

Three central themes span Nath's work. First, the desire to dispel the misrepresentations and myths of memsahibs in popular imagination. In considering many aspects of memsahibs' lives/identities she is able to expand the horizons beyond the women themselves to position their experience in relation to servants, children, soldiers, officials, and local communities, and move beyond the domestic to public health, housing, social etiquette, security, politics, and travel. In doing so, Nath positions memsahibs at the center of the colonial experience—no longer the marginalized voices they once were and certainly not confined to the stereotypes of popular culture—demonstrating the way in which the history of memsahibs can be a lens through which to examine the history of the colonial community. Secondly, Nath considers the importance of the memsahib as a culturally constructed identity, the pressure placed on British women in India to adhere to strict codes of behaviour, and the exclusivity of the very title of “memsahib.” She explores the ways in which memsahibs were essential to the maintenance of colonial codes of practice and the image of empire, centralizing the experience of women within wider colonial discourses. Finally, Nath identifies the complexity of sentiment felt by Britons towards India's climate, people, culture, and society. She builds on the work of Indrani Sen, emphasizing the duality and tension felt by many memsahibs of being at once an insider within the British colonial establishment and an outsider in a distant country. Whilst Nath's exploration of this tension and complexity is evident and could be expanded on, the work still provides the reader with an essential entry point to consider the nuance of colonial identities and sense of belonging.

In her introduction, Nath emphasizes the importance of utilizing the words and writings of memsahibs in her examination. She employs many of the most thumbed accounts including the published accounts of Eliza Fay, Emma Roberts, and Mary Sherwood alongside less common archival accounts, adding voices which are currently only quiet whispers in the literature. Combining these voices provides Nath with an opportunity to examine a broad spectrum of memsahibs' experiences, from the wives of soldiers, merchants, and officials to those embedded in the upper echelons of colonial society. Of course, inherent in the privilege of preservation many of these accounts are not as representative as we may hope, but Nath makes a clear attempt to engage with a cross section of the available material. Interestingly and refreshingly, Nath recognises the ambivalence of many memsahibs' accounts, removing neither credibility nor significance but acknowledging the complexities of women's relationships with India, writing “they cried, complained, appreciated India, and denounced it all at the same time” (31).

Memsahibs: British Woman in Colonial India is a thoroughly researched and engaging read. It captures the essence of existing research into the lives and experiences of memsahibs, collating and expanding it for a new audience. Those new to the study of colonial India or the female colonial experience will find this a helpful introduction to the topic and a springboard for further exploration of works by Indrani Sen and Nupur Chaudhuri, amongst others.

Emily Webb 
University of Leeds
e.webb@leeds.ac.uk

Laura E. Nym Mayhall and Elizabeth Prevost, eds. *British Murder Mysteries 1880–1965: Facts and Fictions*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. 2022. Pp. 241. \$139.99 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2023.224

The nine eclectic essays in this book examine how British murder mysteries published over a span of eighty-five years “both *shaped* and *were shaped* by their social, cultural, and political

contexts and their lived experience of their authors and readers at critical moments in time” (3). The editors argue that the essays “suggest that instead of locating the ‘golden age’ of detective fiction in the interwar period, it is more appropriate to understand the development of the genre as constituting a ‘long’ golden age, from the 1880s through the 1960s” (15). It is far from easy to discern any justification for this claim in the essays themselves. The supposed “long golden age” excludes Wilkie Collins’ major novels, which predate it, and the novels of Colin Dexter and almost the whole output of P.D. James, which post-date it. What are the important common factors which unite the extraordinarily diverse detective stories written during those eighty-five years while distinguishing them from those written before and after the chosen period? The contributors’ intriguing but apparently random choice of subjects provides no answer. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this notion of a “long golden age” is of minimal value in analyzing mysteries written during that time. Yet if the overall premise of the book is artificial, there is nevertheless a good deal of interest to be found in some of the individual chapters.

The approach of the contributors is varied. Kali Israel examines a single novel, *Murder in the House of Commons* by Mary Agnes Hamilton (1931); her criticisms of the book are generally sound, although they will hardly encourage readers to seek it out. Antoinette Burton’s essay, “Semicolonial Housewifery as Detective Fiction: ‘Trinker’s Colt’ and the Mysteries of the Irish R.M.,” which discusses the once-popular stories of Somerville and Ross, also deals with a niche subject, arguing that “when it comes to historicizing colonial detective fiction, we need a multi-species approach” (100). However, the essay does not make a persuasive case that there is much to be gained from regarding Somerville and Ross as writers of detective fiction.

Several essays which tackle broader (if often neglected) topics are more successful. Amy Milne-Smith discusses policing “in the shadow of Jack the Ripper and Sherlock Holmes,” while Susan R. Grayzel offers a thought-provoking and well-researched discussion of civil defense and the wartime mystery. Grayzel demonstrates how detective novelists shortly before and during the Second World War took horrifying subjects such as the use of poison gas in warfare and domesticated them, showing that murder and death on a personal level could be solved, punished, “and seemingly contained” (83). Her examination of novels by J. Russell Warren, Douglas G. Browne, and Max Dalman leads her to conclude that “the gas mask is the lurking symbolic reminder of mass death, but the deaths in these mysteries are local, rooted in interpersonal entanglements, and very individual...The horror is no longer that one has to carry a gas mask, but that there is cyanide in its container” (94).

Co-editor Mayhall writes about the connections between interwar detective fiction and the press and, making a comparison with the objectives of modernism, argues that “detective fiction...took from newspaper reporting a mass of chaotic facts and attempted to make it into something coherent” (162). Especially insightful is Eloise Moss’s study of hotels in the context of detective fiction. She is right to point out that surprisingly little attention has been paid to the use of hotels as a popular and often highly effective setting for detective stories. The novels discussed include J.J. Connington’s *The Mystery at Lynden Sands* (1928) and several titles by Agatha Christie, although a curious omission is Dorothy L. Sayers’ *Have His Carcase* (1932), one of the most renowned and atmospheric hotel mysteries of the Golden Age.

In a book of this kind, it is almost impossible to avoid error, but it is disappointing to note that a few mistakes are of an elementary nature. *The Daughter of Time* (1951) was not Josephine Tey’s “last mystery novel,” while it is well-established that the Detection Club was founded in 1930, not 1928 (148), and the surname of Julian Symons, a prominent historian of the genre, is mis-spelled twice.

The editors contend that the essays support them in challenging conventional narratives of the evolution of detective fiction, but the attempt to weave the disparate ingredients of this book into a coherent whole by reference to the “long golden age” lacks conviction.

Nevertheless, there is enough of merit in this book for it to reward readers who seek to broaden their understanding of the crime genre, and also to justify the editors' less ambitious but more pertinent claim that "Classic British detective fiction is often portrayed as formulaic and predictable, but this collection shows it to be quite the opposite. Instead, detective fiction emerges here as an archive of stories 'good to think with' for historians of modern Britain."

Martin Edwards
martinedwards10@btconnect.com

JAY R. ROSZMAN. *Outrage in the Age of Reform: Irish Agrarian Violence, Imperial Insecurity, and British Governing Policy, 1830–1845*. Modern British Histories. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022. Pp. 330. \$99.99 (cloth).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2023.242

Jay R. Roszman's *Outrage in the Age of Reform: Irish Agrarian Violence, Imperial Insecurity, and British Governing Policy, 1830–1845* places Ireland, particularly "Irish 'problems'" (3), at the center of British politics in the 1830s and 1840s. By focusing on Irish agrarian violence, referred to as "outrages," this work demonstrates the influence such acts had on British politicians and reformist policies. As Roszman argues, the "Irish dimension" (3) of the British political narrative has largely been ignored in most scholarship, yet it provides greater insight into the age of reform. What follows in *Outrage in the Age of Reform* is a masterful approach to the pre-Famine political landscape, which draws on underutilized source material and incorporates a rich interpretation of existing scholarship.

Roszman achieves this by weaving together a three-pronged argument, which he traces over the course of the book. His first line of argumentation considers the British government's approach to Ireland, simultaneously building on and complicating narratives as addressed in K. T. Hoppen's *Governing Hibernia: British Politicians and Ireland 1800–1921*. The first chapter details successive British governments and their interpretations of justice, with the third chapter pointing to 1835 as a point of demarcation for the importance of the Irish office for the British government. In terms of justice, the Tory government viewed their role as the "sword of justice" (36) that sought to counter Irish agrarian violence with policing and force. By contrast, the Whig government sought reforms, such as Catholic Emancipation, believing efforts such as religious tolerance were an aspect of progressive society (50). Despite reforms, these did not solve the so-called "Irish problems." Roszman further builds on this by emphasizing the two-way political relationship between Britain and Ireland. As much as British policies attempted to influence Ireland, so too did Ireland influence British politics. By including Daniel O'Connell alongside discourse on Tory and Whig governments, Roszman further complicates the use of justice in the age of reform. Not least of which, this encourages a reconsideration of this period of O'Connell's political career, particularly his relationship with the Whig Party.

In his second argument, Roszman considers the Protestant reaction to Catholic Emancipation and active inclusion. Despite the Whig government's association of religious tolerance with a progressive society, Roszman states, "Catholic Emancipation did not dampen religious animosity; rather, it acted as an accelerant" (279). As increasing numbers of middle-class Catholics sought to gain seats in the government and propaganda connected Irish agrarian violence with other instances of imperial violence, Roszman also argues "how the perceived rise of Catholic power was more broadly tied to fears about the Protestant nature of the British Empire" (188). This emphasis on anti-Catholicism and sectarianism contributed to the