

published volumes on Irish toponymy some of which are of particular relevance to the topic in question; note, for example, the 1992 volume on the heavily-colonised area of the Ards in County Down (*Place-Names of Northern Ireland*, volume 2). On the other hand, the largest section of the book, 'A gazetteer of the cantreds, *trícha céts* and local kingdoms of Ireland' (pp 125–254), is a splendid achievement and, while ongoing toponymical surveys will do much to assist in the clarification of the boundaries of individual cantreds and *trícha céts*, toponymy itself will also benefit hugely from this gazetteer. The book does not have a concluding chapter; this would have done much to bind the whole together.

MÍCHEÁL B. Ó MAINNÍN

*Irish and Celtic Studies, Queen's University Belfast*

THE BOOK OF HOWTH: THE ELIZABETHAN RE-CONQUEST OF IRELAND AND THE OLD ENGLISH.  
By Valerie McGowan-Doyle. Pp xvii, 206. Cork: Cork University Press. 2011. €39.

This volume offers an important re-assessment of a tract long familiar to historians of Tudor Ireland, *The Book of Howth*, together with a study of its compiler, Christopher St Lawrence, seventh Lord Howth, and his reasons for writing the *Book*. The author argues convincingly two points: first, that the seventh lord is in fact the compiler, a point left uncertain by the editors of the nineteenth-century printed edition. Second, she also demonstrates that Howth's clear and definite purpose in writing is obscured by the editors' failure to appreciate the structural or organisational arrangement of the manuscript as it now is, so giving the impression of a largely chaotic and random compilation. Once the *Book's* intended structure is recovered, it becomes apparent that Howth compiled it in the decade to 1579, and chiefly between 1569 and 1573, in response to Lord Deputy Sidney's policies which threatened the displacement of the Old English from their traditional status as the custodians of English civility in Ireland. The *Book* thus offers a very valuable window on the reaction in this crucial decade of a minor peerage family of the Pale to growing New English dominance and the creation of an alternative historically-based explanation for the failed medieval conquest. All this is very well done. The volume underlines the importance of the 1570s in the developing colonial conflict between New and Old English. It elaborates on the wider significance of the cess controversy in this dispute; and it is also very revealing of the alternative strategies for rewriting history then developed so as to saddle the rival elite with the blame for failed conquest.

The discussion of Howth's career and political attitudes raises more questions. This is not just because the terminology is occasionally clumsy ('justice of the peace commissions' (p. 34)) or unclear: what are 'Counter-Recusancy' (p. 2), or the 'Elizabethan re-conquest' (title page (p. iii), as opposed to the 'Elizabethan conquest' of the dust jacket)? Belatedly in the conclusion, the author usefully addresses the possible applicability of Lawrence Stone's *The crisis of the aristocracy* (1965) thesis to the deteriorating position of the Old English aristocracy, particularly in respect of their role as counsellors and military leaders when faced with Tudor centralisation and a standing army. Another way of looking at the Tudor peerage in Ireland, however, is in terms of service nobles and regional magnates. The evidence adduced here would suggest that Howth saw himself chiefly as a Tudor service noble, hence his generally supportive attitude to successive governors, as noted by the author, despite his opposition to Sidney. His modest income, drawn from ancestral landholdings in the Pale maghery (listed in appendix A), probably prompted his eager pursuit of commissions and his regular attendance at council, but we lack a more rounded discussion of Howth's role within the Dublin county community.

As to the early Tudor background to Howth's views about degeneracy (gaelicisation) and the Gaelic recovery, this is certainly more complex than is implied by the author's

comments about the writings of Sir Patrick Finglas and Sir William Darcy. There were at least four versions of Finglas's tract, which was gradually expanded from a 'briefe note' written c.1515 to the 'breviate' of 1536–7. So without establishing which version Howth was working from, we cannot simply say that he omitted passages of Finglas which did not meet his purpose. The edition of Finglas printed by Harris is in fact a conflation of three documents, only the first of which was certainly by Finglas, the last part being a section of Darcy's 'Articles'. And in regard to domestic violence perpetrated by Howth, the court of Castle Chamber could not touch life and limb any more than could a prerogative court in England (p. 30), and so the real question is why Howth was not prosecuted at common law for his daughter's death: probably because it was feared a jury might refuse to convict.

Overall, however, this volume transforms our understanding of *The Book of Howth* and offers some unique insights into the thinking of a minor Pale peer in the face of Old English displacement.

STEVEN G. ELLIS

*Department of History, National University of Ireland, Galway*

BARBARIANS AND BROTHERS: ANGLO-AMERICAN WARFARE, 1500–1865. By Wayne E. Lee. Pp ix, 340, illus. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2011. £22.50.

Wayne Lee's new book is much more than the military history promised by its subtitle and deserves wide readership and discussion. At the most fundamental level it is, of course, concerned with war in England, Ireland and America (colony and state). No exercise in mere description, the study attempts to explain why the levels and quality of martial violence ranged so greatly over time and space in the Anglo-American worlds. Lee comes at his question from four directions: the capacity of states to raise armies, their ability to control them, the calculations that go into achieving military goals, and the cultural contexts that frame all the previous three. These analytical categories are set against a backdrop of contemporary debates regarding who could be a subject/citizen and who could not, thus the 'brothers' and 'barbarians' of the title. Wars against these two distinct enemy types resulted in markedly different levels and qualities of violence: those against the latter proving time and again far more horrific and indiscriminate than those engaging the former.

The chapters proper open in sixteenth-century Ireland. Lee offers an extraordinarily deft telling of the complexity and contingency that characterised violence there; you would not know that he is not a specialist in the field. Complexity there may have been, yet there was discernible change over time as the restraint shown by Sidney at Clonmel (chapter one) was replaced with Essex's excess in the Ards (chapter 2). Colonial goals, logistical frustrations, Reformation divisions, and increasing ethnic discrimination ensured that come century's end the Irish were barbarians in English eyes and the second realm rocked by terrific bloodshed. This picture is then contrasted with the relative civility of the English Civil War (chapters three and four). This was a brother's war, less savage on account of shared notions of honour, agreed rules of war, and the need to recruit from (and appease) the populace – this last point well-illustrated through a study of the Clubmen.

Moving across the Atlantic, we encounter another barbarian conflict pitting English against Indians. The latter fought wars endemically and they did not learn lethality from Europeans. Nevertheless, mutually incomprehensible notions of war, combined with technological asymmetry and colonists' land hunger, ensured both the natives' non-subject/barbarian status and the consequent armed savagery visited upon them. (Lee's detailed explication of Indian ways of war demonstrates his care to understand both sides in these struggles and make these chapters, five and six, richly compelling.) A particularly well-chosen comparison of 'barbarian' and 'brothers' wars is that between the conduct of