

Works, the first administrative authority for the county as a whole, began to seek legal powers to levy rates for metropolitan purposes. The battle involved a positively Dickensian cast of characters—“mass civil disobedience, powerful corporate adversaries, hostile metropolitan and parliamentary opinion, and sceptical judges” (89). Should the city be divided into two sanitary districts, north and south of the river? The poverty of the southern districts precluded this: financial input from the much wealthier north would be needed to resolve the sanitary ills of the south bank. Despite the opposition, the Metropolitan Board of Works won a signal victory, achieving a “total revolution in metropolitan taxation” (91).

Much of Hanley’s text is given to discussion of the detail of legal cases and strategies, yet his text is never dry. Lucidly written and beautifully organized, this is a major work of scholarship. The thoughtful reading of existing literature and scrupulous labor among previously unexplored legal documents is clear on every page, and even more so in the scholarly apparatus, which covers nearly as many pages as the main text of the book. Hanley’s control over his material is masterly, and thoughtful signposting means that the reader never loses the path of the story. His emphasis on the external boundaries to private property in the first four chapters, does, however, sit a little oddly with the shift to domesticity in the final chapter. Here, Hanley focuses on municipal intervention in internal house features—on the provision of drainage for water closets and the abolition of privies, and on the struggle to regulate and control moral and physical conditions in houses let in lodgings. Regulation here, he notes, “was crucially informed” by “heteronormative middle-class domesticity,” although this ideology did not succeed in determining the scope of the legislation. While this transition to the regulation of internal boundary space is perhaps an inevitable and logical progression, and though it forms a critical part of Hanley’s argument for the creation of local communities of health, it does feel more like the beginning of a different book, one devoted to the legal undermining of the concept—at least in poor class housing—of the idea that the Englishman’s home was his castle.

Anne Hardy
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
anne.hardy@lshtm.ac.uk

KATE HILL. *Women and Museums, 1850–1914: Modernity and the Gendering of Knowledge*. Gender in History Series. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016. Pp. 255. \$105.00 (cloth).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2017.82

The jacket description for Kate Hill’s *Women and Museums, 1850–1914* identifies it as “the first attempt to recover the entirety of women’s contribution to British museums in the period 1850–1914.” This claim about “entirety” captures well the reader’s encyclopedic experience here. In clearly organized chapters, Hill’s study moves through the various roles women played in the burgeoning world of Victorian and Edwardian museology: women were assistants, volunteers, curators, housekeepers, popularizers and educators, donors and vendors, visitors, and patrons. Hill’s interest concerns how women changed the material practices of museums, a story of influence and impact that has—she argues—gone largely untold in scholarship on museums and culture. Crucial to Hill’s argument is the conception of the museum as a “distributed institution.” Scholars writing on the museum typically begin by defining their target institution: was it a temple, people’s university, fun house, world’s fair, or mausoleum? For Hill, the distributed museum accomplishes its cultural work by means of networked operations involving objects and people going in and out of its walls—demarcations that are

simultaneously fortified and porous. A network's aleatory design suits well what Hill sees as the constantly shifting nature of women's relationship to museums, a distributed institution that invites them and their influence inside and then sends them back out again, to continue the work of the museum beyond its walls.

Hill tests the inside-outside binary that, despite its usefulness to her argument, dissolves upon closer inspection due to the nature of a network's operations. Hill acknowledges that it is important to note the ways museum culture reified women's position as outside, as peripheral. Even when women were "invited" inside, Hill explains, there were strategies and professional expectations in place that kept women in constrained roles (in a kind of outsider's space within the inside—that is, volunteerism, charity work, or the largely invisible role of patron's wife). Another generative complicating move is Hill's treatment of "home" versus "museum." Conventionally seen as antitheses, the concepts of home and museum blend for Hill, as, for example, she explores women's vital role in inculcating in children at home the importance of collecting as a hobby, and, on the other hand, she points to museums' aims to be themselves "home-like," welcoming and nurturing. The educative mission of nineteenth-century museums typically called upon women as teachers. Indeed, women in museums were often seen as a desirable presence that legitimated the reputation of a museum. Several of Hill's most fascinating sections explore how the home made its way into museums by way of donations, memorial gifts, legacies, emergent disciplines, and crafts once thought to be at home in the *nuclear family* home rather than in the public spaces of display. Hill explains how authenticity, in great demand within late-century museum display, was often credentialed by means of ties to the home. Here the turn-of-the-century interest in home museums—the homes of the past as they themselves became worthy of "collecting" and "exhibiting"—is a particularly potent iteration of the museum's intimacy with the domestic sphere.

Hill's contention that museums afforded women opportunities even as they fought against the incursion of women is best explored in the many specifics that fill her book, the fruits of assiduous archival mining. Provincial museums in England provide Hill with her preferred case studies, and the book is soon populated by many influential women that shaped the material practices of museums. Appropriately, Hill begins the book at the granular level, with a specific female, Beatrix Potter, returning from an 1896 visit to the British Museum. Many other figures follow in her steps in the pages of Hill's book: the Davies sisters, Nina Layard, and Hilda Petrie. Hill's cast of agents is wide, ranging from women who behaved badly in museums to Ruskin's exemplary female curators. The parts and bits of Hill's historical retrieval effect a more powerful whole, as Hill works by means of a "collective biography"—a network of women but also a network of objects ... often donated by, curated by, discovered by, seen by women. In similar fashion, Hill offers up "object biographies" that follow the routes museum objects take. As she claims, objects often bring their stories with them. Here Hill's analysis of textiles, relics, and souvenirs is particularly rich. Hill's key strategies that pivot on the distributed museum, the blending of inside and outside, public and private, and the collective biographies of networked people and objects bring her subject to life.

For this reader, the most interesting section concerned women's "acquisition events" and how women shaped both knowledge and affect. Hill's theorizing work on the potency of affect (nostalgia, memory, sensation) in museology is particularly intriguing, especially as affect was customarily a woman's province. Women's ascendancy in the new human sciences, archaeology and anthropology—especially their key role in the pop cultural sensation of Egyptology—give the book its freshest material. Though the following chapter on Ruskinian museology is meant to provide the book's culminating analysis, this penultimate chapter with its less obvious conclusions is more compelling.

Women and Museums will interest scholars in museum studies as well as those in gender studies and British culture studies more broadly. Hill tills the exciting territory of the global and local, though here the book is a bit confusing. While Hill indicates that her focus is England with the occasional foray to Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, there are recurring

references to the United States. And the provinces and the city seem largely interchangeable. More intentionality about locale would have only enriched the texture of Hill's analysis. But Hill's main objective is successfully realized: to demonstrate the complex story of modernity by examining how the cultural institution of the museum was shaped by women. For Hill, the museum is a place for dialogue, where norms are revised as well as asserted—a stage for negotiating what and who is a citizen. A few of Hill's conclusions become repetitive, and certain names keep showing up; that might be due in part to the book's chapter design. A reader might welcome a more extended treatment of one of the women profiled here, to diversify the argument's main strategy of accretion, though, admittedly, such a move would counter Hill's collective biography methodology that reveals the distributed museum's vibrant network of human figures and material things.

Barbara Black
 Skidmore College
bblack@skidmore.edu

K. THEODORE HOPPEN. *Governing Hibernia: British Politicians and Ireland, 1800–1921*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. Pp. 368. \$60.00 (cloth).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2017.83

More than three decades after the publication of his magisterial *Elections, Politics and Society in Ireland, 1832–1885*, Theodore Hoppen has produced another major study of nineteenth-century Irish politics. *Governing Hibernia* is, however, a different sort of book. In *Elections, Politics and Society*, Hoppen gave us Irish politics from the bottom up, examining factors that influenced voters at the constituency level. *Governing Hibernia*, in contrast, offers political history from the top down, analyzing “the attitudes and intentions that informed the ways in which those in charge of ... the United Kingdom ... approached and conducted the government” of Ireland under the Union (1). And, whereas in his earlier book, Hoppen played the role of the “splitter,” employing his solvent intellect to overturn the accepted verities of Irish electoral history, in *Governing Hibernia* he appears in the guise of the “lumper,” identifying broad trends in Anglo-Irish relations over time and across party lines. Here, Hoppen's thesis is that “ministers and cabinets” alternated between “policies of differentiation,” which emphasized Irish distinctiveness, and “policies deliberately conceived to assimilate Ireland into the norms and behaviour patterns of a larger metropolitan (that is, British) centre” (2). The main British parties, Hoppen contends, oscillated between these approaches more or less synchronously, so that a thirty-year period of differentiation was followed by four decades of assimilation, after which policy makers reverted to a program of divergent treatment for Ireland.

The Janus face of British politicians, Hoppen maintains, was already apparent during the debates on the Union in 1799–1800. The idea of Union was itself ambiguous—capable of being understood in terms of either “calm and comprehensive uniformity” or “intrusive and coercive control” (11). British advocates of the measure did little to clarify its nature, blending offers of equal partnership with chauvinistic assertions of cultural superiority. The terms of the Act of Union itself, however, suggested “that all the fine talk about assimilation had been nothing more than that, fine talk” (17), with Britain's wartime security needs trumping a more emollient approach to Irish governance. British politicians, consequently, continued to treat Ireland as a discrete entity in the first decades of the Union's existence, ruling through the instrument of a quasi-autonomous government with a distinct administrative apparatus, and pursuing their policy agenda (law and order) via separate legislation (coercion).