Furniss nonetheless feels called upon to lament that his work for the Household Edition was both hurried and badly engraved.

There's doubtless something to be said for at least some of these judgments, and Furniss can be shrewd on detail (he provides an informed and perceptive analysis of the allegorical clutter on display in one of Browne's *Dombey* illustrations, for example), but it's hard to avoid a sneaking feeling that the lecture's principal object is to clear the field for the advent of Dickens's ideal illustrator, and too much of the script is taken up with a gushing display of the lecturer's qualifications for that starring role. Indeed, his hyperbolic veneration for Boz at one point spins so far out of control that Furniss suddenly announces: "if ever a writer could dispense with an artist to illustrate his works, that author was Charles Dickens" – a somewhat unguarded affirmation from the man who was to draw five hundred plates for the eighteen-volume Charles Dickens Library Edition of 1910.

For most readers, I suspect, the real value of this publication will lie not in Furniss's fruity ramblings but in Gareth Cordery's splendid introduction. Prudently conceding that Furniss was "no Chesterton or Gissing," Cordery instead situates the lecture within the history of popular entertainment, arguing that in its rich illustration with lantern-slides it approximates to the condition of early cinema. He goes on to contextualise Furniss's showmanship in terms of the widespread turn-of-the-century commodification of Dickens (in advertising art, for example, and on cigarette cards and calendars) and to relate this "Boom in Boz," in its turn, to Dickens's appropriation as a reassuring embodiment of "Englishness" at a time of ideological crisis, when the values of liberal individualism for which his fiction, densely populated with self-confident eccentrics, could be made representative, seemed under threat. Some of this material has appeared before in *Dickens Quarterly*, but it's good to have it again here, this time juxtaposed with the full text of Furniss's lecture, which thus acquires from Cordery's ministrations far greater interest as a cultural symptom than it could ever claim as a contribution to Dickens studies. Cordery, indeed, writes about Furniss with such zestful authority that one can only hope his projected full-scale biography will not be long delayed.

Robert Dingley

***Victorian Literature and the Victorian State: Character and Governance in a Liberal Society*, by Lauren M.E. Goodlad. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 2003. 320. ISBN 0-8018-6963-3. $45.00 (hardback).**

Lauren Goodlad begins her illuminating study with a deceptively simple statement. "Victorian Britain," she states, "was a *liberal* society" (vii). Yet while many of us today may conflate "liberalism" with *laissez-faire* economic theory or a radically

constrained notion of government, Goodlad offers a valuable corrective. She seeks to "promot[e] a more rigorous and expansive understanding" of the concept, as defined not only by bourgeois economic ideology but also by a variety of other "civic, romantic, and Christian" discourses pervaded by "an antimaterialist concept of the individual which was deeply at odds with *homo economicus*, the hedonistic subject of capitalist ideology" (ix). Her book traces these forgotten ties between "character" and liberalism, while supplying an impressively capacious view of the social and political forces that shaped Victorian individual and collective life. *Victorian Literature and the Victorian State* thus complements a renewed scholarly interest in character as an ideal founded in liberal traditions of civic virtue, tolerance, and self-cultivation. Examined most notably by Amanda Anderson in *The Powers of Distance*, this notion of character gains added heft and historical nuance under Goodlad's treatment, which moves deftly from fiction by Dickens, the Trollopes, Martineau, Gissing and Wells to modernising developments such as the New Poor Law, sanitary reform, educational reform, civil service reform and National Insurance.

One of the most valuable features of Goodlad's study is its emphasis on the idiosyncratically British nature of the contest between individual self-help and collective responsibility – two sometimes warring and sometimes harmonious concepts invoked by the "character" and "governance" of her subtitle. In this respect, Goodlad tells us something that we have already long suspected: that we must closely question the relevance of Michel Foucault's early "disciplinary" notions of the state and citizen for the purposes of specifically Victorian literary and historical study. Certainly, Goodlad highlights, *contra* Foucault, both the smallness and informality of the Victorian state and the protracted resistance that accompanied statist intervention. Indeed, through rigorous historical examination, *Victorian Literature and the Victorian State* makes a premise that may at first seem obvious into a topic of surprising richness. In her first chapter, entitled "Beyond the Panopticon" and originally published in *PMLA*, Goodlad pursues such questions with a dramatic rhetorical flourish undoubtedly directed towards readers seduced by the paranoid glamour of Foucault's "disciplinary individualism." Yet, instead of punching easy holes through Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* (as "not English," to quote Dickens's Mr. Podsnap), Goodlad shows how Foucault's founding claims rely upon an important misreading of the "Panopticon" – Utilitarian philosopher Jeremy Bentham's famously unbuilt model of an Enlightenment prison. For, unlike Foucault, who dwells solely on the "inmate in the cell," Bentham was equally interested in "the vigilant citizen-observer in the tower," whose powers of surveillance would be private, remunerative, and carefully superintended (10). Whereas Foucault mistakes the panopticon for a "generalizable mechanism" of both state institutional discipline and a more diffusive "type of power" (11), Bentham, Goodlad claims, used it for far different means: to issue a call for accountability within governance.

Bentham, of course, was not alone in issuing such a call, although Goodlad begins with him in order to stress a distinctively Victorian-era concern surrounding the responsible exercise of authority in building character. How, after all, should one go about shaping character – without homogenising it – "in a nation of allegedly self-reliant individuals and communities" (xiv)? Victorians, according to Goodlad, responded to this challenge with "pastorship": a brand of personal and informal governance, rooted in practices of civic and religious voluntarism and idealised as a species of "indirect influence, rather than direct institutional domination" (18). Goodlad's use of this term is highly appropriate, as it draws from Foucault's later writings on "the ancient Christian concept of the shepherd's intensive care for his flock" (18) to define forms of normalising and individualising governance that Victorians imagined as moral, religious, familial and profoundly intersubjective. This emphasis on moral governance is especially relevant in light of current trends in Anglo-American culture, such as neoliberalism (which Goodlad treats in a brief but incisive epilogue) and renewed efforts to turn social welfare work over to private religious and philanthropic organisations through "faith-based initiatives."

Goodlad assures us that hers is not an exhaustive undertaking, but rather a study of social and political issues addressed in a select few works of Victorian literature concerned with the care of the liberal self. Nonetheless, any reader acquainted with the broad Foucauldian sweep that has dominated Victorian studies during the past few decades will recognise the ambitiousness of her project. Indeed, this study is extraordinary for its sheer historical breadth, depth and precision alone. After her first chapter on Foucault and Victorian models of liberal pastorship, Goodlad next explores responses to the New Poor Law, character, and legal rationality posed by Harriet Martineau, Dickens's *Oliver Twist*, Frances Trollope's *Jessie Phillips* and the philanthropy of Thomas Chalmers and Dr. James Philips Kay. Goodlad dwells more closely on Dickens in her third and fifth chapters, which respectively treat his ambivalent reactions to sanitary reform in *Bleak House* and educational reform in *Our Mutual Friend*. Chapter four studies the convergence of Anthony Trollope's earlier writings with civil service reform and new gentlemanly and entrepreneurial ideals of character following the administrative debacles of the Crimean War. Goodlad's final chapter addresses the late-Victorian and Edwardian fate of pastorship in a comparative analysis of fiction by H.G. Wells, George Gissing, and E.M. Forster with the Fabian Society, the Charity Organization Society and the New Liberalism of Winston Churchill.

Victorian Literature and the Victorian State may disappoint readers searching for fresh and novel interpretations of literature, partly because the ideological path Goodlad envisions for such texts is often one of ambivalence or inconsistency. It could not, Goodlad argues, have been otherwise – at least not as long as Victorian authors faced the "paradoxical task" of "imagin[ing] a modern governing agency that would be rational, all-embracing, and efficient, but also antibureaucratic, personalised, and liberatory" (xii). Consequently, in chapter after chapter we

encounter novels mired in "tension" and contradiction, torn between idealist and materialist views of character (as in *Oliver Twist*), between arguments for and against pastoral intervention (as in *Bleak House*), and unable to offer persuasive alternatives – different ways of seeing or thinking that might reconcile or transcend conflicts drawn squarely from the Victorian social and political world. Certainly one might question whether Victorian novels performed functions more active and intellectually generative than the culturally reflexive and symptomatic function granted them by Goodlad. Yet if Goodlad's literary readings occasionally pale in comparison with her greater historical claims, *Victorian Literature and the Victorian State* still offers more than adequate compensation in its remarkably layered and cogent account of Victorian Britain's course towards a liberal society.

Tamara Ketabgian

***Crime and Empire: The Colony in Nineteenth-Century Fictions of Crime*, by Upamanyu Pablo Mukherjee. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003. xii + 205. ISBN 0-19-926105-9. £49, US$60.45 (hardback).**

Crime and Empire begins and ends, predictably enough, with *The Moonstone*. But the argument developed by Upamanyu Pablo Mukherjee inside this frame is by no means predictable. The crime in Collins's novel which sparks Mukherjee's interest is not the theft of the titular diamond, but the murder of its thief, Godfrey Ablewhite, by three Hindu priests. Why should it be, Mukherjee asks, that in the aftermath of the Indian mutiny; in a society where the racist discourse of colonialism routinely projected the criminality of colonial subject races; where the dissident Indians were as feared and reviled as suicide bombers; and where the imperial enterprise was underwritten and rationalised by the rule of law: why should it be that Collins so sympathetically portrayed those priests and their crime? The answer, Mukherjee suggests, lies in a subtle but discernible series of social changes after the turn of the nineteenth century. Those changes – focused around Peel's police reforms – transformed the rhetoric of criminality and justice, a rhetoric which was quickly absorbed and interrogated in English fiction and non-fiction with domestic as well as imperial settings and concerns. Mukherjee discovers in these texts "a long tradition of British writing that used 'criminal India' to interrogate, rather than empower, colonialist/imperialist ventures" (4-5). It was the novel, he insists, "more than the legal, historical, political, and geographical narratives, that used the rhetoric of crime to air the possibilities of dissent" (5). The "culture of the juridical," as he calls it, is at the centre of "stories of order and disorder" which "could interrogate empire even as they played a central role in its entrenchment" (3).