

the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, he was “courageous,” as indeed his own memoirs record, but emigrant newspapers were less generous, angered according to Kerby Miller in *Emigrants and Exiles* (Oxford, 1985, p. 343) by “senseless battles” and “incompetent officers such as Meagher.” In 1863, Meagher was forced to rein in his ambitions and reverted to his first loyalties by joining the Fenian Brotherhood.

The last chapters describe Meagher’s move to a new life in the American West, where Egan suggests he hoped to find riches for himself as well as a better life for Irish slum dwellers in New York in a “New Ireland.” However, the reality was lawlessness and extreme violence by vigilante groups who had no intention of accepting the rule of the newly appointed acting governor of Montana. Within months, Meagher was dead, apparently drowned in a fall from a moored steamboat, a mystery that Egan invites us to believe was murder.

This is not an academic book but part of a rich vein of popularizing histories that feed myths while entertaining an enquiring public. As its title suggests, it celebrates, largely uncritically, the contribution of an unusually privileged political leader who helped to set in aspic a nationalist belief, especially in the United States, that the ills of Ireland stemmed from British cruelty in the Famine. Other writers question the heroic label and see self-serving ambition behind the actions of such “professional ethnics.” Whatever the motivation, a powerful Irish-American sense of grievance has continued to play a significant role in Irish nationalism into the present day. Egan’s biography feeds into this foundation myth of Irish-American identity, providing a highly readable romantic saga. Meanwhile, Ireland is only beginning to acknowledge the importance of the diaspora as its other history, mainly now for economic support in difficult times.

Bronwen Walter
Anglia Ruskin University
bronwen.walter@anglia.ac.uk

MARC FLANDREAU. *Anthropologists in the Stock Exchange: A Financial History of Victorian Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016. Pp. 421. \$105.00 (cloth).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2017.78

In his new book, *Anthropologists in the Stock Exchange*, the economic historian Marc Flandreau revisits the heavily discussed history of Victorian anthropology. His aim is to remap a familiar story about the anthropological schism of the 1860s by showing that the debates between anthropologists and ethnologists were not simply about ideological differences, as previous scholars have argued, but also about socioeconomic priorities. Flandreau believes that in order to fully represent the history of Victorian anthropology, one needs to understand how economic and financial interests shaped the activities of researchers. In principle, such an approach seems to offer a fresh perspective on a well-known tale. After all, Peter Kjaergaard’s recent focus section in the journal *Isis*, “Follow the Money” (2012), convincingly showed how an emphasis on money sheds important new light on the history of science. Yet despite its promising historiographical focus, what emerges in Flandreau’s book is nothing more than a crude misunderstanding of the subtleties of Victorian anthropology.

In the introduction Flandreau sets out to establish a new framework for understanding Victorian anthropology. Flandreau calls it the “stock-exchange modality” (8)—the idea that one cannot separate the disciplinary formation of British anthropology in the nineteenth century from the larger economical context of the British Empire. The ups and downs of the stock market, he argues, had a direct impact on the development of British anthropology, leaving a deep imprint. Flandreau states that anthropology benefited greatly from the expansion of

the empire, and researchers acted as cultural brokers for various parties. Such an argument is hardly new, and the relationship between anthropology, imperialism, and government policy is a staple within the secondary literature. One does not really get a sense of how Flandreau's new framework transforms the historiography in any significant way. Is it even necessary to create a new name for this analytical model? After all, historians of science routinely show in their work how researchers are influenced by all sorts of sociopolitical factors, without appealing to a "modality."

Then there is the issue of whether Flandreau follows through with his analytical model and substantiates his claims with evidence. In the first chapter, for example, he devotes much attention to forming links between key members of the ethnological community and big business throughout the empire. The banker and scientific naturalist John Lubbock, a leading figure within British ethnology, is framed as a partisan figure. We are told that Lubbock's involvement in the Corporation of Foreign Bondholders is significant and that it prejudicially influenced his activities in learned bodies such as the Anthropological Institute, where he became president in 1871. However, Flandreau does not provide any firm evidence to show how Lubbock's involvement in these two organizations prejudicially affected one another. We are told that it must have, but there is no illustrative example provided. The result is a rather flat argument. Moreover, for a book on the economic history of anthropology, there is a surprising lack of tabulated information showing the amount of financial investment the discipline was receiving from different sources. If this data were included, the book would be strengthened considerably.

Flandreau's overview of the disciplinary debates between the Ethnological Society of London and the Anthropological Society of London is also poorly executed—not least, the stock-exchange modality is almost completely absent from this analysis. Moreover, his treatment of both the race question and woman question suggests a lack of understanding of the subtleties involved in these controversies. He does not, for instance, see the woman question—for example, whether women should be allowed to attend the meetings of the Ethnological Society of London or the Anthropological Society of London—as an important concern. He also believes that historians, as a way of villainizing the Anthropological Society of London, have overstated the issue. According to Flandreau, barring women from learned societies was a fairly common practice in the nineteenth century and thus does not provide a good example of how the Anthropological Society of London was sexist. Yet, as many historians have shown, allowing women to participate at either of the two society's meetings was far more complex and linked both to anthropology's disciplinary reform tactics and larger socio-cultural issues.

There is, however, buried beneath the economic history, an interesting narrative, one that argues convincingly that the historiography on Victorian anthropology has tended to focus on a rather small group of researchers, and that by extending the gaze beyond this small coterie of figures, we begin to see that there is a whole cast of characters that greatly contributed to the disciplinary development of British anthropology. Had this story been brought to the fore, Flandreau's book would have more impact on the historiography. His examination of the philologist, engineer, and ethnologist Hyde Clarke is a genuinely significant contribution to our understanding of British anthropology's past. Through Flandreau's analysis of the periodical press, he shows how active Clarke was in reforming British anthropology. He underscores the key role Clarke played in both publicly exposing the corruption occurring at the Anthropological Society of London and negotiating the formation of the Anthropological Institute in 1871. Similar praise applies to Flandreau's discussion on the explorer and geographer Richard Francis Burton. Though Burton (an unignorable personality) is regularly mentioned in passing in the secondary literature, very little scholarship has shown how important he was for the society; he was an important networker, connecting British anthropology to elite circles in Victorian Britain and beyond. His numerous contributions to the society's publications also

helped to establish the credibility of British anthropology's research program. It is a real shame that Flandreau did not do more with these overlooked figures in Victorian anthropology. Had personalities and social networks been the focus of the book, instead of the application of the stock-exchange modality to the history of anthropology, its value would have been much greater.

Efram Sera-Shriar

Leeds Trinity University

e.sera-shriar@leedstrinity.ac.uk

MARK FORD. *Thomas Hardy: Half a Londoner*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2016. Pp. 336. \$27.95 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2017.79

When the young Thomas Hardy arrived in London in 1862 to try his luck as an architect, he had a return ticket to Dorchester in his pocket. In the event, he stayed five years, relishing the theaters, galleries, and music halls, taking evening classes in French, and beginning notebooks on poetry and painting, before poor health forced a temporary retreat in 1867. Following his marriage in 1874, he and his first wife, Emma Gifford, lived intermittently in the capital and its suburbs until they settled in Dorset in 1881, and thereafter spent several months of almost every year in the capital until 1910. In a witty nod to the many editions of Hardy's work that feature his own hand-drawn map of Wessex, the endpapers of Mark Ford's informative and elegantly written *Thomas Hardy: Half a Londoner* feature maps of Victorian London; another map traces the more than thirty different residences Hardy occupied in the city prior to his final visit in 1920. By then, as Ford notes, London was eager to travel to him, including in 1925 the entire cast of the Garrick Theatre production of his stage version of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*.

It was Hardy who described himself as "half a Londoner." In part, this was a riposte to those like J. M. Barrie, who argued that Hardy knew London society and professional life only "superficially" and failed in attempting to draw them; no writer quicker than Hardy to bridle at criticism, especially where it touched on his class origins or provincial background. But Ford argues persuasively that Hardy's immersion as a young man in metropolitan life, at a time when railways, newspapers, and the penny post had both forged new connections between country and city and sharpened the disparities between them, was essential to "the kinds of perspective on Dorset that would eventually enable him to transform it into Wessex" (13).

From the first, the capital stirred him to write: not by chance, the protagonists of the two novels most engaged with London, *The Hand of Ethelberta* (1875) and *The Well-Beloved* (1897), are both artists. A third of the fifty-one poems in his first volume of verse, *Wessex Poems* (1898), were written in the 1860s, within easy walking distance of Paddington Station; so, too, was his unpublished novel, *The Poor Man and the Lady*, much of it set in London. As that title suggests, city life prompted an uneasy mixture of erotic excitement and class anxiety, verging on hostility; Macmillan rejected *The Poor Man* because it too evidently meant "mischief." Ford quotes Hardy's observation after taking Emma to a fashionable "crush": "The most beautiful women present. ... But these women! If put into rough wrap-pers in a turnip-field, where would their beauty be?" (18).

Ford writes astutely on the poems of the 1860s, and on Hardy's sense, exacerbated by city life, of what he terms "the peculiar divide between external performance and inner consciousness" (242). He also provides a fascinating account of Hardy's attention to the physical