Gaylin demonstrates the complexities of the moral issues involved with overhearing information; the same occasion of eavesdropping can have different moral implications for characters and for readers.

Chapter five examines Marcel Proust's emphasis on hearing, which Gaylin contrasts with the critical emphasis on his visual imagery. Gaylin believes that the voyeuristic scenes in *A la recherche du temps perdu* are better understood through an examination of what is overheard rather than seen; Proust, Gaylin argues, "links the aural acquisition of knowledge with issues of identity, sexuality, and desire" (141). As with *The Woman in White*, Gaylin argues that the structure of *A la recherche* supports this thesis. Repeatedly, the narrator delays revealing to the reader the whole importance of a given scene—Marcel's spying on the Duke and Duchess to learn about his invitation, for example—until later in the narrative, which mimics the experience of the eavesdropper who encounters information he does not initially understand. Further, Gaylin believes that these scenes of overhearing suggest the fluidity of private and public spaces and identities, which extends and undermines the desire for certainty common in earlier Victorian novels.

Gaylin begins her concluding chapter with a short analysis of Joseph Conrad's *The Secret Agent*, focusing on two aspects: the multiple identities of characters, which prevent a clear division of public and private, and the new, double meaning of "domestic" to mean both "home" and "not foreign." Firmly ensconced in a twentieth-century mentality, *The Secret Agent* illustrates the fiction of clean divisions between private and public spaces and of concrete identities, which are both themes toward which Gaylin's previous chapters tend.

Overall, Gaylin's study of how eavesdropping figures in major nineteenth-century novels is a clear and engaging analysis that will encourage scholars to re-examine the importance of this theme in the development of British and French literature. Particularly helpful are the substantive translations that Gaylin provides for the many French texts she cites, which makes her research accessible while still allowing those fluent in French to return to the original language. On the whole, this study is clearly edited, with helpful notes, a bibliography, and a comprehensive index. *Eavesdropping in the Novel from Austen to Proust* is a welcome addition to the Cambridge Studies in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Culture series.

MICHELLE RUGGABER DOUGHERTY, *Ohio Dominican University*


Sean Grass sets off his account of the "Victorian prison novel" against a Foucauldian analysis in which narrative strategies for the representation of consciousness are made to align perfectly with a panoptic model. In Grass's summation, the Foucauldian perspective envisions a thoroughly chastened subject, exhaustively monitored by omniscient narration and free indirect discourse, a hapless pawn in a world in which "individuals...have no genuine selfhood or identity that is free from the power of society's many prisons" (6). Grass hastens through this "totalizing power" model and deals even more summarily with D.A. Miller's *The Novel and the Police* (seemingly the model's prime exponent in Grass's view). A fuller engagement would have given Grass more to work with when developing his own argument, but

he does put this mock-up to productive use. First, noting that Bentham’s Panopticon was never built in England, Grass questions the explanatory value of an argument that identifies fictional analogues for an architectural model that was not in fact part of the prison system. Next he turns to various mid-nineteenth-century writings by prison officials who purported to reproduce “prisoners’ testimonials written 'in their own words’” (34), and he finds that this offer to tell someone else’s story in the first person has readily specifiable analogues in the novel, even in omniscient narratives, which abound in first-person “letters, diaries, autobiographies, and confessions of Victorian fiction’s imprisoned selves” (11). Finally, Grass points to an explicit link between prison literature and novel-writing, observing that around the middle third of the nineteenth century, prisons became increasingly private, solitary, and shielded from public view, and so novelists who invented stories about crime and punishment were increasingly reliant on the prison officials’ writings. During that period, Grass explains, writers found that “England’s prisons...provided explicit models for...invention in the form of inspectors, officers, and chaplains who claimed to speak for the prisoner, and sometimes to speak as him. By studying these prisons, Victorian novelists learned and came to employ the prisoners’ own strategies for narrating the private self” (48).

After an introductory chapter rehearsing the historical milestones that guide his thinking, Grass offers readings of the Pickwick Papers and Dickens’s American Notes, Reade’s It Is Never Too Late to Mend, Little Dorrit and A Tale of Two Cities, Clarke’s His Natural Life, Villette, Armadale, and Edwin Drood. This range allows Grass to trace the “prison novel” through a number of generic manifestations—including episodic comic fiction, the sensation novel, the mystery, and the historical novel. Grass’s emphasis is on the prison as a means of “produce[ing] and control[ling] the self-account” (220). The concern of carceral scholarship with the elaborate and extensive technologies of narrative supervision, Grass argues, has prevented critics from recognizing that “first-person narration, more than surveillance, is the means by which the novel reflects the prison’s power. The effect of this power...is to open any self to the possibility that it might be invented by the authorial ‘other,’ for any self might be presumed to contain the repressions and self-divisions that make it guilty” (220). Grass’s attention to “interior fictions” and to the “inward migration of the modern novel” is helpful, but this argument makes it difficult to specify the distance between his own position and the scholarship he means to qualify. Miller, for example, attends throughout The Novel and the Police to the process of internalization, not only within the narratives he considers but also as a product of the reader’s engagement with those narratives. Grass usefully shows how the “self-account” intensifies and personalizes the monitoring effects that may be achieved through the workings of narrative in the omniscient novel, but to designate the first-person novel as the primary site that reflects the effects of imprisonment is only to observe that these effects are displayed most directly and literally in that context.

The structure of Grass’s book is chronological and psychological: after a review of the prison system, highlighting the turn to solitary detention, Grass works through the novels in order of publication, dwelling on their means of “penetrate[ing] the psychological story of Victorian confinement” (54). Indeed his strategy is to penetrate ever deeper into the characters’ psyches, concluding with Edwin Drood’s “attempt to narrate the unconscious” (228) and with a discussion of Freud’s case histories, which share the prison novels’ concern “to narrate the disordered, unknown, and ultimately unknowable mysteries of private desire” (223). This onward inward movement gives the argument a sense of logical development, but in maintaining that tight focus, Grass sacrifices the chance to address other plots relevant to the prison narratives.

The problems of narrative mode and self-examination also figure, for example, in Jonathan Grossman’s The Art of Alibi: English Law Courts and the Novel (which
also shares Grass’s interest in Godwin, the Newgate novel, Dickens, and Gaskell), Jan-Melissa Schramm’s *Testimony and Advocacy in Victorian Law, Literature, and Theology* (ditto, plus Collins) and Lisa Rodensky’s *The Crime in Mind: Criminal Responsibility and the Victorian Novel* (which opens, as Grass’s book does, by challenging Foucauldian literary historians’ concern with omniscient narration and by turning to the interplay between first- and third-person narration). These books were published between 2000 and 2003, perhaps too late for Grass to use them productively, but they incorporated work that was available several years earlier. For example, Grossman’s article on *Pickwick* and the criminal trial came out in 1997.

To set these other works next to Grass’s account of “prison novels” is to gain a significantly richer and more nuanced understanding of the legal and narrative ground that he covers. Not only do these other discussions offer a view of the whole trajectory of events preceding incarceration (including crime, accusation, and the ensuing legal process that terminates in a verdict), but they also enrich Grass’s history of legal representation, in some instances by reference to the same novels that Grass discusses. Grass treats the changing regime at Millbank Penitentiary in 1837-38 as one of the first important steps in the movement to force prisoners into solitary self-examination and to exert narrative power over the story of their reform. Grossman and Schramm dwell on a related contemporaneous development that had very different effects, the Prisoners’ Counsel Act of 1836, which provided that criminal defendants no longer had to speak on their own behalf at trial, but could remain silent and be represented by counsel. Grass treats the imposition of the voice-over as a feature that makes the substitute narrator into a manipulative puppeteer, but a defendant’s abdication of narrative supervisory authority at trial might well serve the defendant’s own strategic ends.

Grass provides a useful examination of a subject that, as he rightly notes, has usually been treated metaphorically rather than literally, and he cogently places these novels in relation to the experiences of Victorian prisoners. In attending to the dimensions of real Victorian penitentiaries, however, Grass tells only part of the prisoners’ stories. He helpfully amplifies the most directly observable aspects of their self-accounts, but in neglecting the third-person accounts produced at trial by counsel, and explored in omniscient narration, he gives an incomplete picture of the self-dividing impulses he analyzes. The penitentiary narratives that he discusses constitute a chapter that cannot be understood in isolation from the larger story.

SIMON STERN, Harvard Law School


The Victorian Literature and Culture Series of the University of Virginia Press has become during the last decade an indispensable venue for scholarship in the field. It has featured criticism from Linda Peterson, Lynn Voskuil, and (writing with Peterson) Michael Lund, and it has published major new volumes of primary materials like the letters of Christina Rossetti (ed. Antony Harrison) and Matthew Arnold (ed. Cecil Y. Lang) and a selection of writings by John Ruskin (ed. John Rosenberg). The most recent title to appear in the series, Daniel Hack’s *The Material Interests of the Victorian Novel*, is a worthy addition to the group. The ongoing revitalization