse, and suckles him from her breast^{vii}. This not only parallels the Etruscan she-wolf that suckles Romulus and Remus, but also contrasts with the fact that Mrs Clennam, while similarly the adoptive mother of Arthur, offers him no emotional or psychological nourishment, or the possibility of an Oedipus complex, whether fulfilled or not.

Clennam’s stepmother, Mrs Clennam, is the embodiment of steely coldness. The narrator tells us that she takes off her steel spectacles, and, ‘With her cold grey eyes and her cold grey hair, and her immovable face, as stiff as the folds of her stony head-dress – her being beyond the reach of the seasons, seemed but a fit sequence to her being beyond the reach of all changing emotions’ (LD: 46). Like the grey eyes and coat of a wolf, like the white wolves that stare at Sergei Pankejev, and like the cold fixed stare of the Etruscan wolf statue, Mrs Clennam’s cold stare is accentuated when she replaces her steel spectacles, and reads ‘certain passages aloud from a book – sternly, fiercely, wrathfully’ (LD: 47). The implication is that she reads from the Bible, praying that her,

enemies (she made them by her tone and manner expressly hers) might be put to the edge of the sword, consumed by fire, smitten by plagues and leprosy, that their bones might be ground to dust, and that they might be utterly exterminated. (LD: 48)

In a sense, Mrs Clennam's prayer is answered in the opening of the novel, which opens with a scene that depicts a blinding, mesmeric heat that affects everyone and everything beneath the Marseilles sky. The narrator says,

Everything in Marseilles, and about Marseilles, had stared at the fervid sky, and been stared at in return, until a staring habit had become universal there. Strangers were stared out of countenance by staring white houses, staring white walls, staring white streets, staring tracts of arid road, staring hills from which verdure was burnt away. The only things to be seen not fixedly staring and glaring were the vines drooping under their load of grapes. These did occasionally wink a little, as the hot air barely moved their faint leaves. (LD: 15)

This entire scene depicts a slow, tortuous and incomplete symbolic castration of everything in and about Marseilles. As if bleached of all colour in the heat and light of the burning sun, and mesmerically blinded by its rays, the white houses, white walls, and white streets, together with the arid road, and barren hills, 'stare out of countenance' any strangers who approach the city. If we take 'countenance' to mean 'composure', the staring walls, streets, roads, and hills psychologically unnerve all approaching strangers. In another sense of the word 'countenance', meaning 'face', strangers metaphorically lose their faces, in a psychological sense, their identity, by

the uncompromising heat of the sky. We can compare this to the school boy Bitzer, in *Hard Times*, who is caught in the end of a beam of sunlight entering the classroom of the Gradgrind school of Facts. Bitzer,

was so light-eyed and light-haired that the self-same rays appeared to draw out of him what little colour he ever possessed. His cold eyes would hardly have been eyes, but for the short ends of lashes which, by bringing them into immediate contrast with something paler than themselves, expressed their form. (HT: 12)

The staring of the Marseilles houses, walls, and streets, is a blind, feverish, staring. The only things which do not stare, and glare, as if blinded by the heat, are the ‘vines drooping under their load of grapes’. Instead they anthropomorphically ‘wink’ occasionally, when the ‘hot air barely moved their faint leaves’ (LD: 15). Mrs Clennam’s prayer results in the burning sky over Marseilles and finds her enemy, Rigaud (who also goes by the name of Blandois and Lagnier), imprisoned in Marseilles for the murder of his wife, and punishes him before he has in fact wronged her.

Strangers are symbolically castrated by the white heat of Marseilles, when they lose their countenance, in a literal sense losing their faces which in its literalism is paradoxically a symbolic castration. More specifically, Rigaud, by association, is punished not by the courts, but by God, through Mrs Clennam’s prayer. Rigaud’s punishment, like the metaphorical and literal loss of strangers’ countenances in approaching Marseilles, is to lose his name, requiring him to adopt the pseudonyms of ‘Blandois’ and ‘Lagnier’. Yet, ironically, there is also a sense in which the punishing heat misses Rigaud, and in a strange reversal of cause and effect, precedes Rigaud’s

release from prison where he leaves for Rome, meets the Gowans, and discovers the documents which prove that Mrs Clennam has suppressed Mr Clennam's will, which would have left the imprisoned Amy Dorrit, and indirectly her family, rich enough to leave the confines of the prison. With this knowledge, Rigaud attempts to blackmail Mrs Clennam, thus ironically becoming one of the enemies she had pre-emptively sought to punish through her prayer. Yet, just as Marseilles and in particular Rigaud seem to be her enemy, so the narrator tells us that,

As she read on, years seemed to fall away from her son like the imaginings of a dream, and all the old dark horrors of his usual preparation for the sleep of an innocent child to overshadow him. (LD: 48)

Clennam's dream-like regression to a state of being an 'innocent child' overshadowed by 'dark horrors', suggests that he too is one of her enemies.

On a psychological, and more familial level, she takes on the role of the castratory father, whose threat of castration takes the form of, among other gruesome punishments, having her son 'put to the edge of the sword' (LD: 48). This phallicization of the mother occurs again, when the next morning, Clennam greets his mother. The narrator tells us that, 'Sitting with her hands laid separately upon the desk, and the tall cabinet towering before her, she looked as if she were performing on a dumb church organ. Her son thought so (it was an old thought with him), while he took his seat beside it' (LD: 55). Clennam's perception of her performing on a soundless church organ, contrasts with the visceral prayer read out from 'the book' by her on the previous day. At the same time, her playing upon a dumb church organ could symbolically represent her manipulation and abuse of him, through religion. The fact that for Clennam, the thought of his stepmother playing a 'dumb church

organ' is an old thought, suggests that it is one rooted in his childhood. In effect, she has and continues to symbolically castrate Clennam, striking him impotent and dumb.

The tall cabinet / church organ represents, in Clennam's unconscious mind, the phallus that has transformed his stepmother into the castration threat and object of desire, the Etruscan she-wolf, while simultaneously representing himself as a soundless and impotent Church organ, symbolically struck dumb and castrated by his stepmother. We can compare Mrs Clennam's performance on a dumb church organ to Freud's description of Sergei Pankejev's 'dumb show' of looking from Freud to the grandfather clock. While Pankejev's 'dumb show' is symptomatic of the castration threat that Pankejev feels Freud poses him, and which Freud wilfully performs the role of, unconscious of who the Wolf actually represents to him, namely his mother, Mrs Clennam's performance upon the 'dumb church organ' is indicative of the castration threat she poses to Clennam. While for Pankejev, the grandfather clock symbolically offers him a womb-like protection from Freud, the wolf, Mrs Clennam's tall cabinet / church organ represents the phallus that threatens Clennam.

Mrs Clennam's wolfish-nature, and the castratory threat that she poses to Arthur Clennam, is further reflected in her business partner, Jeremiah Flintwinch, who helps keep the Dorrit family imprisoned and poor by giving the documents pertaining to Mr Dorrit's inheritance to his twin brother, Ephraim. Jeremiah, and by implication his twin brother, share a similarly lupine nature with Mrs Clennam, which is first revealed to Affery, Jeremiah's wife, in what she thinks is a dream, but is in fact reality. She 'dreams' that she has awoken from a long sleep, judging by the melted candle which she lit before retiring, and realises that Jeremiah is not in bed. Walking downstairs and along a corridor, she 'peeped in between the rusty hinges of the door'

of 'a little waiting-room, like a well-shaft, with a long narrow window in it as if it had been ripped up. In this room, which was never used, a light was burning' (LD: 53).

In this room, she sees Jeremiah conspires with and argue with his double, unbeknown to Affery, his twin brother Ephraim. Jeremiah's double turns a short nap into a two-hour sleep, which angers him: "'You have been asleep", snarled Jeremiah' (LD: 54). The 'snarl' is commonly associated with dogs and wolves, and indeed, his anger at his double sleeping parallels the 'real' Jeremiah's violent, almost canine means of waking Mrs Flintwinch. The narrator says, 'Mr Flintwinch took her by the throat, and shook her until she was black in the face' (LD: 55). As a man, he takes her by the throat and shakes her with his hands. However, the expression 'took her by the throat' and the action of shaking her, is connotative of dogs and wolves.

Jeremiah then exclaims that she has been dreaming, saying, "'If you ever have a dream of this sort again, it'll be a sign of your being in want of physic. And I'll give you such a dose, old woman – such a dose!" Mrs Flintwinch thanked him and crept into bed' (LD: 55). When, much later, she does have a similar episode, hearing strange noises, Affery says, "'There, Jeremiah! Now! What's that noise!" His angry response again takes on an almost wolfish quality when the narrator tells us, 'Mr Flintwinch would snarl, turning upon her as if she had cut him down that moment against his will' (LD: 188). Ironically, however, it is Jeremiah who continually cuts Affery down against her will. In a strange externalisation of Affery's unconscious mind, the dream-like perception of Jeremiah and his double arguably represents the threat of castration which she poses to him, and which he poses to her.

Jeremiah's aggression towards Affery stems from her hearing ghostly noises, which has an effect upon him comparable to her 'metaphorically cutting him down that moment against his will' (Ibid.). As a witness of her husband's hitherto secret

double, and the box of documents to be secretly taken away to France, Jeremiah must convince her that she has been dreaming, and frighten her into never having such dreams again. Yet, Jeremiah's anger is also arguably an unconscious response to the castration threat that he perceives Affery to represent. Affery's metaphorical act of cutting him down against his will, which the narrator suggests Jeremiah perceives Affery to threaten him with, is in a sense, the castratory act which gives rise to Jeremiah's double.

If we view Affery's experience as a dream, we can see that Jeremiah and his double represent the father divided into the good father, the ego ideal, and the threatening father, the castration threat. While Jeremiah is her husband, their relationship is so imbalanced in terms of power that his relationship to her is almost that of the stern father, paralleling the relationship between the phallicized Mrs Clennam and her stepson, Arthur. Likewise, Jeremiah's relationship to Affery parallels the relationship between Mr Casby, the Last Patriarch, and his daughter Flora Casby. The name 'Last Patriarch' is a reference to the biblical figure Noah. At the same time, however, Mr Dorrit is called the Father of the Marshalsea, and upon leaving prison becomes in a sense the last Father of the Marshalsea, another Last Patriarch. Likewise, Jeremiah's name is historically the name of the biblical patriarchal figure Jeremiah, the last ruler of Jerusalem, from 626 BC- 586 BC, before it fell to the Babylonians^{viii}. At the same time, Jeremiah's twin brother, Ephraim, has a first name, which was also another name for Israel during Jeremiah's rule over Jerusalem.

As a patriarchal figure who dominates Affery, and the patriarchal figure within Affery's dream that is not a dream, Jeremiah represents the monstrous, demonic, father who threatens her with castration, in order to destroy the Oedipus complex.

Conversely, while Ephraim cannot be said to be the loving father figure, he is at least a non-threatening father figure. Together with their subservience to Jeremiah, there is an implicit sense of familiarity between them, arising from their similar sounding names, Affery and Ephraim. A sense is created in which Jeremiah is unconsciously aware that the act of perceiving the Patriarch as being split in two, represents the primal murder which gives rise to God and Devil, only for the Devil to return in search of revenge in the form of the threat of castration. As Sabine Prokhoris says,

In Jewish history, Freud likens the religious process of the institutionalisation and sacrilisation of a divine figure with the consummation and subsequent repression of an act of murder which took that figure as its victim. Despite repression, says Freud, a memory of the murder remains active within the unconscious. What was repressed returns, without becoming fully conscious in Christianity, with the murder of Christ (a condensation of father and son). Thus the Devil appears as a resurrected primal father, or more precisely as living proof that the murder of the father was unsuccessful, because impossible. By way of the pact, the primal father returns to seek vengeance and settle accounts. (Prokhoris: 117)

Jeremiah attempts to deny and repress the perceptual split that transformed him into a wolfish father-figure and Ephraim into a passive father-figure, by convincing Affery that she was merely dreaming. Yet, paradoxically, it is through his wolfish nature that he intimidates and threatens her into believing that what she saw, the division of Jeremiah and Ephraim, was only a dream. Moreover, the dream is a creation of the unconscious mind, where the perceptual splitting of the father-*imago* first takes place.

Yet, the threat of castration that she poses, and which Jeremiah poses to her, is carried out as soon as Affery looks upon Jeremiah and his Ephraim. The narrator tells us, 'The waking Flintwinch was the old original; the sleeping Flintwinch was the double. Just as she might have distinguished between a tangible object and its reflection in glass, Affery made out this difference with her head going round and round' (LD: 53). It is Affery's differentiation between the original Jeremiah and the double that divides him into two, symbolically separating the King Jeremiah from his Kingdom, Ephraim, itself symbolic of the castration threat. Paradoxically, however, it is her castration of him which then gives rise to the castratory Jeremiah, who threatens Ephraim and Affery. Yet, Affery recognizes this 'original' Jeremiah through his 'impatience' with the sleeping double. The restraint of this description suggests that the narrator describes Jeremiah from Affery's subservient perspective, through free indirect discourse, and that 'impatience' is a euphemism for 'aggression' or 'violence'.

This would suggest that it is not Affery's perception which gives rise to Jeremiah the castration threat, but rather that either the narrator castrates Jeremiah, or if the narrator has no role to play, that Jeremiah has always been castrated. This in turn suggests that the castration threat in Affery's unconscious, originally modelled on her father, finds its external equivalent in Jeremiah Flintwinch. The sleeping, rather passive Ephraim Flintwinch is arguably the alternative Jeremiah that Affery might have married had her psychology been different. She is, in a sense, imprisoned not only within her marriage to Jeremiah, but imprisoned within her own psychology and past. When Affery witnesses Jeremiah talking to his double, she is confronted on the one hand, with the oedipal fantasy of the father divided into the ego ideal and the

castration threat, and on the other hand with the possibility that there might be an alternative 'Jeremiah' to whom she could have been married.

Just as Affery's 'dream' shows us the patriarchal figure divided into two patriarchal figures, Jeremiah and Ephraim, so this is paralleled by the superficial similarity Arthur Clennam perceives between his stepmother's house, and the house of Mr Casby, the Last Patriarch. Clennam observes upon entering Casby's home, that, 'The house [...] is as little changed as my mother's, and looks almost as gloomy. But the likeness ends outside. I know its staid repose within. The smell of its jars of old rose-leaves and lavender seems to come upon me even here' (LD: 147). The old rose-leaves and lavender symbolically represent in one sense, the oedipal love for his stepmother, which he seeks to escape from, and yet which 'seems to come upon me even here' (Ibid.). At the same time, however, they represent the love Clennam once felt for Flora Casby, the real reason for his visit to the Last Patriarch.

Arguably, Clennam unconsciously views Flora to be the last woman who might be able to take the place of his stepmother, thus ending his Oedipus complex. This is reflected in Flora's breathless, barely punctuated manner of speaking that creates a sense of time running out. Yet, this also reflects the fact that Flora has not aged well in the time that has passed since Clennam last saw her. Indeed, it is both her unattractiveness and the reminder that he has also aged that he suddenly feels he must escape. Sensing his anxiety, Flora says,

You mustn't think of going yet, [...] you could never be so unkind as to think of going, Arthur –I mean Mr Arthur - or I suppose Mr Clennam would be far more proper - but I'm sure I don't know what I'm saying – without a word about the dear old days gone for ever, however when I come to think of it I dare say it would be much better not to speak of them. (LD: 153)

The narrator tells us that, ‘Arthur had looked at his hat, being in a ludicrous dismay, and not knowing what to do’ (LD: 153). Perceptively, almost as if time was ironically slow enough for her to notice something so fleeting, Flora exclaims, ‘You mustn’t think of going yet [...] you could never be so unkind as to think of going yet’ (Ibid.). Reminiscent of the Wolfman’s ‘dumb-show’ of anxiously looking to the grandfather clock in Freud’s office, Clennam anxiously looks at his hat, ‘not knowing what to do’ (Ibid.). In one sense, Clennam wishes but is unable to put his hat on and leave. Yet on an unconscious level, Clennam arguably perceives the hat as a safe, womb-like interior into which he can retreat. Within the already womb-like house of the Patriarch, with its jars containing leaves and lavender, retreating yet further into the womb is for Clennam also a means of escaping. What he escapes from is not simply a middle-aged Flora, but the ravages of time, and his own mortality.

Just as Freud’s office is dominated by the presence of a grandfather clock, at least from Pankejev’s perspective, so in the Last Patriarch’s house,

There was a grave clock, ticking somewhere up the staircase; and there was a songless bird in the same direction, pecking at his cage as if he were ticking too. The parlour-fire ticked in the grate. There was only one person on the parlour-hearth, and the loud watch in his pocket ticked audibly. The servant-maid had ticked the two words ‘Mr Clennam’ so softly that she had not been heard; and he consequently stood, within the door she had closed, unnoticed. The figure of a man advanced in life, whose smooth grey eyebrows seemed to move to the ticking as the firelight flickered on them, sat in an arm-chair, with his list shoes on the rug, and his thumbs slowly revolving over one another. This was old Christopher Casby – recognizable at a glance – as

unchanged in twenty years and upwards, as his own solid furniture – as little touched by the influence of the varying seasons, as the old rose-leaves and lavender in his porcelain jars. (LD: 147, 148)

While we can say that Clennam wishes to escape from Flora and the Patriarch's claustrophobic house, we can also view this as Clennam's deeper desire to escape from his mother. Mrs Clennam lives in a house which on the outside is very similar to that of the Patriarch, but while Clennam differentiates the Patriarch's house from his mother's by the smell of rose leaves and lavender contained in jars, the leaves and lavender in the Patriarch's house arguably represent Clennam's oedipal desire for his mother.

In a psychological inversion of Clennam's fears and desires, his escape from his domineering mother, by entering into the house of the Patriarch, in fact takes him into the heart of the Oedipal desire from which he attempts to escape. His entrance into the Patriarch's house, which Clennam observes to superficially be the same as his mother's house, but to have a distinctively old and feminine smell inside, symbolically represents his sexual entrance into his stepmother. Just as Clennam's meeting with his stepmother results in him feeling as though time has reversed, resulting in him psychologically regressing back to his childhood, while Mrs Clennam is unchanged by time, so Clennam's discomfort in his meeting with Flora arguably stems from the shock of seeing in a potential mother substitute the passage of time. His need to escape from his mother, who psychologically reduces him to a child, parallels his need to escape from Flora, who unintentionally reduces him psychologically to a tired, middle-aged man.

Little Dorrit, in this sense, represents a happy medium between Clennam's need to escape his being a child in relation to his mother, and being a middle-aged man in

relation to Flora, for he finds in Little Dorrit both a 'little mother', a name given to her by Maggie, and at the same time, a 'poor child'. He continues, in a sense, to be a child, in relation to this 'little mother', and yet a middle-aged father, in relation to this 'poor child', in the grip of his repressed Oedipus complex. At the same time, however, she neither wishes to be treated like a child, nor to mother Clennam. Her own repressed Oedipus complex, in a sense, complements his repressed Oedipus complex. He finds in her a mother substitute, while she finds in him a father substitute.

Yet, the Oedipus complex is only repressed and displaced, rather than fully destroyed. It is for this reason that Dickens' novels would continue to depict characters with the same psychological conflicts, as we see in the later *Great Expectations*. Dickens' understanding of the role that the parents play in informing the child's later choice of marital partner can also be seen in Dickens' *Great Expectations*, which as a novel arguably owes as much to *Little Dorrit* as to *David Copperfield*. The novel's depiction of Joe Gargery's relationship with his father and mother helps us understand the relationship between Arthur Clennam and his stepmother, and Affery and Jeremiah. Joe Gargery tells Pip the story of his childhood, in which he was psychologically scarred by his violent alcoholic father who 'hammered away at my mother' and 'hammered at me with a wigour only to be equalled by the wigour with which he didn't hammer at his anvil' (GE: 45). The consequence of this is that Joe identifies with his mother rather than his father, becoming a gentle, almost feminine man, in his relationship to women and children.

When Joe and Pip learn of Pip's secret benefactor, Pip, as the adult author and narrator of his memoirs tells us, 'Joe laid his hand upon my shoulder with the touch of a woman. I have often thought him since, like the steam-hammer, that can crush a

man or tap an eggshell, in his combination of strength with gentleness' (GE: 138, 139). Reminiscent of the gentle hand Mr Omer places upon the shoulder of David Copperfield at the funeral of David's mother, Joe is loving and kind, but like his mother, he chooses to marry someone who is cruel and violent. Just as his mother could not protect him or herself, so Joe is unable to protect Pip or himself from the phallicized Mrs Joe, who tyrannises them both with her 'Tickler', which Pip tells us 'was a wax-ended piece of cane, worn smooth by collision with my tickled frame' (GE: 9). The name connotes a playfulness that belies its violent function. At the same time, the name Tickler is connotative of female masturbation, contrasting Mrs Joe's sexual inaccessibility to Joe, and to Pip, as a substitute oedipal object of desire.

Her phallic nature, combined with her sexual inaccessibility, is accentuated by Pip's description of her at the beginning of the novel. Pip tells us that she had 'such a prevailing redness of skin that I sometimes used to wonder whether it was possible that she washed herself with a nutmeg-grater instead of soap'. At the same time, 'She was tall and bony, and almost always wore a coarse apron, fastened over her figure behind with two loops, and having a square impregnable bib in front, that was stuck full of pins and needles' (GE: 8). Being tall and bony with red skin, together with the two genital-like loops that fasten from behind her 'impregnable bib in front' gives her an explicitly phallic appearance, in a sense, taking the place of Joe's father, with Joe taking the role of his victimised mother. Yet, Joe understands the choice he has made in identifying with his mother rather than his father. He explains,

I see so much in my poor mother, of a woman drudging and slaving and breaking her honest hart and never getting no peace in her mortal days, that I'm dead afeerd of going wrong in the way of not doing what's right by a

woman, and I'd fur rather of the two go wrong the t'other way, and be a little ill-conwenienced myself. (GE: 49)

Joe's only means of unleashing his anger towards his father, and Mrs Joe, takes place in the forge, psychologically representative of his unconscious mind.

Joe sings 'Old Clem', a song that he 'used to hum fragments of at the forge' (GE: 93). Just as *Little Dorrit* is populated by a number of 'last Patriarchs', so the title of the song refers to St. Clement, the 1st century AD Pope and first of the Apostolic Fathers, believed to have had real contact with the original Apostles^{ix}. Joe's revenge against his father is to fragment the song of the first Apostolic Patriarch, as if in doing so he fragments, destroys, and castrates the patriarch. However, Joe's repressed anger towards his father contrasts the name Clement from which the word clemency derives, and indeed the clemency which Joe shows his father. Joe tells Pip that, 'In time I were able to keep him, and I kep him till he went off in a purple leptic fit' (GE: 46). With almost poetic irony, Joe's gentleness, forgiveness, and generosity in supporting his father, are met only with his father's apoplexy, a fit of anger, from which he dies. Through his son's refusal to identify with him, thereby breaking the generational chain of sons becoming their fathers, Joe's father becomes the 'last Patriarch' of his familial line of violent men.

Just as Joe Gargery in the end finds happiness in his marriage to Bidy, Arthur Clennam in the end escapes the influence of his stepmother, and finds happiness in his marriage to Amy Dorrit. At an unconscious level, Clennam fulfils rather than destroys his Oedipus complex through his marriage to Little Dorrit, the 'little mother'. Amy similarly brings to their marriage her own repressed Oedipal desire for her father, finding in Clennam an Oedipal substitute for her father. At the same time, however,

her father treats her as a substitute for the wife he lost. When William Dorrit melodramatically despairs of his life in prison, he says to Amy, 'I tell you, if you could see me as your mother saw me, you wouldn't believe it to be the creature you have only looked at through the bars of this cage' (LD: 226). William Dorrit's wish that Amy should see him from her mother's perspective unconsciously harbours the wish that Amy should be his wife, or take her place as his wife. As if granting his implicit wish, she replies to his despair, saying, 'Dear father, loved father, darling of my heart' (LD: 226). Mr Dorrit goes on to theatrically cry, 'O despise me, despise me! Look away from me, don't listen to me, stop me, blush for me, cry for me - Even you Amy' (LD: 226). The poetic rhythm of this plea, the repetition of the word 'me', and the rhyming name of his daughter, 'Amy', creates a sense in which the father wishes himself, 'me', to be united with 'Amy', with an added sense that the father unconsciously wishes to possess his daughter, through the written form of the second syllable of Amy's name, 'my'. On this basis, Mrs Clennam's earlier command that Clennam 'look at me, in prison' unconsciously refers not only to herself, 'me', but also, ironically, to 'Amy', whose imprisonment Mrs Clennam is responsible for (LD: 60).

The further irony of this, however, is that for much of the novel, Clennam looks at Amy the 'child', but does not see Amy the young woman, repressing his desire for her, out of his own sense of inadequacy at being an older man. Conversely, William Dorrit asks Amy to look on him, not as her father, but as a young, handsome, man, asking her to take her mother's place, and become the 'classical daughter' who both mothers her father, and offers herself sexually, by suckling him at the breast (LD: 227). Amy makes her father sit down again, and attempts to put his arm round her neck. The father's arm has a certain phallic quality to it, yet the fact that the once melodramatically outstretched arm can now be moved by Amy, as she puts it round

her neck, suggests that the arm is limp, reflecting William's depressed self esteem, diminished sense of phallic power, and sense of impotence. As if referring directly to his flaccid state, Amy says, 'Let it lie there, father. Look at me, father, kiss me, father! Only think of me, father, for one little moment!' (LD: 226). The impression created is that Amy and her father are making love, and that she reassures him, despite his impotence. As the narrator says,

There was a classical daughter once – perhaps - who ministered to her father in his prison as her mother had ministered to her. Little Dorrit, though of the unheroic modern stock, and mere English, did much more, in comforting her father's wasted heart upon her innocent breast, and turning to it a fountain of love and fidelity that never ran dry or waned, through all his years of famine. (LD: 227)

For Little Dorrit to do 'much more' than the classical daughter in ministering to her father's needs, to do more than suckle her father at the breast, would seem to imply that they have sexual intercourse. The narrator tells us that William Dorrit turned to Amy's breast 'a fountain of love and fidelity that never ran dry or waned', in one sense, describing her breast as a 'fountain of love and fidelity', indirectly equating the milk from the breast with 'love and fidelity' (LD: 227). In another sense, however, the image of a 'fountain of love and fidelity', through the connoted phallic shape of the fountain, becomes a euphemistic symbol of the male orgasm. This imagery of the classical daughter and the father represents both the daughter's Oedipus complex, in which she takes her mother's place, and the father's displaced and inverted Oedipus complex, which places the daughter in the role of the wife.

Amy's apparently innocent willingness to enter into an incestuous fulfilment of her and her father's oedipal desire, and her repressed wish to escape from her father and the Marshalsea prison, contrasts with Arthur Clennam's conscious desire to escape the influence of his stepmother, and his repressed desire to enter into an almost incestuous fulfilment of his Oedipal desire with his stepmother. Both Amy and Clennam, however, find a socially acceptable, and psychologically healing rather than harmful fulfilment of that desire in each other. Amy, the 'classical daughter' of Greek mythology takes the place of Mrs Clennam, the Etruscan she-Wolf of ancient classical Rome. Likewise, Arthur Clennam, who was temporarily imprisoned in the Marshalsea some time after William Dorrit's release, is in effect the last Father of the Marshalsea, paralleling Mr Casby the Last Patriarch, and as such takes the place of Mr Dorrit, the original Father of the Marshalsea. Amy's escape from the Father of the Marshalsea, made possible when she takes refuge in her marriage to Arthur Clennam, the last Father of the Marshalsea, is paralleled by Clennam's escape from his mother the Etruscan Wolf, made possible when he takes refuge in the house of the Last Patriarch, and later in his marriage to the 'Little Mother', Amy.

Their mutual escape from and fulfilment of their oedipal desires, finds its analogue in Sergei Pankejev's need to escape from Freud, cast in the role of the Wolf through Pankejev's transference, made possible, at least in the Pankejev's imagination, when he takes refuge in the womb of the grandfather clock. At the same time, however, Freud's counter transference, leads him to perceive himself as the Wolf, at an unconscious level, through his identification with his mother. However, Freud does not associate his mother with the wolf because of the wolf story told by Pankejev. It is the similarity between Amalia Freud and Mrs Clennam (and indeed Elizabeth Dickens whom Mrs Clennam is a cruel parody of), who reject their sons, that arguably leads

Freud to unconsciously see his mother as the wolf and through his identification with her, to see himself as the wolf. Just as there are two Wolfmen, Pankejev who is afraid of wolves, and Freud, who identifies with the wolf, so there are at the same time two sides to this figure of the wolf, ostensibly shared by Freud and Pankejev in their mutual transference and counter-transference. There is Pankejev's wolf which he projects onto Freud, and which Freud and Pankejev trace back to Pankejev's reading of the Brothers Grimm' story, 'The Wolf and the Seven Little Kids'. Yet, there is also Freud's wolf, which he perceives himself to be in relation to the patient, which he suggests originates in the Brothers Grimm story, but which perhaps alternatively originates in Freud's reading of Charles Dickens' *Little Dorrit*.

If Dickens' *Little Dorrit* does play an unconscious role in how Freud perceives the figure of the wolf that he encounters while treating Sergei Pankejev, so that the identity of the wolf that Pankejev transfers onto Freud is different to the identity of the wolf that Freud's counter-transference leads him to embrace the role of, then the 'wolf' in the case history of the Wolfman becomes something of an empty signifier, not because it is devoid of meaning, but because it has multiple meanings. Just as the narrator of *Little Dorrit* describes Mr Casby, the Last Patriarch as 'a mere Inn signpost without any Inn – an invitation to rest and be thankful, when there was no place to put up at, and nothing whatever to be thankful for' (LD: 151), so the 'wolf' in Freud's case history is both a sign without any 'in', and a sign with multiple 'ins', a paradox which arises out of Freud's transference onto the psychoanalytic session, and the patient. While Pankejev unconsciously perceived the Wolf to be representative of the father as castration threat, Freud unconsciously reconstructed the figure of the Wolf into a double of his mother as castration threat, ego-ideal, and oedipal object of

desire, arising through his unconscious perception of the Capitoline Wolf and Mrs Clennam in *Little Dorrit*.

ⁱ Bob Allen, *Eugene Lauste: Father of Sound on Film*

http://www.amps.net/newsletters/issue22/22_lauste.htm.

ⁱⁱ <http://inventors.about.com/library/inventors/blmotionpictures.htm>

ⁱⁱⁱ Sigmund Freud, *The Wolfman and Other Cases* (London: Penguin Books 2002) p. 235. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{iv} Ned Lukacher, *Primal Scenes: Literature, Philosophy, Psychoanalysis* (New York: Cornell University Press 1988) p. 137. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^v William Shakespeare, *Hamlet* in *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* (New York: Avenel Books 1985) p. 1091.

^{vi} Freud, S. *The Interpretation of Dreams* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1999) p. 382 Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{vii} Charles Dickens, *Little Dorrit* (London: Penguin Books 1998) Edited and with an Introduction and Notes by Stephen Wall and Helen Small. n. 7. p. 862 Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{viii} *The New English Bible* (Great Britain: Collins 1970) p. 23. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

^{ix} James Hall, (London: John Murray 1995) p. 71. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.

Conclusion

In 1875, five years after the death of Charles Dickens, Sigmund Freud was nineteen years old, and to celebrate his graduation from the Gymnasium, went on holiday to Manchester, England, where his half brothers Emanuel and Philipp lived (Breger: 49). Knowing that up to this point Freud's academic life in high school (Gymnasium) had been dominated by languages and literature, and having examined his identification with Charles Dickens, and enjoyment of Dickens' novels, we can perhaps safely speculate that as Freud made the journey to England, he was aware that only five years earlier, one of his favourite writers had died. However, as the years passed, and Freud embarked upon his career in medicine and psychoanalysis, coupled with his continued interest in art and literature, memories of Dickens, and the Oedipus complex that manifested in Dickens' writing, were repressed, only to return in Freud's writing. Just as Dickens had once sought to recreate in his writing an idealised double of his mother, so Freud unconsciously did the same. In his attempt to forget Dickens, Freud sought to deny his repressed Oedipus complex, only for both to make an uncanny return to Freud's writing. Through this return of the repressed, there emerges a kind of doubling between Dickens and Freud, rooted in the Oedipus complex.

Bibliography

Primary Texts

- Dickens, C. *Barnaby Rudge* ed. by Gordon Spence (London: Penguin Books 1997)
- Dickens, C. *David Copperfield* ed. by Malcolm Andrews (London: Everyman 1993)
- Dickens, C. *Little Dorrit* ed. by Stephen Wall and Helen Small (London: Penguin Books 1998)
- Freud, S. *Art and Literature* trans. by James Strachey, ed. by Albert Dickson (London: Penguin Books 1990)
- Freud, S. *Case Histories I: 'Dora' and 'Little Hans'* (London: Penguin Books 1990)
- Freud, S. *Dora: An Analysis of a Case of Hysteria* trans. by Philip Rieff (New York: Simon & Schuster 1997)
- Freud, S. *The Interpretation of Dreams* trans. by Joyce Crick (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1999)
- Freud, S. *The Uncanny* trans. by David McLintock gen. ed. Adam Philips (London: Penguin Books 2003)
- Freud, S. *The 'Wolfman' and Other Cases* trans. by Louise Adey Huish (London: Penguin Books 2002)

Secondary Texts

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms Sixth Edition* (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers 1993)
- Abrams, M.H. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature Sixth Edition Volume 2* (New York. London: W.W. Norton & Company 1993)

- Ackroyd, P. *The Collection: Journalism, Reviews, Essays, Short Stories, Lectures* ed. by Thomas Wright (London: Vintage 2002)
- Ackroyd, P. *Dickens* (London: Vintage 1999)
- Andrews, M. "I Will Live in the Past, Present, and the Future": Time, Place and Dickensians' in *Dickens Quarterly* Amherst MA Dec. 1995
- Arnold, M. *Culture and Anarchy* ed. by Samuel Lipman (New Haven & London: Yale University Press 1994)
- Attridge, D. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1997)
- Augustine, St. *On Christian Doctrine* trans. by D. W. Robertson, Jr. (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company Inc.)
- Bakhtin, M.M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* ed. by Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press 1998)
- Barthes, R. *Image Music Text* (London: Fontana Press 1977)
- Barthes, R. 'The Death of the Author' in *Literature in the Modern World* ed. by Dennis Walder (Oxford: Oxford University Press in association with The Open University 1990)
- Benjamin, W. *Charles Baudelaire: A Lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism* (London. New York: Verso 1997)
- Benjamin, W. *Illuminations* ed. by Hannah Arendt (London: Pimlico 1999)
- Bennett, A and Royle, N. *Introduction to Literature, Criticism and Theory* 2nd Edition (Essex: Prentice Hall Europe 1999)
- Best, G. *Mid-Victorian Britain 1851-75* gen. ed. E. J. Hobsbawm (London: Fontana Press 1985)
- Bloom, H. *Agon: Towards a Theory of Revisionism* (Oxford New York: Oxford University Press 1983)
- Boireau, N. 'Tom Stoppard's metadrama: The Haunting Repetition' in *Drama on Drama: Dimensions of Theatricality on the Contemporary British Stage* ed. by Nicole Boireau (New York: St. Martin's New York 1997)
- Bowen, J. *Other Dickens: Pickwick to Chuzzlewit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2003)

Breger, L. *Freud: Darkness in the Midst of Vision* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 2000)

Brooke, R. *Friends and Apostles: the Correspondence of Rupert Brooke and James Strachey 1905-1914* ed. by Keith Hale (New Haven; London: Yale University Press 1998)

Brooks, P. 'Repetition, Repression, and Return: The Plotting of *Great Expectations*' reprinted from *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1984)

Browne, D., ed. et al *MHRA Style Book: Notes for Authors, Editors, and Writers of Theses Fifth Edition* (London: Modern Humanities Research Association 1999)

Burke. S. *The Death and Return of the Author Second Edition* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press 1999)

Clark, D.S. *Psychiatry Today* (Middlesex: Penguin Books 1969)

Clark, T. and Royle, N. ed. *The Oxford Literary Reviews: Derridas Vol. 18, nos 1-2* (London: The Oxford Literary Review 1997)

Cleary. R. J. Dec. 'Haunting Households, Heidegger, and Holy Ghosts: A Psychology of the Family within the Economy of Culture' in *Dissertation Abstracts International* 1990 Ann Arbor, MI

Coolidge Jr., A. C. *Charles Dickens as Serial Novelist* (Iowa: The Iowa State University Press 1967)

Collins. P., ed. *The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul 1971)

Connor. S., ed. *Charles Dickens* (London and New York: Longman 1996)

Coen. S. J. *Between Author and Reader* ed. by Arnold. M. Cooper and Steven Marcus (Columbia: Columbia University Press 1994)

Culler. J. 1997 *Literary Theory A Very Short Introduction* Oxford University Press

Cronin. M. 'The Rake, The Writer, and The Stranger: Textual Relations between Pemmison and David Copperfield' in *Dickens Studies Annual: Essays on Victorian Fiction* New York NY 1996

Daleski, H. M. *Dickens and the Art of Analogy* (London: Faber and Faber 1970)

Daleski, H.M. 'Dickens and the Proleptic Uncanny' in *Dickens Studies Annual: Essays on Victorian Fiction* 1984 vol: 13 pp: 193 - 206

Danow, D. K. 'The Enigmatic Faces of the *Doppelgänger*' in *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* CRCL/RCLC June / Juin 1996

Davies, J. A. *The Textual Life of Dickens's Characters* (London: Macmillan 1989)

Davis P. *The Penguin Dickens Companion The Essential Reference to His Life and Work* (London: Penguin Books 1999)

Davis, W. *Drawing the Dream of the Wolves Homosexuality, Interpretation, and Freud's "Wolf Man"* (Indiana: Indiana University Press 1995)

Dawood, N.J (trans.) *Tales From the Thousand and One Nights* (London: Penguin Books 1973)

De Botton, A. *The Consolations of Philosophy* (London: Penguin Books 2000)

Derrida, J. *Dissemination* trans. by Barbara Johnson (London: The Athlone Press 1981)

Dever, C *Death and the Mother from Dickens to Freud: Victorian Fiction and the Anxiety of Origins* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1998)

Dickens, C. *Bleak House* ed. by Nicola Bradbury (London: Penguin Books 1996)

Dickens, C. *A Tale of Two Cities* (London: Penguin Books)

Dickens, C. *Christmas Books including 'A Christmas Carol'* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1998)

Dickens, C. *Dombey and Son* ed. by Peter Fairclough (London: Penguin Books 1985)

Dickens, C. *Great Expectations* Introduction by Kate Flint (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1994)

Dickens, C. *Hard Times For These Times* ed. by Grahame Smith Series Editor Michael Slater (London: Everyman 1994)

Dickens, C. *Oliver Twist* ed. by Peter Fairclough (London: Penguin Books 1985)

Dickens, C. *Our Mutual Friend* ed. by Adrian Poole (London: Penguin Books 1997)

Dickens, C. *Selected Short Fiction* (London: Penguin Books 1985)

Dickens, C. *Sikes and Nancy and Other Public Readings* ed. by Philip Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1983)

- Dickens, C. *Sketches by Boz* ed. by Dennis Walder (London: Penguin Books 1995)
- Dickens, C. *The Mystery of Edwin Drood* ed. by Arthur. J. Cox (London: Penguin Books 1985)
- Dickens, C. *The Old Curiosity Shop* (London: Penguin Books 1995)
- Dickens, C. *Pickwick Papers* ed. by Mark Wormald (London: Penguin Books 1999)
- Doane, M. A. 'Subjectivity and Desire: An (other) Way of Looking' in *Contemporary Film Theory* ed. by Antony Easthope gen. ed. Stan Smith (London and New York: Longman 1996)
- Dostoevsky, F. *The Double* gen. ed. Stanley Appelbaum ed. by Adam Frost (New York: Dover Publications Inc.)
- Duvall, D. S.. 'Inner Demons: Flawed Protagonists and Haunted Houses in The Haunting and The Shining in *Creative Screenwriting* Washington DC July-Aug 1999
- Eagleton, T. *Literary Theory An Introduction* 2nd Edition (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers 1999)
- Edgecombe, R. S 'Patrick White and Dickens: Two Points of Contact' in *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* East Sussex 1996
- Eliot, T. S. *The Waste Land and Other Poems* (London: Faber and Faber 1990)
- Ermath, E.D. *Realism and Consensus in the English Novel* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press 1983)
- Fanu, S. *In a Glass Darkly* ed. by Robert Tracy (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1999)
- Fisher, L. M. June 'Alice Lemon's Childhood Recollections of Charles Dickens' in *Dickens Quarterly* New Brunswick, NJ 1985
- Foucault, M. *Madness and Civilization* (London and New York: Routledge 2001)
- Freud, S. *Civilization, Society and Religion: Group Psychology, Civilization and its Discontents and Other Works* ed. by Albert Dickson (London: Penguin Books 1991)
- Freud, S. *Historical and Expository Works on Psychoanalysis: On the History of the Psychoanalytic Movement, An Autobiographical Study, An Outline of Psychoanalysis and Other Works* (London: Penguin Books 1993)

Freud, S. *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* trans. and ed. by James Strachey and Angela Richards (London: Penguin Books 1991)

Freud, S. *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious* trans. and ed. by James Strachey Present volume ed. by Angela Richards (London: Penguin Books 1991)

Freud, S. *Letters of Sigmund Freud* ed. by Ernst. L. Freud trans. by Tania and James Stern (New York: Dover Publications Inc. 1992)

Freud, S. *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* trans. and ed. by James Strachey assisted by Angela Richards London: Penguin Books 1991)

Freud, S. *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis* compiled and ed. by Angela Richards (London: Penguin Books 1991)

Freud, S. *On Sexuality* trans. under the gen. ed. of James Strachey. Present volume compiled and ed. by Angela Richards gen. ed. Albert Dickson (London: Penguin Books 1991)

Freud, S. and Breuer, J. *Studies on Hysteria* ed. by Angela Richards (London: Penguin Books 1991)

Freud, S. *The Freud Reader* ed. by Peter Gay (London: Vintage 1995)

Freud, S. *The Origins of Religion: Totem and Taboo, Moses and Monotheism and Other Works* trans. under the gen. ed. of James Strachey. Present volume ed. by Albert Dickson (London: Penguin Books 1990)

Freud, S. *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* ed. by Angela Richards (London: Penguin Books 1991)

Freud, S. *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* gen. Ed. Adam Phillips trans. by Anthea Bell (London: Penguin Books 2002)

Freud, S. *The Schreber Case* (London: Penguin Books 2002)

Freud, S and Breuer, J. *Studies in Hysteria* trans. and ed. by James Strachey and Alix Strachey assisted by Angela Richards Present volume ed. by Angela Richards (London: Penguin Books 1991)

Gilchrist, A. 'The Power of the Grotesque in *Great Expectations*' in *The Dickensian* no. 388 vol. 75 pt 2. Summer 1979

Gilman, S. L., ed. & pref. *Reading Freud's Reading* Ed. by Jutta Birmele, Jay Geller, Valerie Greenberg, fwd. By Jeffrey Berman (New York: UP. New York 1994)

Ginsburg, M. P. 'Dickens and the Uncanny: Repression and Displacement in *Great Expectations*' in *Dickens Studies Annuals: Essays on Victorian Fiction* 1984 vol: 13 pp: 115 - 124

Girard, R. 'From Mimetic Desire to the Monstrous Double' in "*To Double Business Bound*": *Essays On Literature, Mimesis, and Anthropology* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press 1988)

Glavin, J. *After Dickens: Reading, Adaptation and Performance* gen. ed. Gillian Beer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999)

Gold, J. 'Dickens' Exemplary Aliens: Bumble the Beadle and Fagin the Fence' in *Mosaic-A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature* Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2, Canada 1968

Greer, G. *The Female Eunuch* (London: Penguin 1999)

Groom, N. *The Forger's Shadow: How Forgery Changed the Course of Literature* (London: Picador 2002)

Hale, K. (Ed.) *Friends and Apostles: The Correspondence of Rupert Brooke and James Strachey 1905-1914* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press 1998)

Hall, J. *Hall's Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art* Revised Edition (London: John Murray 1995)

Henning, S. D. Summer 'Samuel Beckett's Film and *La Dernière Bande*: Intratextual and Intertextual Doubles' in *Symposium-A Quarterly Journal in Modern Foreign Literatures* 1981 Washington DC

Hibbert, C. *The Making of Dickens* (London: Penguin Books 2000)

Hirsch, G. 'The Mysteries in *Bleak House*: A Psychoanalytic Study' in *Dickens Studies Annuals: Essays on Victorian Fiction* vol: 4 pp: 132 – 152 1975

Hogg, J. *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics 1997)

Hogle, J. E. 'The Gothic Ghost as Counterfeit and Its Haunting of Romanticism: The Case of 'Frost at Midnight'' in *European Romantic Review* Los Angeles CA Spring 1998

Hogle, J. E., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2003)

Hollington, M. 'Dickens the Flâneur' in *The Dickensian* 1995

- Ibsen, H. *A Doll's House* (New York: Dover Publications, Inc. 1992)
- Jentsch, E. 'On the Psychology of the Uncanny' in *Angelaki: 2:1 home and family* ed. by Sarah Wood Great Britain Antony Rowe Limited 1995
- Jirousek. L. Autumn 'Haunting Hysteria: Wharton, Freeman, and the Ghost of Masculinity' in *American Literary Realism, 1870-1910* Albuquerque NM 1999
- Johnson, K. 'Haunting Transcendence: The Strategy of Ghosts in Bataille and Breton' in *Twentieth Century Literature* vol: 45 part: 3 pp: 347 – 370 1999
- Jordan, J O., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2001)
- Joseph. G. 'The Labyrinth and the Library en abyme: Eco, Borges, Dickens' in *City Images: Perspectives from Literature, Philosophy, and Film* ed. by Mary Ann Caws. (New York: Gordon & Breach 1991)
- John. J., ed. *Rethinking Victorian Culture* ed. by Alice Jenkins, foreword by John Sutherland (Houndsmills, England – New York: Macmillan-St. Martin's 2000).
- Johnson. K. 'Haunting Transcendence: The Strategy of Ghosts on Bataille and Breton' in *Twentieth Century Literature* Hempstead NY Autumn 1999
- Kaplan. F. *Dickens and Mesmerism The Hidden Springs of Fiction* (New York: Princeton University Press 1975)
- Kincaid, J.R. *Annoying the Victorians* (New York & London: Routledge 1995)
- Kopp, S. *If You Meet the Buddha on the Road, Kill Him!: A Modern Pilgrimage Through Myth, Legend, Zen, & Psychotherapy* (London: Sheldon Press 1990)
- Lacan. J. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-analysis* ed. by Jacques-Alain Miller trans. by Alan Sheridan (London: Vintage 1994)
- Lacan. J. 'The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I as revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience' in *Modern Literary Theory A Reader* 3rd Edition ed. by Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh (London: Arnold 1996)
- Laing, R. D. *The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness* (London: Penguin Books 1969)
- Leitch, V. B., gen. ed. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism* (New York London: W. W. Norton & Company 2001)

Lloyd Smith, A. 'The Phantoms of Drood and Rebecca: The Uncanny Reencountered through Abraham and Torok's "Cryptonymy"' in *Poetics Today* vol: 13 part: 2 pp: 285 – 308 1992

Long, P. H 'Fagin and Monopodio: The Source of Oliver Twist in Cervantes's Rinconete y Cortadillo' in *Dickensian* Summer 1994

Loydell, R. (ed.) *My Kind of Angel: I.M. William Burroughs* (Devon: Stride Publications 1998)

Lukacher, N. *Primal Scenes Literature, Philosophy, Psychoanalysis* (London and New York: Methuen 1987)

Lynch, D.S *The Economy of Character: Novels, Market Culture, and the Business of Inner Meaning* (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press 1998)

Marwick, M. *Witchcraft and Sorcery: Selected Readings Second Edition* (Middlesex: Penguin Books 1986)

Mahony, P. *Freud as a Writer: Expanded Edition* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press 1987)

Mantaut, M. 'The Second Mrs. Dombey' in *Dickens Quarterly* vol: 4 part: 3 pp: 141-153 1987

Marcus, L., ed. *Sigmund Freud's The Interpretation of Dreams: New Interdisciplinary Essays* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press 1999)

Marcus, S *Freud and the Culture of Psychoanalysis Studies in the Transition from Victorian Humanism to Modernity* (Boston: George Allen & Unwin 1984)

Matus, J. L. *Unstable Bodies Victorian Representations of Sexuality and Maternity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press 1995)

Mary, M.J. 'The Veiled Woman in Freud's 'Das Unheimliche'' in *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol: 11 part: 3 pp: 519- 528 1986

McLean, R. S. 'Fagin: An Early View of Evil' in *Lock Haven Review* Lock Haven, PA 1967

Melville, H. *Moby Dick* ed. by Tony Tanner (Oxford: Oxford World's Classic 1998)

Michasiw, K. I. 'Haunting the Unremembered World: Shelley's Gothic Practice' in *Gothic Fictions: Prohibition / Transgression* ed. by Kenneth. W. Graham 1989.

Miller, K. *Doubles: Studies in Literary History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1985)

- Milton, J. *Paradise Lost* (London: Penguin Books 1989)
- Mitchell, J. 'Femininity, Narrative and Psychoanalysis' in *Feminist Literary Theory A reader* Ed. by Mary Eagleton (Cambridge MA & Oxford UK: Blackwell 1993)
- McKeon, M., ed. *Theory of the Novel: A Historical Approach* (Maryland: John Hopkins University Press 2000)
- Moberly, L.G. 'Inexplicable' in *Strange Tales from The Strand* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1992)
- Monleon, J. B. *A Specter is Haunting Europe: A Sociohistorical Approach to the Fantastic* (Princeton: Princeton UP 1990).
- Morris, C. D. 'The Bad Faith of Pip's Bad Faith: Deconstructing *Great Expectations*' in *English Literary History*, 54 1987
- Morrison, M. A. 'Journey's End: The Haunting: From Book to Film' in *Studies in Weird Fiction* Hoboken, NJ Spring 1993
- Murphy, S. 'Haunting Memories: Inquest and Exorcism in Baudelaire's 'La Corde' in *Dalhousie French Studies* Halifax, NS, Canada Spring 1995
- Musselwhite, D.E *Partings Welded Together: Politics and Desire in the Nineteenth-Century English Novel* (London and New York: Methuen 1987)
- Nabokov, V. *Collected Stories* (London: Penguin 2001)
- Nabokov, V. *Despair* (London: Penguin Books 2000)
- Nietzsche, F. *On the Genealogy of Morals A Polemic: By Way of Clarification and Supplement to my Last Book Beyond Good and Evil* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1998)
- Nietzsche, F. *The Birth of Tragedy* ed. by Michael Tanner trans. by Shaun Whiteside (London: Penguin Books 1993)
- Nietzsche, F. *Twilight of the Idols / The Anti-Christ* trans. by R. J. Hollingdale Introduction by Michael Tanner (London: Penguin Books 1990)
- Nigosian, S. *Judaism The Way of Holiness: The History, Beliefs, Literature, and Observances of the Jewish Faith* (Great Britain: Crucible 1986)
- O'Hear, A. (ed.) *German Philosophy Since Kant* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999)

- O'Malley. P. R. T. 'Skeletons in the Cloister: Catholicism, Sexual Deviance, and the Haunting of English National Identity' Dissertation Abstract Number DA9935870 Harvard University 1999
- Otsuka, K. and Sakai, A. 'Haizmann's Madness: the concept of bizarreness and the diagnosis of schizophrenia' in *History of Psychiatry* ed. by German. E. Berrios Volume 15 Issue 1 Number 57 March 2004 Sage Publications
- Ousby, I. *The Cambridge Guide to Literature in English New Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999)
- Paroissien, D. *Selected Letters of Charles Dickens* (London: Palgrave 2001)
- Payne. M. *Reading Theory An Introduction to Lacan, Derrida, and Kristeva* (Oxford: Blackwell 1993)
- Pearlman. E. 'David Copperfield Dreams of Drowning' in *American Imago: a Psychoanalytical Journal for Culture, Science, & the Arts* Detroit, MI 1971
- Pivato, J. 'The Other as Double: Italo-Québécois Writers' in *Journal of Contemporary Thought Inaugural Issue* Published by Forum on Contemporary Theory M.S. University of Baroda, India 1991
- Poe, E. A. *Selected Tales* ed. by David Van Leer (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1998)
- Prawer, S.S. 'Hoffmann's Uncanny Guest: A Reading of Hoffmann's *Der Sandmann*' in *German Life and Letters* Vol. XVIII No. 4 July 1965
- Prokhoris, S. *The Witch's Kitchen: Freud, Faust, an the Transference* trans. from the French by G.M Goshgarian (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press 1995)
- Punter. D. *The Literature of Terror The Modern Gothic Volume 2* Second Edition London and New York: Longman 1996)
- Quincey. T. D. *Confessions of an English Opium Eater* ed. by Alethea Hayter (London: Penguin Books 1986)
- Rank, O. *Art and Artist: Creative Urge and Personality Development* (New York / London: W. W. Norton & Company 1989)
- Rank, O. *The Double: A Psychoanalytic Study* trans. and ed. by Harry Tucker, JR. London: Karnac Books 1989)
- Reber, A. S. and Reber, E. *The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology* 3rd Edition (London: Penguin Books 2001)

- Rhinehart, L. *The Dice Man* (London: HarperCollinsPublishers 1999)
- Rice, P. and Waugh, P. *Modern Literary Theory: A Reader Third Edition* (London: Arnold 1996)
- Rorty, A.O. 'Characters, Persons, Selves, Individuals' in *Theory of the Novel: A Historical Approach* ed. by Michael McKeon (Baltimore & London: The John Hopkins University Press 2000)
- Rorty, R. *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1980)
- Royle, N. *After Derrida* (Manchester: Manchester University Press 1995)
- Royle, N. 'Back' in *Derridas* ed. by Timothy Clark and Nicholas Royle Volume 18 *The Oxford Literary Review* 1997
- Royle, N. *The Uncanny* (Manchester: Manchester University Press 2003)
- Rubin, S. S. 1976 'Spectator and Spectacle: Narrative Evasion and Narrative Voice in Pickwick Papers' in *Journal of Narrative Technique* vol: 6 pp: 188- 203
- Sadoff, D.F 'Locus Suspectus: Narrative, Castration, and the Uncanny' in *Dickens Studies Annuals* vol: 13 pp: 207-230 1984
- Sanders, A. *The Short Oxford History of English Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1994)
- Schad, J. *The Reader in the Dickensian Mirrors* (London: Macmillan 1992)
- Schad, J., ed. 1996 *Dickens Refigured Bodies, desires, and other histories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press 1996)
- Scott, W. *Ivanhoe* ed. by Graham Tulloch (London: Penguin Books 2000)
- Scott, W. *Waverly* (London: Penguin Books 1985)
- Sedgwick, E. K. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press 1985)
- Selden, R, Widdowson, P, and Brooker, P. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory* 4th Edition (Essex: Prentice Hall 1997)
- Sim, S. *Post Modern Encounters: Derrida and the End of History* (Cambridge: Icon Books 1999)

Slagter, C. Autumn 'Pip's Dreams in Great Expectations' in *Dickensian* London, England 1987

Slater, M., ed. *Dickens' Journalism The Amusement of the People and Other People: Reports, Essays and Reviews 1834-51* (London: J. M. Dent 1996)

Smith, A. *Gothic Radicalism: Literature, Philosophy and Psychoanalysis in the 19th Century* (Basingstoke: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's Press 2000)

Smith, A. *Love, Freud, and the Female Gothic: Bram Stoker's The Jewel of Seven Stars* in *Gothic Studies* 6, 2004

Smith, G. *Charles Dickens A Literary Life* gen. ed. Richard Dutton (Hampshire and London: Macmillan Press Ltd. 1996)

Spilka, M. 'On the Enrichment of Poor Monkeys by Myth and Dream; or, How Dickens Rousseauisticized and Pre-Freudianized Victorian Views of Childhood' in *Tennessee Studies on Literature* Knoxville, TN 1984

Spilka, M. *Dickens and Kafka A Mutual Interpretation* (London: Denis Dobson 1963)

Sprengnether, M. *The Spectral Mother: Freud, Feminism and Psychoanalysis* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press 1990)

Stafford-Clark, D. *Psychiatry To-day* (London: Penguin Books 1965)

Stevenson, R. *A Reader's Guide to The Twentieth Century Novel in Britain* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf 1993)

Sucksmith, H.P. *The Narrative Art of Charles Dickens: The Rhetoric of Sympathy and Irony in his Novels* (London: Oxford University Press 1970)

Tambling, J. (ed.) *Bleak House: Contemporary Critical Essays* (New York: St. Martin's Press 1998)

Tambling, J. 'Prison-bound: Dickens and Foucault *Great Expectations*' in *Essays in Criticism* 36:1 1986

Thomas, D. M. *The White Hotel* (Middlesex: Penguin Books 1981)

Tobias, J. J. 'Ikey Solomons: A Real-Life Fagin' in *Dickensian* London WC1 7HX, England 1969

Tracy, R. 'Stranger Than Truth: Fictional Autobiography and Autobiographical Fiction' in *Dickens Studies Annual: Essays on Victorian Fiction* New York 1986

Tredell, N. (ed.) *Charles Dickens Great Expectations: A Reader's Guide to Essential Criticism* (Cambridge: Icon Books 2000)

Wall, W. G. 'Mrs. Affery Flintwinch's Dreams: Reading and Remembering in Little Dorrit' in *Dickens Quarterly* New Brunswick, NJ Dec.1993

Wechter, S. 'Cruikshank's Fagin: The Illustrator as Creator' in *The Courier* Syracuse, NY 1977

Welsh, A. *Dickens Redressed: The Art of Bleak House and Hard Times* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press 2000)

Welsh, A. *From Copyright to Copperfield: The Identity of Dickens* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press 1987)

West, P. *Rat Man of Paris* (London: Paladin Grafton Books 1988)

Whitlock, K., ed. *The Renaissance in Europe: A Reader* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press in association with the Open University 2000)

Worth, G. J. *Dickensian Melodrama: A Reading of the Novels* Lawrence: The University of Kansas 1978 *University of Kansas Humanistic Studies*, 50 1978

Wyatt, J. 'I Want to Be You: Envy, the Lacanian Double, and Feminist Community in Margaret Atwood's *The Robber Bride*'

Zarifopol-Johnston. I. *To Kill a Text: The Dialogic Fiction of Hugo, Dickens, and Zola* University of Delaware P. Newark 1995

Online Sources

Chapman, M. *Blade Runner: Frequently Asked Questions*
<http://www.faqs.org/faqs/movies/bladerunner-faq/>

Allen, B. *Eugene Lauste: The Father of Sound on Film*
http://www.amps.net/newsletters/issue22/22_lauste.htm

Freud and Dora: Cast of Characters

<http://www.richardeinhorn.com/Freud/FreudCast2.html>

Ibsen, H. 'Little Eyolf' *Project Gutenberg* e-text

<http://www.gutenberg.net/etext/7942>

Little Blue Light: E.T.A Hoffmann-Criticism

<http://www.littlebluelight.com/lblphp/crit.php?ikey=9>

Rieff's Freud and the Tyranny of Psychology

<http://jcs.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/3/3/263>

Smith, G. 'Dickens and the City of Light' in *The Victorian Web*

<http://www.victorianweb.org/authors/dickens/turkey/turlit10.html>

Steiner, R. *Foundations of Esotericism:*

http://wn.elib.com/Steiner/Lectures/FoundEsoter/FndEso_index.html

The Charles Dickens Museum, London

<http://www.dickensmuseum.com/>

The Dickens Page

<http://www.lang.nagoya-u.ac.jp/~matsuoka/CD-Dickensian.html>

The National Library of Scotland

<http://www.nls.uk/>

The Dickens Quarterly

<http://www.umass.edu/english/dickens/>

Victorian Studies

<http://iupjournals.org/victorian/>

Wilkie Collins Society

<http://www.deadline.demon.co.uk/wilkie/wcs/publications.htm>

Kasper Hauser

<http://www.mysteriouspeople.com/Hauser2.htm>