

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 'brieve 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

Washington's men at Valley Forge – respectful of international laws of conflict, to the benefit of local non-combatants and enemy 'brothers' alike – and those same men's horrific slaughter of the Iroquois in 1779 (chapters seven and eight). Indians could be allies, but not brothers; in war they were always, and to their great loss, barbarians. A brief conclusion uses the United States's brothers' war, the Civil War, to reinforce how tensions created by questions of capacity and culture determined the nature of violence. Industrialisation heightened the potential for lethality, and slavery introduced an element of the 'barbarian' to this war as the enslaved were deemed no more potential subjects than were Irish and Indians before them. Nevertheless, the expectation of a renewed, common (if white) citizenship ensured that atrocity was not visited upon the people.

This is a provocative and at times brilliant study. It operates masterfully on a number of levels – descriptive, methodological, conceptual and theoretical – making it accessible and useful to a variety of audiences. One might ask questions of its assumptions and definitions, however. The binary of barbarian and brother seems unnecessarily restrictive for so subtle a study. Is there no other option for enemies outside of these opposites? Could there not be 'cousins' wars, for instance? Such a compromise position might fit the Irish context particularly well: periods of intense violence were often separated by long stretches of peace and cultural blending. And the Irish certainly did become subjects and citizens, and quite rapidly. Moreover, it is worth wondering if the English thought of the Irish and Indians in terms so coterminous as Lee suggests: were all barbarians created equal? The author is insistent in his belief that pinning violence on notions of racial/ethnic difference is insufficient. Nevertheless, it is curious that no barbarian wars seem to have been fought internally. How important then are matters of capacity and the culture of the soldier? I suspect very much so, but that is a case that Lee and those who follow him will most likely have to explicate further. For this extraordinarily learned and wide-ranging book will alter how we approach the questions of war, violence and culture in domestic and colonial settings throughout the Anglo-American Atlantic world. And that is quite an achievement.

BRENDAN KANE

*Department of History, University of Connecticut*

THE COURT OF ADMIRALTY OF IRELAND, 1575–1893. By Kevin Costello. Pp xvii, 294. Dublin: Four Courts Press. 2011. €55.

The history of Ireland, whether that of a kingdom, a colony or otherwise, is the history of an island. Thus, matters maritime can be said to merit a degree of scholarly attention greater than that which they sometimes receive. Kevin Costello's book, *The court of admiralty of Ireland, 1575–1893*, makes a very worthwhile contribution to our knowledge of this key aspect of Irish history.

The book contains six chapters, the first five of which provide a chronological account of the personnel, the problems and the work of the court of admiralty across the three centuries of its existence. The final chapter examines the issue of admiralty criminal jurisdiction in the period 1580 to 1861. A glossary of legal terminology, which will be a vital aid for many readers, is also included. The combination of its twenty-seven terms with the preceding table of seventy-three abbreviations may, however, appear to some as a rather daunting preliminary apparatus. Yet this material merely reflects the complexity of the subject and the breadth of the research required to master it.

Among the obstacles to research that exist on the subject in question are the absence of the original records of the court of admiralty and the fact that it was only a minor element of the judiciary. Costello overcomes these by mobilising an impressive array of sources and by avoiding the inevitable temptation to exaggerate the importance of the court. Indeed he acknowledges that it existed for the most part on 'the fringes of the Irish