
English

9-2010

Reluctant Cosmopolitanism in Dickens's Great Expectations

John S. McBratney

John Carroll University, jmcbatney@jcu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://collected.jcu.edu/engl-facpub>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

McBratney, John S., "Reluctant Cosmopolitanism in Dickens's Great Expectations" (2010). *English*. 1.
<https://collected.jcu.edu/engl-facpub/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Carroll Collected. It has been accepted for inclusion in English by an authorized administrator of Carroll Collected. For more information, please contact mchercourt@jcu.edu.

RELUCTANT COSMOPOLITANISM IN DICKENS'S *GREAT EXPECTATIONS*

By John McBratney

IT HAS RECENTLY BEEN SUGGESTED, in various quarters, that cosmopolitanism, a concept that has proved broadly useful and popular in Victorian studies in the last several years, may have entered its critical senescence.¹ The reports of its decline are, I believe, greatly exaggerated. I would like to prove the continuing vigor of the concept by using it in a reading of Dickens's *Great Expectations* (1860–61). Conceiving of the cosmopolitan figure as a mediator between native English and colonial subjectivities, I will argue that Pip and Magwitch are reluctant cosmopolitans of indeterminate national identity. Although their final lack of a home country represents a psychological loss, the sympathy they learn to feel for each other – a fellow-feeling between gentleman and convict produced by a transnational irony enacted across class and cultural divides – represents a clear ethical gain, the attainment of a partial universalism that goes to the heart of the moral vision of the novel. Throughout this study, I will seek to extend that “rigorous genealogy of cosmopolitanism” that Amanda Anderson has urged (“Cosmopolitanism” 266).

Critics from various fields have expressed impatience with the cramped critical mindset imposed by a binary approach to the geopolitics of past and present empires.² Those who have sought to break out of the conceptual straightjacket that such a model imposes have produced three main kinds of alternatives: an expansion from a monocentric (in this case, Anglocentric) to a “multi-centric” approach, an exploration of “transperipheral” or “transcolonial” approaches, and a ringing of theoretical changes upon the familiar core-periphery approach.³ The conceptual route I take to my subject represents a variation on the third approach. However, rather than reprise the conflation of core and periphery in configurations of hybridity or the reversal of power differentials between center and margins often found in discussion of imperial discourses,⁴ I have attempted a different approach: the creation of a geopolitical position – that of the mediating cosmopolitan – at the rough midpoint along the axis joining imperial metropole and colony. This mediating figure is implicitly Janus-faced, looking both inward toward an insular England and outward toward a “Greater Britain,” or even the larger world.⁵ This model of cosmopolitanism, in which the cosmopolitan affiliates him or herself with the local *and* the global, with a commitment to both and without sacrifice of either, has replaced, for most critics today, the earlier model dating from Diogenes the Cynic to the nineteenth century, in which the cosmopolitan (the “world-citizen”) forsook his native country to embrace the world.⁶ Kwame Anthony Appiah

has coined the term “partial cosmopolitanism” to describe this new model (xvii). The partial nature of this cosmopolitanism will be useful to me later in delineating the limited moral universalism Pip achieves in the novel.

In using a version of this model, I am obviously importing a twentieth- and twentieth-first-century concept into study of the English nineteenth century. I do so to define a field of subjectivity culturally and ethically capacious enough to accommodate the many kinds of cosmopolitans – whether purported or self-ascribed, detested or admired – who move through Victorian literature and culture, not only the more familiar types (the aesthete, the Jew, the international financier, the detached intellectual, the deracinated gentleman or lady of leisure) but also less familiar types such as those represented by Pip and Magwitch. This conceptual importation might be considered a form of presentism; however, the Janus-like quality of the model of cosmopolitanism I offer accords closely with an important cultural pattern found in nineteenth-century British culture. Robin Gilmour identifies this pattern as a “double movement of national consciousness” combining a “drive outwards” to enlarge the empire and a “drive inward” to discover “an essential rural England” (*Victorian* 232, 184). Given the pervasiveness of this double consciousness in nineteenth-century Britain, a Janus-faced cosmopolitanism seems an appropriate rubric under which to read Victorian novels, particularly those in which the domestic encounters the foreign or the colonial.

In reading the Victorian novel through the figure of the double-sighted cosmopolitan, I seek to chart a middle course between two rival ways, represented by the work of Edward W. Said and James Buzard, of reading the English novel in an era of empire. Conveniently, Said has offered an interpretation of *Great Expectations* that sets out his general critical position clearly: “Most, if not all, readings of this remarkable work situate it squarely within the metropolitan history of British fiction, whereas I believe that it belongs in a history both more inclusive and more dynamic than such interpretations allow” (xv). In that more capacious and engaged approach to the novel, he contends, “Magwitch and Dickens [figure] not as mere coincidental references in that history, but as participants in it, through the novel and through a much older and wider experience between England and its overseas territories” (xv). Buzard, however, finds a danger in this globally more inclusive method of reading. By focusing so intently on Britain’s engagement with the outside world, Said and other postcolonial critics incur two limitations: [first] “blotting out . . . completely all those fine differentiations (of class, of region, of religion, and so forth) observable *within* the imperial nation and [second] regarding ‘England’ or ‘Britain’ (or even ‘the West’) as one unanimous whole, poised against the whole it coercively constructs of its ‘Other’” (43). These two limitations are in fact related: if one tends to take Britain as a single, monolithic unit in its relations with non-Britain, then one is also apt to miss the social, political, and cultural variety that composes that nation. As an alternative to Said’s globally integrated approach to reading, Buzard offers what he calls an “autoethnographic” approach, one that sees the nineteenth-century English novel as primarily concerned with constructing not a cultural account of the non-English “Other” (in the manner of the modernist ethnography it anticipates) but a “pre-” or “proto-ethnography” of England itself (21 and *passim*), a description of a culture delimited by national boundaries and defined (and riven) by all those subtle differentiations of class, region, and religion that, according to Buzard, Said, with his gaze turned “without,” misses. We can see reflected in this contest of reading strategies a rough version of the double consciousness that Gilmour finds operating in nineteenth-century British culture.

I would argue that a reading of the Victorian novel that takes as its guiding principle the figure of the Janus-faced cosmopolitan looks to combine, in a single reading, the strengths of Said's more outer-oriented and Buzard's more inner-directed approaches: the geopolitical comprehensiveness of the former and the fine-grained sensitivity to national cultural particularities of the latter. I attempt such a combination in an analysis of *Great Expectations*.

Before I begin my reading of Dickens's novel, I want to clarify the meaning of a concept that is crucial to an understanding of reluctant cosmopolitanism in the work. Anny Sadrin's remarks on the novel provide an entry into a discussion of this concept: "Such is the paradoxical nature of *Great Expectations* that it has all the outward signs of romance, and yet is not a romance" (*Great* 146). Sadrin sees in the narrative the continual undermining of Pip's dreams of aspiration with grimly comic results, a technique she denotes as Romantic irony (146–64). In view of the cosmopolitan dimensions of the narrative as I see it, we might argue that this irony has a transnational cast. Indeed, we might speak of "transnational irony" as the kind of irony operative in this international novel. I take the term from Arjun Appadurai, who uses it to describe the sudden, unexpected confluences of contemporary intercultural experience, elisions that are both spatial (blending near and far) and temporal (mixing now and then) ("Global" 201). While preserving the basic form of Appadurai's concept, I wish to give it an aesthetic dimension lacking in his account by seeing it as a species of Romantic irony at work within an international context.

By Romantic irony, I refer to the concept formulated between 1799 and 1802 by Friedrich Schlegel in response to the theories of Kant and Fichte and intended by Schlegel to describe both a philosophical practice and an artistic method that he saw as characteristic of the *Zeitgeist* at the turn of the nineteenth century.⁷ Although philosophers have disagreed about the meaning and merits of Schlegel's concept and literary critics have differed about its implications for the study of Romantic and post-Romantic literature, there is general agreement about its basic features. As Schlegel defined it, Romantic irony has a two-part, oscillating action: first, the creation (*Selbstschöpfung*), by an individual subject, of some "fiction" about the world as he or she understands it and then, in a moment of ironic skepticism, the shattering, or "de-creation" (*Selbstvernichtung*), of that fiction as a mere projection of his or her egoistic desires and, therefore, as something partial and untrue. What distinguishes Romantic irony from pre-Romantic, Pyrrhic irony is that, whereas the latter comes to rest in a coolly rational skepticism, the former, in response to the oscillation inherent in its structure, gives rise to a fresh, enthusiastic burst of creation in a process of continual "becoming" that moves the subject toward a fuller understanding of the self and the world.⁸ For Schlegel, this vital process is ultimately aimed at an apprehension of the infinite, but since it grows out of our finite condition as human beings, it must always fall short of absolute success. In seeking to unite finitude and infinitude, the process of becoming dissolves the distinctions between opposites to produce a dynamic, paradoxical state of mixture on all levels: ontological, epistemological, ethical, and aesthetic. Yet out of this contradictory melding emerges that greater wisdom about the self and the world that is the goal of Romantic irony. Although I will have cause to depart in some ways from this account of Romantic irony (Pip's "recreation" of his love for Estella after Magwitch's reappearance, for example, is more restrained than enthusiastic), the three aspects of the concept I have identified – its alternating structure of creation and de-creation, its quality of mixture, and its process of ontological and ethical becoming – will find their corollaries in the novel: in

the rising and falling rhythms of Pip's imaginative life, in the paradoxical meeting of social and cultural opposites in Pip and Magwitch, and in the ethical knowledge that Pip achieves toward the end of the novel.

Although critics have studied the operation of Romantic irony in Victorian poetic and fictional narratives,⁹ none has sought to place the concept within the specific experience of an English nation convulsed by the transnational: the rapid expansion of its empire and the dizzying increase of its international trade, communication, immigration, and infrastructure over the course of Queen Victoria's reign. Transnational irony, as I conceive it, represents the *spatialization* of Romantic irony, the location of an evolving process of creation and de-creation occurring in psychological time within a recurrent process of "voyage in" and "voyage out," of "tour" and "retour," occurring within international space.¹⁰ Indeed, these two processes, one temporal and the other spatial, can be seen to overlap in a novel like *Great Expectations* – and perhaps in other "international" Anglophone novels by a range of authors including Charlotte Brontë, Wilkie Collins, George Eliot, Henry James, and Anthony Trollope, as well. Two brief examples (examples to which I will return) will help to elucidate this overlapping in Dickens's novel. In the first, Pip finds his dream about his great expectations utterly exploded shortly after Magwitch returns to England from Australia to reveal his identity as the youth's benefactor. Thus, a temporal event – Pip's moment of de-creative irony – coincides with a spatial event – Magwitch's unanticipated movement from imperial periphery to center. Conversely, in the revised ending of the novel, Pip weaves a new "fiction" about his relationship with Estella as the two leave Satis House. Here a fresh act of Schlegelian creation occurs as Pip bids farewell to a dwelling that has been for him a kind of home.

In this general description of transnational irony, there are affinities between it and similar concepts in Said and Buzard: Said's idea, on the one hand, of "contrapuntal" reading – the movement that occurs in postcolonial analysis as the critic's gaze swings back and forth between the metropolitan center and the imperial margins (18 and *passim*) – and Buzard's concept, on the other, of "self-interruption" in ethnographic or autoethnographic narrative – the textual break that occurs when the ethnographic or novelistic writer crosses the line dividing the space inside from the space outside the culture he or she is studying (34 and *passim*). This is not the place to elaborate on these parallels; however, it is worth noting here that neither Said's nor Buzard's model emphasizes the restless self-ironizing, the jarring mixing of social antagonists, or the small ethical gains of cross-cultural "becoming" implicit in the idea of transnational irony.

A pattern of transnational irony establishes itself at the very beginning of *Great Expectations*. As Pip sits in the churchyard wondering about "the identity of things" (9; ch.1), he finds out "for certain" the following:

that Philip Pirrip, late of this parish, and also Georgiana wife of the above, were dead and buried; . . . that the dark flat wilderness beyond the churchyard, intersected with dykes and mounds and gates, with scattered cattle feeding on it, was the marshes; and that the low leaden line beyond, was the river; and that the distant savage lair from which the wind was rushing, was the sea; and that the small bundle of shivers growing afraid of it all and beginning to cry, was Pip. (9–10; ch. 1)

The boy's thoughts are brought to a halt when the convict rears up and cries: "Hold your noise!" (10; ch. 1).

Pip's attention moves here in a gradually widening and then rapidly shrinking circle: from his family members' tombstones, to the marshes, to the river, to the sea, and finally back to himself – a circuit that ends abruptly with the convict's shout. In this short passage, we can detect the chief features of transnational irony. First, we see the ironic effects of the intersection of spatial and temporal movements in the protagonist's life: when a stranger to the marshes disrupts Pip's meditation on his family, the boy finds himself forced to revise (de-create and then recreate) his sense of "the identity of things." Second, we observe the fantastical, anomalous joining of convict and boy. Finally, we see the laying of a foundation for new ethical growth in Pip: a dawning sympathy for the convict that will move him to fetch food, drink, and a file for the unfortunate man.

This primal scene of transnational irony also prefigures future transnational events in the novel. In the circular movement of Pip's gaze, the scene anticipates not only the journey that Magwitch will take as a convict from England to Australia and back but also the voyage that Pip will make from London to Egypt and back. It also looks ahead to the central scene of the novel in which Magwitch returns from Australia, again with terrible abruptness, to reveal to Pip that he is the source of the youth's fortune. Finally, in the arc of Pip's focus from the near to the far and back, it suggests a map on which three important subject-positions – the native Englishman, the colonial, and the cosmopolitan – will shortly emerge, positions that will work ironically against one another to define the fruits of a Schlegelian becoming in an international context: Pip's deepening understanding of himself as a cosmopolitan and his growing sympathy for his social alter ego, Magwitch. In the remainder of the essay, I will focus on these three subject-positions. For each I will examine two characters: Joe and Wemmick as native Englishmen, Pip and Magwitch as colonials, and finally Pip and Magwitch as cosmopolitans. As the argument moves from position to position, it will become clear why the hero and his convict friend must end up at the third site – that of the cosmopolite.

The Native Englishman

AS THE OPENING OF THE NOVEL SUGGESTS, Pip begins as a boy plunged into extreme confusion about home and family. On the one hand, orphaned and adopted by a sister who is physically and emotionally abusive, Pip lacks the maternal love necessary to establish a deep and abiding attachment to his birthplace. On the other hand, he is befriended by an affectionate and morally upright stepfather, the blacksmith Joe Gargery, who though powerless to stop his wife's "Ram-page[s]," offers a worthy paternal substitute for the boy's absent biological father (13; ch. 2). Given his mixed feelings about his adoptive parents, it is not surprising that, at his first opportunity to leave the hearth, an opportunity afforded by Miss Havisham's request for a companion in play, Pip jumps at the chance. Thus begins his long attempt to escape his persistent sense of his own commonness and become a gentleman of great expectations. Although he returns again to the forge, to the emotional warmth and fine moral example that Joe represents, he realizes in the end that he has no place in his natal home. What impels him to distance himself from his roots despite his love and respect for Joe? To answer this question, we need to place first Joe and then Wemmick, the successor to Joe as a warm domestic presence, in their native English settings. The irrelevance of the nostalgic pre-modern ideal that Joe embodies, an irrelevance that Pip senses early on without fully comprehending, is confirmed for the youth by the sheer absurdity of Wemmick's

unconscious parody of that ideal. Against that old-fashioned ethos, Pip invents himself as a modern gentleman, an urban, upper-middle-class man of leisurely dissipation.

Joe represents the novel's most complete incarnation of the gentleman. Herbert Pocket quotes his father, who offers the clearest definition of this moral epitome: "it is a principle of his that no man who was not a true gentleman at heart, ever was, since the world began, a true gentleman in manner. He says, no varnish can hide the grain of the wood; and the more varnish you put on, the more the grain will express itself" (142–43; ch. 22). In this novel about a young man trying to improve himself, Joe as the perfect gentleman poses a problem. While the narrative implicitly endorses Mr. Pocket's idea of a true gentleman as a moral desideratum, it is less certain about this idea as a social and national good. Robin Gilmour is right to argue that, given the popularity at mid-century of the nostrums of Samuel Smiles, Dickens and his middle-class readers would have implicitly supported Pip's desire to rise (*Idea* 105–48). The difficulty for Dickens is that, as the young man moves up in the world, he inevitably puts on more and more varnish – a process that shows all the more glaringly his uncertain moral grain. A corollary difficulty – one that must have caused Dickens some discomfort – is that this same process also reveals the blacksmith's shortcomings as a gentleman. Joe is found wanting not because he is deficient in moral fiber but because he lacks any real relevance to the modern middle-class nation.

Joe is linked to a particular English cultural fantasy – what Peter Mandler has called the "Olden Time," a Romantic myth that evolved in the early nineteenth century and culminated at mid-century. According to Mandler, its origin lay in a particular conflation of class and national feeling: "The last [the eighteenth] century had witnessed the separation of an exclusive elite from the mass of the people; now the people were catching up, and they needed to rein in their errant, over-cosmopolitan 'betters,' reconnecting them with the lost world of a common English culture" (81). This lost world was the period stretching from the ascent of the Tudors to the beginning of the Civil War. Mandler identifies four strands of the Olden Time, each standing for a different England: "Merry England," where "traditional English games and rituals" from the Middle Ages were performed; "Social England," where social equality reigned; "Domestic England," where the common people were able to "cultivate the domestic virtues"; and "Literary England," where the vernacular literature became for the first time the national literature (82–86). Joe twists together all four of these strands in his person, enjoying "larks" with Pip, standing in rough equality with the young boy, cultivating key domestic virtues, and by the end of the novel, under Bidley's tutelage, learning to read. Even Joe's single comment on English culture – "A Englishman's ouse is his Castle, and castles must not be busted 'cept when done in war time" (346; ch. 57) – is redolent of Stuart England.¹¹

Because Joe inhabits a myth of charming archaisms, he is for Dickens merely a figure of sweet nostalgia, a Victorian holdover from Raymond Williams's "golden age" of a greener England (35–45). Joe's fine, gentlemanly virtues – an amalgam of the rural, the artisanal, and the pre-modern – have the unchanging quality of something under glass. As John Lucas puts it, the blacksmith "stands for a moral economy, for a quality of relationships in work, that may be becoming a thing of the past" (qtd. in Sell 10). Joe's attachment to a traditional Little England is attractive but quaint and therefore, for Pip as well as for Dickens, impertinent to the class and national aspirations of the modern age. Drifting away from Joe as an exemplar of the gentleman, Pip comes to resemble the "errant, over-cosmopolitan 'better'" that the myth of the Olden Time was meant to counteract.

Wemmick's example implicitly drives home the irrelevance of the pre-modern spirit that Joe embodies. The law clerk, in effect, seeks to bring the ideal of the Olden Time into the modern, capitalist city – a feat he accomplishes only by compartmentalizing the two temporalities within which he moves, pursuing a soul-destroying professional career in modern London while enjoying a soul-nourishing domestic life in his simulacrum of a medieval castle at Walworth.

Pip bitterly rejects the cold, dehumanized London within which the clerk's modern half moves. In an ironic moment, Pip quickly finds himself disenchanted with the city in which he had hoped to realize his great expectations as a gentleman, viewing it as “decidedly overrated” (137; ch. 21). Moreover, he sees it as emblematic of a particular *national* failure: “We Britons had at that time particularly settled that it was treasonable to doubt our having and our being the best of everything: otherwise, while I was scared by the immensity of London, I think I might have had some faint doubts whether it was not rather ugly, crooked, narrow, and dirty” (129; ch. 20). The editorial “we” here echoes Dickens's voice in “Insularities,” published in *Household Words* in 1856:

We English people, owing in a great degree to our insular position, and in a small degree to the facility with which we have permitted electioneering lords and gentlemen to pretend to think for us, and to represent our weaknesses to us as our strength, have been in particular danger of contracting habits which we will call for our present purpose, Insularities. (471)

Both writers, the mature Pip writing his memoir and Dickens himself, condemn a parochial English populace that blinds itself to its own moral shortcomings. George Orwell observed that “One very striking thing about Dickens, especially considering the time he lived in, is his lack of vulgar nationalism” (69). Pip, sharing his creator's absence of crude ethnocentrism, finds his attachment to England loosening.

Repelled by the law clerk's modern side, Pip is nonetheless drawn to Wemmick's pre-modern, domestic aspect, which is brilliantly realized in the castle he has built as his home, complete with a top “painted like a battery mounted with guns,” “the queerest gothic windows,” “a gothic door,” a moat, a drawbridge, and a “piece of ordinance” (“the Stinger”) that he fires regularly at nine o'clock at night (160–62; ch. 25). Joe speaks of a house being a man's castle; Wemmick has made that figure literal. Where Dickens elegizes Joe's association with the Olden Time, he burlesques Wemmick's participation in the Gothic revival. Like Joe's pre-modernity, Wemmick's brand of feudalism clearly concatenates home and nation. Linda Colley argues that, beginning in the eighteenth century, the peoples of the United Kingdom began to think of themselves as Britons when they came to feel threatened by foreigners: “They came to define themselves as a single people not because of any political or cultural consensus at home, but rather in reaction to the Other beyond their shores” (6). During the nineteenth century, defense of the nation went hand in hand with protection of the home. Writing in 1833 about the English, Edward Lytton Bulwer observed, “The root of all our notions, as of all our laws, is to be found in the sentiment of property. It is *my* wife whom you shall not insult; it is *my* house that you shall not enter; [and] it is *my* country that you shall not traduce . . .” (21). Wemmick clearly thinks of his home as property to be defended against foreigners. At the back of the castle, “so as not to impede the idea of fortifications,” he keeps a pig, fowls, and rabbits and maintains a small garden; “if you can suppose the little place besieged,” he remarks, “it would hold out a devil of a time in point of provisions” (161;

ch. 25). To underscore his patriotism, and to strike fear into any foreigner who might think of attacking, he flies a Union Jack from time to time (222; ch. 37). For Wemmick, his home amounts to a neo-feudal version of the nation in small. This is English insularity – Dickens’s Mr. Podsnap and Mr. Sapsea – but in a comic light. The charming whimsy of Wemmick’s evocation of a bygone era seals for Pip his sense of the irrelevance of English nativism to his life. Whether embodied in Joe or Wemmick, the native English is associated for Pip with a past frozen in amber, clearly a time and place with little attraction for a modern gentleman.

The Colonial

THROUGHOUT THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, white British colonials (the brown or black colonized were an entirely different matter) often bore an ambivalent attitude toward domestic and colonial spaces. While identifying themselves with their colonial residence, they also hankered after “home,” a place that for them usually meant England – or Scotland, Ireland, or Wales. As the speaker in Rudyard Kipling’s “The Native-Born” remarks when referring to his fellow colonials:

They change their skies above them,
But not their hearts that roam!
We learned from our wistful mothers
To call old England “home” . . . (9–12)

The scare quotes around “home” convey precisely the ambivalence of the native-born’s identification with place. Although English-born, Pip and Magwitch will be afflicted by a similar dubiety about belonging during and after their time in the colonies. First, however, it is necessary to contrast Pip’s and Magwitch’s lives on the imperial margins.¹²

Said distinguishes sharply between the colonial experiences of Pip and Magwitch: “the old Pip takes on a new career with his boyhood friend Herbert Pocket, this time not as an idle gentleman but as a hardworking trader in the East, where Britain’s other colonies offer a sort of normality that Australia never could” (xvi). Although I will have occasion to qualify Said’s point below, his comparison makes a useful starting-point. As he suggests, the Egypt where Pip works as a clerk in Clarriker’s shipping firm represents a far different part of the Empire, socially and economically, from the Australia where Magwitch is transported as a convict. If, as Anny Sadrin and others assert, the action of the novel occurs roughly during the first quarter of the nineteenth century (“Chronology” 540), then Pip resides in Egypt long before the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 and the British annexation of the Canal Zone in 1882 – in other words, before major economic and political penetration by European imperial powers into the country. However, in the early nineteenth century, Egypt under the modernizing rule of Muhammad Ali would still have offered ample opportunities for European economic activity in its major entrepôts.¹³ Cairo, in particular, was an important city in the growing wheat and cotton trade between Egypt and Europe and in the overland shipment of goods from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean linking India and Great Britain.¹⁴ Herbert conveys something of the restless, expansive spirit of English capitalism during this period: “Then the time comes . . . when you see your opening. And you go in and you swoop upon it and you make your capital, and then there you are! When you have once made

your capital, you have nothing to do but employ it" (145; ch. 22). Making allowances for Herbert's naiveté, we can nonetheless sense in his remarks the economic desire that propelled middle-class men like him, who lacked business openings at home, to venture to the margins of the Empire to seek wealth and power.

Yet when Pip himself goes to Cairo to join Herbert at Clarriker's, he seems depleted of entrepreneurial energy. Pip the narrator writes laconically: "I must not leave it to be supposed that we were ever a great House, or that we made mints of money. We were not in a grand way of business, but we had a good name, and worked for our profits, and did very well" (355; ch. 59). Although I will treat Pip's muted and prosaic affirmations in greater detail in the next section of my essay, it is worth noting here that he neither displays any interest in Egypt nor offers any details about his life there as a foreigner. Indeed, he makes a point of mentioning that while there "he maintained a constant correspondence with Bidley and Joe" (355; ch. 59). Instead of the tension between colonial and domestic subjectivities that we find in Kipling's poem, we see here only a simple desire, undisturbed by any attraction to colonial life, to identify, if merely in epistolary terms, with home. Yet as I will show in the next section, Pip's national identity when he returns to England is by no means clear.

Magwitch's experience in Botany Bay is, in an obvious sense, socially and economically asymmetrical with Pip's in Cairo. If Pip chooses to work in Egypt, Magwitch is transported against his will to New South Wales. If work as a trader in Egypt is worthy employment for a middle-class English gentleman, imprisonment as a convict in Australia represents the antithesis of "normal" bourgeois respectability. And if economic initiative in the East is seen as a healthful overflow of the forces of Victorian improvement from the imperial center to the periphery, then maintenance of the Australian convict colony is regarded as a necessary diverting and draining away of dangerous social energies that threaten middle-class progress. Pip's horror at Magwitch, when he shows up at night on Pip's doorstep to announce himself as the youth's benefactor, is clearly driven by middle-class revulsion from the criminal class. However, it is also engendered by an English antipathy to colonial Australia. Robert Hughes writes of the land:

Within its inscrutable otherness, every fantasy could be contained; it was the geographical unconscious. So there was a deep, ironic resonance in the way the British, having brought the Pacific at last into the realm of European consciousness, having explored and mapped it, promptly demonized Australia once more by chaining their criminals on its innocent dry coast. It was to become the continent of sin. (44)

Bearing this sin, Australia's felons were said to carry "the convict stain" (Hughes xiii). Marked in this way, they were, according to Leon Litvak, the "antipodean Other" (Part I, 35 and *passim*). Although Dickens's attitude toward the prisoners of New South Wales changed over the years, from a sense that they were utterly irremediable to a sense that in some cases they might achieve moral and economic redemption, he never lost sight of the otherness of those who bore the convict stain.¹⁵ The true litmus test of tolerance, for many nineteenth-century English observers including Dickens, was the attitude toward the returned Australian felon. Hughes writes, "They [the convicts] could succeed, but they could hardly, in the real sense, return. They could expiate their crimes in a technical, legal sense, but what they suffered there warped them into permanent outsiders. And yet they were capable of redemption – as long as they stayed in Australia" (586). That Dickens has Magwitch

die, the fate usually reserved for characters in nineteenth-century British fiction that are too ideologically troublesome to place in “home” society, corroborates Hughes’s point.

Yet despite the obvious structural inequalities between their lives abroad, Magwitch in New South Wales bears a key resemblance to Pip in Egypt. Just as the young trader keeps writing home, the felon keeps thinking of his beneficiary in England. Although as a lonely shepherd he saw “no faces but faces of sheep till I half forgot wot men’s and women’s faces was like,” he nonetheless sees Pip’s (241; ch. 39). When he meets well-to-do Australian settlers on their horses who mock him, he clearly conceives of himself as a colonial, a resentful “Emancipist” confronting the disdainful “Exclusivists” in that archetypal social battle that dominated early Australian history (Hughes 295, 324–25). Yet this battle is *au fond* an overseas version of Magwitch’s old struggle against the English “gentleman” Compeyson, whose betrayal had led to his transportation. When he declares satisfaction at the sight of the well-heeled Pip – “Why, look at you, dear boy! Look at these here lodgings o’ yourn, fit for a lord! A lord? Ah! You shall show money with lords for wagers, and beat ‘em!” – he is thinking not so much of the lords in New South Wales as those in England (241; ch. 39). But just as Pip is no uncomplicated Englishman when he returns “home” from Egypt, Magwitch is no simple returned English native either. Their experiences abroad have left a colonial residue upon them despite their best efforts to shake it off. To see why this is so, we must consider Pip and Magwitch as cosmopolitans.

The Cosmopolitan

JUST BEFORE PIP ARRIVES AT HIS LIVING quarters in the Temple one night, he receives a message from Wemmick, “DON’T GO HOME,” warning him that Compeyson is lying in wait for him (273; ch. 44). It is an ironic note because the apartment that Pip shares with Herbert can hardly be called “home” in any emotionally resonant sense. Having left Joe’s forge, Pip has lived in a succession of domiciles, none of which can be considered a proper substitute even for the house where he once lived unhappily with Joe and Mrs. Gargery. In his moves from residence to residence, he comes to resemble the vagabond Magwitch. For both Pip and Magwitch, their lives are, in essence, a study in homelessness – lives that began with no proper origin and lead to no familiar and comfortable resting place.

The incident that most decisively defines this homelessness, giving it for the first time a distinct shape, is the fateful meeting between Pip and Magwitch in the former’s apartment after the latter’s return from Australia. There, we can see the decisive consequences of transnational irony, in its three aspects, on Pip’s life. First, it reveals the unexpected merging of spatial and temporal dimensions in the hero’s existence: as the colonial breaks in upon the Englishman’s hearth, Pip finds his dream of great expectations suddenly revealed as a piece of vain, tawdry wish-fulfillment. In addition, it shows the contradictory mixing of social and cultural opposites, a mixing that, for Pip, works to cruel effect. It is the very union of Pip’s high hopes as a gentleman with their “low” origins in a convict’s earnings that forces the youth to realize the artifice and falsity of his dream. Yet this collision of opposites will have a productive double effect, as well. It will spur a fresh round of “creation” in Pip’s imaginative life: out of the ruins of his old love for Estella, he will build a new dream – one in which he is no longer a rich gentleman and Estella’s intended, but one that is ostensibly all the stronger for these negations. More profoundly, it will also stimulate, for Pip, a process of becoming that will result in a deeper knowledge of himself and of the convict he now despises. For both

these effects, the logic of transnationality will be decisive. Just as Pip's de-creative moment in his apartment depends on the intrusion of the colonial into the space of the native, so Pip's newly creative phase – his renewed love for Estella and his new-found compassion for the convict – will rely upon a re-evaluation, on Pip's part, of his and Magwitch's positions within international space. Indeed, the bringing together of this odd couple will paradoxically imprint upon both their shared unsettledness – what I have described as their condition of reluctant cosmopolitanism. I will study each character in turn, beginning with Magwitch.

In Pip's initial revulsion from the returned felon, Magwitch seems irremediably besmirched with the convict stain, locked in an irreversible atavism. The young man's attempts to fashion a new man out of him are hopeless: "The more I dressed him and the better I dressed him, the more he looked like the slouching fugitive on the marshes. . . . [F]rom head to foot there was Convict in the very grain of the man" (252; ch. 40). The regression Magwitch undergoes, however, does not always take him back to the marshes of Pip's English childhood. After the convict refers sneeringly to "The blood horses of them [Australian] colonists," Pip shudders "at the thought that for anything I knew, his hand might be stained with blood" (242; ch. 39). The repetition of "blood" and the reference to "stained" make clear that the young man associates Magwitch as much with Australia as with England. Although the felon, in returning to London, had wished to secure his English identity as the creator of a gentleman who can rival "lords," he carries with him, in spite of his efforts at self-reinvention, the indelible mark of his colonial experience.

Magwitch, however, is not defined simply by his past. While on the boat that transports him to New South Wales, he takes the alias "Provis," a name whose etymology ("looking forward") turns out to be prescient. Knowing that return from transportation is a capital offense, Herbert and Pip realize that the convict's only hope for safety lies in his fleeing abroad – in other words, in his adopting an exile's identity. It does not matter to them where he goes: "Hamburg, Rotterdam, Antwerp – the place signified little, so that he was got out of England" (310; ch. 52). Indeed, the list of Continental destinations reads like a grim parody of the European tour that his daughter, Estella, takes to put a foreign finish on her education. Although the police apprehend Provis before he can board a ship to escape, it is clear that, if he had succeeded, he would have lived a continual life on the lam abroad. It would be premature at this point to describe the nature of Magwitch's ambiguous cultural identity (that will have to wait until I examine Pip), but it is clear that, in the mere juxtaposition of his names, Magwitch and Provis, he is that Janus-faced figure I associate with the cosmopolitan, looking backward and forward, gesturing at once toward England, Australia, and the vague Continental abroad and yet unable to consider any of these his proper home.

After his fateful encounter with Magwitch, Pip also undergoes a re-orientation in transnational space. While hatching his plan with Herbert to take Provis abroad, Pip understands that he must accompany the convict to Europe if their plan is to succeed. In this moment, Pip seems to be consigning himself, with Magwitch, to a life overseas of indefinite duration. Later, when trapped by Orlick, he hallucinates about his own death – his friends and acquaintances "all drifting by, as on the swift stream of my life fast running out to sea" – as if it were a version of his prospective voyage across the Channel (318; ch. 53). Throughout the lead-up to their escape to the Continent, Pip rarely betrays a longing to remain in his native land and is instead resigned to an extended separation from it.

Indeed, he has implicitly changed his relation to the world and become cosmopolitan in his outlook upon it – a shift that is effected as much by his altered relationship with

Magwitch as by his immersion in the many practical considerations of their flight. Through a “soften[ing]” in Magwitch’s manner toward Pip (282; ch. 46) and a concomitant softening in Pip’s manner toward his convict friend (brought about chiefly by Pip’s forgiving Magwitch for having made him the creature of his revenge), Pip no longer regards his friend as a convict and instead thinks of him simply as a fellow human being:

For now, my repugnance to him had all melted away, and in the hunted wounded shackled creature who held my hand in his, I only saw a man who had meant to be my benefactor, and who had felt affectionately, gratefully, and generously, towards me with great constancy through a series of years. I only saw in him a much better man than I had been to Joe. (332; ch. 55)

In his physical intimacy with Magwitch, Pip discovers a psychic interconnectedness with the convict; he might say with Stuart Hall, “This is the Other that belongs inside [me]” (48). In this moment of intersubjectivity, the convict has not entirely disappeared (the shackles still remain), but the “man” – a gentleman much like Joe, a gentleman beyond social class, a gentleman defined not by his external aspect but by his internal virtues – shines through clearly. As Magwitch approaches the universally human (a subject about which I will say more below), Pip sees him as tied less to the parochial moorings of place – whether England, Australia, or the Continent – than to a humanity that at once includes all of these locales and refuses any particular attachment to them. Thus, despite his lack of actual foreign experience at this point, Pip has become a cosmopolitan in spirit.

After Magwitch’s death, Pip’s life displays, with increasing clarity, its cosmopolitan character. In the delirium he suffers after the convict dies, Pip writes:

that I confounded impossible existences with my own identity; that I was a brick in the house-wall, and yet entreating to be released from the giddy place where the builders had set me; that I was a steel beam of a vast engine, clashing and whirling over a gulf, and yet that I implored in my own person to have the engine stopped, and my part in it hammered off; that I passed through these phases of disease, I know of my own remembrance, and did in some sort know at the time. (343; ch. 57)

Wishing to be “released from the giddy place,” to have his part “hammered off” from the whole, Pip desires nothing less than to be freed from his native England. He makes one more attempt to return to the town of his boyhood, quixotically to propose to Biddy, only to find that she and Joe are preparing to get married. Within two months, he becomes a clerk with Clarriker and Co. in Cairo.

Dickens’s decision to send Pip to Egypt may seem arbitrary. After all, the novel offers very few details about Pip’s life “in the East,” a dearth that seems odd given Dickens’s own close attention to his sons’ work overseas as part of the British Empire: Charley’s in Hong Kong, Sydney’s at sea, Walter’s in India, and Alfred’s and Edward’s in Australia (Moore 1). Yet, at the same time, the novel grants an important symbolic resonance to Egypt that fits the cosmopolitan identity Pip confirms in going there. When Herbert receives the news that Clarriker is sending him to Cairo, he “sketched airy pictures of himself conducting Clara Barley to the land of the Arabian Nights, and of me going out to join them (with a caravan of camels, I believe), and of our all going up the Nile and seeing wonders” (309; ch. 52). This seems a piece of silly Orientalist fantasy, but it has an unexpected relevance to Pip’s life, for it recalls “the Eastern story” of Misnar, a tale clearly influenced by the *Arabian Nights*, that Pip relates just before Magwitch’s momentous return (235; ch. 38).¹⁶ That story prefigures

not only Magwitch's crushing revelation but also the event that revelation brings about: the young man's eventual settlement in Cairo. Thus, through the device of the Eastern story, Egypt, the site of both Herbert's sentimental dream and Pip's humdrum experience, comes to concatenate the contradictory, romantic and anti-romantic aspects of the "Orient" as they play themselves out in the two men's lives.

Though alienated from England, neither Pip nor Magwitch wishes to live abroad as a colonial or exile. Both are linked by their reluctant cosmopolitanism, their participation in transnationality as a kind of Hobson's choice. Of course, their routes to this kind of existence are very different. In the words of James Clifford, their cosmopolitanisms are "discrepant" (365). We might say that Pip's stay in Egypt represents a cosmopolitanism from above (one that he chooses and that confirms his high status) and that Magwitch's proposed flight to Europe constitutes a cosmopolitanism from below (one that is forced upon him and deepens his low social standing).¹⁷ Yet despite this difference, they are joined by their half-hearted assent to their positions as cosmopolitans. If a thoroughgoing cosmopolitan (the Enlightenment ideal of the cosmopolitan) is "A Citizen of the world, one who is at home in every place," then neither Pip nor Magwitch is a cosmopolitan of this sort.¹⁸ As a transported felon, Magwitch is neither a citizen nor a man who has any home in the world. Though Pip is certainly a "citizen" (or, more precisely, an English subject with many of the rights of a citizen), he has, as he says, "no home anywhere" (335; ch. 55). The ending of the novel confirms his nomadism. When he returns from Cairo to seek out Joe and Bidley, he finds that their son, also named Pip, has replaced him at the forge. And when he meets Estella in the revised ending and sees "the shadow of no parting from her," it is hard to know where they are headed, even if they are headed there together – a dubious proposition given that Estella is given no opportunity to speak for herself about the matter (358; ch. 59). Even a reading inclined to reward Pip with Estella at the end must acknowledge that the final scene of the novel, with its muted, elegiac tone, is one of departure – a scene whose Miltonic echoes make this leave-taking both a banishment from a past that lies in ruins and a prelude to a future of "wand'ring steps and slow."¹⁹ Ironically, it is the native Joe who underscores the exilic theme of the novel: "Pip, dear old chap, life is made of ever so many partings welded together . . ." (173, ch. 27). For both Magwitch and Pip, their role as mediators between home and abroad has left them to traffic between these positions without settling anywhere or inhabiting any national identity for long. For both, life after Magwitch's return represents a *pis aller* suspended between England and abroad, a contact zone of diminished opportunities, a reluctant cosmopolitanism that sees the fluid national identities such a condition provides not as enriching but as burdensome. If, beyond the limits of the narrative, Pip and Estella are to go to the colonial margins – to Egypt again or to New South Wales, as some Australian stage productions would have it – Pip would be able to give to that existence only two cheers.²⁰

So far this version of the cosmopolitan seems to have "founder[ed]" in the way Lauren Goodlad and Julia Wright find all too common in Victorian treatments of cosmopolitanism (7). Several critics have pointed out the limitations of Victorian cosmopolitanism as it is commonly represented: its elitism; its self-regarding individualism; its aesthetic rarefactions; its class, gender, and national exclusions; and its studied detachment from any meaningful action.²¹ Yet it is possible to find a benefit in Pip's condition – the achievement of a "partial" moral universalism – despite his reluctant embrace of cosmopolitanism. I borrow the word "partial" and, to an extent, the idea of a limited universalism from Appiah.²² Partial cosmopolitanism, and the universalism it implies, suggests an ethical embrace of humankind

that begins in and often returns to a partiality toward certain human beings rather than others. Pip implicitly espouses such an ethic. He is not interested in a Kantian universalism, for he has no general, abstract, benevolent love for criminals or colonials. But he learns to love a particular felon and erstwhile Australian and, in so doing, becomes more selfless, caring, and considerate toward others whom he knows and meets at home and abroad. The narrative shows Pip's (and the novel's own) ethic of partial universalism most clearly in the courtroom scene where Magwitch is judged:

The sun was striking in at the great windows of the court, through the glittering drops of rain upon the glass, and it made a broad shaft of light between the two-and-thirty [prisoners] and the Judge, linking both together, and perhaps reminding some among the audience, how both were passing on, with absolute equality, to the greater Judgment that knoweth all things and cannot err. (340; ch. 56)

Pip demonstrates here a partiality to the “distinct speck of face in this way of light” that is Magwitch's countenance (340; ch. 56). Yet Magwitch is linked to everyone in this scene, including the judge, through a Christian vision of equality that transcends all class and national hierarchies. Likewise, Pip's narration reveals a compassion that extends to all the doomed. Appiah has pithily called cosmopolitanism “universality plus difference” (151). From the mediating position of the cosmopolitan, Pip sympathizes with both the specific difference that Magwitch represents and the universal that he suggests. This is obviously a small ethical accomplishment, one that hardly leads, in terms of class, to a broad intersubjective understanding of social marginalization or, in terms of nation, to a rich and productive cultural dialogue with colonial or foreign alterity.²³ However, if ethical progress is measured as the distance traveled *from* an origin in moral confusion rather than as the distance still to be traveled *to* the telos of a perfect moral theory and practice, then Pip's advance is real and significant. Such an achievement is consonant with the model of transnational irony I have sketched, since the Schlegelian becoming in which Pip is engaged can never reach the end to which it aspires: total knowledge of and immersion in the infinite – in this case, of human compassion. All that can be hoped for is some development from an initial point of moral obtuseness to the point of partial enlightenment and fellow-feeling he attains.

The cosmopolitan figure Pip represents has implications for his own and his creator's brand of storytelling. It is from the mediating position between polarities (home and abroad, specific and general) that Pip begins to narrate. Shortly after Magwitch's trial, he starts “to write out a petition to the Home Secretary of State, setting forth my knowledge of him, and how it was that he had come back for my sake” (340; ch. 56). This initial account of Pip's and Magwitch's life is the autobiographical narrative of *Great Expectations* in embryo – in effect, the novel's first draft. The journey that Pip makes as an author, from this initial scene of writing to the undisclosed place from which he composes the narrative we read, inscribes a narrational dynamic analogous to the ethical dynamic that characterizes Pip's cosmopolitanism. He begins with a document that has a specific motivation and a circumscribed audience (Appiah's “difference”) and ends with a memoir that has a more undifferentiated intention and a more general audience (Appiah's “universality”). Moreover, in creating a narrator who moves back and forth between a designated place within the narrative and a point of detachment outside it (the site of the novel's narration), Dickens himself constructs a “cosmopolitan” narrational environment in which he can fluidly shift points of view – now past, now present; now

limited in perspective, now more knowledgeable – thus, achieving the subtle moral ironies for which the novel is justly praised. Among Dickens's first-person narrators *qua* narrators (including David Copperfield and Esther Summerson), Pip is the one we know least about – a paucity of detail that befits his houseless, amorphous cosmopolitan identity. Yet from the vague, detached space of the cosmopolitan comes the most particular and embracing, hard-earned and tender, compassion for other human beings. Late in his career, increasingly plagued by a restlessness that often drove him abroad to rest and write, Dickens turned with greater and greater frequency to limning the reluctant cosmopolitan – from Sydney Carton to the aptly named Neville and Helena Landless – but nowhere does he delineate the partial moral universalism that grows out of this cosmopolitanism so sharply and so movingly as in *Great Expectations*.

In writing such a transnational novel, Dickens implicitly asks his audience to read in a similar transnational spirit, alert both to the particularities of the native ground toward which the novel's cosmopolites express such deep ambivalence and to the specificities of a colonial or Continental terrain for which these same characters feel only faint interest and affection. Such a reading would have to fit the comprehensive dimensions of the novel's narrative space, which touches Joe's forge on the one hand and Magwitch's Australian sheep station on the other. In focusing on the Janus-faced cosmopolitan as an agent who mediates between home and the world under the crisscrossing pressures of a transnational irony, I have sought to reflect this comprehensiveness. Steering between Said's emphasis upon the imperial aspects of the nineteenth-century British novel and Buzard's attention to the thick description of a multi-faceted national culture in Victorian fictional narrative, I have offered what I hope is a reading worthy of the geographical and cultural largeness of Dickens's novel.

John Carroll University

NOTES

1. For such suggestions, see Goodland and Wright; and Robbins. Both sets of authors, for different reasons, prefer the term "internationalism."
2. Appadurai, for example, argues that the "global cultural economy" represents a "disjunctive order" that calls into question a view that simplistically opposes centers and margins ("Disjuncture" 328). Catherine Hall asserts, "It is not possible to make sense of empire either theoretically or empirically through a binary lens: we need the dislocation of that binary and more elaborate, cross-cutting ways of thinking" (16). Burton, too, implies a need for "a critique of the core-periphery model of British imperialism" (478).
3. Bayly favors a "multi-centric" understanding of world history (470). Trumpener has traced transperipheral connections along the Celtic fringe and transcolonial relations between Celtic and overseas colonies during the development of the national tale and historical novel in Great Britain, while Nagai has charted the transcolonial links between India and Ireland in the works of Rudyard Kipling. Said, who had been accused earlier in his career of relying too heavily upon a monolithic model of dominant core and subordinate periphery, argued later in his career for a more nuanced, "contrapuntal" conceptualization of power-relations under empire (18 and *passim*).
4. In this regard, Gikandi has written, "For when we look beyond the metaphorical and mythological binarism promoted by empire, we discover that notions of margins and centers are conflated and often

- reversed . . .” (37). In postcolonial studies, the first process (conflation) is best represented by the work of Bhabha, the second process (reversal) by that of the later Said.
5. On the nation as Janus-faced, see Habermas (131). Dilke made the phrase “Greater Britain” popular with his travelogue *Greater Britain: A Record of Travel in English-Speaking Countries during 1866 and 1867*.
 6. On the new model, see many of the essays in Cheah and Robbins. For a provocative defense of the earlier model against its many critics, see Nussbaum’s essays in *For Love of Country*.
 7. For the following, I am indebted primarily to Mellor’s *English Romantic Irony*, especially 3–30.
 8. On the difference between Pyrrhic and Romantic irony, see Gurewitch 5.
 9. On Romantic irony in Victorian literature, see Gurewitch, especially 49–58; Mellor, especially 109–34 and 165–84; and Rigg. On Romantic irony in Dickens, in this case *Bleak House*, see Vescovi.
 10. On the idea of “retour,” see Gikandi 97, 117.
 11. According to Bartlett’s *Familiar Quotations*, the famous Tudor and Stuart judge Sir Edward Coke (1552–1634) first used the expression “a man’s house is his castle.”
 12. It is the nature of the core-periphery model as I see it operating in *Great Expectations* that the positions along it are inherently unstable. Because this model is ineluctably ironic, no sooner do characters occupy one place along this continuum than they find themselves shifted to another. The difficulty of using the organization I have in this essay – that is, of placing the characters in *Great Expectations* in separate boxes (“The Native Englishman,” “The Colonial,” and “The Cosmopolitan”) – is that characters keep slipping out of them. This awkwardness will become evident in treating the colonials Pip and Magwitch.
 13. On Muhammad Ali, see Dodwell.
 14. On British economic activity in Egypt during the early part of the nineteenth century, see Dodwell 4, 27, 29–31, 56–59, 134–37; Hunter 13–14; Mitchell 15–16; and Vatikiotis 60–62.
 15. On the shift in Dickens’s attitude toward the convict colonies in Australia, see Lansbury 60–78, 104; Litvak, I 32; and Moore 7–20.
 16. “[T]he Eastern story” to which the narrative refers is “The Enchanters, or, Misnar the Sultan of India,” from *The Tales of the Genii, or The Delightful Lessons of Horan, the Son of Asmar*, written by the Reverend James Ridley “in the heyday of the Oriental craze” (Rosenberg 235n3). The story describes how two evil sorcerers are entrapped by the vizier of the sultan from whom they have wrested power. Their doom is sealed when a stone slab falls upon the royal bed on which they are sleeping off their victory. Rosenberg writes, “The point is that Pip, like the Enchanters, is struck down when he least expects to be, at the height of his fortunes” (235n3).
 17. On cosmopolitanism “from below,” see Appadurai, “Grassroots” 3; and Mignolo 183–84.
 18. I quote from Sheridan’s 1780 *A General Dictionary of the English Language* (qtd. in Goodlad and Wright 3).
 19. I quote from Milton’s *Paradise Lost* 12: 648. On Miltonic overtones in the novel, see Greenberg 160; and Meckier 35 and *passim*.
 20. On Australian dramatic adaptations of *Great Expectations*, see Litvak, II123.
 21. On the limitations of Victorian cosmopolitanism, see Anderson, *Powers* especially 31–32; Goodlad and Wright 5–8; and Keirstead 427–29. For an affirmation of the possibilities of political engagement in an “aesthetic cosmopolitanism,” see Agathocleous.
 22. On “partial cosmopolitanism,” see Appiah xvii. For his treatment of universalism, see xv and *passim*.
 23. For a similar point about Dickens’s *Little Dorrit*, see Anderson, *Powers* 89–90.

WORKS CITED

- Agathocleous, Tanya. “London Mysteries and International Conspiracies: James, Doyle, and the Aesthetics of Cosmopolitanism.” *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 26.2 (2004): 125–48.

- Anderson, Amanda. "Cosmopolitanism, Universalism, and the Divided Legacies of Modernity." Ed. Cheah and Robbins. 265–89.
- . *The Powers of Distance: Cosmopolitanism and the Cultivation of Detachment*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2001.
- Appadurai, Arjun. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." *Public Culture* 2.2 (1990): 1–24. Rpt. in *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*. Ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman. New York: Columbia UP, 1994. 324–39.
- . "Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for a Transnational Anthropology." *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*. Ed. Richard G. Fox. Santa Fe: American Research, 1991. 191–210.
- . "Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination." *Globalization*. Ed. Arjun Appadurai. Durham: Duke UP, 2001. 1–21.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton, 2006.
- Bayly, C. A. *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1914: Global Connections and Comparisons*. Malden: Blackwell, 2004.
- Bulwer, Edward Lytton. *England and the English*. 1833. Ed. Standish Meacham. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1970.
- Burton, Antoinette. Rev. of *Imperial Connections: India in the Indian Ocean Arena, 1860–1920*, by Thomas R. Metcalf. *Victorian Studies* 50 (2008): 477–78.
- Buzard, James. *Disorienting Fiction: The Autoethnographic Work of Nineteenth-Century British Novels*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2005.
- Cheah, Pheng, and Bruce Robbins, eds. *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1998.
- Clifford, James. "Mixed Feelings." Ed. Cheah and Robbins. 362–70.
- Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1992.
- Dickens, Charles. *Great Expectations*. 1860–61. Ed. Rosenberg. 3–359.
- . "Insularities." *Charles Dickens: Selected Journalism, 1850–1870*. Ed. David Pascoe. London: Penguin, 1997. 471–76.
- Dilke, Charles. *Greater Britain: A Record of Travel in English-Speaking Countries during 1866 and 1867*. 1868. London: Macmillan, 1872.
- Dodwell, Henry. *The Founder of Modern Egypt: A Study of Muhammad 'Ali*. 1931. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967.
- Gikandi, Simon. *Maps of Englishness: Writing Identity in the Culture of Colonialism*. New York: Columbia UP, 1996.
- Gilmour, Robin. *The Idea of the Gentleman in the Victorian Novel*. London: Allen, 1981.
- . *The Victorian Period: The Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature, 1830–1890*. London: Longman, 1993.
- Goodlad, Lauren M. E., and Julia M. Wright. "Introduction and Keywords." *RAVON (Romanticism and Victorianism on the Net)* 48 (2007): 1–22. Web. 3 Sept. 2008.
- Greenberg, Robert A. "On Ending *Great Expectations*." *Papers on Language and Literature* 6.2 (1970): 152–62.
- Gurewitch, Morton. *The Comedy of Romantic Irony*. Lanham: UP of America, 2002.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory*. Ed. Ciaran Cronin and Pablo De Greiff. Trans. Ciaran Cronin. Cambridge: MIT P, 1998.
- Hall, Catherine. *Civilising Subjects: Colony and Metropole in the English Imagination, 1830–1867*. Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 2002.
- Hall, Stuart. "2. Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities." *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*. Ed. Anthony D. King. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997. 41–68.
- Hughes, Robert. *The Fatal Shore*. New York: Random, 1988.

- Hunter, F. Robert. *Egypt under the Khedives, 1850–1879: From Household Government to Modern Bureaucracy*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1984.
- Keirstead, Christopher M. “Stranded at the Border: Browning, France, and the Challenge of Cosmopolitanism in *Red Cotton Night-Cap Country*.” *Victorian Poetry* 43 (2005): 411–34.
- Kipling, Rudyard. “The Native-Born.” 1895. *Complete Verse*. Definitive Ed. New York: Anchor, 1989. 191–94.
- Lansbury, Coral. *Arcady in Australia: The Evocation of Australia in Nineteenth-Century English Literature*. Carlton, Australia: Melbourne UP, 1970.
- Litvack, Leon. “Dickens, Australia and Magwitch, Part I: The Colonial Context.” *Dickensian* 95 (1999): 24–50.
- . “Dickens, Australia and Magwitch, Part II: The Search for *le cas* Magwitch.” *Dickensian* 95 (1999): 101–27.
- Mandler, Peter. “‘In the Olden Time’: Romantic History and English National Identity, 1820–50.” *A Union of Multiple Identities: The British Isles, c. 1750-c. 1850*. Ed. Laurence Brockliss and David Eastwood. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1997. 78–92.
- Meckier, Jerome. “Charles Dickens’s *Great Expectations*: A Defense of the Second Ending.” *Studies in the Novel* 25.1 (1993): 28–58.
- Mellor, Anne K. *English Romantic Irony*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1980.
- Mignolo, Walter D. “The Many Faces of Cosmopolis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism.” *Cosmopolitanism*. Ed. Carol Breckenridge et al. Durham: Duke UP, 2002. 157–87.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost. John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose*. Ed. Merritt Y. Hughes. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1957. 211–469.
- Mitchell, Timothy. *Colonising Egypt*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.
- Moore, Grace. *Dickens and Empire: Discourses of Class, Race and Colonialism in the Works of Charles Dickens*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Nagai, Kaori. *Empire of Analogies: Kipling, India and Ireland*. Cork, Ireland: Cork UP, 2006.
- Nussbaum, Martha C., with respondents. *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. Ed. Joshua Cohen. Boston: Beacon, 1996.
- Orwell, George. “Charles Dickens.” *A Collection of Essays*. New York: Harcourt, 1953. 48–104.
- Rigg, Patricia D. “The Reader’s Conversion through Romantic Irony in *Christmas-Eve and Easter-Day*.” *Studies in Browning and His Circle: A Journal of Criticism, History, and Bibliography* 22 (1999): 67–80.
- Robbins, Bruce. *Feeling Global: Internationalism in Distress*. New York: New York UP, 1999.
- Rosenberg, Edgar, ed. *Great Expectations, Charles Dickens*. Norton Critical Ed. New York: Norton, 1999.
- Sadrin, Anny. “A Chronology of *Great Expectations*.” Rosenberg. 537–43.
- Sadrin, Anny, ed. *Great Expectations*, by Charles Dickens. London: Unwin, 1988.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Random, 1993.
- Sell, Roger D. Introduction. *Great Expectations, Charles Dickens*. Ed. Roger D. Sell. New Casebooks. New York: St. Martin’s, 1994. 1–40.
- Trumpener, Katie. *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1997.
- Vatikiotis, P. J. *The History of Modern Egypt: From Muhammad Ali to Mubarak*. 4th ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1991.
- Vescovi, Alessandro. “Romantic Irony as an Epistemological Device in *Bleak House*.” *Textus* 16.2 (2003): 233–54.
- Williams, Raymond. *The Country and the City*. New York: Oxford UP; Chatto & Windus, 1973.