No. 7 Autumn/Winter 1996-97

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

ANGLO-NORMAN SETTLEMENT IN CONNACHT IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

It was not until 1235, more than sixty-five years after the arrival of the Anglo-Normans in Ireland, that the English crown allowed the conquest of Connacht to take place. John had granted Connacht to William de Burgh in about 1195, but in 1203-4 had terminated William's efforts to make good his grant. Henry III had subjected William's son and heir, Richard, to the same treatment, granting him Connacht in 1227 and removing him from it in 1232-3. Both kings had feared that the conqueror of such a remote area would be difficult to control. However, by the 1230s, means of safeguarding royal interests there had been devised. There were royal castles at Athlone and Rindown, to the south and on the western shore of Lough Ree, and five cantreds to the west of the Shannon had been reserved to the crown. In 1234 Henry III restored Connacht to de Burgh for a fine of 3,000 marks, increased his annual rent and service to 500 marks and 20 knights, and urged him to exert himself strenuously to take possession of the land. [1]

The 1235 invasion of Connacht was one of the largest and most spectacular military operations undertaken by the Anglo-Normans in Ireland. Barons from virtually every part of the Lordship led forces into Connacht, there were detours into Breifne, Thomond and Tir Conaill; and Irish allies brought boats for the Anglo-Normans to use in the fighting that spilled over onto the islands of Clew Bay. But the most dramatic action took place in Lough Key, where Mac Dermot's Rock was besieged by a ship-borne siege engine and, more successfully, by numerous burning rafts. However, the king of Connacht was not entirely dispossessed. In 1235 and again in 1237, after more fighting, Felim O'Connor agreed to hold the five cantreds west of the Shannon of the English king. [2]

In 1236 Richard de Burgh built a castle at Loughrea, establishing his headquarters in Connacht. [3] His principal tenants did likewise the following year. *The Annals of Connacht* record that in 1237 'The Irish Barons *(Baruin na hErenn)* came into Connacht and began the building of castles therein' and that in 1238 'Castles were built in Muinter Murchada and Conmaicne Cuile and Carra by the aforesaid Barons'. These three areas lay in a line up the centre of Connacht, to the east of Loughs Corrib, Mask and Carra in what today is north Co. Galway and south Co. Mayo. Walter de Ridelsford, who held Muinter Murchada, must have built Athmekin (Headford) castle at this time; Matthew fitz Griffin, who held half of Conmaicne Cuile, must have built Shrule castle then; and Adam de Staunton, who held Carra, probably built Castlecarra castle at this time. [4]

The term 'the Barons of Ireland' is striking. Not only were the Anglo-Normans well established in Ireland by this time, their expansion into Connacht seems to have received little or no reinforcement from outside the country. Some of them had been in Ireland long enough to acquire a provincial identity. The annals tell of a terrible slaughter inflicted on 'the Welsh and Leinstermen of West Connacht' in 1266. [5] The Leinstermen were probably the settlers that de Ridelsford, fitz Griffin and de Staunton had brought into Connacht: all three were Leinster barons. The Welsh, on the other hand, obviously retained a strong Welsh identity after years of residence in

Ireland. It is not clear that annals are referring to the famous Welshmen of Tirawley here, but Barrett and Walsh family tradition, as recorded in the sixteenth century, links at least some of the Welshmen of Tirawley with Maurice fitz Gerald (d. 1176), one of the earliest Anglo-Norman settlers in Ireland. [6]

The Anglo-Normans were seasoned settlers by the time they moved into Connacht, but they were not set in their ways: mottes, which are so common in the east of the country, are rare in Connacht. [7] Richard de Burgh seems to have set the tone with a business-like approach to settlement. His strategy was to establish manors for himself in the south and to grant most of the rest of Connacht away. His manors were conveniently close to the ones he had in Cos. Limerick and Tipperary, with Meelick on the Shannon providing a crucial link. Also, both Meelick and his principal manor at Loughrea were on the best agricultural land in Connacht. Galway was selected because of its potential as a port. De Burgh also built (or rather rebuilt) Hen's Castle in Lough Corrib and Hag's Castle in Lough Mask, probably to protect both Galway and his vassals to the east of these lakes. [8]

The delegation of responsibility inherent in feudalism greatly facilitated the settlement process. We have seen how de Ridelsford, fitz Griffin and de Staunton began to build settlements on the land that de Burgh had granted them. Other grantees would follow. Several of them, such as Maurice fitz Gerald, Peter de Bermingham, John de Cogan and Gerald de Prendergast, were already important lords in other parts of Ireland. They had the resources to invest in new lands. It is evident that Anglo-Norman settlement had taken place in many parts of Connacht by the end of the 1240s. The process would continue in the 1250s; more remote parts of Connacht may not have seen settlers until the 1260s and 70s. There was, of course, considerable subinfeudation. Hugh de lacy granted away all five of the cantreds he received from de Burgh, but most of de Burgh's tenants established settlements on at least part of the land they received. Some ended up with extensive holdings in Connacht. The greatest of them was Maurice fitz Gerald. He not only established settlements at Ardrahan and Kilcolgan on land in Co. Galway that de Burgh had given him, he also created settlements at Loughmask and Ballinrobe in south Co. Mayo, and at Banada, Ardcree and Sligo in Co. Sligo, on land that he had received from others. [9]

Younger sons and younger brothers also profited from the colonisation of Connacht. The best known case is that of Peter de Bermingham's younger son, Meiler, who established what would become a thriving town at Athenry, Co. Galway. [10] Mayo also provides good examples of the same process, even if we do not know all the details. The names of three baronies in Mayo indicate the impact junior branches had. 'Burrishoole' is named after the borough that a collateral branch of the Butlers established in Umhall; 'Clanmorris' would seem to be named after the de Prendergast who established a junior branch of the family in what was then called Crích Fer Tíre; 'Costello' comes from the Irish name for the de Angulo family (Mac Costello, i.e. son of Jocelin) who settled in what was then called Sliabh Lugha. In this case the junior branch seems to have become established only after the father, Miles, died in 1259. [11]

Connacht was a land of opportunity for many, as the substantial Welsh settlement in Tirawley indicates. Even Anglo-Normans with lands elsewhere in Ireland put down roots in Connacht. Jordan de Exeter, lord of Affane, Co. Waterford, seems to have made his manor at Athlethan, (Ballylahan) in the centre of Co. Mayo, his principal place of residence. He built a castle and established a borough with a weekly market and annual fair there, and he (or his son) founded a Dominican friary a few miles away at Strade. It was possibly in this friary that the thirteenth century Anglo-Norman chronicle known as 'the Annals of Multyfarnham' was written. [12] De Exeter served as sheriff of Connacht in 1249

and again in 1258 when he as killed on an island off the west coast fighting Mac Sorley of the Hebrides whose fleet had robbed a merchant ship off Connemara of its cargo of wine, copper, cloth and iron. [13] Anglo-Norman Connacht was prosperous enough to attract both merchant ships and pirate fleets. There was also competition among the Anglo-Normans there, as numerous lawsuits attest. It was particularly intense in Mayo in the late-1240s to mid-1250s, when William Barrett used force in his conflict with Adam le Cusack and Adam le Petit over Bredagh, and in 1281, when the Barretts and the Cusacks fought against each other in a battle at Moyne. [14] In Connacht as a whole, there was a fierce power struggle between the de Burghs and Geraldines in the 1260s and 1290s. [15]

The lordship of Connacht was very much the creation of Richard, son of William de Burgh. He had come of age in 1214 but had not been allowed to become involved in Connacht until 1226-7. In many ways he was very Anglo-Norman. After his father died in 1205, when he was about nine, he seems to have spent some time in England with his uncle, the powerful Hubert de Burgh, who had been in John's service since the 1190s and was justiciar of England from 1215 to 1232. [16] Richard seems to have been in King John's entourage as a member of Hubert's household from 'at least June to September 1215'. [17] He was thus close to the action during a very formative time in England's constitutional development, the granting of Magna Carta. Magna Carta is dated June 15, but peace was not concluded between John and his barons until June 19, the day that Richard's uncle Hubert was appointed justiciar. [18] Richard later married Walter de Lacy's daughter, Egidea, ending an old Anglo-Norman rivalry in Ireland, and he died on the king's service in Poitou in 1243. [19] However, there was a Gaelic-Irish side to Richard too. His mother is thought to have been one of Donal O'Brien's daughters, and she evidently taught him Irish. [20] A bardic poem was written for him by one of the masters of the art, the famous early thirteenth century poet, Muireadhach Ó Dálaigh. The poet addresses Richard when he is a young man, before he had acquired Connacht, and he opens the poem by commenting on the two cultures at Richard's court in Castleconnell, Co. Limerick:

> Whence comes it that ye have guests from afar,
> O youth of foreign beauty,
> O ye who are become Gaelic, yet foreign, young,
> graceful and highborn?
> This band that is in your house, that is come to you
> from afar, they were wont to quaff wine from the
> hand of kings or knights.

Although the poet emphasises de Burgh's foreigness, he recognises his right to Connacht by proclaiming, 'Thine is Meadhbh's mighty Cruacha', referring to Maeve's stronghold at Rathcroghan, Co. Roscommon. [21] His words, when taken literally, raise an interesting question for students of settlement. Did the Anglo-Normans physically take over Irish strongholds and build their own castles on them?

It would seem that several Anglo-Norman castles were either built on or near Irish strongholds. We can tell this very often simply from the placename. The word 'dún' meaning 'fort' appears as a prefix in Dunmore and Dunamon, and as a suffix in Rindown. Smaller manors were established at Duniry and Dunmougherne. The evidence is late, but it is hard to ignore the list of the chief seats (bailte puirt) of the kings of Uí Fiachrach in pre-Norman times that the seventeenth century Irish genealogist, Dualtagh Mac Firbisigh, gives the area covered being Erris and Tirawley in Co. Mayo, and Tireragh in Co. Sligo. [22] Dookeegan, the chief seat that he gives for Erris, appears as an Anglo-Norman manor in a case before the common bench in 1318 when Matilda, the widow of Stephen son of Stephen de Exeter, sued for dower in it. [23] Three of the strongholds that Mac Firbisigh lists for Tireragh -

Donaghintraine, Castleconor and Bunnina - were also held by Anglo-Normans. It is not clear that there was an Anglo-Norman manor at Donaghintraine, but it was a de Bermingham stronghold by 1249. [24] Lawsuits of the late thirteenth/early fourteenth century show that there was a de Bermingham, and later a le Poer, town, castle, mills, church, and chapel at Castleconor, and that Buninna must have been part of the Cusack manor of Cuilcnamha which Margaret Cusack and her husband, Richard de Tuit, granted to Richard de Burgh, the Red Earl, sometime before 1306. [25] Graham has shown that Castleconor castle, 'a stone keep of uncertain date', was built on a small promontory in the Moy estuary that was enclosed by a fosse and a wall with a stone gatehouse, and he has suggested that Buninna castle (mentioned 1308-10) was an Anglo-Norman ringwork. [26] It would be nice to have archaeological evidence to show whether the Anglo-Norman structures at these places had Gaelic predecessors.

It would be wrong to exaggerate the use of Irish strongholds by the Anglo-Normans in Connacht. There are enough Anglo-Norman castles beginning with the prefix 'Ath' - Athlone, Athleague, Athenry, Athmekin and Athlethan - and with the prefix 'Ard' - Ardrahan, Ardnaree and Ardcree - to show that fords and high ground were important to the settlers too. Of course, some of these may have had Gaelic strongholds: Ardcree is Ráith Aird Craibhi in Irish. Turlough O'Conor built a castle at Athlone.

The Anglo-Normans' extensive use of Gaelic territorial units is perhaps of some relevance here. These units dominated both the way they distributed land and their assessment of its value. What appear in the Anglo-Norman sources as cantreds, *theoda* and villates had a former life as *tricha cét*, *tuatha* and *bailte* in pre-Norman times. The *tricha cét* was an assessment unit rather than a territory per se. The kings of Connacht had found it useful for taxation purposes to assess the largest subkingdoms and territories in Connacht as *tricha cét* [27] Umhall might be considered one *tricha cét*, for example, Tirawley, two. Some of these large kingdoms and territories survive today as baronies. A *tuath* was a smaller area under a petty ruler called a *dux, tigerna or taoiseach*. Where there were three or four *tuatha* in one area, that area might be considered a *tricha cét* for taxation purposes. That is why the Anglo-Normans could say that Connacht contained thirty cantreds: twenty-five in de Burgh's lordship plus the five king's cantreds. [28] That is why de Burgh could grant out cantreds and *theoda*, and call the latter half-cantreds or quarter-cantreds. [29] The *bailte*, which were the holdings of the Gaelic aristocracy, became the villates of the Anglo-Normans, and many survive today as townlands. It would seem reasonable to assume that the Anglo-Normans would take over the main Gaelic stronghold in each *baile*, as Jordan de Exeter seems to have done at Dunkellin, in the manor of Ardrahan, Co. Galway, where he built a castle before 1240, but again it would be nice to have archaeological evidence. [30] What is clear is that in Muinter Murchada, to the east of Lough Corrib, *bailte* belonging to O'Flaherty's officers - his standard bearer, his ollamh, his headsteward, the master of his feast, the master of his horse and the keeper of his bees, became the villates of the tenants of the manor of Athmekin. [31] The O'Flahertys, and presumably their subordinate chiefs, moved west of Lough Corrib. The Anglo-Normans attacked them there in 1248 and 1256, and we are told that they banished Rory O'Flaherty from West Connacht in 1273. [32] However, they do not seem to have been able to maintain much of a presence to the west of Lough Corrib and the O'Flahertys would ultimately prosper there.

There is a lot of evidence to show that Anglo-Norman settlement was heavy enough and effective enough to reduce the size of Irish sub-kingdoms in Connacht, but it was not extensive enough to destroy them. The Irish of the lordship of Connacht - the O'Flahertys, O'Malleys, O'Dowdas, O'Haras, O'Garas, O'Flynns, O'Maddens and O'Heynes - retained at

least some of their former kingdoms, either, like the O'Conors, as tenants of the Anglo-Normans or outside the system. Some Irish kings held a substantial part of their old kingdoms as the feudal tenants of Anglo-Norman lords. For example, Maurice fitz Gerald granted Eoghan O'Heyne, king of Ui Fiachrach, half of one of the two cantreds of Ui Fiachrach that he held of de Burgh. O'Heyne did homage to him in the court of Ardrahan, enfeoffed four people, two of whom were Irish, and received their homage. However, his relationship with fitz Gerald seems to have soured: in 1252 his holding was reduced to two villates. [33] In Umhall, Carra and other parts of Mayo, a segment of the O'Conor family, the Clann Murtough, which had intruded itself into the region before the conquest of Connacht, caused more problems for the Anglo-Norman settlers than the traditional rulers of these areas did. In 1247 and 1248 members of the Clann burned what must have been the borough and the castle of Burrishoole, and in 1272 they killed Henry Butler, lord of Umhall, and Hosty Merrick, one of the Welshmen of Tirawley. In 1273 Donal of Erris, one of the Clann who had been an ally of the Anglo-Normans, was expelled from both Umhall and Erris. [34] In the 1333 inquisition, held on the death of William de Burgh, the Brown Earl, O'Malley is listed as holding four villates of de Burgh in Umhall. [35]

The question that has to be asked about Anglo-Norman settlement in Connacht is: was it substantial enough, were conditions peaceful enough, was the soil fertile enough for the Anglo-Normans to maintain an Anglo-Norman way of life there during the thirteenth century? The answer is, I think, that, for the most part, Anglo-Norman settlers were able to maintain a viable Anglo-Norman existence throughout the thirteenth century. Irish attacks took their toll and were at times severe, notably in the late 1240s, late 1250s, mid-1260s and early 1270s - the Aedh O'Conor years - but the Red Earl's presence from 1286 had a subduing effect until the Bruce invasion, when there was a massive amount of destruction. Settlements in and around the king's cantreds suffered the most attacks, and the government had difficulty attracting settlers into the southern half of the king's cantreds in the second half of the thirteenth century, when it decided to expel the king of Connacht from that area. However, there was enough of an Anglo-Norman presence there to keep the O'Conors out from the 1280s to 1315. [36]

There was undoubtedly some intermarriage between Anglo-Norman men and Irish women, but the best known examples belong to the late thirteen/early fourteenth century: Richard de Bermingham and William Liath de Burgh, who won a big victory over the Irish at the battle of Athenry in 1316, were both married to Finolas. [37] The common bench rolls provide little evidence of such marriages: the vast majority of wives in Connacht cases have Anglo-Norman names. While some of these women were undoubtedly Irish - Anglo-Norman names were adopted by some Irish men and women - most were probably Anglo-Norman. The eye-catching marriages of the thirteenth century are very Anglo-Norman ones. We meet poor little rich girls like Christiana de Marisco, who inherited Athmekin manor and other lands from her grandfather, Walter de Ridelsford, c: 1243, when she was about six, and who was married to her third guardian (Ebulo de Geneve) by the time she was eleven or twelve. [38] Gerald de Prendergast's daughter, Matilda, was the widow of Maurice de Rochford when she married Maurice fitz Gerald's son, Maurice, at age seventeen: another of fitz Gerald's sons, to whom she had been betrothed, had died before she was seven. [39] Perhaps the best known Anglo-Norman marriage of thirteenth century Connacht is that of Basilia, daughter of Meiler de Bermingham of Athenry, to Stephen, son of Jordan de Exeter of Athlethan. According to the fifteenth century register of the Dominican friary of Athenry, Basilia was able to persuade her husband to replace the Fransciscan friary at Athlethan with a Dominican one by threatening at a banquet to neither eat nor drink until she got

her way. [40]

The Anglo-Normans, from the king downwards, made a huge investment in Connacht. Government expenditure peaked in the late 1260s to the early 1280s, when a new royal castle - Roscommon - was built and then rebuilt, and then rebuilt again, in order to confine the king of Connacht to the northern half of the king's cantreds. The final version was the latest in military architecture, very similar to the castles Edward I was then building in Wales, with curtain walls, massive gatehouse and rounded corner towers. Expenditure was enormous. The original castle, built in 1269, seems to have cost at least £3,148-4-3. Between 1270 and 1272, a further £1,601-18-8 was spent on provisioning and defending it and the other two royal castles in Connacht and, in 1278-1279, a further £3,200-2-5 was spent on works at the three castles. [41]

We do not have any financial figures for the baronial castles in Connacht, but it is clear that Anglo-Norman lords also invested heavily in Connacht. By 1333, at least forty-five castles had been built, at least thirty of which were in stone. The royal castles have been included in these figures, but not rebuildings: however, Sligo castle was rebuilt three times, Kilcolman and Roscommon twice, and many others once. At least fifteen religious houses were founded by the Anglo-Normans in Connacht (Dominican, Franciscan, Carmelite, Augustinian, Templar, Fratres Cruciferi and, unique in Ireland, Carthusian). The Irish contribution to this building activity should not be overlooked. The register of the Dominican friary at Athenry gives a list of Irish patrons, including Felim O'Conor, king of Connacht (1233-1265), who built the refectory; Eoghan O'Heyne, mentioned above, who built the dormitory (as well as the one at John de Cogan's Franciscan friary at Claregalway); and Florence O'Flynn, archbishop of Tuam (1250-53), who built a house for scholars. Also, the annals say that Felim built Sligo castle for Maurice fitz Gerald in 1245, but they make it clear that this was not a voluntary act. [42] The Anglo-Normans established at least twenty boroughs in Connacht, were granted at least nine weekly markets and annual fairs there, and built walls around at least five towns, those at Athenry being particularly impressive. [43]

Watermills were probably set up at all manorial centres - there are numerous references to them - and a windmill was built at the royal borough of Rindown in the 1270s. Sometimes mills were set up at two locations within the same manor: e.g., at both Loughrea and at Toolooban in the manor of Loughrea. Occasionally there was more than one mill in a town, suggesting the use of waterpower for other purposes besides grinding grain. There seem to have been fulling mills at the royal town of Athlone, and brewing mills are at least a possibility. Ale was made at Athlone (where there is a reference to a kiln) and in de Burgh's manors of Loughrea, Meelick, Portumna, and Ballintober. [44]

The Anglo-Normans expected to make a profit from their manors in Connacht. The thirteenth century was, after all, a time of great manorial prosperity. De Burgh would not have gained much if he had granted out all of his 25 cantreds for the 20 marks rent and service of 2 knights that he demanded from each of the cantreds that he did grant out. [45] He would have ended up with the service of 50 knights - 30 more than he owed the king - but with only 500 marks rent, just enough to pay his own rent to the king. Obviously, where he hoped to make a profit was from the manors that he invested his time, money and effort in.

The inquisition taken on the death of the Brown Earl in 1333, suggests that de Burgh's manors in Connacht conformed to the classic Anglo-Norman type, especially Loughrea, with its pigeon-house and enclosed park with wild beasts. The acreage under the lord's plough was either average (about 300 acres)

or above average for Ireland: [46] 570 acres at Toolooban and 360 acres at Camclon (in the manor of Loughrea), 480 acres at Monbally (Meelick), 360 acres at Kilcorban (Portumna), and 300 acres at Ballintober. Another type of revenue were the rents paid to de Burgh by the various tenants on his manors - burgesses, free tenants, tenants-at-will, gavillers, cottagers and betaghs. However, betaghs are found only in the manor of Meelick, where, in addition to rent, they paid 20 shillings and 15 shillings annually for 200 harvestmen and 120 beasts carrying corn. Hired labour would seem to have replaced labour service. The lord's right to charge his tenants for using his equipment and resources provided another source of manorial revenue, and it tells us about economic activities. On de Burgh's manors, the profits of the mill indicate cereal cultivation: prisage of ale indicates brewing: profits of the bakery, bread-making; pannage, pig-rearing; fisheries and weirs, fishing. Ferries also provided income at Portumna, as they did in the royal boroughs of Rindown and Athlone. [47]

Stallage (the renting of stalls) at Loughrea indicates a market, yet there is no evidence of a royal grant to hold one there. In fact, such grants were not always obtained, and other towns in Connacht, especially the boroughs, probably had markets and fairs. Certainly, boroughs, markets and fairs were key elements in both international trade and the local economy. They provided local landholders, from the lord of the manor down, with a market for their agricultural produce and livestock and thus with the means to buy the products of local industry and the international merchandise available within them. We know what kind of goods were brought into and sold in the boroughs of Galway and Dunmore in the 1270s, because of the murage that was levied on these items: wine, salt, wool, cloth, hides, skins of goats and lambs, herrings and other types of fish at Galway; cloth, iron, wheat, oats, horses, cows, sheep, herrings, hides, skins of goats and lambs at Dunmore. [48] Anglo-Norman towns played a crucial role in the development of a money economy in Connacht, though there already had been some movement in that direction. Turlough O'Conor had established a mint at Clonmacnoise, and, in 1231, just before the conquest of Connacht, Cormac MacDermot began to establish a market town at Rockingham on the southern shore of Lough Key. [49] Irish interest in markets and fairs, promoted mostly by monasteries in pre-Norman times, [50] continued under the Anglo-Normans. In 1260 Tomaltach O'Conor, archbishop of Tuam, was granted an annual fair at Tuam, and in 1279 the prior and convent of Roscommon were granted 'their weekly free market' at the Irish town in Roscommon. [51]

It is difficult to say to what extent other manors in Connacht resembled de Burgh's. The 1289 extent of the Geraldine manor of Ardrahan, Co. Galway, shows that demesne cultivation was important, that mills, fisheries, and weirs were all sources of revenue, and that there was a forest for hunting. However, there were only burgesses and free tenants on the manor. This indicates that lords found it difficult to attract the lower ranks of Anglo-Norman society into Connacht. Also, in addition to 11 carucates of arable and pasture, several entire villates are said to have been held in demesne, but such large areas were probably let to Irish tenants. In the 1289 extent of Sligo, the villates held in demesne do not seem to have been used at all - no value is given - and here again the only tenants were burgesses and free tenants. [52] However, Sligo was one of the most besieged Anglo-Norman settlements in Connacht, a victim of both O'Donnell and O'Conor attacks. It would certainly be wrong to assume that grain could not grow so far north. Corn was grown extensively in Anglo-Norman Tireragh, Co. Sligo, and around the Mayo of the Saxons and Turlough, Co. Mayo, in pre-Norman times. [53]

Anglo-Norman settlement was not as heavy in Connacht as in other parts of the Lordship of Ireland. A lot of land remained in Irish hands both outside the manors and within them. Also,

there were settlements around the king's cantreds that suffered numerous Gaelic attacks. However, there was relatively heavy and secure Anglo-Norman settlement from east of Galway Bay to Killala Bay. This core was where some of the best land was. Anglo-Norman Connacht was prosperous in the thirteenth century. It was a source of revenue for both the king and de Burgh. Between 1272 and 1280 the escheator accounted for £2,210-9-2 that he received from the lordship of Connacht while it was in the king's hand; and the Red Earl made what look like regular payments of his rent into the exchequer after he came of age in 1280 until 1299. [54] The 1333 inquisition *post mortem* says that the old value of the lordship of Connacht was £2081-9-21/2 and that its value in 1333 was £661-0-63/4 i.e. less than one-third of its former value. [55]

The decline and the Gaelicisation that occur in the fourteenth century may have started in the thirteenth century, but they were essentially fourteenth century developments. The thirteenth century was essentially a time of Normanisation. In the thirteenth century Anglo-Norman barons, burgesses and other settlers established castles, religious houses, manors, towns and a more fully developed money economy in Connacht - a process that contributed to Connacht's rich cultural heritage.

HELEN PERROS
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

Notes

1. C[alendar of] D[ocuments Relating to] I[reland], ed. H.S. Sweetman (London, 1875-86) I, nos 2189, 2217, 2218.
2. [The] A[nnals of] C[lonnacht], ed. A.M. Freeman (Dublin, 1994) pp 51-67; C[alendar of] J[usticiary] R[olls, Ireland], ed. J. Mills (Dublin, 1905-14) II, p. 133.
3. [The] A[nnals of] Clon[macnoise], ed. D. Murphy (Dublin, 1896) p. 235.
4. Athmekin castle was built by 1246: CDI I, no. 2810; Shrule castle by 1244: E. Curtis, 'Feudal charters of the de Burgo lordship of Connacht, 1237-1325'. Feilsgríbhinn Eóin Mhic Néill, ed. J. Ryan (Dublin, 1940) no. XV.
5. AC p.149
6. [The Genealogies,] Tribes and Customs of Hy-Fiachrach, ed. J. O'Donovan, (Dublin, 1844) p.330, note a.
7. R.E. Glasscock, 'Mottes in Ireland', Château-Gaillard 7 (Caen, 1975) p.97; P. Holland, 'the Anglo-Normans in Co. Galway: the process of colonization', J[ournal of the] G[alway] A[rchaeological and] H[istorical] S[ociety] 41 (1987-88) pp 85-86; idem. 'Anglo-Norman Galway; rectangular earthworks and moated sites', ibid, 46 (1994) p.204; idem, The Anglo-Normans and their castles in county Galway' in Galway, History & Society, ed. G. Moran et, al. (Dublin, 1996) pp 3-7.
8. CDI I, no. 2908; 36th R[eport of the] D[eputy] K[eeper of the Public Records in Ireland] p. 63 - Pipe Roll 10 Edw. I; G. H. Orpen, 'Richard de Burgh and the conquest of Connaught', JGAHS 7 (1911-12) p.130; M.J. Gardiner & P. Ryan, 'A new generalized soil map of Ireland and its land-use interpretation', Irish Journal of Agricultural Research 8 (1969) pp 100, 105.
9. G.H. Orpen, [Ireland Under the] Normans, (Oxford, 1911-20) III, pp 190-224.
10. G.H. Orpen, 'Notes on the Bermingham pedigree', JGAHS 9(1916) pp 197-98.
11. E. Curtis, 'Original documents relating to the Butler lordship of Achill, Burrishoole and Aughrim (1236-1640)', JGAHS 15 (1931-33) pp 121-28; Orpen, Normans III, p. 35, note 2, pp 201-2, 209-11.
12. CDI II, no. 250; 'Historia [et genealogia] familiae de Burgo', JGAHS 13 (1924-27) p.135; H.G. Leask, Irish Castles and Castellated Houses (Dundalk, 1973) p.72; A. Gwynn & R.N. Hadcock, Medieval Religious Houses, Ireland (London, 1970) p.230; 'Annales de Monte Fernandi', ed. A. Smith, Tracts Relating to Ireland, II (Dublin, 1842)

pp v-26.
13. AC pp 99, 127; AClon. pp 239, 241-42.
14. Orpen, Normans III, pp 217-19.
15. J.F. Lydon, 'The years of crisis', in [A] N[ew] H[istory of] I[reland] II, ed. A. Cosgrove (Oxford, 1987) pp 182-84, 187-88.
16. S. Painter, The Reign of King John (Baltimore, 1949) pp 25, 84-86, 123.
17. Orpen, 'Richard de Burgh', JGAHS 7 (1911-12) p.130.
18. Painter, op. cit., pp 327-28; J.C. Holt, Magna Carta (Cambridge, 1969) pp 156-66.
19. AC p.79; CDI I, no. 2636; Orpen, 'Richard de Burgh, op. cit, p. 131.
20. Ibid, pp 129-30; M.J. Blake, 'William de Burgh, progenitor of the Burkes in Ireland', JGAHS 7 (1911-12) pp 99-101.
21. Irish Bardic Poetry: texts and translations, together with an introductory lecture by Osborn Bergin, ed. D. Greene & F. Kelly (Dublin, 1970) pp 88-92, 252-54. I should like to thank Máire Cruise O'Brien for helping me with this poem.
22. Tribes and Customs of Hy-Fiachrach, pp 172-75.
23. H.T. Knox, The History of the County of Mayo, to the close of the sixteenth century (Dublin, 1908), p.309. Castlemore and Castlekirk, Co. Mayo, were built near Irish forts, Ibid., p.104.
24. AC p.99.
25. NAI RC7/3, p.157 - Common Bench Roll 19 Edw. 1; RC7/4 pp 123-23, 491-93 - Common Bench Roll 24-25 Edward I; RC7/11, pp 229-30 - Common Bench Roll 34-5 Edw. 1; RC7/13, p.49 - Common Bench Roll I Edw. II CJR II, pp 65-66. See also H.T. Knox. The Bermingham Family of Athenry' JGAHS 10 (1917-18) pp 141-43.
26. B.J. Graham, 'Medieval timber and earthwork fortifications in western Ireland', Medieval Archaeology 32 (1988) pp 123-24.
27. Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters, ed. J. O'Donovan (Dublin, 1854) III, pp 86-87; J. Hogan. 'The tricha cét and related land-measures', Pro[eedings of the] R[oyal] I[rish] A[cademy] 38C (1929) pp 148-235.
28. 35th R[eport] D[eputy] K[eeper]], pp 37, 47 - Pipe Rolls 19 & 51 Hen. III; AC pp 56, 66.
29. 36th RDK, p.63 - Pipe Roll 10 Edw. I; Curtis, 'Feudal charters of the de Burgo lordship', op. cit. in note 4 above, nos XXI, XXIII.
30. De Exeter also held the villate of Roevehagh, where Turlough O'Conor had fortress: [The] Red Book of [the Earls of] Kildare, ed. G. Mac Niocaill (Dublin, 1964) p. 55 and no. 191; P. Holland, 'The Anglo-Normans in Co. Galway; the process of colonization'. JGAHS 41 (1987-88) p.74. For recent works on the classification of earthworks in Connacht and eslewhere, see: P. Holland, op. cit. in note 7 above; B.J. Graham, op.cit. in note 26 above; idem. 'Medieval settlement in County Roscommon', Proc RIA 88C (1988) pp 19-38; M. Herity, 'Motes and mounds at royal sites in Ireland'. J[ournal of the] R[oyal] S[ociety of] A[ntiquaries of] I[reland] 123 (1993) pp 127-151.
31. A Chorographical Description of West or H-Iar Connaught written A.D.1684 by Roderic O'Flaherty, ed. J. Hardiman (Dublin, 1846) pp 368-72; CDI I, no. 2810; II nos 1801, 2340.
32. AC, pp 95, 123, 161.
33. Red Book of Kildare, no. 67.
34. AC. pp 92-95, 159-61; AClon, p. 238.
35. H.T. Knox 'Occupation of Connaught by the Anglo-Normans after A.D. 1237' JRSAI 33 (1903) p.58.
36. H. Walton, 'The English in Connacht, 1171-1333', Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, TCD (1980) pp 466-87.
37. NAI Betham's Genealogical Extracts: Misc. Collection I, p.48; 'Regestum [Monasterii Fratrum Praedicatorum] de Athenry', Archivium Hibernicum I (1912) p.212.
38. CDI I, nos 2645, 2689, 2810, 2863, 2947, 2971-72; II. no. 144.
39. Orpen, Normans III, pp 198-99.
40. 'Regestum de Athenry', op. cit., pp 204-5.

41. TCD MS 671, fol. 36v - Pipe Roll 54 Hen. III; BM Add. MS 4789, fol. 290 - Pipe Roll 53 Hen. III; *CDI* II, no. 890, p. 147; 36th *RDK*, p. 48 - Pipe Roll 8 Edw. I See also S. Harbison, 'Rindown castle: a royal fortress in Co. Roscommon', *JGAHS* 47 (1995).

42. J. Watt, *The Church in Medieval Ireland* (Dublin, 1972) p.64; AC, p85.

43. Lists cannot be given here due to lack of space, but are available upon request. For published lists and other valuable information, see C.J. Lynn 'Some 13th-century castle sites in the west of Ireland: note on a preliminary reconnaissance', *JGAHS* 40 (1985-86) pp 90-111; P. Holland, op. cit. in note 7 above; B.J. Graham, op. cit. in note 30 above; Gwynn & Hadcock, op. cit. in note 12 above; G. Martin, 'Plantation boroughs in medieval Ireland, with a handlist of boroughs to c.1500', *The Town in Ireland* ed. D. Harkness & M. O'Dowd, Historical Studies XIII (1979) pp 23-53; J. Bradley, 'Planned Anglo-Norman towns in Ireland' in *The Comparative History of Urban Origins in Non-Roman Europe*, ed. H.B. Clarke & A. Simms (Oxford, 1985) pp 411 - 67; A. Thomas, The Walled Towns of Ireland (Worchester, 1992) 2 vols. An examination of the Anglo-Norman contribution to Connacht's parochial development was not possible here, but see K.W. Nicholls, 'Rectory, vicarage and parish in the western Irish dioceses', *JRSAI* 101 (1971) pp 53-84.

44. J. A. Claffey, 'Rindoon windmill tower', *Irish Midland Studies* ed. H. Murtagh (Athlone, 1980) pp 84-88; Knox, 'Occupation of Connaught', *JRSAI* 32 (1902) pp 135-36, 394-95; 33 (1903) p. 60; 'The Irish pipe roll of 14 John', ed. O. Davies & D. B. Quinn *Ulster Journal of Archaelogy* 4 Supplement (1941) p. 39.

45. *Calendar of the Gormanston Register*, ed J. Mills & M.J. McEnery (Dublin, 1916) pp 143, 191; *Red Book of Kildare*, no.23; *CJR* I, pp 227-28.

46. K. Down, 'Colonial society and economy in the high middle ages'. *NHI* II, p. 460.

47. Knox, 'Occupation of Connaught', *JRSAI* 32 (1902) pp 133-36, 393-98; 33 (1903) pp 58-61; *38th RDK*, p. 54 - Pipe Roll 29 Edw.I.

48. *36th. RDK*, pp 47-48 - Pipe Roll 8 Edw. I; J. Hardiman, *The History of the Town and County of the Town of Galway* (Galway, 1820) pp 53-54.

49. A. *Clon.* p.214.

50. C. Doherty, 'Exchange and trade in early medieval Ireland', *JRSAI* 110 (1980) pp 80-85; idem, *The monastic town in early medieval Ireland*' in *The Comparative History of Urban Origins in Non-Roman Europe*, ed. H.B. Clarke & A. Simms (Oxford, 1985) pp 45-75. For a possibly more active royal role, Sec. J. Bradley, 'Killaloe: a pre-Norman borough?', *Peritia* 8 (1994) pp 170-79.

51. *CDI* II, nos 672, 2008.

52. *Red Book of Kildare*, nos 60, 129.

53. *AC*, pp 63, 147.

54. *CDI* III, nos 149, 309, 403, 475, 1148, IV no. 587.

55. TCD 1060, p. 214- Inq.P.M. 7 Edw. III.

[An expanded version of this paper was read to the annual conference of the *Group for the Study of Irish Historic Settlement* in Westport, Co. Mayo on 11th May 1996]

****

LORDSHIP AND LANDOWNERSHIP IN TWO MAYO BARONIES, 1550-1630.

This paper focuses on the changing concept of lordship in Mayo in the century after 1550 and the evolution of a new understanding of landownership during that period. The two concepts of lordship and landownership are of course linked. The precise nature of the link was, however, not clearly understood in early modern Ireland, and is one which still challenges historians today. The changes which occurred in people's understanding of lordship and the changing nature of landownership were crucial elements of the transfer from a Gaelicised system of political, social and economic organisation to one which was based on the English common law model.

The process was a complex one, and the pattern of change varied from one region to another, even within Mayo. This paper examines two distinct regions of South Mayo, the barony of Burrishoole in the West and the barony of Costello in the east. It compares some of the evidence for changing ideas of lordship and for the process of landownership change from the mid sixteenth century to about 1630, and shows that the influences promoting change were both political and economic. A small number of individuals, mostly newcomers, with appropriate contacts prospered in the transition period, through land acquisition, while the fortunes of the majority of the indigenous population went into decline.

The barony of Burrishoole circles clew Bay on its north and east shores, and the land is of limited productive capacity. The southern part of the barony is characterised by steeply sloping land, the central part is poorly drained while the mountains in the northern part of the barony have very limited productive potential. However, in the context of County Mayo, the central part of Burrishoole barony, comparatively speaking, contained some of the best land in the county. It was surpassed only by the land in the barony of Carra in the south of the county. *[Carra was the core of the lordship of the Mac William Burkes, the traditional overlords of the area of north west Connacht, known as Mayo since the late sixteenth century.]* An added economic resource in Burrishoole was of course Clew Bay itself.

The key to wealth and power in late medieval Gaelic society was people rather than land. One of the principal Gaelicised families associated with the barony of Burrishoole was Mac Philbin, *(a branch of the Burke sept).* Land was also held by others such as Mac Gibbon, Mac Ruddery, MacGneale, Kelly, O'Malley and Burke. Traditionally, the Mac William Burkes were the overlords of the Mac Philbins and others. That this was still a current concept in the 1580s is suggested by the evidence of the 1585 Composition of Connacht.

I

The agreement known as the composition of Connacht, was devised, at least in part, to fund the office of president of Connacht. An Elizabethan provincial administration designed to curb the powers of Gaelic lords and promote the common law had been in operation in the province from 1569, though its impact in Mayo had been marginal until the mid 1580s.[1] Under the composition, first introduced in 1577 and developed into a more comprehensive deal in 1585, agreement was reached between the Lord Deputy and the principal inhabitants of Connacht, about certain annual payments - taxes.

It was agreed that annual payments would be made to the crown by the occupiers of each quarter of land in the province, in return for the services of the president as protector and arbitrator in disputes.

The second element of the composition agreement was that the traditional overlords were to be entitled to an annual money payment from the lands of their followers, in place of all traditional exactions due to them as overlords. The amount due varied from barony to barony, apparently reflecting the nature of the Mac William claims to overlordship in different regions. The evidence suggests that in general the composition agreement was welcomed by the inhabitants of Connacht, and the payments were made for some years, until the outbreak of the nine years war in the 1590s.[2]

Under this agreement a money payment of approximately 5/=

per quarter of land, was to be paid annually by the Mac Philbins to Mac William Burke, in lieu of traditional exactions. This sum was to be paid to Mac William 'in full recompense of all such rents, beeves, rent, money, spendings and other customary exactions by him claimed upon the said freeholders lands'.[3] It was part of a multi-layered deal negotiated to promote 'the enhancement of every subject according to his degree'. This terminology suggests that the negotiations attempted to ensure that the relative status of individuals and families in the locality was to be reflected in the terms of the Composition agreement.

The parties to the deal may have been more concerned with concepts of honour than with any realisation that they were commuting traditional rights to money payments. The importance which contemporaries attached to 'honour' and the trappings of social status continued to influence interactions between individuals thereafter, and were, arguably, almost as important as economic factors in determining the direction of change in early modern Mayo. Such concerns influenced the way Gaelic families, Galway merchants, Palesmen, and English soldiers, cum administrators, behaved and interacted.

Writing to his superiors in 1576, the Lord Deputy of Ireland, Sir Henry Sidney, described the head of the Mac William sept as 'lord of a territory of three times so much land as the earl of Clanricard,'[4] and was essentially congratulating himself on successful negotiations with this influential man. It is important to note, however, that MacWilliam was in no sense landlord of any such expanse of territory, his status was that of overlord, and Mac William's role as overlord over the Mac Philbins, Mac Gibbons and others in Burrishoole seems to have been minimal by the late sixteenth century.

Sidney went on to comment that the Mac Philbin's and others were very poor and expressed the opinion that they were 'with one consent crying for justice and English government...in so miserable (and yet magnanimous) manner, as it would make an English heart to feel compassion with them'.[5]

The general level of support for the composition deal suggests that by the 1580s there was some truth in the claim that the inhabitants of Mayo had some interest in 'justice and English government'. However, the trend towards anglicization being advanced through the Connacht presidency in the 1570s and 1580s was not the only force for change in late sixteenth century Mayo. It would also seem to be the case that the degree of poverty among freeholders was considerable. Impoverishment in fact had a major role in the transfer of ownership of land out of the hands of Gaelicised freeholders of Mayo, in the decades after the negotiation of the composition of Connacht in 1585.

The evidence which survives for the pattern of landownership in Burrishoole barony, in the sixteenth century, (documented in inquisitions taken in the early seventeenth century, most notably the 1635 Strafford Survey incorporated into the *Books of Survey and Distribution*),[6] suggests that a system of partible inheritance, the system known to the English as gavelkind, was widespread. This meant that land was shared among a number of co-heirs, rather than being inherited by the eldest son. This system of partible inheritance, when coupled with demand for land prompted by rising population, gave rise to repeated subdivision and resulted in very small disjointed holdings, with individual freeholders sometimes holding very small units of land. There is plentiful evidence of this process at work in the barony of Burrishoole.

For example, the quarter of land known as Truminhoe /Trumnaha was divided among a number of Mac Philbins, including Gerald Mc Philbin who held one eighteenth of half a quarter, and Moyler Mac Philbin who held one fifth of half a

quarter in Trumnaha,[7] together with one fifteenth of a quarter at Knockmonyhelly.[8] In all, at Trumnaha, seven persons were sharing 133 acres. Other examples, including some of the islands in Clew bay had five or six named individuals each owning a share of a segment of land totalling less than ten acres.

The traditional Gaelic system of partible inheritance involved a temporary distribution of land to individuals. A new allocation was made, either annually in May, or, more usually, on the death of the head of the sept. It would appear, however, that this concept of land owned by a kin group and redistributed at intervals had declined in much of Connacht by the late sixteenth century. Jean Graham has highlighted a definite trend towards individual ownership of portions of the family lands evolving in the course of the sixteenth century.[9]

One major implication of this development within Gaelic society, away from the idea of a temporary interest in a portion of the kin lands towards individual ownership, was that it allowed scope for sale of land to outsiders. In times of economic pressure, therefore, individual owners of small units of land frequently mortgaged that land. Very frequently, they failed to redeem the mortgages and thereby relinquished title to the land.[10] In this way economic pressures were a major factor in the disintegration of traditional Gaelic lordship society. It should be emphasised, though, that the movement towards the idea of individual ownership of land preceded the transfer of that land out of Gaelic hands.

By the early years of the seventeenth century, and especially in the 1620s and early 1630s, whole farms were being acquired by speculators. They bought up individual segments of land from a variety of family members who were in financial difficulties. In Burrishoole, most of the speculators who were acquiring land in this way in the early years of the seventeenth century were Galway merchants, investing their surplus money in land. The evidence of the 1635 Strafford inquisition gives extensive details about the process whereby ownership of much of the land of the barony passed from individuals with surnames like Mac Philbin, Mac Gibbon, Mac Tibbott Burke O' Farresy, Mac Rubbery to individuals with surnames which are immediately recognisable as being of the 'Tribes of Galway': Darcy, French, and Martyn.[11] [This process has been documented in detail by Breandan O Bric.[12]]

Not all who acquired land through unredeemed mortgages were outsiders: some examples from Burrishoole show one MacGibbon mortgaging land to another member of the same family.[13] In many cases those outsiders who acquired land retained the former owners as tenants. This meant that there was a large scale change in the ownership of land, but relatively little change in land occupancy.

The trend which was evolving, therefore, in the first third of the seventeenth century, was towards the emergence of a prosperous class of small-farmer-proprietors. They were becoming increasingly conscious of the concept of land as wealth, and were consequently anxious to have secure title to land valid in English law. The Galway merchants who were speculating in Mayo land, frequently had close relatives who had acquired a legal education at the inns of court, and such connections were exploited as necessary. Thus, by the time of Strafford's proposed plantation of Connacht in the 1630s, the opponents of his plan were not the Mac Philbins and Mac Gibbons but rather the newcomers who had been themselves acquiring land in Burrishoole and elsewhere in Connacht through a process of informal colonisation over the previous forty years.[14]

II

In contrast to Burrishoole, only one Galway merchant is recorded as having possession of land in the barony of

Costello at the time of the 1635 Strafford Inquisition. Having already held a half quarter of land in Ballindangin, between 1630 and 1632 Dominic Lynch Fitzjohn of Galway, purchased small portions of land in five separate units. Some of these portions of land -half a gnive and one eighth part of half a gnive in Breacklone and one quarter part of half a gnive in Derry - appear to have previously been held in common by four people. Dominic expended £16 acquiring these particular lands and spent a total of £45 on land purchases over a period of three years.[15] These were very small investments indeed compared to the activities of the principal speculator in the barony of Costello - Theobald Dillon, of Killowra, Co. Westmeath, whose activities will be considered below.[16]

The barony of Costello, which attracted the attention of Theobald Dillon, lies in the eastern extremity of County Mayo. Like Burrishoole, it is comprised of relatively poor land. A portion is bog, the remainder is poorly drained land, course in texture, and adversely affected by a high rainfall. It is inferior in quality to much of the lands of north county Roscommon, or the barony of Carra in south Mayo.

Costello barony was described by an English commentator in 1585 in terms of 'the hard passage of travel thither, by means of the great bogs, woods, moors and mountains' it was 'barren amongst the most barren... standing in so discommodious a place ...[that it] can hardly be brought about to be peopled with civil inhabitants'.[17]

This land, unpromising as it may have been, was traditionally the inheritance of the Mac Costellos. The family was of Anglo Norman descent, originally known as De Angulo, but thoroughly Anglicised by the sixteenth century. There is evidence in this region too of partible inheritance resulting in freeholders possessing very small portions of land. The degree of subdivision seems to be less than that found in Burrishoole, suggesting that a lower population level meant there was little pressure on land.

The barony of Costello was the only barony in Mayo excluded from the Composition of Connacht. This was done at the request of an Old Englishman named Theobald Dillon, who was none other than the collector of crown revenues in Connacht and Thomond.

That the barony of Costello was initially excluded, at the request of Theobald Dillon, suggests not only that he was intimately acquainted with the mechanisms of the provincial government, but also that Dillon was a man with a particular interest in the barony of Costello and with considerable influence over the Costellos.

The connection between Dillon and the lands of the Costellos first came to public attention in 1580 when the then President of Connacht, Sir Nicholas Malby, noted that

> 'the possessor of a large but poor territory, Mac Costello, by surname Nangle, claims to be allied to the Dillons, and had called out of the English Pale, Tibbot Dillon ... and given him with the consent of all his kinsmen, as a free gift, a great portion of his land with a fair ancient castle called Castlemore...'[18]

One way of describing Theobald Dillon, apparently a younger son from an Old English family in the Pale, is as a 'broker' between the Costellos and the English administration. But there is more to the story than that, and the case can shed light on the way concepts of lordship and landownership evolved in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

It would appear that Theobald Dillon came to Mayo in about 1580 as an ambitious young man with a legal education, but few prospects at home. By the 1620s he had secured title to a large quantity of land in Mayo and had acquired the title of Viscount Dillon of Costello Gallen. In a series of transactions

which few contemporaries understood, the MacCostellos became tenants of Dillon on their own family lands. Dillon, it would appear, successfully exploited the lack of concern among Connacht inhabitants in the late sixteenth century about whether or not they held valid title to their lands under English law.

Those who did understand English common law concepts of landownership included Sir Richard Bingham, the third president of Connacht. He was very suspicious of Dillon's activities, commenting in the late 1580s that

> 'if Dillon had his right and no more than he ought to have, he should not have any one foot of land in all Clancostello, for what he hath there he hath gotten by practising, and by very indirect ways, from the inhabitants there in the time of the collectorship, when he did what he list.'[19]

Dillon's post as collector of the Composition rent would have brought him into contact with individuals throughout Connacht. In the eyes of the gentlemen and freeholders of Mayo he would have been clearly identifiable as a middleman between them and the provincial president. This did not necessarily make life easier for him, and in 1583 he related that having collected rents in Tyrawley he proceeded next 'towards the place where MacWilliam was, who met me and his wife Grainne Ni Mhaille with all their force, and did swear they would have my life for coming so far into their country and specially his wife would fight with me before she was half a mile near me'.[20]

As other newcomers to the county discovered to their cost, in times of crisis their position was vulnerable. The more astute newcomers sought to ingratiate themselves with the local population by any available means. Thus, in 1586, after the Mayo Burkes had gone into rebellion against Bingham, Theobald Dillon, and his colleague, Francis Barkely, who was provost Marshall, intervened, and promised 'that they would repair to Dublin and procure their pardons'.[21] The newcomers were offering their services as brokers between the rebels and the government. As it turned out, the lord Deputy, Sir John Perrot did not grant the pardons, but the significant fact is that the local population believed through the intervention of Dillon that he might have done so.

It appears that these two newcomers had set themselves up in the role of protectors of the native population of south-east Mayo. As far as some of the Burkes and the MacCostellos were concerned in the 1580s, Theobald Dillon was a conveniently accessible broker who was prepared to act on their behalf. But Dillon was, of course, working on his own behalf also.

When the barony of Costello was belatedly dealt with by the Composition commissioners in 1587 Dillon also demonstrated how shrewdly he could deal with the officers of the crown. The deal was negotiated while Sir Richard Bingham was absent from the province. A significant difference between the composition indenture for Costello and that for the remaining baronies of Mayo is that the Costello composition was worded as an agreement made with Dillon rather than the indigenous local lords.

That the deal was to Dillon's advantage is underlined by the fact that Dillon went to London personally to have the composition ratified. [The Connacht president, Bingham, much to his annoyance, only discovered that the deal had been concluded when he met Dillon in Chester on his way to have the deal ratified.][22]

Under the agreement for Costello barony it was conceded that Composition rent would only be charged on 83 of the 275 quarters of land surveyed in that barony. The advantage of such exemption was that the land left free of Composition rent would be more attractive to potential tenants. Tenants were a

vital economic asset. Dillon's achievement in the composition deal for the barony of Costello was to secure favourable conditions for himself as owner of the land he had reputedly been given by the Costellos in 1580.[23]

The question remains whether the Costellos had really given him the land 'as a free gift' as Malby reported. The Annals of Loch Ce offer a brief glimpse of the native interpretation of this transaction. It is recorded, under the year 1586, that 'Castlemore of the Mac Costellos and half the lordship of the country were given to Tibbot Dillon by Mac Costello...'[24]

The word used in the original Irish text was Tiarnas, which would imply lordship or dominion, or an area of jurisdiction. Under the native system a lord exercised jurisdiction over people rather than over any particular extent of land. It would appear likely that it was not ownership of land but rather lordship over people - -the role of protector, intermediary and arbitrator -which the Costellos had intended to offer to Dillon in 1580.

It was noted at the time of the transaction that the Costellos and Dillons were in fact related, both being descended from a common Anglo-Norman ancestor. It could be argued that this emphasis on a shared ancestry adds further weight to the idea that Dillon was being chosen by the Costellos as their lord rather than being merely a purchaser of land in a commercial transaction.

There is a discrepancy of six years between the date when Dillon's acquisition of property in the Mac Costello territory as a 'free gift' is noted in the records of the Dublin government and its recording in the Annals of Loch Cé. It seems plausible that the nature of the deal that had been entered into was not fully considered by the native population for some time. At any rate, there is no record on the native side of Dillon's activities into 1586. In that year a controversy arose which illustrated that the MacCostellos had misunderstood Dillon's intentions, or that Dillon had misrepresented them. In that year, Theobald Dillon lodged a petition that his lands at Castlemore and Binnfada, which he held 'by lawful and just title taking the profit thereof without disturbance', had been unlawfully taken over by five of the MacCostellos from Tolghay who had dispossessed Dillon's tenants and proceeded to occupy the land themselves.[25] This disputed land included Castlemore - the centre of the hereditary Costello territory. It was part of the land which had been surrendered to the Queen by Shane Mac Costello in June 1586, when he had also agreed to the renunciation of the title 'MacCostello'.[26] The surrender was accompanied by a memorandum by Shane Mac Costello that he had voluntarily surrendered the property to the Lord Archbishop of Dublin for the use of her Majesty the Queen.

Unlike earlier cases of surrender and regrant, there is no record of a regrant to the Costellos in this case. Soon afterwards the land was deemed to be the property of Theobald Dillon. When the Costellos challenged his right to the land, Dillon attempted to have the case heard in Dublin rather than locally, claiming he would not get an unbiased jury in the province. The outcome of the case is not recorded in the decrees register, suggesting that the case was settled prior to a final hearing. The early seventeenth century evidence shows, however, that the manor, castle, town and lands of Castlemore, and a great much else besides, were the property of the Viscount Dillon of Costello Gallen. [27]

What was under way in the barony of Costello, from 1580 if not earlier, was a process of informal colonisation, unplanned by the central administration in Dublin or London. It had been facilitated by the opening up of the province to newcomers under the auspices of the Connacht presidency. By a variety of means, and largely for economic reasons, the pace of that colonisation process increased significantly in the early seventeenth century. By then Dillon was one of the most successful newcomers in Mayo, untypical only in that he and his relatives had amassed a very large estate amounting to the greater part of the barony of Costello, and extending north into Gallen barony also.

His success illustrated that there were fortunes to be made by a few enterprising individuals in a period of transition, particularly when the native population got into economic difficulties which prevented them adapting, or were the consequences of them not adapting to changing circumstances.

III
It was not only newcomers who capitalised on the transition from Gaelic lordship society to a system of estates on the English model. Elsewhere in Connacht, the earl of Clanricard was particularly successful in a similar role as broker for his followers or tenants in the lordship of Clanricard, though apparently showing rather more concern for the welfare of his tenants. Further west, Morrogh O Flaherty had purchased almost the entire barony of Ballinahinch by the 1630s. Elsewhere in Mayo, Sir Theobald Burke, 'Tibbot na Long' had established himself on a par with Dillon, on MacWilliam Burke lands in south Mayo.[28] In these cases too, the weaker families were reduced to the status of tenants, the only difference being that it was the native lord rather than an outsider who had assumed the role of English style landlord.

Where the native overlords were in a weak position, unable to adapt sufficiently to the demands of a changing economic and political climate, as was frequently the case in Mayo, the lack of a powerful overlord meant that the property of individuals was open to manipulation by speculators.

In Burrishoole, much of the Mac Philbin lands had been mortgaged by the traditional freeholders and was now part owned by a variety of wealthy Galway merchants who had chosen to invest their surplus wealth in land. There were also, however, still many indigenous property owners there in the 1630s, some owning very small segments of land. The number of freeholders had, however, decreased between 1617 and 1635, but the general pattern in Burrishoole barony was still one of numerous landowners owning relatively small tracts of land.

In contrast, Theobald Dillon had demonstrated, in Costello barony, that one man with political contacts and a little legal knowledge, and a certain lack of scruple, could exert a great deal of influence and create a handsome estate for himself.

To men like Dillon, however, landownership was not an end in itself. When Dillon had successfully established himself as a landowner in Mayo, he next proceeded to assemble some of the trappings of Gaelic lordship. A Dillon poembook contains a poem dated to the 1620s which manipulates the genealogical record to give Dillon a Gaelic ancestry. The connection back to Niall of the Nine Hostages is achieved by inventing a fourth son of Uisneach - Conall - who had gone abroad - and from whom the Dillons were descended.[29] [The 1580s claim to common descent with the De Angulo's was not mentioned]. That Theobald Dillon was prepared to pay for such a poem to be written in the closing years of his life indicates that there was more to being landlord of an estate in East Mayo than merely title to land. It was still necessary also to be lord of a people, and he employed native propagandists to make an appropriate case on his behalf.

But while patronising Gaelic poetry as a way of establishing himself locally, Dillon was also buying status for himself and his heirs after the English manner, through the acquisition of the title of Viscount Costello Gallen in 1621. He paid £1,500 for this honour[30] - such a sum of money would have bought a

great deal of land - but honour and status were as important as landed possessions to an individual seeking to establish his family securely for the future.

Having built his wealth by exploiting the discrepancies between Gaelic and English law and the different value placed on land ownership in the two systems, Dillon continued to work both systems to the end of his days, brokering between Gaelic and English systems on his own behalf.

The first Viscount Costello Gallen lived to a great age and was reputed to have 100 descendants when he died in 1624. Although his own eldest son had predeceased him and although the estate fell victim to the confiscations of the mid-seventeenth century, in 1883 the Costello-Gallen estate, which was the property of the lineal descendant of Theobald Dillon, consisted of 83,749 acres in Mayo, besides 5,435 acres in Co. Roscommon, 5,444 acres in Oxfordshire, and 136 acres in Co. Westmeath.[31] (The Irish property was sold in May 1899 to the Congested Districts Board, by the seventeenth viscount, Harold Arthur Lee-Dillon.)

The transition from Gaelic Lordship to English landlordism was a complex process, and the detail is as yet largely undocumented. The variations within south Mayo suggest that detailed local studies of the process are required before the broader picture can be fully understood.

<div align="right">
BERNADETTE CUNNINGHAM
DUBLIN DIOCESAN LIBRARY
</div>

1   Bernadette Cunningham, *Political and Social Change in the lordships of Clanricard and Thomond, 1569-1641.* M.A. Thesis, University College Galway, 1979, pp 10-63.
2   Public Record Office, London [P.R.O.(L.).], SP63/183/65, SP63/183/99 [1595].
3   T.W. Freeman (ed), *The Compossicion Booke of Conought* (Dublin, IMC 1936), p 108.
4   H.T. Knox, *The History of the county of Mayo,* (Dublin, 1908) pp 183-5.
5   Knox, *History of Mayo,* p 185.
6   R. C. Simington (ed.), *Books of Survey and Distribution, II, County of Mayo.* Dublin IMC, 1956.
7   Simington, *Books of Survey and Distribution, Mayo,* p 97.
8   W. O'Sullivan (ed). *The Strafford Inquisition of Mayo.* Dublin, IMC, 1958.
9   Jean Graham, 'Rural society in Connacht, 1600-1640', in *Irish Geographical Studies,* ed. Nicholas Stephens and R.E. Glasscock, (Belfast, 1970), pp 192-208.
10 Raymond Gillespie, *The Transformation of the Irish Economy,* (Dundalk, 1991), pp 19-24.
11 O'Sullivan, *Strafford Inquisition,* pp 11-25.
12 Breandan O Bric, *Galway townsmen as the owners of land in Connacht, 1585-1641.* (M.A. Thesis, UCG, 1974).
13 O'Sullivan, *Strafford Inquisition,* p. 22.
14 Cunningham, *Political and Social Change,* pp 247-75.
15 O'Sullivan, *Strafford Inquisition,* pp 1-6.
16 On Dillon see also Bernadette Cunningham, 'Theobald Dillon, a newcomer in sixteenth-century Mayo', in *Cathair na Mart,* vi (1986), pp 24-32.
17 J.C. Morrin, *Calendar of Patent and Close Rolls of Chancery in Ireland, ii,* London, 1863, pp 141-3.
18 P.R.O.(L.). SP63/73/85.
19 P.R.O.(L.) SP63/87/35.
20 P.R.O.(L.). SP63/99/37.
21 P.R.O.(L.). SP63/126/53,i.
22 *Calendar of State Papers Ireland, 1586-88,* pp 482, 486-7, 500-01.
23 Bernadette Cunningham, 'The Composition of Connacht in the lordships of Clanricard and Thomond, 1577-1641', in *Irish Historical Studies,* xxiv (1984), pp 1-14.
24 William Hennessy (ed.). *The Annals of Loch Ce,* (London, 1871), ii, p 477.
25 National Archives, Dublin, Chancery Bills, B.97 [1586].
26 Morrin, *Cal. Patent and Close Rolls, Ireland, II, Elizabeth.* p 113.
27 O'Sullivan, *Strafford Inquisition,* pp 4-5.
28 Bernadette Cunningham, 'Natives and newcomers in Mayo, 1560-1603', in R. Gillespie and G. Moran (eds). *A Various Country: essays in Mayo History, 1500-1900,* Westport, 1987, pp 24-43; Bernadette Cunningham, 'From warlords to landlords: political and social change in Galway, 1540-1640', in Gerard Moran (ed), *Galway: history and society,* Dublin, 1996, pp 97-129.
29 Royal Irish Academy, MS A.v.2, f. 27.
30 Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report,* VIII, Appendix 2 (1881), p. 30.
31 G.E.C. *The Complete Peerage,* (London, 1910-59), IV, p.363.

[An expanded version of this paper was read to the annual conference of the *Group for the Study of Irish Historic Settlement* in Westport, Co. Mayo on 11th May, 1996]

<div align="center">
****
</div>

FROM CROMWELL TO WILLIAM: LAND SETTLEMENT IN SOUTH MAYO 1649 - 1702

Cromwell had come to Ireland in 1649, and, in a veritable blitzkrieg, his avenging forces had completed the subjugation of Ireland with the capture of some isolated strongholds in the summer of 1653. Mayo, because of its remoteness, inaccessibility and relative poverty, was not directly involved in hostilities, apart from the surrender of Inishbofin which at that time was part of the county of Mayo, in February 1653. The county did, however, suffer from depredations committed against its castles and monasteries, while the few Protestant settlers were attacked by bands of rebels seeking revenge against those newcomers who were occupying their lands. The most serious of these attacks on Protestants was the massacre at Shrule in February 1652.

What then was the position of the county in August 1652 when the Act for the Settling of Ireland declared in its preamble that *'it is not the intention of the Parliament to extirpate that whole nation'?* [1] Unfortunately, plague and starvation had effectively helped to extirpate about half a million Irish people between 1641 and 1651. Mayo waited with bated breath for the fate about to be meted out to them by the Parliamentarians.

Before the Rising, Mayo had been largely in the hands of the local chieftains, Irish and Hibernicised English, as we can see from Strafford's Inquisition and the relevant columns of the Mayo Book of Survey and Distribution. [2] However, it was an uneasy situation. The Irish system had been one of land occupation rather than land ownership, which was the basis of the new system. Doubts had been cast on the rights of the present occupiers to ownership of the land, and large sums of money had been extorted from them on empty promises of confirming their titles. However, as Breandán Ó Bric has pointed out, 'it was the smaller lords and petty chieftains who suffered most, as they had been uncompensated for the abolition of their customary privileges', and therefore 'became easy victims of the aggrandisement of the great lords and the opportunism of adventures.' [3] In a desperate attempt to pay their debts, they mortgaged and sold their lands to New English, such as John Browne of the Neale, Old English, such as Lord Mayo, officials, such as John Bingham, and the ever-alert merchants of Galway who had clever lawyers and that

scarcest of commodities, ready cash, at their disposal. The result was that in all but three Mayo baronies, more than one third of the owners had some of their lands mortgaged.

Strafford's Inquisition reflects an extraordinary complexity of land-holdings as they existed in 1635, and there is not much evidence that these had altered much by 1651. There was a multiplicity of claims upon small portions of land, and even parts of castles. Gradually, however, mortgages became sales, and the smaller landholders dropped down the social ladder to become tenants on their own lands. The wealthier Galway tribes, Lynches, Frenches, Brownes, Kirwans and Blakes, began to exploit their new property and some even took up residence in Co. Mayo.

The barony of Kilmaine, being the closest to County Galway, was the first to attract the attentions of the Galway merchants, and they owned over ten thousand acres there. [4] Among the newcomers in Kilmaine at the end of the sixteenth century was John Browne of the Neale, the Sheriff of Mayo, whose descendants were later to be prominent landowners in Kilmaine, Breaffy, and, above all, in Westport. However, this John Browne was an Englishman, and not a tribesman. In addition to Kilmaine, the Galwaymen were also especially active in Clanmorris, Tirawley and Carra. These four baronies accounted for 76% of all the monies recorded in the Strafford Inquisition, and 92% of all monies expended by the Galway townsmen. About seventy townsmen spent almost £20,000 in County Mayo. Four Blakes, two Lynches, two D'Arcys, three Frenches and one Martin were the thirteen most important. By 1641, the townsmen owned about 86,000 acres in Mayo, which represents an area about half the size of County Louth.[5]

In the baronies of Burrishoole and Murrisk, the townsmen are not so prominent, owning only 389 acres in Burrishoole and 286 acres in Murrisk. Sir Richard Blake and Dominick French are among the landowners in Burrishoole, while the same Sir Richard Blake, Edmund Joyce and Stephen Lynch are among the landowners in Murrisk. Sir Richard Blake was the ancestor of the Towerhill and Ballinafad families, and was the largest individual owner of Mayo land among the Galwaymen, with almost 5,000 profitable acres as well as almost 6,000 unprofitable acres spread over six baronies. Between them the Galway merchants owned about half of the profitable land in Mayo at this time. [6]

Other Old English landowners in Burrishoole were the Duke of Ormond, who owned nearly all Achill, and the earl of Claricarde, who owned Inishbofin, which was then in the barony of Murrisk, as well as Clare Island. The palesman, Sir Theobald Dillon, had got possession by rather dubious means of most of the barony of Costello. The civil servant, John Moore, was in possession of MacMorris, originally Prendergast, land at Brees in the barony of Clanmorris. A prominent landowner in Clanmorris and Carra was Patrick D'Arcy, the famous Galway lawyer, [7] while the descendants of the New English Sheriff of Mayo, John Browne of the Neale, had become significant owners of land in Carra, Burrishoole and Murrisk. We have here a patchwork of landoccupiers representing all strands of society at the time - Old Irish, Old English, New English, Galway merchants and lawyers, civil servants and officials, northern gallowglass families and some few Protestant settlers.

What is notable about this patchwork is that no single landowner emerges with the authority of a Clanricarde in Galway. The Viscounts Mayo amassed large estates, and kept their heads above water in difficult times, but they displayed a vacillating tendency in both religion and politics which left them open to official retribution. The massacre at Shrule gave the Cromwellians the opportunity they wanted, and the execution of the third viscount left a minor in the person of Theobald, the fourth viscount, to fight for the restoration of his lands.

The future of Irish land had already been discussed by the Parliamentarians in 1642, so that the war in Ireland was clearly understood in England to be for the possession of the lands of Ireland, and those lands were to be used to punish the rebels and reward the Cromewellian soldiers, and the adventurers who had invested in the war. As Peter Beresford Ellis put it, *The war became a gigantic capitalist speculation with Ireland as the prize'*. [8]

In August 1652 the fate of Connacht was sealed with the Act for the Settling of Ireland. Under the terms of this settlement the poor with not more than £10 in goods were left on their land. About two hundred who fought against the Parliamentarians were executed, and others were banished and had their lands confiscated. Many had died in the war and, of those who survived, about 35,000 had left Ireland to fight in the armies of Continental Europe. Priests were banished and sent with large numbers of others to work as labourers on the sugar plantations of the West Indies or as servants to the owners thereof. Nine counties were confiscated to meet the claims of the soldiers and adventurers, but when this amount of land was not sufficient to meet the claims on it, the idea of transplantation was adopted by an Act of Satisfaction in September 1653. By this act the Catholic upper classes were to transport themselves beyond the Shannon, and were given estates in Clare and Connacht to compensate for their loss.

This operation had been completed by 1655, in so far as such a complicated procedure could ever be said to be completed. Petty estimated that the Irish share of the profitable land had fallen from more than two-thirds in 1641 to less than one-third in 1672. Dr. Simms informs us that the Catholic ownership of land had fallen from 59% in 1641 to 22% in 1688. [9] The Catholic ownership in 1653 was probably somewhere in between, because the full effects of confiscation, restoration and transplantation would not have been felt for some time.

There now began an extraordinary scramble for Irish land which, for Mayo at least, would not be finalised until the Act of Resumption was passed in 1700. And this time Mayo was certainly not to escape as the greater part of Connacht and Clare in general, and County Mayo in particular, was to be reserved for the Irish. The mass of the people remained where they were, but the Catholic landowners became involved in a bitter struggle to hold on to the one commodity which gave them status and power - the land.

As has been said already, about 35,000 Irish soldiers left Ireland at the end of the war. Of those who remained, all those who had joined the rebellion before 10 November 1642, being the date of the meeting of the Confederate Assembly, were exempted from pardon. Of those who joined the Confederate armies after that date, any officers of the rank of colonel or over were to be banished and their estates confiscated. But their wives and children were to receive lands equal in value to one-third of their former estates. Those officers of lesser rank were also to receive lands equal in value to one-third of their former estates. These terms also applied to those members of the armed forces which had secured special terms of surrender. Catholics were to lose one-third of their estates and receive land elsewhere to the value of two-thirds of their estates, unless they could prove *Constant Good Affection* to the Commonwealth. The remainder had to remove to Connacht and Clare before 1 May, 1654.

This is only a broad outline of a scheme for transplantation to Connacht and Clare which was announced in September 1953. All those who claimed land had to have their claims heard first at Loughrea and subsequently at Athlone. Lists

then had to be made of the transplanters, together with their families, servants, tenants and livestock. It soon became obvious that these and the other necessary formalities could not be completed before the stipulated time and extensions had to be granted. The transplantation was in fact never fully accomplished. Butler estimates that there were 1,073 landlords and nearly 27,000 others from Munster and Leinster named on the Connaught Certificates. Lists of transplanted persons among the Ormond Manuscripts give a total of nearly 2,000 names who were to receive over one million English acres. [10] It is impossible to know for certain how many did in fact transplant, but it is certain that the Cromwellian settlement was the most drastic of the three seventeenth century settlements. By it nearly all Catholic landlords were cleared from east of the Shannon, but the mass of the inhabitants in those parts of the country were unaffected by it.

About 1,620,000 acres of Connacht land were confiscated and, of this amount, 1,100,000 were allotted to Catholics and 460,00 to new Cromwellian settlers. Two prominent families who came to Mayo at this time were the O'Donnells of Newport, who came from Donegal, and the Fitzgeralds of Turlough, Castlebar, whose ancestor was John Fitzgerald of Gurtines, Co. Kilkenny. [11]

Of course our friends, the Galway merchants, were among the first to get into the ring with their sharp minds and fat purses. They were surprisingly successful in their claims. The Lynches of Castle Carra and Partry, had 21,469 acres in Counties Galway, Mayo, Sligo and Clare in 1641, and received no less than 20,438 transplantation acres. Sir Richard Blake of the Ballinafad and Tower Hill families, who owned over 25,917 acres in Galway, Mayo and Clare in 1641, was restored to over 90% of those acres. The Galway and Athenry Brownes did even better, for they had owned 9,175 acres in the same three counties in 1641 and were awarded 11,980 acres in transplantation. Sir Dominick Browne of the Castlemagarrett family succeeded in getting more land in transplantation than he had in 1641. But the French family did better than anyone, increasing their holding of 12,739 acres to 20,777 in transplantation. [12] It should be remembered, however, that Galway Catholic merchants had been removed from the town by the Cromwellians and replaced by reliable Protestants, so that their success in acquiring transplantation acres has to be set against their commercial losses.

The Galway merchants appear to have been the most successful of the transplanters, if not of the settlers as a whole, in Co. Mayo. They bought even more land in Co. Mayo between the Cromwellian Settlement and the reign of William III. Some of this was confiscated land and more was bought from transplanters from other parts of Ireland or from Cromwellian settlers. Many of them survived into this century, still professing their Catholic faith, although the majority converted to the Established Church when it seemed the only way to hold on to what they had. Their success may in part be attributed to their familiarity with Irish conditions, and, in part, to their moderation. Their property was never large enough to attract the greed of their rivals, while their attachment to their religion was in time to prove less important to them than their attachment to their property.

One result of the Cromwellian Settlement was the disappearance of the native Irish proprietors as landowners. But the reality was that these proprietors continued to occupy their former lands as tenants or middlemen. Sir Owen O'Malley has shown how the original O'Malley clan territory in Murrisk remained largely in the hands of the Belclare O'Malleys throughout the seventeenth century. Captain Thomas O'Malley of Belclare fought with Owen Roe O'Neill, while in the Jacobite War, Captain Tadhg O'Malley was in Colonel John Browne's regiment. Meanwhile, Captain Owen O'Malley of Burrishoole became aide-de-camp to Balldearg

O'Donnell, who retired to Spain before the Treaty of Limerick, whereupon Captain Owen entered William's service. After the Treaty we find Tadhg O'Malley still occupying a large part of his ancestral lands but he holds them as a tenant of John Bingham, who held it from the See of Tuam. Captain Owen O'Malley, at the same period, is leasing land from the Brownes which originally had been part of the patrimony of the Cahernamart branch of the O'Malleys. Judicious marriages had always been important to the survival of leading families, and Owen O'Malley had made a good match when he married a daughter of George Browne of the Neale. Through other alliances with Garveys, Bourkes and Brownes, the O'Malleys were still holding land, if not actually owning land, in the eighteenth century. [13]

In the remainder of the Barony of Burrishoole the O'Malleys were not so successful. The Ormond Butlers claimed the area as theirs of right, calling themselves lords of Achill and Umhall. However, they disappeared from the area in the thirteenth century, only to reappear after the Composition of Connacht in 1585. They were replaced first by the O'Malleys, and then by the De Burgos. The Bourkes had largely supplanted the O'Malleys there during the declining years of Gráinne Ní Mháille, who had married Riocard an Iarainn Bourke. Their son was Tibóid na Long, the first Viscount Mayo, who is recorded as Lord of Achill and Corraun. Tibóid acquired large estates which he claimed by right of inheritance. The family became one of the most important in Mayo and owned vast tracts of land which were confiscated by the Cromwellians when the Third Viscount was executed in 1652. After much delay and much expense the Fourth Viscount was finally restored to 50,000 acres in 1666. However, as the biographer of the first viscount, Anne Chambers, has written, 'the restoration was worth more on paper than in practice'. [14] For Theobald it had all happened too late. When he returned to Mayo, he found his lands occupied by transplanters who had to be compensated, and to do this he had to borrow money and mortgage, lease or sell most of his property. In this way his sister's husband, John Browne of Westport, acquired a great deal of property, and laid the basis of the family fortunes.

To continue the story of the Barony of Burrishoole, the Lords Baltinglass, Ikerrin and Mayo, were given lands in the Barony in exchange for confiscated lands elsewhere. Ormond now sought to re-establish his claim to the barony. His agent there was John Browne, grandson of Sir John Browne of the Neale. Sir John Brown's great-grandson, Colonel John Browne of Westport, bought the Ikerrin and Lord Mayo estates in Tiranair. This section of his property was sold to the Knoxes and Gores, when his property was confiscated after the Treaty of Limerick and he fell into debt. Between 1698 and 1708, 114,323 Irish acres in Mayo and 41,127 acres in Galway, of Browne property, were sold by the Trustees, but the colonel retained a small portion of his property in the barony. [15]

The Butlers retained their property in Burrishoole until 1696, when the Earl of Arran, Ormond's grandson, sold to Thomas Medlicote. Sir Henry Bingham had rented some of the property, but he was evicted for non-payment of rent in favour of Mr. Pratt, who in turn was ejected for the same reason. Part of the property was sold in 1774 to John Browne, earl of Altamont and grandson of the colonel, but for some reason the property fell back to Medlicote, who sold to Sir Neal O'Donel of Newport in 1785. Sir Samuel O'Malley, of the Cathernamart O'Malleys, came into possession of a large estate worth £3,000 a year at the close of the eighteenth century, and this estate also included Clare Island.

The Restoration of Charles II brought new hope to the Irish after two decades of turmoil. They hoped for some reward for their loyalty to his father, and were assured that the new king would remember them when he came into his own. But Charles could not favour one section of his subjects at the

expense of others, even if those others had beheaded his father. He made promises to both sides, but as Ormond remarked: 'there must be new discoveries made of a new Ireland, for the old will not serve to satisfy these engagements'. [16]

As part of the Restoration settlement, an Act of Settlement was passed in 1662, but it was to please no one. Sir Robert Southwell declared that, like Saint Sebastian, it was stuck full of arrows. [17] It was followed in quick succession by a Court of Claims in 1663 and an Act of Explanation in 1665. The final result was that those declared *Innocent* by the Court of Claims, and a number of specifically named royalists were to get back their lands, with those Cromwellians in occupation getting other lands of equal value elsewhere. There was not enough land to go around, so the Act of Explanation decreed that most of the Cromwellians should give up one-third of their lands so that some Catholics could be restored. About five hundred Catholics were eventually declared *Innocent*, but many claims were never heard, and, as Dean Swift said, the regicides 'obtained grants of those very estates the Catholics *lost in defence of the ancient constitution, and thus they gained by their rebellion what the Catholics lost by their loyalty.'* [18] The Catholics were to be struck by the injustice of these proceedings and voted to overthrow the Act of Settlement when the opportunity arose at the Patriot Parliament in 1689.

It is noticeable that the Old English were more likely to be restored than the Old Irish. Their English blood still set them apart from their fellow Catholics of the older race. They were more attached to their monarch than the native Irish, and were less likely to enter into rebellion because they had more to lose. So, in South Mayo we find the Old English Viscount Mayo being restored, and Garrett Moore, son of John Moore, the civil servant, while the O'Malleys of Belclare did not even feel it was worth their while making a claim. Colonel John Browne, who married Maud Bourke in 1669, was a minor during the war, so he was left undisturbed in his estates.

Although the Catholics did not receive what they had hoped for, the reign of Charles II was a peaceful one for Ireland and, on the whole, it was a period of religious toleration. With economic expansion the population grew to near two million. The Galway merchants continued to buy land and, as we have seen, John Browne was amassing an estate. He was an astute man, a lawyer and an owner of ironworks.

Hopes were raised still higher by the accession of James II, brother of Charles, in 1685. James was a declared Catholic, but he frankly preferred, if at all possible, to appease his English enemies rather than promote the welfare of his Irish subjects. He was no diplomat, but even he could see that to upset the *Cromwellian Settlement*, and the *New Interest* men who had profited by it, would unduly provoke his Protestant subjects. However, he was caught in a tide of events which were to sweep him to his undoing.

Richard Talbot, the Catholic viceroy, was busy undoing the Protestant establishment in Ireland, while James was struggling against the power and prejudices of Protestant England. Finally, England revolted and called in William of Orange, nephew and son-in-law of James. In this crisis James fled to France, where his first cousin Louis XIV received him and his family with great compassion and hospitality.

And so began the Jacobite War of 1689-91 which was to cause further changes in the land ownership of County Mayo. It was a movement of all Ireland united behind the Catholic James II. The few exceptions were the bastions of Protestantism, such as Derry and Enniskillen in Ulster, and some Protestant magnates, such as Ormond and Inchiquin in the south. The army was Irish and Old English, but was led mainly by Old English superior officers. It was the last desperate attempt of

these Catholic leaders to secure the possession of their lands or to recover the lands which they had lost.

Once more the Irish had put their trust in a Stuart king and once more they were to be disappointed. The war was fought ostensibly for king and religion but, in reality, it was being fought for the land of Ireland. Once more the war finished with Irish soldiers going overseas to join Continental armies, while those at home remained to face the music. The Treaty of Limerick was held by the Williamites to be far too favourable to the defeated Irish. There was to be a certain amount of toleration for Catholics, and only those who died in the war or had gone overseas were to lose their property. All those who had lived in Limerick or other garrisons which had resisted to the end, or who had lived under the protection of the Irish in the last stages of the war, were to retain their property. In fact, this last provision was the famous missing clause, and was not ratified by the Protestant Irish Parliament.

In the event, the *Williamite Settlement* was not nearly as drastic as the *Cromwellian Settlement*, which had involved considerable movements of people, and the virtual extinction of the old proprietors as large owners of land. The *Restoration Settlement* was mainly to restore some Catholic landowners to some part of their ancient patrimony. It also, in the main, confirmed the Cromwellians in their grants of land. By 1688 the Catholic share of the land of Ireland was reduced to 22%, from their share of 59% in 1641. However, in 1691, about half the land beyond the Shannon was in Catholic hands. [19]

The majority of Jacobites in both England and Ireland were either outlawed or attainted, but this was beginning to happen in 1689, well before the Treaty of Limerick in 1691. There were 2,603 indicted for high treason in Ireland, but no names from Connacht and Clare featured on the list. [20] During the period 1697-9 there was renewed activity to prosecute Connacht landowners who had been neither indicted nor protected by the Articles of Limerick and Galway, but these activities were not successful. These men were saved by the fact that they were not in Williamite quarters during the war, and because the charge of treason was effectively restricted to the war years and Mayo had been only indirectly involved.

In 1696 there had been proceedings against those convicted of foreign treason and a list was drawn up of 1,261 names. About one-third of these names were of residents of Connacht and Clare, but most had no estates to lose. Exceptions were Henry O'Neill and Walter Bourke. [21] Henry O'Neill had been a major in Colonel Gordon O'Neill's infantry regiment, while Walter Bourke was colonel of an infantry regiment. This regiment was in command of the old castle of Aughrim, where the left wing of the Jacobite army fought at the battle of 12/22 July 1691. Unfortunately he was issued with bullets of the wrong calibre, and the Williamite cavalry was thereby able to pass by the castle and take the Irish in flank. This mishap, combined with Saint-Ruth's death, and the wounding of his second in command, swung the battle in favour of the Williamites. Walter Bourke, who was of the Turlough family, had a distinguished career in the French service and died a Field Marshal of France in 1715. Patrick, Hugh and Darby O'Malley of County Mayo were attained, and we hear no more of them.

William was personally in favour of a liberal interpretation of the Treaty as he did not want to be represented abroad as someone who did not keep faith with Catholics. Accordingly, only sixteen out of 1,283 claims made to benefit from the Articles of Galway and Limerick were disallowed. Twelve peers were restored. A further sixty persons were restored in 1692, and 483 persons from 1692 to 1694. Again, 783 claims were successful from 1697 to 1699. Still more received royal pardons. Included in these was a pardon on behalf of Henry Dillon, son of Theobald, the Seventh Viscount Dillon, who had

been killed at Aughrim. [22]

Such was the extent of the royal pardons that in 1697 the Irish Parliament passed an act 'to hinder the reversal of several outlawries and attainders'. However, this did not altogether put a stop to the pardons, and George Browne and his son John were pardoned the next year. At this stage, the English Parliament decided it was time to take action against the King's rather cavalier attitude towards the distribution of Irish land. In 1699 the Parliament appointed a *Commission of Inquiry* into the disposal of forfeited estates. The report of this commission was adopted, but not without much opposition, by the English Parliament. Accordingly, a *Resumption Bill* was passed in 1700, which was to appoint trustees to hear the claims of those whose interest in forfeited land was prior to 13 February, 1689. These claims had to be heard before March, 1701, by which time more than one half of them was allowed. The remaining forfeited estates, which had been resumed by the trustees, comprised 568,000 profitable acres, and were sold from 1702-3, bringing the Catholic share of Irish land down from 22% in 1688 to 14% in 1703. [23] William died in 1702, but, by then, the long struggle for the land was over for another two hundred years.

SHEILA MULLOY
WESTPORT HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Notes:
1. As quoted by Peter Beresford Ellis, *Hell or Connaught! The Cromwellian Colonisation of Ireland 1652-1660* (London, 1975), p 50.
2. *The Strafford Inquisition of County Mayo*, (Ed.) William O'Sullivan (Dublin, 1958); *Books of Survey and Distribution*, Vol. 11, County of Mayo, (Ed.) Robert C. Simington (Dublin, 1956).
3. 'Galway townsmen as the owners of land in Connacht 1585-1641 (Unpublished MA Thesis, UCG, 1974), p 125.
4. Ibid., p 262.
5. Ibid., pp 241, 252.
6. Ibid., pp 253, 258, 267, 269.
7. Ibid., pp 276, 293, 300.
8. *Hell or Connaught!*, p 12.
9. Sir William Petty, *The Political Anatomy of Ireland* (Irish University Press, 1970), p 3; J.G. Simms, *The Williamite Confiscation in Ireland 1690-1703* (London, n.d.), p 195.
10. William F.T. Butler, *Confiscation in Irish History* (New York/London, 1917), pp 148-9, 153.
11. Ibid., pp 150, 152; *Burke's Irish Family Records* (London, 1976), pp 420-1.
12. 'Galway townsmen', pp 635, 641, 645, 657, 670.
13. "O.'Malleys between 1651 and 1725', *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society*, vol. xxx, Nos. 1 and 2 (1952), pp 32-46.
14. *Chieftain to Knight, Tibbott-ne-Long Bourke*, 1567-1629 (Dublin, 1983), p 163.
15. The Marquess of Sligo, *Westport House and The Brownes* (Moorland Publishing Co., 1981), p 13.
16. J.G. Simms, 'The Restoration and the Jacobite War (1660-91), in T.W. Moody and F.X. Martin (eds.), *The Course of Irish History* (Cork, 1967), p 204.
17. J.G. Simms, *Williamite Confiscation*, p 19.
18. J.G. Simms, 'Restoration and Jacobite War', pp 205-6.
19. J.G. Simms, *Williamite Confiscation*, p 195.
20. Ibid., p 33.
21. Ibid., p 41.
22. Ibid., pp 45-7, 77.
23. Ibid., pp 79, 81, 154, 195.

[An expanded version of this paper was read to the annual conference of the *Group for the Study of Irish Historic Settlement* in Westport, Co. Mayo on 11th May, 1996]

****

REVIEW ARTICLES

CAROLINE TOAL, *North Kerry Archaeological Survey*, Pp. 335 Dingle: Brandon. IR £14.95 pbk, ISBN 0-86322-186-6
ANN O'SULLIVAN and JOHN SHEEHAN, *The Iveragh Peninsula:* an archaeological survey of south Kerry. Pp 461, Cork: Cork University Press 1996, IR£25.00   0-902561-84-7

I vividly remember being annoyed at a review many years ago. It was of the *Archaeological Survey of the Barony of Ikerrin* (Co. Tipperary) in which, in my opinion, the reviewer had immersed himself in the minutiae of the publication and missed its most significant feature: that an archaeological survey had been completed under the guise of an AnCO (now FÁS) Community Youth Training Scheme, and that this was the first of it's kind to be undertaken in the country. That was 1984. Now in 1996 FÁS has become synonymous with heritage and archaeological surveys and has been a driving force in the whole area of heritage conservation throughout the nation. In County Kerry, their long term commitment to local community projects has in the last year resulted in the publication of two major archaeological surveys of the Iveragh Peninsula and North Kerry. The unprecedented length of the acknowledgements alone in both published surveys highlights widespread community involvement and the profound impact these surveys have had on both local communities. It also underlines the strong core of better informed youth this type of training is leaving behind.

The archaeological survey of the Iveragh peninsula (including its islands) is a weighty synthesis of the evidence for c. 6,000 years of settlement in the 'Ring of Kerry'. On the basis of a detailed field survey the authors have been able to reconstruct how the Southwest was won. In this, the largest most mountainous peninsula in Ireland, co-authors Anne O'Sullivan and John Sheehan offer almost two thousand archaeological sites for our perusal, arranged under 22 different headings covering everything from prehistoric shell midden sites at Beginish to Seventeenth-century artillery forts on Valencia Island. This was a mammoth task which has been completed to a high professional standard. Each one of the sections is accompanied by a concise discussion which combines site analysis and serves as a useful up-date on the more recent excavations on the peninsula, including Frank Mitchell's ongoing work on settlement in Valencia Island. Over sixteen percent of the sites are illustrated with scaled drawings of a very high standard: certainly the illustrations of the rock art of the region are superb works of art in themselves. The drawings are further supplemented by excellent black and white photography. The colour plates are less successfully reproduced. Individual site reports are well written, but the precise grid references and description of the sites location only partially make up for the lack of accompanying location maps. Placename evidence, provided by Breandán Ó Ciobhán, peoples these sites and evokes striking images of their locations, such as Drum na Coille, Cathair na Gaoithe, Dún Ciaráin, Lios Lonáin.

The North Kerry Archaeological Survey produced from a base in Listowel with the North Kerry Archaeological Committee and FÁS is another co-operative success story with over 75 local trainees working on the survey between 1986 and 1992. Their publication is similar in content to the previous, taking the Archaeological Survey of Dingle (Cuppage, 1986) as its principal model but is published in a more modest format: the first of the archaeological surveys not to be A4 in page size. The survey covers the baronies of Iraghticonnor and Clanmaurice which incorporate three geographical areas, Kerry Head, the Stack Mountains and a low level plain that

stretches from Ardfert to Listowel. Over 1,300 sites were identified by the team and described in this publication. Approximately ten percent of the sites are illustrated with scaled drawings and a selection of black and white photography. It is unfortunate that the scales were not standardised. This would have made it easier to make comparisons between the different sites. Again, Breandán Ó Ciobháin's placename evidence, accompanied by translations, has enriched the descriptions of archaeology of the area. There is a good variety of site types represented in North Kerry, but it is undoubtedly the ringforts, which again win the day with a staggering 717 sites. Indeed the impact on this landscape of a population explosion in the Early Christian period is highlighted by a point this survey makes, that over half of the placenames in North Kerry refer to features which existed in the Early Christian period countryside such as Cill, Rath, Lios, Dun, Cathair. In the county Kerry SMR, 78% of the monuments recorded were considered to date from the Early Christian period.

When the results of both surveys are compared, the differences in both regions archaeology becomes immediately apparent. The apparent absence of ogham stones in North Kerry contrasts with the figure of 47 recorded for Iveragh. There is also a dearth of coastal sites in North Kerry compared with the south-west. One of the more striking differences is the presence of numerous medieval moated sites in North Kerry and a total absence of this site type in the Iveragh peninsula. Their distribution pattern highlights a line of demarcation between the Anglo-Norman and the Gaelic worlds in the 13th and 14th centuries.

A particular of the most alarming facts disclosed in the North Kerry survey is that 41% of ringforts have been levelled. The figure is 23% in Iveragh, which is still frighteningly high. On a more positive note, in both surveys the investigation of wetlands and inter-tidal areas has resulted in the discovery of vast tracts of prehistoric field walls and associated hut sites.

One criticism I have is one which applies to almost all of the archaeological surveys published to date; namely, the illustration of only a selection of an area's archaeology. The criteria for the selection of a site for presentation is never explicitly stated, but I assume they are either the more outstanding sites or else monuments which were easily surveyed. It doesn't help to have only the more outstanding sites illustrated as this might give the wrong impression, both of an area's archaeology and, more importantly, to those who might use this selectivity to justify the legitimacy of destroying even the smallest part of our priceless archaeological heritage.

I congratulate all those involved in both of these impressive Kerry surveys and share the aspirations of Ned O'Sullivan, Chairman of the North Kerry Archaeological Committee, whose hopes are that these surveys 'will be read, not just by academics, but by the general public and especially young people, to whose care the protection of our heritage is entrusted'.

GERALDINE STOUT
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF IRELAND
HERITAGE SERVICES
DEPARTMENT OF ARTS,
CULTURE AND THE GAELTACHT

****

LINDSAY J. PROUDFOOT. *Urban Patronage and Social Authority: The Management of the Duke of Devonshire's Towns in Ireland 1764-1891.* Pp. 300. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press. 1995. £62.95 0-8132-0819-X

Suddenly Irish towns matter. No longer are they dismissed as an awkward bequest from a colonial past. Instead their importance in the politics, economy and society of the country is being better appreciated. Recent publications, such as the fascicules of the Historic Towns Atlas and the two collaborative volumes edited by John Andrews and Anngret Simms, which originated in Thomas Davis lectures, testify to the interest. Another sign of scholarly attentiveness is the 1994 pamphlet, issued under the auspices of the Group, by B.J. Graham and Lindsay Proudfoot on *Urban Improvement in Provincial Ireland.* In general, the more modest settlements have proved most amenable to thorough evaluation. For larger conurbations, such as Belfast, Cork, Derry, Drogheda, Limerick, Waterford and even Dublin, although each has provoked excellent investigations, the volume of documentation, together with its uneven spread over the centuries, have inhibited comprehensive histories.

Dr. Lindsay Proudfoot's meticulous examination of the five boroughs within the massive Cork and Burlington *(later Devonshire)* apanage in south Munster is impressive and important. Apart from the intrinsic interest of the places themselves - Bandon, Dungarvan, Lismore, Tallow and Youghal - his book amplifies many of the trenchant contentions in his earlier pamphlet. By blending exact and painstaking scholarship with methodological sophistication and interpretative subtlety, he has produced one of the most satisfying books on Irish history of recent years. The author commands not just the austere skills of the urban historian but also the different and equally arcane attributes needed to write agrarian and estate history. It is striking that the pioneers who have already ventured onto this terrain, notably W.W. Maguire, W.H. Crawford, Anthony Malcomson, Peter Roebuck and Raymond Gillespie, have concentrated on Ulster landlords. If, as Dr. Proudfoot contends in his sometimes polemical introduction and conclusion, the topic of Irish towns has too often been ignored as a revenant from 'a disregarded colonial past', as unappealing to current sensibilities as the Russians who established themselves on the latifundia of Poland and Finland, it is notable that Ulster is the most intensively studied province in Ireland. This imbalance may simply reflect the materials accessible and well-ordered in P.R.O.N.I.. In addition, it may speak of a greater willingness to engage with the historical phenomenon of landlordism in a region where it survives and may even be accepted as a legitimate form of economic organization rather than as a symptom of a colonial pathology. Other parts of Ireland have not been totally ignored. Munster itself has attracted such adepts as Jim Donnelly, David Dickson, Michael MacCarthy-Morrogh and Tom Power. Yet their studies have considered aggregated rather than individual estates.

At the outset, in order to assess the magnitude of Dr. Proudfoot's achievement, it is appropriate to consider the technical and logistical difficulties in reconstructing the history of these towns in Counties Cork and Waterford. The estate, having been accumulated by the first earl of Cork in the early seventeenth century, was inherited through marriage by the duke of Devonshire in 1755. It generated voluminous records. Yet, despite their volume, what survives is incomplete and is, moreover, divided arbitrarily rather than logically between Chatsworth and Dublin, with odd parcels left at Lismore or emerging now and again from the offices of London solicitors. Notwithstanding the advances in electronic wizardry, the simple reconstruction of the original archive is in itself a taxing task. Furthermore, as the author admits, the

towns, although they had their special characteristics and problems, cannot be divorced from their rural surroundings. Moreover, the Irish estate, while large and valuable enough to place the Devonshires among the sixteen leading landowners in Ireland, contributed only 30 per cent of the family's total income. Throughout much of the seventeenth century, the holdings were overseen attentively, even obsessively, by normally resident owners. Thereafter the estate fell prey to the problems and opportunities created by absenteeism. Its proprietors alternated between disengagement, ignorant of the physical and human topography of the property, and erratic interventions. The Irish rentals mattered chiefly as a way to subsidize English operations. In this spirit, parts of the Irish assets would be cashed in. The habit had begun in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries when financial embarrassments first obtruded. Between 1859 and 1862, Dungarvan and Youghal were sold; Bandon would follow within thirty years. Yet, as Dr. Proudfoot frequently reminds, the Devonshires did not view the Irish estate simply in economic terms. They took their duties seriously, worried about upholding their ' legitimate interests' in the region, and invoked 'vision' and 'tradition' when planing what might be done. Such concepts, at once loose and elastic, sometimes dressed self-interest in more becoming garb. Nevertheless, it is one of Dr. Proudfoot's outstanding achievements to re-enter the minds of aristocratic proprietors. The precise actuarial calculations beloved of their more scrupulous agents and auditors (and of later economic historians) were not always uppermost in the thoughts of the owners.

Especially in the opening and concluding sections, Dr. Proudfoot displays a mastery of recent writing on British as well as Irish social and economic history. As a result he constantly sets his apparently parochial findings in a larger and comparative context. By English standards, level of investment on improvement were low in Ireland; but less so when set beside Spanish or French practice. English landowners were unusual in possessing and developing substantial tracts of town property. Occasionally, the apparent oddities in the Irish scene suggest that Scotland and Wales, rather than England, would furnish more revealing contrasts. Even more interesting might be an extended comparison between the management and performance of the Devonshires' trans-national enterprise and of continental domains, such as those of the Esterhazys, Mondéjars, Béjars, Osunas and Saulx-Tavannes, which have recently been studied. However, the essential and most demanding first steps have been taken: analysing how the Irish estate was organized and functioned; how if fitted into the Devonshires' other undertakings and how it differed from similar operations elsewhere in Ireland. On the basis of Dr. Proudfoot's findings, others may conclude that direct comparisons between Irish and English experience, though easiest, do not necessarily provide the greatest illumination. His detailed analysis may in time also correct another bizarre misapprehension about Irish landed society before 1922. A recent helpful synthesis of work on the European aristocracy between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, edited by H.M. Scott, has nothing to say about either les grands or the hobereaux of Ireland. This is in keeping with the prevalent view of Ascendancy Ireland as an unusually open and meritocratic society, notwithstanding that it possessed a parliamentary peerage modelled after and with much the same (attenuated) powers as its British counterparts.

The Devonshires, like their predecessors as proprietors, the Boyles, earls of Cork and Burlington, were assuredly among les grands of Protestant Ireland. Fortunately, Dr. Proudfoot is not so bedazzled by their magnificence that he exaggerates what human agency (even when ducal) could accomplish. He gives weight to the temperamental quirks of successive dukes and agents; but he also appreciates the underlying structural shifts, many of them inimical to seigneurial influence. Growing population, Catholic emancipation and political mobilization all undermined proprietorial authority. Nevertheless, a strong thread in Dr. Proudfoot's interpretation is how the duke and his representatives reasserted his electoral interest in the boroughs in the early nineteenth century. This followed a long phase during which the Devonshires had abdicated to those on the spot, like the Conners and Bernards in Bandon and the Shannons and Ponsonbys elsewhere. If much of this changed priority can be attributed to the succession of a new duke, it also reflected the enhanced value of parliamentary boroughs once the Act of Union had reduced their total from 117 to 33.

In order to concentrate on the urban element in a territory that was predominantly rural, Dr. Proudfoot may seem to dismember an integrated system. In fact, of course, he, like the Devonshires' agents before him, understands very well how much the fortunes of the five boroughs depended on the prosperity of their hinterlands and their ability to market the produce from, and service the inhabitants of, the surrounding countryside. Even so, interesting puzzles remain. What is not altogether clear is the degree to which the towns were peopled by traders and tenants whose interests were bounded by the borough limits or, alternatively, by those whose interests reached deep into the rural world. Almost in passing, the author throws out some suggestive ideas about the nineteenth-century campaigns of physical improvement. Not only the scale but also the style of public architecture which the dukes sponsored carried ideological charges. As markets and fairs competed for custom, Ivory's short-lived bridge over the Blackwater, the spacious Devonshire square in Dungarvan and the symmetrical market houses advertised the improved facilities of the towns. Dr. Proudfoot is generally sanguine about the success of Youghal and Bandon in retaining customers. He attributes much to modernized buildings and more diversified goods and services. Accordingly it would be illuminating to know whether the lengthening list of attorneys, schoolmasters, printers, stationers, surveyors, apothecaries, scriveners, masons, cabinet-makers and dancing masters owed anything to the inducements proffered by a ducal landlord.

Because Dr. Proudfoot is sensitive to what cannot always be quantified precisely, he proposes another theme which others may soon take up. Insofar as these settlements were conceived and came to function as havens of civility and urbanity, the relationship between the values of the landed and the townspeople awaits careful exploration. Urban culture in Ireland is often seen as deriving from the nearby rural grandees. In part, this may be explained by the better survival of the testimonies of landowners than of merchants and craft-workers. Then, too, torpid and deferential eighteen-century boroughs are still contrasted, implicitly or explicitly, with the vibrant and assertive culture of the politicized Catholic townsfolk of the 1820s. So a notion of the typical Protestant burgess as passive receptor of the elite's polite manners persists. In these five towns, because their absent owners had effectively disengaged themselves throughout the eighteenth century, others moved in. The best known, the Shannons, Bernards, Ponsonbys, Grandisons and Osbornes, were all substantial landowners in their own right. Thus it looked as if rural notables continued to set the tone, not just in politics but in behaviour and fashions. Yet others beside these squires participated regularly in the routines of the towns. Important in this respect, as in many others, as mediators between discrete and potentially opposed spheres, were the agents, brought vividly to life by Dr. Proudfoot. Well-documented, they were merely one among several groups of professionals and 'pseudo-gentry' who colonized the vital institutions of Protestant Ireland. Until we have a clearer idea of who manned the magistracy, the corporations, parish vestries, the boards of turnpikes and who ran the charter schools and hospitals, we may be in danger of belittling the autonomy of the towns. In addition, many centres of polished recreation, such as masonic lodges, assembly rooms and the Hanover

Club in Youghal, were town inns and special urban buildings rather than country mansions. Towns had been intended as bastions from which fitting values and behaviour would be spread throughout Ireland. By the late eighteenth century we cannot be confident that they merely reflected rather than initiated cultural innovations.

Dr. Proudfoot's account quantifies, analyses, maps and tabulates a formidable body of material. As a result it will be quarried by others. Its arguments, at times provocative and didactic, may well occasion debate. But the book is uncommonly satisfying because it moves beyond the purely quantifiable to the apparently irrational. Thus, he allows how reputation, honour and interest may have motivated successive owners. The volume, extremely expensive in Ireland and the United Kingdom, is handsomely produced.

Indeed, the excellent typography and figures admirably match the author's own spare and lucid style. A couple of misprints - Sir Richard Cox becomes, appositely, Fox, and the Wandesfords of Castlecomer are transmuted into the Pooterish Wandesworths - look inspired. Blemishes of this kind are few and do not detract from Dr. Proudfoot's remarkable achievement. All in all, then, the appearance of his study is an occasion for celebration.

<div align="right">T. C. BARNARD,
HERTFORD COLLEGE,
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.</div>

<div align="center">********************</div>

THOMAS BARTLETT AND KEITH JEFFERY (Eds.),
A Military History of Ireland. Pp. 565 (115 illustrations, 8 maps, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, £40.00. 0521-41599-3

This attractive volume consists of an impressive chronological series of chapters on organised Irish military activity over the past thousand years. Each of the 19 chapters is written by a leading scholar, expert on different periods of Irish military history. The volume is pioneering in many respects, is highly documented and presents military history as part of a broader social history of Ireland. The editors, in their preface, acknowledge the long-standing contribution of *The Irish Sword* to the study of Irish military history, but the present volume, much more than any journal article, allows the contributors to paint a broad historical canvas of military might, evolution of warfare, small wars and resistance by Irish governmental and popular forces in and outside of Ireland and collective and individual military initiatives abroad.

Each of the chapters addresses a single period of Irish military history. The chapters are well written, are highly informative, and generally present principles of military history, but also chronicle historical events. The volume is well illustrated, has many maps and an excellent index and bibliography. Although there is some inevitable overlap between chapters, this also helps to connect each. This review cannot specifically address the many merits and few weaknesses of each chapter but, instead, reviews some salient points of each.

Thomas Bartlett and Keith Jeffery (chapter 1) open the volume by addressing the question of the extent to which there is an Irish military tradition dating back from Celtic times to modern history. Rightly, they emphasize that Irish military history is much more than campaigns, battles, victories and defeats. Military tradition was often held within certain families over many generations, with its members serving in Ireland, Britain, and abroad. The 1916 rising and its aftermath redefined Irish military tradition, eventually leading

to the establishment of the national army under the republic. After this introduction, T. M. Charles-Edwards *(chapter 2)* reviews Irish warfare before 1100 in a political-military context. Although there was little warfare during the period, there was frequent conflict between different septs. Internal borders, for example between Ui Neill and Munster, experienced repeated flashes, while Vikings intruded both on the coast and in many locations inland. Marie Therese Flanagan *(chapter 3)* picks up the thread by examining Irish and Anglo-Norman warfare in the twelfth century. Whereas cattle raids continued, the period saw a few battles and the capturing of towns. The Anglo-Norman invasion drastically changed relationships of power between Irish chiefs. In the process, the role of mounted soldiers increased, but the foot soldiers continued to be crucial. Soldiers were raised by cantred; the geographic origin of troops was a feature that persisted over many centuries. It is little recognized that Irish forces served in most early Anglo-Norman field armies. This ability of Irish soldiers to serve under different masters also applied to Irish soldiers in later centuries.

Robin Frame (chapter 4) addresses the defence of the English (Anglo-Norman) Lordship in the period from 1250 to 1450. This is a period characterized by the linkage of landownership and knight service *(425 knights being known in Ireland),* together with a general obligation for adult males to serve in hostings. External threat continued, as during the invasion by Robert Bruce from Scotland. The period also saw a large scale building of castles *(even until the 14th century),* with the well-known £10 castles being promoted on the borders of the Pale. This was also a time in which the Irish were able to push back the Anglo-Normans, effectively limiting Anglo-Norman control of the country. Katherine Simms *(chapter 5)* reports more in detail on Gaelic warfare during the middle ages. Irish kings employed vassal nobility and tenants in their troops. The troops were often led by the captain of the royal household, and consisted of kerns and Irish professional military horsemen, who did not own or rent land and thus were without private means of subsistence. The introduction of Scottish galloglasses, starting in the 11th and 12th century, considerably changed the composition of opposing Gaelic forces. Some of these mercenary galloglasses were later given land and established their own lineage among the Irish. As Simms points out, the galloglasses were not only employed to thwart external threat, but also strengthened Irish lords' control over the people of his own sept.

Steven G. Ellis *(chapter 6)* focuses on the establishment of a standing army during Tudor times. This type of army was much needed, because of the presence of many internal borders within the island, and because of the repeated internal threats to the Dublin government. The nature of campaigns during this period changed much due to the gradual introduction of guns, which could batter down most castle walls, but which were difficult to transport in much of the Irish terrain. The siege of Dublin by Lord Offaly, with his 15,000 men in 1535, was a turning point in the need for a standing army. Ciaran Brady *(chapter 7)* stresses the increased violence between the crown's forces and private armies of native lords. He reviews the *'little wars,'* without decisive battles, but characterized by scorch and destroy techniques. A network of garrisons was established, but these did not cover the whole of the country by far. The size of the standing army gradually increased, from 1,200 to 6,000 before 1593, to 20,000 at the siege of Kinsale in 1603. Local control, however, was in the hands of captains, who with the constables of castles and senechals were the agents of social and political reform in 16th century Ireland.

Jane Ohlmeyer *(chapter 8)* stresses a new element in Irish conflict: the wars of religion. Catholic Italian and Spanish forces, funded by the Pope, landed at Smerwick in 1579 and Spanish forces landed in Munster in 1601, each of which took considerable government forces to defeat. The next set of

religious conflicts ensued from the Rebellion of 1641, which was followed by *'the wars of the three kingdoms.'* Whereas the *Confederates* were able to muster armies in the field, reinforced by Irish soldiers returning from the continent, factional divisions, based on regional loyalties, undermined their effectiveness. The invasion by Cromwell, with the new model army, produced some major sieges of towns *(e.g., Drogheda, Wexford, Clonmel)* and hundreds of sieges of castles in the countryside. At the height of the war there were four separate armies in the field, consisting of circa 40,000 to 50,000 soldiers. The feeding and supplying of these troops was an unprecedented burden to noncombattant native Irishmen. John Child *(chapter 9)* continues the story of the religious war with a review of the course of the Williamite War from 1689 to 1691. The war was precipitated by the purging of Protestant officers by the Earl of Tyrconnell. At the height of the war, there were two regular armies *(one of which was led by James I, the other by William III)* and the Enniskillen and Londonderry forces. Sieges of town were rare *(a notable exception was Limerick)*, and decisive battles were fought on the field *(such as at the Boyne)*. After the conclusion of the war, in 1691, 19,000 soldiers of the Jacobite forces sailed to the continent, where many joined the armies of other states.

From the second half of the 17th century onward, the organization of the Irish military establishment improved considerably. Alan J. Guy *(chapter 10)* addresses this by answering such questions as: was the army in Ireland combat efficient? did the king's army function as an occupational force? and, what changes took place in the religious profile of soldiers in the army? Regimentation only started in 1672 and was completed by 1683. In that period, a militia was formed, which later assisted in disarming Catholics, but soon was disbanded itself. The militia played a role in the Williamite War in 1690-1, but was not formally re-established until 1716. The standing army during the 18th century was large, amounting to 7,000 soldiers, effectively serving as an army of occupation. Military organization was unusual: there was no general, the Lord Lieutenant was in charge, with his chief secretary effectively serving as the equivalent of a secretary of war. Some integration of the Irish army with the English army meant service in the British colonies, including India, the East Indies, and America. S. J. Connolly *(chapter 11)* describes in detail the role of army and militia in the defence of Ireland in the period 1660 to 1760. He shows how social and political order was moulded by military force. The war with France, that followed the conclusion of the Williamite War in Ireland, further reinforced the defensive function of the Irish territorial army, both to thwart external and internal threats to English sovereignty in Ireland. Thus, the army became an essential component in enforcing public order.

However, disaffection with government grew, leading to the rebellion of 1798. Thomas Bartlett *(chapter 12)* reviews the events leading up to the rebellion and the government's military response. The renewed hostilities between France and England in 1793 led to the withdrawal of most regular forces from Ireland. This left a vacuum that was filled by the establishment of the largely Catholic Irish militia in that year, the English and Scottish Fencibles *(early 1795)*, followed by the founding of a largely Protestant Irish Yeomanry in 1796. Sectarian conflict accelerated in Ulster in 1792-3, and the Dublin government was faced with dealing with a French invasion in 1796 and combatting a growing insurgency, leading to the insurrection of 1798 led by the Ulster United Irishmen and followed soon in the South. Bartlett provides much detail about the course of subsequent battles and small wars, leading to the defeat of the insurgents.

The next two chapters concern special aspects of military history during the 17th and 18th centuries. First, Harman Murtagh *(chapter 13)* reviews the activities of Irish soldiers abroad in the armies of Spain, France, and the Habsburg monarchy in central Europe. He chronicles the history of

Irish brigades and regiments in foreign service and the careers of commanders, some of whom became officials in governments abroad, were given estates and established lineages of continental landownership. Eventually, Irish regiments abroad saw dwindling numbers of Irish in their ranks, and the disbandonment of regiments led to large problems for its soldiers and officers and their families. He also discusses the implications of the employment of Irishmen in British forces, both in England and in the colonies. Second, David W. Miller *(chapter 14)* reviews non-professional soldiery in the context of the *"polity,"* that is the subset of a population among whom there is a regular contention for power. He distinguishes between two forms of non-professional soldiery: sheriffs, justices of the peace and their helpers, and Protestant militia. These two functions emerged subsequent to the introduction of settlers in plantation areas in Munster and Ulster, which initially did not have a military organization. A mostly Protestant militia flourished somewhat from the late 1660s to the middle 1680s, and, after 1689, became part of regular Irish life. The militia and other non-professional soldiers were needed against the dispossessed Catholic elite, the tories and rapparees, the possible invasion by France and the Pretender, and the lower orders. From 1715, independent or volunteer companies were raised and funded by gentlemen in the country and towns, partly in response to the government's lack of support for a militia and the depletion of the regular army. The functions of these volunteers consisted largely of policing, advocacy of their interests, and ceremonies. Later the volunteers included Presbyterians and Catholics.

The next two chapters concern military affairs in 19th century Ireland and abroad. E. M. Spiers *(chapter 15)* illustrates how Irishmen continued to enlist in a stunningly diverse list of armies abroad. He continues the history of foreign wars in which large numbers of Irish served, such as the second Mahratta War *(1803-6)*, the Nepal War *(1814-15)*, and the Peninsular War *(1808-15)*. He explores the many reasons for Irishmen to enlist. They mostly served in the infantry and artillery, and less in the cavalry. Members of the Anglo-Irish landed gentry, especially younger sons who did not qualify for succession to the family estate, sought out military service. The purchase system for officer positions continued unabated until its abolishment in 1871. The century also saw the infiltration by Fenians of the English army. Remarkably, many Irishmen served on the American continent during the War of Independence, and in the Anglo-Irish army raised for South America. There, the St. Patrick's battalion fought for Mexico and for the independence of Venezuela. Virginia Crossman *(chapter 16)* addresses the function of the army in 19th century Ireland to maintain law and order. About 15,000 to 30,000 troops were stationed in the country to serve a vital role in law enforcement, supporting the civil powers during the land and tithe wars. These troops consisted partly of Irishmen, whose loyalty to the crown usually did not swerve. Moveable columns were used to deal with agrarian unrest, complemented by flying columns later, which included magistrates to administer justice. Also, the army was used to provide protection for the landlords and for reaping of crops.

The last chapters cover military changes during the 20th century. David Fitzpatrick *(chapter 17)* shows that the British army increasingly drew recruits from Irishmen living in England. In Ireland, the Special Reserve was created to replace the militia and Royal Irish Constabulary. Popular reaction had far-reaching effects. The Ulster Volunteer Force was formed, reinforced by the importation of arms. In reaction, the Irish Citizens' Army was founded. In turn, these organizations became dwarfed by the Irish Volunteers, formed in Dublin in 1913. The outbreak of the First World War in the next year was followed by massive recruitment in Ireland for the British army, especially for active service in France. In Ireland, conflict continued to ferment, leading to the ineffective Easter Rising of 1916. The savage repression of

18

noncombatants further fuelled military nationalism. The demilitarization of 1918, after the end of the First World War, was followed by large scale unemployment of returning soldiers, reinvigorating major private armies in Ireland according to sectarian lines. In addition, the Irish Republican Army was founded after the creation of Dáil Éireann in 1919. The measures executed by the Black and Tans, as a special police force, further led to widespread actions against civilians. Eunan O'Halpin (chapter 18) further follows military developments in Ireland, starting with the war of independence from 1919 onwards. The IRA little heeded the influence of politicians and, in an anti-treaty spirit, launched attacks on departing British troops and police. Soon after, Civil War started in 1922, leading to a five-fold increase in the Irish army's size. At the end of the war, the new Irish army was in a very poor condition. Further unrest culminated in the establishment of a semi-secret organisation, the O[ld]IRA. At the end of the Civil War, the Irish standing army still did not fully exercise territorial control: Britain retained control over the Irish ports until 1938. The Irish army, in the meantime, was poorly equipped and suffered major financial handicaps. Defence preparations, however, needed to be made in 1936-39, culminating in the mobilisation of 1939, when the army was increased to a force of 20,000 men. The Irish army's role during neutrality in the period of 1939-45 is highlighted. In a final chapter, Keith Jeffery (chapter 19) chronicles the role of the British army in Ireland after 1922, particularly the military activities resulting from the troubles in the North.

This brief summary cannot do justice to the sophistication of *A military history of Ireland*. The mosaic of recurring events over centuries is both stunning and perplexing: internal conflicts, external threats, increased organization of army units, waxing and waning of militias, the emergence and endurance of insurrectional forces, the increasing role of a regular army in peace keeping on a local level, and the role of religion as a diverging force, continued throughout the 17th to the 20th centuries.

Personally, I would like to have understood better Irish military history as a symbiosis between military personnel, military activities, the often difficult terrain, with its extensive woods, bogs, and mountains, and military architecture erected to exert control. Flanagan and Frame discuss some of these aspects, but the volume does not present a good review of the defensive functions of crannogs, castles, coastal and inland forts, barracks and garrisons. However, this volume is an important milestone in Irish military studies and is bound to fascinate and instruct readers on the functions and malfunctions of military might.

ROLF LOEBER
PITTSBURGH, PA.

****

DAVID BRETT. *The Construction of Heritage.* Pp 172, Cork: Cork University Press, 1996, IR£32.00 cased; 1-85918-052-3; IR£14.75 pb. 1-85918-053-1

There is a clear need for some critical analysis of the elements of heritage tourism in Ireland and Europe today. The designation heritage 'industry' is a signpost to the pitfalls that mark these journeys back in time - to use what Brett might call the de-problematised spatial language of many heritage centres. Tourism-driven, Euro-funded and commodified strategies have resulted in shallowly-based developments which are directly attributable to a lack of understanding or poor technological appreciation and appropriation of the past.

The Construction of Heritage is seriously concerned with addressing this deficiency in the methodology of heritage tourism and the application of critical theory to its development in Ireland and universally. This is of immense importance in Ireland, which is so dependant on tourism and heritage. The dangers are there for all to see, suggested in Brett's example of central York which increasingly resembles its own museum of the 16th century town.

How much of Ireland's heritage - so valuable to us and our tourism industry - is constructed? The aestheticisation of history suggests, in Brett's words, *"the validation of experience by art"*, where concepts of the picturesque and sublime have been adopted in our approaches to heritage and all the touristic, commercial, planning, interpretive and conservationist strategies which we apply to our pasts. We have been culturally conditioned, since the celtic revivalism of the later 19th century, to see ourselves as passionate Celts, warm and vivacious, wild, irrational and sublime. Ours is a fairyland of mist, magic and legend; a past fabricated by Yeats, which had little enough connection with the real world around him, but which has been appropriated by the modern Irish tourism industry. Pearse's representation of a similarly distinctive Ireland - pastoral and Gaelic - was appropriated by the new Irish state in the twentieth century. Yeats's *'Inishfree'* is more real than the real island; Joyce's Bloomsday, an even more ephemeral non-historial event, is now a real part of Dublin's heritage.

Bearing in mind the role of picturesque and sublime concepts in strategies of modern heritage tourism, Brett examines the achievements of five case studies, four of them Irish, viz. the Ulster-American Folk Park, Eamhain Macha *(the Navan Centre in Armagh)*, Céide Fields and Strokestown Famine Museum. As an academic devoted to the history of Design in the University of Ulster, he is particularly interested in the application of critical theory to the physical presentation of heritage, so his case studies focus on the visualisation *(in representational and ideological senses)*, simulation and narrative topology of the five cases. Following the intensively conceptual discussion in his early chapters, these case studies focus on what to many readers will be an interesting analysis of the methodology of display and exhibition, for example, the way in which a display's objectives can be facilitated or obstructed by the layout of different spaces - *"the circulation pattern is part of the constructive of a narrative"*. The Famine museum receives full marks in this sense in that it allows the visitor to move around fairly freely to 'construct' her own narrative; conversely the Navan Centre forces her through a rigidly-determined narrative. Brett's prescription for a comprehensive spatial interpretation of the average big house is impractical but instructive - involving three separate journey perspectives as *'servant'*, *'master'* and *'mistress'*! There is another interesting discussion on the technical nature and use of pictorial representation in the *Illustrated London News* during the Irish famine by artists and reporters who seem to have been aware that the calamity stretched their craft to its technical and conceptual limits. Cultural conditioning in the traditions of the picturesque and the sublime continues to influence the mode of representation and awareness of this conditioning - and its mediation in our interrogation of the past - must inform our heritage interpretation strategies today. In the end, Brett encourages us not to assume a singular, say a 'picturesque', strategy to understand, represent and interpret our past but, as in the Famine Museum, that "we, the visitors, create the integration and integrity of the experience; we are not given an *'interpretation'"(p164)*.

The Construction of Heritage is an important book. It is skillfully and thoughtfully written. Indeed, in keeping with its author's background in design, it is a beautifully crafted book which presents a logically- structured argument that needs to be followed throughout. The case studies can certainly be

read in some isolation, but to appreciate the provocative critiques which are presented, the book must be read as a whole. While the author has the greatest respect for the integrity of the average viewer/visitor *(consumer in the tourism industry's parlance)*, -all the time favouring the centrality of the visitor's individual creativity in the interpretative process - a lot of the book's argumentation is somewhat esoteric if not elitist in its preoccupations. The symbolism in the constructed narrative of Céide's design - death, resurrection, enlightenment, return - would leave the average punter gobsmacked. In the Navan Centre, the author justifiably criticises the naivieties and paradoxes in mixing orthodox heritage interpretation with recreational tourism. But I wonder about his arguments that the Centre uses what he calls *'deproblematised sublimity and collective amnesia'* in its flights of *'other-world'* fantasy as a process of normalising a society where terrorism and racketeeering prevail? Having watched a coach disgorge fifty *(noisy)* OAPs at one Irish heritage experiment, I am skeptical about some of this critical theory! A final complaint - while the marginal referencing and notes represent the resurrection of a nice piece of typographical heritage, the absence of a bibliography is a serious drawback for those wishing to follow-up a reference.

But this is a book meriting serious consideration by those interested in studying popular history or heritage. And it contains some gems: using history as a verb to represent our role in its telling: *"We history. From which it follows that history is not given, but made"(p.4).* And a recurring theme: *"Issues of the past tend swiftly toward the definition of the present" (p.8).* Finally, William Gilpin's 1786 representation of Oliver Cromwell must surely be an opportunity for somebody in Ireland - revisionist historian or tourism entrepreneur: "that picturesque genius [who] omitted no opportunity of adorning the countries, through which he passed , with noble ruins".

P.J. DUFFY,
ST. PATRIACK'S COLLEGE,
MAYNOOTH.

****

TOBY BARNARD AND JANE CLARK (Eds.), *Lord Burlington. Architecture, Art and Life.* Pp 328 + 72 drawings, plates and plans. London: The Hambledon Press, 1995. £37.50. 1-85285-094-9.

This well produced and copiously illustrated volume provides eloquent testimony to the fascination which eighteenth-century aristocrats and their *milieu* continue to hold for modern historians. When the aristocrat in question held both British and Irish peerages and possessed property in both countries, the fascination is all the more profound. Such men were placed in an uniquely ambiguous position within British and Irish society. With interests and responsibilities on both sides of the Irish Sea, and identities that were often perceived to be neither wholly English nor truly Irish, they were particularly vulnerable to the vagaries of high government policy and their consequences for Anglo-Irish relations. Some distanced themselves from these ambiguities by operating exclusively within an English domain, but even so, and especially in cases where their Irish estates were an important source of income, they could not isolate themselves entirely from their *'Irish'* identity.

So it proved with the central character in this book: Richard Boyle, the 'architect earl', 3rd Earl of Burlington and 4th Earl of Cork (1694-1753). As the great great grandson of the 1st Earl of Cork (the title skipped a generation on the premature death of Burlington's grandfather), he inherited over 90,000 acres in Munster from the vast acreage his ancestor had amassed throughout Ireland, together *(through the marriage of his great grandfather, the 2nd Earl of Cork, to Elizabeth, the Clifford heiress)* with estates at Bolton Abbey and Londesborough in Yorkshire and property at Chiswick and Picadilly in and near London. The Yorkshire estates were large but not particularly remunerative; the London property small though relatively valuable. Thus the bulk of Burlington's income came from Ireland, but in true absentee fashion, though he planned to go to Lismore to see about rebuilding the castle there in 1728, there is no record of his ever having visited his Irish estates.

Indeed it is as architect and architectural patron that Burlington is best remembered. As one standard biographical dictionary puts it, he was

> ....an enthusiastic architect, a great admirer of Palladio, and patron of the arts generally. By his influence over a group of young architects [he] was responsible for fostering the Palladian precept which was to govern English building for half a century.[1]

But as the editors of this volume point out, this sort of conventional appraisal is based on Burlington's well-attested architectural *oeuvre* alone; surprisingly little is known about the man himself, and no biography of him as yet exists.

It is this void which the editors have sought to fill with a collection of essays which deal with various aspects of Burlington's career from a revisionist standpoint. The new message comes through somewhat unevenly, but as clearly as the frequently subjective and circumstantial evidence allows. Far from being an establishment Whig, loyal to the Hanoverian succession and concerned, as Howard Colvin states in his cautious introduction, to embody in his architecture *"the intellectual values of the dawning Age of Reason",* the 3rd Earl *may* have been an active Jacobite and Free Mason, who supported attempts at the Stuart Restoration with his immense wealth, and signalled his support in the symbolism used in his 'new house' at Chiswick.

The two chapters which focus most closely on this quite startling reinterpretation are Richard Hewlings' meticulously documented discussion of the sources and meaning of the gardens and architecture at Chiswick, which opens the book, and Jane Clark's concluding essay which interprets Burlington's travels and expenditure in terms of a Jacobite agenda. In essence these are the core of the work, indeed, at 149 pages Hewlings' piece takes up approximately half the entire volume. Much of Hewlings' discussion is concerned with identifying the origins of the various architectural *motifs* used at Chiswick. On the basis of his painstaking and amply - if rather minutely - illustrated analysis, he concludes that, far from being an exercise in *Palladian* architecture, the house borrows more from other sixteenth-century architects such as Castell, Montfaucon and Serlio, and *far* more from the ancients themselves. Hewlings concludes that Burlington was in fact *"indifferent"* to Palladio as an architect, but used his and others' skills as archaeological draughtsmen to draw inspiration directly from sixteenth-century representations of Classical architecture. Chiswick thus emerges not as an important essay in Palladian taste, but as something else: a carefully contrived architectural *'text'*, whose form, decoration and surroundings could be read as an allegorical statement of support for the Stuart cause, imbued with the imagery of Free Masonry and in subversive opposition to the Hanoverian regime.

Hewlings' arguments are persuasive, but it must be said that much depends on whether we find his interpretation of the forms and symbols used in the villa's architecture and

decoration and in the design of its gardens to be convincing. There is no hard evidence either way. Clark's chapter reaches a similar conclusion but by a different route. Here, the evidence is perhaps even more circumstantial but is intriguing nevertheless. Clark has no difficulty in establishing that Burlington made contact with members of the exiled Stuart court at Saint-Germain in 1714-15, at the start of his Grand Tour and at a time when Queen Anne was dying and the question of the British succession was very much in the balance. Burlington's contacts with other Stuart exiles, frequently made under the sobriquet of 'Mr Buck', continued during his subsequent visits to the continent, and he was evidently known to the exiled James III. But more intriguing than either this or his acquaintance with Jacobite families in England, is the question of his finances. Clark demonstrates that Burlington's enormous debts peaked at precisely the time - circa 1717 and between 1725-1732 - when James' English followers were being called upon to raise money for the intended invasion. One clear possibility is that these debts - and the sales which they prompted of part of the Earl's Irish estates - were caused by his contributions to the Stuart cause. The point is unprovable, but it prompts two further speculations. If this *was* the case, then we are left, first, with the considerable irony that the dismemberment of one of the greatest of Irish 'great estates', founded and managed for much of the 17th century in support of the Protestant cause, was undertaken to support the restoration of a Catholic king of England. Second, and this is a point Clark also makes, that when the 3rd Earl's daughter and heiress, Charlotte, married the Marquis of Hartington, the future 4th Duke of Devonshire, in 1748, it may have been intended by the Devonshires - themselves staunch Whigs - as insurance in case of a future Stuart succession. Burlington's debts were well known at the time; so too, Clark implies, may have been his real political sympathies.

The remaining chapters provide various contexts for this reinterpretation. McParland uses the career of Edward Lovett Pearce, arguably with James Gandon one of the two eighteenth-century Irish architects of international repute, to discuss Burlington's curiously limited influence on the early Irish Palladians, while Erskine-Hill explores his role as friend and patron of Alexander Pope. Given the poet's Catholicism and well-attested suspicion of the Hanoverian court and government, Erskine-Hill suggests that the Augustan relationship he enjoyed with Burlington as patron, may have signalled the latter's true political inclinations. Similarly, in tracing Burlington's participation in parliamentary debates both prior to and after his resignation of office in 1733 - conventionally ascribed to George II's failure to keep his word to the earl - Cruickshanks concludes that he was very much a 'political animal'. Although disappointed in his expectations of high office before 1733, thereafter *"he attended faithfully when matters concerning Yorkshire, Irish affairs, or affecting his friends or dependents, came before parliament"*. Although Cruickshanks doesn't explicitly develop the theory of Burlington's Jacobinism, such political awareness would not have been inappropriate to it. The two remaining chapters set more general contexts. Toby Barnard explores the complex social and political world of seventeenth-century Ireland and Anglo-Irish relations, and charts the course by which the 1st Earl of Burlington - the architect earl's great grandfather - managed to preserve the family's Irish patrimony, although ironically at the eventual cost of their Irish identity. Murray Pittock deconstructs *The Aeneid* as a Jacobite text, and as Colvin points out, provides a meaningful basis for Hewlings' reading of the symbolism employed by Burlington at Chiswick.

What does this all add up to? At the very least, the contributors have provided us with a radical re-interpretation of the life and work of one of the leading eighteenth-century architectural figures which, if it cannot be proven beyond all doubt, nevertheless seems to justify the editors' claim that it calls for "a reassessment of many aspects of eighteenth-

century life and thought". In addition, it admirably exemplifies the benefits which can accrue from interdisciplinary studies which offer a series of perspectives on some common theme or subject. In this instance, the subject was one of the foremost patrons of the Arts in eighteenth-century England. If he was also a clandestine Jacobite and active opponent of the Hanoverian regime, then we now know him so much the better.

LINDSAY PROUDFOOT
QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
BELFAST

1) J.O. Thornes and T.C. Collocott (eds.), *Chambers Biographical Dictionary* (Edinburgh, 1988), p. 209.

****

RAYMOND GILLESPIE (Ed.) Cavan: Essays on the History of an Irish County. Pp. 240. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1995, IR£19.95 cased; 0-7165-2553-4 IR£14.95 pbk. 0-7165-2554-2.

This book started life as a series of lectures in the winter of 1993-4 at the request of the Breifne Historical Society. The structure of the series is interesting because it reflects the strategy of the editor, Raymond Gillespie, who also organised the speakers. As Gillespie has been a pioneer of the teaching, writing and publication of local history in Ireland, we value his assessment of the potential of source materials for opening up fresh themes. To this end he has selected a team of individuals whose previous publications have proved their ability to handle specialised sources. They have been able also to draw on the articles published in the *Journal of the Breifne Antiquarian and Historical Society*. As in the volume on Longford, edited by Gillespie and Gerard Moran and published in 1991, Gillespie has been well served by the team he selected.

The sub-title of this volume emphasises that it was not designed to provide a history of Cavan, as such, but 'to open up new perspectives on the past of the region now known as county Cavan'. The essays should be regarded ' as a series of bore-holes through the complicated social fabric of the past which provide a series of glimpses of that world. The focus and breadth of vision of those glimpses can be much improved by local historians studying both the themes examined in this book and others, such as the workings of the linen industry and the great landed estates, which have been omitted here, in their own area.' (p.13)

In his introduction Gillespie points out that, while all local historians are concerned with three variables, people, place, and time, most of them have tended to concentrate on place. He argues that our main concern should be instead the people who occupied that place, whether townland, county or diocese. Each of these units, along with baronies and parishes, 'reflects a different experience and to select only one is to limit the scope of any local study, both chronologically and thematically.' This is counsel of perfection and, as such, it should become embedded in the agenda of local history. It does not prevent the editor, however, from opening the series with Paddy Duffy's 'Perspective on the making of the Cavan Landscape' as if it was designed to provide a backdrop for all the action to come. Duffy's essay, however, is much too powerful in its concepts to accept any subordinate role and it is evident that in editing the volume Gillespie has been trying to relate them to his own research and to tease out their implications. It might have been wiser to move this essay to the end of the book where it could have introduced a discussion about the changing nature of the local history

agenda. Such a move would have forced the editor to extend his introduction and perhaps to expand on his point that 'the fabric of local society was often not created by the prominent but the ordinary.' He has to admit that in this volume there is a traditional focus on prominent figures such as great lords, clergy, and members of parliament.

The fate of the great lords takes up the next two chapters. Ciaran Parker diagnoses Cavan as a medieval border area dominated by the O'Reillys after they had managed to throw off the O'Rourke yoke with Anglo-Norman assistance. *'Its position on the periphery of the Anglo-Norman lordship, while giving its rulers and their cadet branches the opportunities for hostile incursions and territorial aggrandisement, also left it vulnerable to counter attacks and military intervention...'* (p.49) Bernadette Cunningham, in 'The anglicisation of East Breifne: the O'Reillys and the emergence of County Cavan', traces the stages by which the influence of the Dublin government increased, so that it was able to tighten its control over the region. Its intention was *'to remove the need for the confrontational politics of the Gaelic system of tanistry, and replace it with English style landownership and inheritance structures.'* (p.60) She has observed, however, how *'the Tudor attempts at peaceful reform in Ulster had undermined the political authority of the traditional elite, while encouraging their followers to demand increased autonomy'* until *'the power struggle degenerated into rebellion throughout much of Ulster by 1594.'* (p.69)

It is the diocese of Kilmore that unites the succeeding three essays: Alan Ford's *The Reformation in Kilmore before 1641'*, Raymond Gillespie's own *'Faith, family, and fortune: the structures of everyday life in early modern Cavan'*, and James Kelly's, *'The formation of the modern Catholic Church in the diocese of Kilmore, 1580-1880'*. Ford examines the progress of the Reformation in Kilmore, especially under Bishop William Bedell, and concludes that *'Kilmore both encapsulates the various strategies and tactics employed by the Protestant church to foster the Reformation, and at the same time provides a means of judging the success or failure of national religious politics at the diocesan level.'* (p.75). In contrast, James Kelly explains the ultimate success of the Catholic Church in reorganising the diocese of Kilmore along Tridentine lines, while admitting that it was long delayed by political and economic circumstances as well as opposition from members of its clergy. The religious theme is given an extra dimension by Gillespie's paper examining the tremendous changes made by the seventeenth century to the structures of everyday life in Cavan. *'Religion was central to the understanding of every aspect of life from the physical landscape to the political and social structure. All these were the result of direct intervention of the supernatural power of God in the world.'* (pp 103-4) He emphasises the importance of *'extended lineages'* in local society and their relationship to the pattern of violence. He reckons that they had been supplanted before 1700 so that *'a man's landholding and social position was determined not by his family or his background but by the contracts or leases into which he entered.'* (p. 110) He would have to admit, however, that the old tradition took a long time to die.

The series concludes with studies of the local responses to three major national events in the more modern period: Margaret Crawford's essay 'Poverty and the Famine in County Cavan' provides a model for anyone who wants to study the poor and their life-styles in the nineteenth century and to plot the local course of the Great Famine. It is important that the Famine should be viewed in its local context: there is no comparison between the impact of the Famine in Mayo and in Wexford. The same point could be made about Gerard Moran's 'The emergence and consolidation of the Home Rule Movement in County Cavan 1870-86', which places Cavan in the national picture. While his footnotes display a broad knowledge of political history at the county level, the local historian must speculate about what this essay can tell us

about Cavan society and the groups that composed it. It would be interesting, for example, to know the views of the town commissioners and, after 1898, the urban and rural district councillors. Eileen Reilly's Cavan in the era of the Great War, 1914-18, juxtaposes the changing scene of local and national politics with the carnage of the Great War, so that those who returned from the war found themselves marginalised and their sacrifices overlooked. When so much of her source material was taken from newspapers, it is pity that she did not have as much access to the unionist weekly newspaper in Cavan, the *Irish Post*, as she had to the nationalist *Anglo-Celt*. Might this have affected her interpretation?

This doubt should make us reflect on one of the major constrictions on the development of local history, if only in the long run; the absence of source materials for the study of specific topics such as the linen industry and the great landed estates mentioned by the editor in his introduction. The commemoration of the Great Famine has made us more aware of this problem and the Irish Famine Network have published two guides to Famine archives, 1840-55. Even where such materials have survived, they may not have received the curatorial and conservation treatments that they require before they can be made available for the scrutiny of the local historian, i.e. they may not even be listed! The writing of local history of high quality owes much to the work of librarians and archivists.

W. H. CRAWFORD
FEDERATION FOR ULSTER LOCAL STUDIES.

****

RUTH FINNEGAN (Series Eds). *Studying family and Community History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press in association with the Open University, 1994.
Vol 1. RUTH FINNEGAN AND MICHAEL DRAKE (Eds).
From family tree to family history. £35.00 hbk.
0-521-46001-8 £11.95pbk. 0-521-46577-X
Vol 2. W.T.R. PRICE (Ed.) *From family history to community history* £35.00 hbk.
0-521-46002-6: £11.95 pbk. 0-521-46578-8
Vol 3. JOHN GOLBY (Ed.) *Communities and families*
£35.00 hbk. 0-521-46003-4:
£11.95 pbk. 0-521-46579-6
Vol 4. MICHAEL DRAKE AND RUTH FINNEGAN (Eds.)
Sources and methods for family and community historians: a handbook. £35.00 hbk. 0-521-46004-2
£11.95 pbk. 0-521-46580-X

Even a cursory survey of the sort of historical work produced in Ireland over the last decade or so would reveal three main classes of endeavour. First, there are the scholarly monographs preoccupied with the doings of politicians, governments and churchmen. Secondly, there are many local studies of particular places and, finally, though published work does not reflect its real dynamism, there are genealogical studies of individual families. In the main, these three approaches to the experience of the past have dwelt in isolation from one another, but there are now signs of a productive cross-fertilisation between the different disciplines. Local historians, in Ireland as elsewhere, are trying to understand the relationship of their own work to that of others and to grapple with the thorny problem of the links between local, regional and national history.

These four volumes, produced as part of the Open University's course 'Studying family and community history: nineteenth and twentieth centuries', make a significant contribution to the interchange of ideas between those who try to understand the past. The first volume begins by using the techniques of the genealogist to study an individual family and then set that family in context. The second volume explores the link between individual families and that more nebulous concept 'community' by looking at how communities are formed through migrations of individuals and groups. The third volume looks at the experience of communities in the past through a series of themes: work, politics, religion and culture. While each volume introduces research strategies and techniques, such as relevant statistical concepts, the fourth volume tries to draw together some of the techniques of dealing with written, visual and oral sources, using quantitative methods and computers and describes how to present a study.

Taken together there is no doubt that these volumes constitute the single best introduction to local historical study which underlines the importance of history for the genealogist and the significance of genealogy for the historian. They offer practical help on starting a project and guide the historian through the many pitfalls which await the unwary. Local historians, for example, do not like people who move about, preferring to deal with closed geographical communities, yet these volumes underline the importance of understanding migration and building it into local studies. While many of the examples offered are based on English evidence, there are some, such as that on nineteenth century migration, which draw directly on Irish evidence. However, many of the case studies may serve as models for future Irish studies. The case study of Katherine Buildings in the first volume is an example of what could be undertaken for any block of flats in Ireland.

These volumes open up a new perspective on the local past. This is local history at its best, based on people rather than on places. No one who even vaguely considers themselves to be a genealogist or local historian should be without these volumes.

<div align="right">RAYMOND GILLESPIE
ST PATRICKS COLLEGE
MAYNOOTH</div>

****

NEWSLETTER

ANNUAL CONFERENCE, 1996

Welcomed with a civic reception, provided by Westport Urban District Council, and opened with a message from President Robinson, the 1996 annual conference was held in the Olde Railway Hotel, Westport, on the week-end of 10 - 12 May. Organised in association with the Westport Historical Society and the Mayo Archaeological and Historical Society, the theme of the conference was 'South Mayo and its settlement'.

Papers were presented by by Paul Gosling (Archaeological Survey) on 'The Archaeology of Clare Island'; Nollaig O'Muraile (Queens University) on'Late Medieval and Gaelic Surveys of counties Mayo and Sligo'; Helen (Walton) Perros (North Carolina State University) on 'The Anglo Normans in Connaught, 1170 - 1224'; Bernadette Cunningham (Dublin Diocesan Library) on 'Lordship and Landownership in County Mayo, 1550 - 1630'; Sheila Mulloy (Westport Historical Society and formerly of Irish Manuscripts Commission) on 'From Cromwell to William: Landownership transformation in county Mayo, 1649 - 1700'; Joe McDermott (Mayo Archaeological and Historical Society) on 'Eighteenth century urban and village transformation; the case of Newport Pratt' and Desmond McCabe (National Famine Research Project) on 'Population and land settlement in County Mayo, 1740 - 1840'. The Saturday

afternoon field trip took participants to Turlough church and round tower and included a practical demonstration of the cooking of two lambs at a reconstructed fulachta fia site by Gerry Lawless of the Mayo Archaeological and Historical Society and members of his family. The annual dinner was preceded by a visit to Westport House for a wine reception and tour, courtesy of Lord and Lady Altamont, who welcomed conference paticipants. The conference concluded with a walking tour of Westport town impressively conducted by Bronagh Joyce of the Westport Historical Society. Westport 1996 was a memorable and very successful annual conference.

****

THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON URBAN HISTORY"CITIES IN EASTERN AND WESTERN EUROPE" BUDAPEST, 29TH-31ST AUGUST 1996

The third conference of the European Association of Urban Historians was held at the Central European University in Budapest, where papers dealt with a variety of aspects of the European city from the Early Modern period to the twentieth century.

The key-note speech by Professor Heinz Schilling of the Humboldt University in Berlin, was delivered in Budapest Town Hall. Schilling's paper dealt with Church and State in the European town in the Early Modern period.

A session on The topography of Medieval Towns was chaired by Terry Slater (University of Birmingham), where a number of interesting papers were offered. Tony Scrase (U.W.E., Birmingham) presented a paper which discussed processes and triggers of change in medieval towns. The main thrust of this paper was that while 'organic towns' may not be regular and grid-iron in structure, planning goes beyond layout. There are often four or five phases of development in towns and each of these place different emphasis on planning. Pat Dargan, of the Dublin Institute of Technology, delivered a paper which examined the influence of Celtic plan-forms on town planning in the British Isles and Europe. Making extensive use of examples from Ireland, England, Wales and France, this paper highlighted the influence which this distinctly Irish town form has had on the development of urban morphology throughout the Western extremities of Europe. Also in the same session, Neven Budak of the University of Zagreb in Croatia presented an interesting paper on the concept of public and private spaces in Dalmatian towns.

In the session on European Small Towns Brian Graham, of the University of Ulster, delivered a paper on Town Tenant Protest in North-east Ireland, 1880-1914. The main process highlighted in Graham's paper was the way in which the all-Ireland campaign for tenurial reform was subsumed by political/sectarian struggle between nationalists and unionists, particularly in the north east of Ireland.

Helen Meller from Nottingham University chaired another well organised session which focused on the history of Leisure and Recreation in the European city. Among the papers presented were: The Tourism Industry in Late Imperial Vienna by Jill Steward of the University of Northumbria; Leisure and Identity in Cape Town c. 1838-1910 by Vivien Bickford-smith of the University of Cape Town; Public Parks in Glasgow 1850-1914, by Irene Maver of the University of Glasgow; The Commercialisation of Leisure in the 1800s in British Towns by Bob Morris of the University of Edinburgh; The Fashion of People-Watching in Post-Revolutionary Parisian Tourism, by Denise Z. Davidson of the University of Pennsylvania and; Leisure in Hannover during the 1920s, by Adelheid von Saldern

from the University of Hannover.

It was announced that the next conference in the series will be hosted by the Instituto Universitario di Architettura in Venice from the 3-5 September 1998. The title of the next seminar will be **European Cities: Places and Institutions.**

<div align="right">

KEVIN A. GRIFFIN
DUBLIN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

</div>

****

GROUP NEWS

COMMITTEE 1996-97

Following the 1996 Annual General Meeting held on Sunday 12th May 1996, in conjunction with the annual conference in Westport, Co. Mayo, the Committee elected for the year 1996-97 was as follows:

President	:	Dr. Harman Murtagh, Athlone, Co. Westmeath.
Hon. Secretary	:	Mr. Michael O'Hanrahan, Kilkenny.
Hon. Treasurer	:	Ms. Niamh Crowley, Waterford.
Hon. Managing Editor	:	Mr. Paul Ferguson Map Librarian Trinity College, Dublin.
Committee	:	Dr. Patrick J. Duffy, Associate Professor of Geography, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Co. Kildare.
		Mr. Charles Doherty, Department of Early and Medieval Irish History, University College, Dublin.
		Dr. Tadgh O'Keeffe, Department of Archaeology, University College, Dublin.
		Dr. Raymond Gillespie, Department of Modern History, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Co. Kildare.
		Mr. Michael Byrne, M. Litt. Tullamore, Co. Offaly.

NOTICE BOARD

Group for the Study of Irish Historic Settlement

ANNUAL CONFERENCE 1997
Friday 9th to Sunday 11th May 1997

Theme: "Settlement in the Upper Blackwater Valley (North Cork)"

Venue: The Hibernian Hotel, Mallow, Co. Cork

Speakers: Denis Power, Tadhg O'Keeffe, Matthew Stout, K.W. Nicholls, Rolf Loeber, Patrick O'Flanagan and David Dickson

Further information: Michael O'Hanrahan, Hon. Secretary, 12, Oak Road, Duke's Meadows, Kilkenny Telephone: 056 21667

ROSCREA SPRING CONFERENCE
Friday 4th to Sunday 6th April, 1997

Theme: 'The Monastic Midlands'

Venue: Mount St. Joseph's Abbey, Roscrea, Co. Tipperary

Further information: George Cunningham, M. Litt. Parkmore, Roscrea, Co. Tipperary Telephone: 0505 21619

THE GROUP FOR THE STUDY OF IRISH HISTORIC SETTLEMENT

The Group was founded in 1969 to encourage, co-ordinate and publish the study of Irish historic settlement, and to offer advice on matters relating to historic settlement which are of national and local concern.

The Group attempts to achieve these aims through an annual weekend conference, comprising lectures and fieldtrips, focusing on a particular area, and through publication of a biannual *Newsletter* and a series of scholarly monographs written by settlement experts.

Membership and paticipation in the annual conference and fieldtrips is open to all. Further information may be obtained from the Hon. Secretary: Mr. Michael O'Hanrahan, 12 Oak Road, Dukes Meadows, Kilkenny, Ireland.

IRISH SETTLEMENT STUDIES

1. B. J. Graham. *Anglo-Norman Settlement in Ireland. (1985). Out of print.*

2. C. T. Cairns. *Irish tower houses: a Co. Tipperary case study.* (1987). *Out of print.*

3. Rolf Loeber. *The geography and practise of English colonisation in Ireland, 1534-1609. (1991).*

4. B. J. Graham and L. Proudfoot. *Urban improvement in provincial Ireland, 1700-1840. (1994).*

5. J. H. Andrews. *Interpreting the Irish landscape: explorations in settlement history. (1997).*

6. M. Stout. *The Irish Ringfort.* IR19.95 cased (May, 1997).

Nos. 3 and 4 are available from Dr H. Murtagh, Mount View, Athlone, Co. Westmeath, at IR£6.00 each. No. 5 and subsequent numbers, are being published in association with Four Courts Press, 55, Prussia Street, Dublin 7, Ireland, from whom copies will be available as well as from bookshops.

****

SUBSCRIPTION NOTICE

The annual subscription for 1996-97 (IR£7. Students IR£5.) was due on 1st. May 1996. This may be sent direct to the Hon. Treasurer or paid by Bank Standing Order (the preferred method). A subscription renewal form incorporating a standing order mandate, is included with this *Newsletter.*

Members in Great Britain and Northern Ireland may now pay their annual subscription in sterling, by cheque or standing order.

Members who have not amended their bank standing order to take account of the increased subscription from 1st. May 1996 should now complete a new standing order for the amended rate.

****

****