

would like a source for Aubrey's conclusion that "printed histories" present us with "uncertainty"—not because one doubts Scurr's understanding of Aubrey but just because the point is sufficiently revealing to prompt readers to seek more information.

A further problem arises when Scurr substantially alters her source. It is fascinating to learn that a lovelorn Aubrey quotes eight English lines translating Virgil's description of Dido; yet a check of Bennett's edition discloses that Aubrey retrospectively quoted two words in Latin that he ended up deleting. The deletion of Aubrey's identification with Dido is a more complex act than Scurr's version of that act would let on. More generally, because Scurr is pervasively modernizing and paraphrasing her sources, the reader is never sure how much she is capturing Aubrey's own voice: the lack of quotation marks makes it impossible to know unless the source is printed or the reader is at the Bodleian.

These remarks are neither merely quibbles nor are they finally complaints. Scurr has done her homework and offers students of Aubrey an enjoyable way to learn a great deal about him, his contemporaries, and their times (the book intersperses updates on historical events). The choice of a single word such as "Penury" as the heading for chronological sections of Aubrey's life can seem reductive or arbitrary. But Scurr's afterword tracing Aubrey's reception through the centuries is helpful for situating the book's approach, which comes closest to Anthony Powell's World War II-era study. As Bennett's edition explains, however, that earlier assessment of Aubrey needs revision and in some measure even reversal; scholarly readers of Scurr will want to balance her construction of Aubrey against that to be found in the introduction to Bennett's edition and in her soon-to-be forthcoming biography. The advantage of Scurr's fictional diary is that it is great fun to read; the liability is that it is sometimes hard to tell whether it is right.

Reid Barbour, *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

The Scots in Early Stuart Ireland: Union and Separation in Two Kingdoms.
David Edwards, ed.

With Simon Egan. *Studies in Early Modern Irish History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016. xii + 284 pp. £75.

In his introduction, the editor claims that there must have been an unexpected degree of "diversity" (4) among Scottish settlers in Ulster because so many stood aside at the beginning of the 1641 rising. Not content to use this as a rhetorical hook to snag the reader's attention, Edwards then accuses other historians of ignoring "the sheer scale of Scottish collusion" with the Irish (3). But is it fair to blame those who write surveys of whole centuries for smoothing out the ephemeral, regional, and ultimately incon-

sequential? In his own contribution on officeholders, Edwards concedes that the leading Scottish nobles Hugh First Viscount Montgomery and James Hamilton First Viscount Claneboye may have attended the Privy Council so rarely because they chose to focus their attention on east Ulster. However, the failure of the well-connected Patrick A'Hanna (the surname Ó hAnnaigh is an unusual example of a Scottish Gaelic *O* name) to get the clerkship of the council shows that the New English “really controlled” (5) government and the Scots had to be content with a “negligible” (32) number of offices. The exclusion of the Scots is all the more striking after reading Jane Ohlmeyer’s contribution on Scottish peers like Montgomery and Claneboye whose choice of marriage partners and other indexes show that they were really quite anxious to assimilate to the New English elite. William Roulston’s piece on Scottish settlers modestly disavows any “claim to originality” (95) but this reviewer learned a lot, not least about that nebulous but often-mentioned social category of freeholder.

Alan Ford explains that “particularly Irish compromise” whereby bishops in east Ulster operated a “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy toward ministers suffering qualms about episcopacy and an English-style liturgy. Claneboye pops up again to broker such compromises. Furthermore, as Robert Armstrong demonstrates, the next Claneboye/Montgomery generation lobbied Oliver Cromwell to delay transplanting Presbyterians to Counties Kilkenny and Tipperary. Given the limited life expectancy of the republican regime, to delay was to divert and so they saved “Scottish Ulster” but were themselves “perhaps fatally weakened” (269). Ford worries that historians may have gone too far in rehabilitating the popular appeal of Rome to the extent of caricaturing Protestantism as a top-down imposition with little popular appeal, and vividly captures the excitement and enthusiasm of early revival meetings. (He needn’t fret; the notion of the Protestant Reformation as a protest by “the people” against “abuses” will never be dislodged from popular imagination in the English-speaking world.)

Brian Mac Cuarta deftly delineates the Scottish Catholic presence in Ulster, most memorably the block of papist plantation in northwest County Tyrone carved out by the Hamiltons who fled “severe coercion” (150) in their native Renfrewshire. R. Scott Spurlock and Jason Harris reach apparently opposite conclusions about the reasons behind the Roman missions to the islands and western Highlands of Scotland. On the first reading the initiative came from the hard-pressed leaders of Clanranald and allied clans who requested the missionaries as a “powerful tool” (185) to bring about clan cohesion. On the other hand, Harris asserts that the nuncio in Flanders and the pope imposed the first mission on skeptical Irish Franciscans. Both make good cases, which I suspect would have been reconcilable if merged into a jointly authored essay. The long-term outcome was that the missionaries managed to “sew a Catholic fringe onto the frayed ends of the kirk in western Scotland” (223). Aoife Duignan vividly describes how, in 1641–42, Sir Frederick Hamilton raided far and wide into neighboring counties and baronies from his fortified base at Manorhamilton. Duignan

seems unsure if the “ruthlessness and ferocity” he displayed was “notable” or was a “regular feature” (236) of early modern conflict in Ireland. I would agree that Hamilton “epitomized the isolated Protestant settler” (243) but would have liked to see that comparison developed by reference to the likes of Charles Coote the younger who waged an equally aggressive, and far more successful, *chevauchée* in neighboring County Roscommon.

Edwards has drawn together an unusually cohesive set of articles grouped around an orderly sequence of themes that include land, office, religious identity, and politics.

Pádraig Lenihan, *National University of Ireland, Galway*

Witchcraft and Magic in Ireland. Andrew Sneddon.

Palgrave Historical Studies in Witchcraft and Magic. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. x + 222 pp. \$90.

This work is the first extended study of witchcraft in Ireland since the publication in 1913 of St. John D. Seymour's *Irish Witchcraft and Demonology*. The latter was pioneering for its time and is still considered of value given the author's use of primary materials that subsequently perished when the Public Record Office in Dublin was destroyed in 1922. Andrew Sneddon builds on Seymour's research while seeking to locate evidence of Irish witchcraft across the ages in the context of recent and contemporary research on witchcraft in Britain and the Continent that has been informed by anthropological insights and greater attention to regional variation. Given the destruction of the bulk of Irish legal records relating to the criminal courts of quarter sessions, assizes, and court of King's Bench for the period up to the mid-eighteenth century and a parallel loss of probate material and administrative records of the established church, Sneddon marshals a diverse range of sources to reconstruct evidence of and attitudes to witchcraft from the early medieval period. As a consequence of what he terms a “lack of sources,” Sneddon argues that the academic history of witchcraft in early modern and modern Ireland has been distinctly underresearched by comparison to England and the greater part of Continental Europe.

Drawing on primary material encompassing sources such as church records, private correspondence, printed ephemera, and ballads, Sneddon provides an overview of the manifestation of demonic and malefic beliefs in Ireland. The bulk of the analysis is concerned with the early modern period and chapters deal with questions of belief in witches, witchcraft legislation, cunning-folk, witchcraft accusations, trials, and demonic possession in a chronological context that reaches well into the eighteenth century. Sneddon is particularly convincing when he argues that settlers from England and Scotland brought with them to Ireland their witch beliefs. The replication of En-