

***Our Mutual Friend:***  
**In Defense of Lizzie Hexam**

Gregory Hutchinson

**Introduction:** This paper will address a popular prejudice against a certain kind of Dickens heroine. I will discuss Lizzie Hexam, one of two heroines in Dickens's last completed novel, *Our Mutual Friend*. Too many critics, in my opinion, put Lizzie in a preconceived category that oversimplifies the character Dickens has created. Even granting that there are concrete examples of the type of heroine Lizzie is supposed to represent, "she" (really, Dickens, of course, but the metaphor saves time) is the victim of stereotyped thinking: some critics have such a strong sense of the category into which she is supposed to fit that they fail to observe Lizzie's distinguishing traits. This paper will begin, in Part I, by describing the type of heroine critics refer to, focusing on Agnes Wickfield from *David Copperfield*. In Part II I will show briefly that Lizzie is associated with this type. Then I will try to demonstrate why she deserves to be taken on her own merits. I will discuss three features that distinguish her from the typical Dickens heroine in the Agnes tradition. Anyone interested in reading the paper without a fresh knowledge of *Our Mutual Friend* can consult Endnote 8, which briefly reviews Lizzie's background.

**Part I:** The most commonly attacked Dickens heroine, as close as

Dickens comes to the stereotype, is Agnes, David Copperfield's second wife.<sup>(1)</sup> Once David's sweet but inadequate mother has died, David runs away from his cruel stepfather, Mr. Murdstone. He makes a desperate pilgrimage to Canterbury, where he succeeds in finding his aunt, Miss Betsey Trotwood. Aunt Betsey is strong, kind, and very eccentric. Once she grasps the fact of David's innocence, she takes him in, adopts him, and eventually, apart from placing him in Dr. Strong's admirable boarding school, puts David in the house of her friend, Mr. Wickfield, a kindly gentleman with a young daughter named Agnes. Next to the house he escaped from (his late mother's house, but taken over completely by Mr. Murdstone and his horrible sister), this house might as well be Eden.<sup>(2)</sup>

Such a setting has to be insisted on because it explains why I find the dismissive references to Agnes puzzling. Surely David's first-person account of her can be understood in this context as inevitable. She is a benevolent influence, a pleasant voice, and David's very first experience on his own social level<sup>(3)</sup> of a normal female: one who is neither odd (like his weak mother and strong aunt) nor evil, like Mr. Murdstone's sister.<sup>(4)</sup>

In any case, all the critics agree that Agnes is the epitome of Dickens's Victorian angel: mature, compliant in all good things, industrious, devoted, self-effacing, and very middle-class. Comparing Agnes with Princess Mary in Tolstoy's *War and Peace* (a character whom Tolstoy's study of *David Copperfield*, and specifically of Agnes, inspired) (Mrs.) Q. D. Leavis passes final judgment on her: "But Agnes is seen pictorially and her inside never examined, she has no life of her own like Princess Mary, in consequence Agnes's spiritual attributes are little more than uplift" (106).<sup>(5)</sup> This seems to imply that

all fictional characters who really figure in a story must be examined from the "inside," which strikes me as illogical and counter to actual practice. As E. M. Forster counseled in his lecture (and subsequent book) *Aspects of the Novel*, complex ("round") characters must be used sparingly (except, say, by a Tolstoy or Dostoevsky) if the balance and economy of the novel are to be retained: simpler ("flat") characters are not a liability but a necessity.

To let one more example stand for the many that could be cited, Philip Hobsbaum, in an otherwise literate study of Dickens, turns psychoanalyst when he gets to Dickens's "autobiographical" *David Copperfield* (generally a mistake in literary criticism, except, perhaps, for the critic with a real qualification in psychology). Contrasting the case of Dora, David's "child-wife," with Agnes, Hobsbaum produces the following irony:

And an oddly parallel case is that of Agnes: while Dora is married to a substitute father, Agnes is "married" to her real-life father, a kind of substitute husband. After David's child-wife dies, he eventually marries this wife-child. (124)

This is too clever by a half. Why, one might ask, is Agnes a "wife-child"? In what sense does she function as her father Mr. Wickfield's wife? She is a dotting daughter for sure, but if there is any libido inspiring Agnes's attempts to keep her father comfortable and happy, Hobsbaum doesn't try to identify it. So why, then, is she still a "wife-child" when she marries David? Even as metaphor this is incoherent. Agnes has been accused of pale sexlessness, but hardly of bigamy or adultery, or any spiritual state these transgressions

might stand for (such as the spoiled princess's folly of leaning on her father more than her husband). Hobsbaum concludes with the following judgment:

There is no indication that the relationship will ever graduate to intercourse between adults, and it is an insult to the reader to expect him to give it his blessing. (124)

The word "intercourse" is amusing in such a context, since Hobsbaum can hardly be referring to carnal knowledge. (It goes without saying that the marriage is consummated.) Hobsbaum must mean a mature relationship on a spiritual plane, though why the reader should be insulted by this possibility is hard to guess. David has known and respected Agnes for years; she is devoted to him, of course; and neither is stupid (like Mrs. Bennet, say, in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*). Aristotle's dictum for the drama is true of novels as well: we ask not for the literally possible, but for the plausible. There is nothing implausible about Agnes and David's devotion to each other.

In short, if David's first wife Dora is the perfect Dickens girl-child, Agnes is viewed by critics as the overly-perfect Dickens woman. She is not, like Peggotty's niece Little Emily, interested in a relationship that will raise her status. On the contrary, she would rather go through life a spinster than marry anyone but the man she has set her heart on. Aside from Agnes, this is true of Mary in *Martin Chuzzlewit*,<sup>(6)</sup> of Tom Pinch's adorable sister Ruth in the same novel, and also of Esther in *Bleak House* (who is willing, nevertheless, to sacrifice this preference and marry her guardian Mr. Jarndice, to whom she feels that she owes everything). All are middle-

class, mature, sweet, and devoted to someone of their own class.

**Part II:** The question that this paper poses, then, is whether or not Lizzie Hexam belongs to the above set of heroines and is subject to the same limitations. As already explained in the introduction, my object is to dispute the commonplace that she does belong to this group and is similarly limited as a character. Harry Stone, for instance, divides Dickens's women into those who are a "summoning up of the sexual in Dickens' life," like Dora, and those who are "the summoning up of the sisterly and idealized in Dickens' life," like Agnes (270). He puts Bella Wilfer, the other heroine of *Our Mutual Friend*, in the former group, and Lizzie in the latter. Bella, it might be pointed out, is a development from Dora—she is flighty and vivacious at the beginning, and at least with her father, the "cherubic" Mr. Wilfer, she is kittenish, albeit charmingly so, to the end of the novel. It is easy to see how Lizzie would be bracketed with Agnes in this context. The analogies are plain and satisfying: In *David Copperfield* Dora is to Agnes as, in *Our Mutual Friend*, Bella is to Lizzie. And there is nothing wrong with this way of thinking, as long as it doesn't force Lizzie into a bed of Procrustes.<sup>(7)</sup>

To show the effect of Lizzie's inclusion in this group, two more brief examples will suffice. Hobsbaum goes so far as to say that of the four lovers (John Harmon, Bella Wilfer, Eugene Wrayburn, and Lizzie Hexam), Lizzie is "the least alive" (267). Hobsbaum is not trying to diminish Lizzie at all; he discusses her struggles sympathetically and keenly: first "her struggle towards literacy,"<sup>(8)</sup> and then the ultimate struggle to save Eugene's life, which is one of the great scenes in the novel. Yet, he doesn't hesitate to subordinate Lizzie to

the other three members of the quartet, presumably because a reincarnation of Agnes must, a priori, be more limited than the other main characters (though how more limited than John Harmon, who is perfect but hardly complex, is unclear).

The second example of the same tendency is a reference to Lizzie in a book on Dickens by the ever-quotable G. K. Chesterton:

In *Our Mutual Friend* we do not, for some reason or other, feel really very much excited about the fall or rescue of Lizzie Hexam. She seems too romantic to be really pathetic. But we do feel excited about the rescue of Miss Lammler, because she is, like Toots, a holy fool; because her pink nose and pink elbows, and candid outcry and open indecent affections do convey to us a sense of innocence helpless among human dragons, of Andromeda tied naked to a rock. Dickens had to make a character humorous before he could make it human; it was the only way he knew, and he ought to have always adhered to it. (188)

Chesterton has obviously made a slip here: There is no *Miss Lammler* in the novel, and he can't mean *Mrs. Lammler*, who has her points, but hardly these. So by "Miss Lammler" Chesterton must mean Miss Podsnap. The mistake goes with a lack of detail in the discussion. The latter probably led to the former.

The point is that Chesterton brackets Lizzie with Agnes, whom he of course despises, especially because she violates the one unchanging tenet in Chesterton's catechism: a good character must embody a paradox, and Agnes is a simple, unparadoxical character. Lizzie is also an unambiguously good girl, and this triggers Chesterton's quiet

dismissal. In any case, Chesterton's real mistake is the unavoidable one, in an honest critic, of abiding by his own lights. Chesterton is looking for paradox, but Lizzie is straightforward. Therefore, "…we do not feel very much excited about the fall or rise of Lizzie Hexam." But apparently "we" do feel excited about Miss Podsnap's "rescue," because she has contradictory—which is to say, paradoxical—emotions.

Chesterton is being himself here, and it is impossible to doubt his sincerity. But, consulting my own feelings, I am much more interested in Lizzie's rescue than Miss Podsnap's. And so is Dickens, who doesn't arrange much of a rescue for Miss Podsnap, anyway. If Chesterton took time to think about it, he would probably have agreed that the day after Mr. Boffin intercepts the gifts that Miss Podsnap wants to give the Lammlers, she will be back with her awful parents, who will give her even less freedom than she has enjoyed to this point, since they will have been advised, by Boffin's order, that their daughter's choice of friends should be monitored more closely. In any event, this is a minor theme, and little Miss Podsnap isn't really a complex character at all. She just expresses the reader's dislike for the pompous arbitrariness (in parenting and everything else) of Mr. and Mrs. Podsnap.

Lizzie's rescue, on the other hand, is a fight against the assumptions of a whole society. She is "romantic," yes, but in a rather paradoxical way, in fact, as our first view of her—our first view of anyone in the novel—demonstrates: assisting her father in a corpse hunt, not as a novelty but as the thing she does every day. Lizzie has three characteristics that distinguish her from the type represented by Agnes and Mary:

First, she is unprotected. While Agnes has her father and, when Mr. Wickfield falls under the malign spell of Uriah Heep, David to protect her, Lizzie has no one. Her father uses her and holds her back even from reading. Charley is much worse, and torments her for everything she does that isn't a sacrifice to his own plans. He ends by cursing her for refusing to marry his teacher, Bradley Headstone:

"But you shall not disgrace me," doggedly pursued the boy. "I am determined that after I have climbed up out of the mire, you shall not pull me down. You can't disgrace me if I have nothing to do with you, and I will have nothing to do with you for the future." (396)

As for the two lovers, Bradley turns into a murderous stalker, who can't even speak civilly to Lizzie, and Eugene is in constant danger of seducing and abandoning her, if she will let him. And the voices of society are especially hostile. Even after Lizzy has saved Eugene's life, and thereby given him the means and courage to defy his father and marry her, the socialites who congregate at the Veneerings' (antecedent to Mr. Veneering's bankruptcy) are as one voice in denouncing this unnatural union:

"But, excuse me," says Podsnap, with his temper and his shirt-collar about equally rumpled; "was this young woman ever a female waterman?"

"Never. But she sometimes rowed in a boat with her father, I believe."

General sensation against the young woman. Brewer shakes

his head. Boots shakes his head. Buffer shakes his head.

“And now, Mr. Lightwood, was she ever,” pursues Podsnap, with his indignation rising high into those hair-brushes of his, “a factory girl?”

“Never. But she had some employment in a paper mill, I believe.”

“Then all I have to say is,” returns Podsnap, putting the thing away with his right arm, “that my gorge rises against such a marriage—that it offends and disgusts me—that it makes me sick—and that I desire to know no more about it.” (794-95)

To be fair, and not to fall into my own Procrustean bed, Lizzie does have one champion here (apart from the purveyor of information, Mortimer Lightwood, who is Eugene's best friend, a superior person, and one of the wedding attendees): feeble old Mr. Twemlow, who faces down Mr. Podsnap and even reduces him to silence. Twemlow is a real gentleman, and not in tune with the reactions of Society, whose members resent his appeal to decency and values:

Somehow a canopy of wet blanket seems to descend upon the company, and Lady Tippins was never known to turn so very greedy or so very cross. Mortimer Lightwood alone brightens. (797)

Lightwood rewards Mr. Twemlow by seeing him home and shaking hands with him cordially. But clearly, Society's insiders sneer at this affront to their class presumptions. And we see, in short, that at least until now (when she has in fact been raised from the despised

class), Lizzie has had no protectors.

Secondly, besides being unprotected, Lizzie violates a major attribute of the delicate Dickens heroine by being very strong physically. We are reminded of this throughout the novel, and it is Dickens's unmistakable goal to stress her work background. In his excellent notes to the Penguin edition of *Our Mutual Friend* (which is the edition referred to in this paper), Adrian Poole indicates how consciously Dickens made the scene in which Lizzie rescues Eugene evoke Chapter One of the novel, in which Lizzie rows her father along in search of bodies and sees the body that is mistaken for John Harmon's. Poole refers to the manuscript of the original monthly edition: "In Number Plans (17), Dickens exhorts himself at this point, 'Back to the opening chapter of the book, strongly': (the last word is heavily underlined)" (837). To achieve this effect, Dickens lays the same emphasis on Lizzie's rowing skill, as can be seen with a comparison of passages:

The girl rowed, pulling a pair of sculls very easily....So with every lithe action of the girl, with every turn of her wrist...they were things of usage. (13, Ch. 1, Book the First)

Trusting to the girl's skill and making no use of the rudder, he eyed the coming tide with an absorbed attention....Always watching his face, the girl instantly answered to the action in her sculling...." (14, Ch. 1, Book the First)

Her old bold habit and life inspired her. (682, Ch. 4, Book the Fourth)

Now, merciful Heaven [Lizzie is saying to herself as she hurries to the drowning Eugene] be thanked for that old time....A sure touch of her old practised hand, a sure step of her old practised foot, a sure light balance of her body, and she was in the boat. A quick glance of the practised eye showed her...and that boat shot out into the moonlight, and she was rowing down the stream as never other woman rowed on English water. (683 Ch. 4, Book the Fourth)

The point is made—above all by the repetition of words like *old*, *sure*, and *practised*—that these are the same hands and feet that guided Gaffer's scavenging boat, and these are the same eyes that spotted the corpse in Chapter 1. Before rowing back against the tide, “by main strength she lifted him in her arms and laid him in the bottom of the boat” (684). Then the lifting is followed by carrying:

She made the boat fast and again by main strength took him up, and never laid him down until she had laid him down in the house. (684)

The strength this requires is not lost on Eugene's surgeon, who, like most of Dicken's physicans, is a sympathetic figure:

The first surgeon came, and asked, before proceeding to his examination, “Who brought him in?”

“I brought him in, sir,” answered Lizzie, at whom all present looked.

“You, my dear? You could not lift, far less carry, this

weight.”

“I think I could not, at another time, sir; but I am sure I did.” (683)

Obviously, despite her perfect middle-class grammar, Lizzie is no pampered Victorian angel. This may be obscured by the fact that she really is an angel of mercy on more than one occasion. It is she who ministers to the exhausted Betty Higden, about to be released from her terror of spending her last days in the tender hands of “the Parish.” When Betty wakes up beside the road and feels Lizzie’s touch, she has to adjust to the fact that she is not yet dead. Finally, realizing where she is, and that she is with a nice young woman she can trust, she accepts her fate:

“What is your name, my dear?”

“My name is Lizzie Hexam.”

“I must be sore disfigured. Are you afraid to kiss me?”

The answer is, the ready pressure of her lips upon the cold but smiling face.

“Bless ye! Now lift me, my love.”

Lizzie Hexam very softly lifted the weather-stained grey head, and lifted her as high as Heaven. (506)

Thus, the lifting of Eugene is prefigured in the gentler lifting of the dying Betty. Lizzie’s strength, like Esther Summerson’s industry, is gently applied and ladylike. But it is far from the stereotype and serves to distinguish Lizzie from the middle-class heroines.<sup>(11)</sup>

Finally, Lizzie is simply too close to being a tragic character to be bracketed with Dickens's more delicate heroines. Referring to *David Copperfield* again, she is much closer to the position of Little Emily, who is seduced by the arrogant young aristocrat Steerforth, than to Agnes. Lizzie has the character and self-knowledge to leave Jenny Wren's home and seek asylum among the friends of Mr. Riah in the paper mill village, but not to cut Eugene dead when he finds her (by bribing Mr. Doll—as Eugene calls Jenny's demented father because he sits in the corner like one of Jenny's dolls). Lizzie lacks the strength to shoo Eugene away in a rough manner because she is torn by ambivalence. And then, after his rescue, she accepts the marriage, with its many snags for her, as resolutely as Eugene does.<sup>(12)</sup>

In summary, Lizzie Hexam shares many of the traits of Agnes, Mary, and the other Dickens heroines of the compliant type. But critics ignore a good deal of her portrait when they fail to see how poorly she fits the overall stereotype. Lizzie is as sweet as Agnes, and as helpful as Esther, but she is an outcast in polite Victorian society, with no protector until late in the novel; she exhibits a physical strength that is directly related to her background and is the very opposite of what we expect from the stereotype; and she faces and overcomes potentially tragic problems of a type that are associated with her working-class roots. Therefore, she is not a typical Dickensian angel.

## Notes

- (1) For anyone unfamiliar with Dickens who might read this paper, David is the eponymous hero of the novel *David Copperfield*. His first wife, Dora, is a charming girl, but terminally childlike and irresponsible. When Dora dies, David marries Agnes, daughter of the man in whose house he has grown up.
- (2) In fact, David is no stranger to places in which he is really welcome, the first being the house of his faithful nurse Peggotty, and the second being the house of Aunt Betsey. But Wickfield's is really the house David grows up in. There is often a snake in Dickens's Edens. Wickfield's secretary, Uriah Heep is the snake here. He is a priceless villain, one of Dickens's greatest, who has become proverbial for greasy, insinuating servility.
- (3) Social levels are everything in *David Copperfield*. Class rigidity causes a lot of grief in the novel. For instance, it gives Mr. Murdstone an excuse to forbid David's visits to Peggotty's home, his only refuge before running away; and later it enables David's aristocratic comrade Steerforth to seduce and abandon Peggotty's niece, who aspires to the middle class.
- (4) Miss Murdstone is no ordinary witch. She conspired with her brother in hounding and humiliating David's sweet little mother to the grave. Dickens makes it plain that however "weak" David's mother was, her early death was thanks to the Murdstones. Later, David happens to chance upon the Murdstones again, and sees that they have found another weak little woman to exploit.

In this light it is interesting to note that the very name Murdstone is associated with the name Headstone, which is the name of Lizzy's murderous stalker, the schoolteacher Bradley Headstone, and both names suggest murder and death. As Jane Vogel, in a book with many word associations, explains it, "Murdstone and Headstone are grave and 'headstone' to mark the Murd-er or unnatural, untimely decease of wonder, reflection and hope in young minds entrusted to their care" (43). Bradley, Vogel maintains, is responsible for metaphorical murder in his teaching, not just the attempted murder of his hated rival, Eugene Wrayburn. More germane to the point, Murdstone associates both with

murder and the grave. Anyone who reads these two novels will agree that Bradley Headstone is immeasurably more sympathetic than either of the Murdstones. He is one of Dickens's most human creations, while the Murdstones are never portrayed as anything but monsters. In fact, they represent a nexus of two traditions: the murderous bully tradition going back to Bill Sykes in *Oliver Twist*, and the parasite tradition, seen in classically serpentine form in this novel as Uriah Heep and at its most Draculean in the form of Mr. Voules of *Bleak House*.

- (5) Mrs. Leavis notes of Esther in *Bleak House* that "as a good angel" she "is altogether more acceptable than Agnes, showing an advance on that part of the previous novel" (217). This is true. Esther has suffered much more than Agnes, and is altogether a more complex character, which shouldn't surprise us. She is a central character (surely *the* central character) in *Bleak House*, while in *David Copperfield*, Agnes plays Penelope to David's Odysseus. She seldom appears and is more important as a goal than as an actor. But in discussing Agnes in one of her essays on *David Copperfield*, Mrs. Leavis claims that "the reader doesn't mind" the threat to her posed by Uriah Heep "as much as David does because she is too good to be true" (119). This having been said, Mrs. Leavis recognizes Dickens's attempt with Agnes to create "a little *woman*" (82, italics in the text)—a departure from the girl-child represented by both David's mother and Dora, his first wife.
- (6) If Agnes is a Penelope figure, Mary is one with a vengeance, since Martin Chuzzlewit literally sets an ocean between himself and her, and then, enlightened by hardship, forges his way back to her, through some real perils.
- (7) Procrustes is the Greek monster-innkeeper who forces all his "guests" to fit in his bed by amputating any member of a guest's body that protrudes, whether it be a hand, a foot, or a head. This is a useful metaphor for the literary critic who comes to a novel (say) with a preconceived notion and tries to make everything in the novel fit that notion.

In fairness to Bella, the whole point of her characterization is that, *in potentia*, she is much more than a spoiled child of the Dora type, and it is the task of her future husband John Harmon (alias John

Rokesmith) to woo her out of the avarice that dominates the scene of his past life. So we must not go too far with comparisons between her and Dora, who has no learning curve at all.

- (8) For those who have not read the novel, yet have gotten this far in the paper, aside from my sincere thanks I would like to offer a brief explanation. Lizzie grew up working for her father, Gaffer Hexam, a water-side character whose business would put him among the untouchables in English society. He fishes dead bodies from the Thames to collect the bounty on them and also to free them of any cash in their pockets. In the very first scene of the novel, which is alluded to quite deliberately during the scene in which she rescues Eugene, we see Lizzie rowing expertly for Gaffer. She—and not Gaffer—espies the drowned corpse that is mistaken for John Harmon, thus setting the Harmon plot in motion. Lizzie hates this job but is a dutiful daughter.

Gaffer Hexam's worst flaw is that he doesn't want his children to be educated out of their class, so he insists that Lizzie and her horrible little brother Charley never learn to read. Until Gaffer's death, Lizzie abides by his wish, while giving Charley most of her savings and sending him off to a Ragged School run by Bradley Headstone. In the time between the first scene and the rescue scene, she has become the object of two men's obsessions: that of Headstone, who had originally advised Charley to stop seeing his sister, since she was a low connection, and that of Eugene Wrayburn, a suave young gentleman. Eugene can't marry Lizzie without flouting the strictures of his society, to say nothing of his much-contemplated father, who expects an elegant marriage from his future heir. To complicate matters, though Eugene acts the part of the cynical playboy, he harbors a conscience-ridden sense of Lizzie's value, which is enough to temporarily restrain his urge to seduce her, since the dictates of society and his father would then require him to abandon Lizzie, when, in the popular eighteenth- and nineteenth-century tradition, she might have to choose between prostitution and death.

- (9) As for Uriah Heep's designs on Agnes, George Orwell (41) thinks the real problem is a class issue. Heep should keep his grubby working-class hands off this lovely middle-class girl. He even drops his *h*'s when he talks! This really is David's view, but we have to add that both

David and Dickens are displaying more than snobbery. Heep is a disgusting person, and if he were middle-class, like the vampire-lawyer Mr. Voules in *Bleak House*, he would still be unacceptable for Agnes. So Orwell exaggerates the class issue. Still, it serves to make my point: Agnes is a middle-class girl, with layers of protectors around her, while Lizzie is not.

- (10) They are in fact a chorus, as Hobsbaum observes (255).
- (11) As earlier claimed, Esther can also be distinguished from the Agnes-type heroines in some important details.
- (12) Lyn Pykett points out that the wedding of Lizzie and Eugene represents the inauguration of Eugene into "a new life" (177). And similarly, Hobsbaum observes, Lizzie is saved as well "by the altruistic practice of her craft" (267).

### Works Cited

- Becker, May Lamberton. *Introducing Charles Dickens*. London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1941.
- Chesterton, G. K. *Charles Dickens*. London: Methuen & Co., 1906.
- Dickens, Charles. *Our Mutual Friend* 1865. Ed. Adrian Poole. London, New York: Penguin Books, 1997.
- Eigner, Edwin M. *The Dickens Pantomime*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Herst, Beth F. *The Dickens Hero*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.
- Hobsbaum, Philip. *A Reader's Guide to Charles Dickens*. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1972.

- Leavis, F. R. and Q. D. Leavis. *Dickens the Novelist* 1970. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1980.
- Martin, Christopher. *Charles Dickens*. Vero Beach, FL: The Rourke Corporation, Inc., 1990.
- Orwell, George. *Dickens, Dali & Others* 1946. San Diego, New York, London: Harcourt Brace, Janovich, 1973.
- Pope, Norris. *Dickens and Charity*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1978.
- Pykett, Lyn. *Charles Dickens*. London: Palgrave, 2002.
- Stone, Harry. *Dickens and the Invisible World*. New York: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1979.
- Vogel, Jane. *Allegory in Dickens*. University, Al.: The University of Alabama Press, 1977.
- Waters, Catherine. "Gender, Family, and Domestic Ideology." *The Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens*. Ed. John O. Jordan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.